

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Scientific and Educational Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

Master's thesis

**AMERICAN LEGAL ENGLISH OF THE 17TH CENTURY (BASED ON
THE COURT RECORDS OF THE SALEM WITCH TRIALS)**

Skiridova Anna

2nd year student of the Education Program
'English Communication Studies and Translation
and Two Western European Languages'
Field of science: 03 "Humanities"
Specialty: 035 "Philology"

Supervised by:

Karaban Anna, PhD

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 18.04.2023

Зав. кафедри _____ д. філол. н., проф. Алла БЄЛОВА

KYIV - 2023

Contents

INTRODUCTION	6
CHAPTER I Historical Legal English	9
1.1. Legal Discourse	9
1.1.1. Terms and Definitions	10
1.1.2. Modern Legal English	12
1.1.3. Legal Genres	15
1.1.4. American Tradition of Legal Discourse	20
1.2. Historical Varieties of English	22
1.2.1. Terms and Definitions of Diachronic Linguistics	22
1.2.1.1. Early Modern English Characteristics	24
1.2.2. Historical Varieties of American English	27
1.2.2.1. Historical and Linguistic Background of Salem	29
1.2.2.2. 17th Century American English	31
Chapter Conclusions	33
CHAPTER II SYNCHRONIC AND DIACHRONIC APPROACHES IN VARIETY STUDIES	34
2.1. Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches	34
2.2. Legal Linguistics	36
2.3. Salem Witchcraft Records	37
CHAPTER III CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF SALEM WITCH TRIALS ARCHIVES	39
3.1. Plea	39
3.1.1. Spelling	39

3.1.2. Grammar.....	39
3.1.3. Vocabulary.....	39
3.1.4. Structure.....	40
3.1.5. Conclusion.....	41
3.2. Mittimus.....	41
3.2.1. Spelling.....	41
3.2.2. Grammar.....	42
3.2.3. Vocabulary.....	43
3.2.4. Structure.....	44
3.2.5. Conclusion.....	45
3.3. Summons.....	46
3.3.1. Spelling.....	46
3.3.2. Grammar.....	46
3.3.3. Vocabulary.....	47
3.3.4. Structure.....	48
3.3.5. Conclusion.....	50
3.4. Recognizance.....	50
3.4.1. Spelling.....	51
3.4.2. Grammar.....	52
3.4.3. Vocabulary.....	53
3.4.4. Structure.....	54
3.4.5. Conclusion.....	56
3.5. Warrant.....	57
3.5.1. Spelling.....	57

3.5.2. Grammar.....	58
3.5.3. Vocabulary.....	59
3.5.4. Structure.....	61
3.5.5. Conclusion.....	63
3.6. Testimony	63
3.6.1. Spelling	63
3.6.2. Grammar.....	65
3.6.3. Vocabulary.....	66
3.6.4. Structure.....	67
3.6.5. Conclusion.....	68
3.7. Examination	69
3.7.1. Spelling	69
3.7.2. Grammar.....	70
3.7.3. Vocabulary.....	72
3.7.4. Structure.....	73
3.7.5. Conclusion.....	76
3.8. Indictment.....	76
3.8.1. Spelling	76
3.8.2. Grammar.....	77
3.8.3. Vocabulary.....	78
3.8.4. Structure.....	78
3.8.5. Conclusion.....	80
3.9. Deposition	80
3.9.1. Spelling	80

3.9.2. Grammar.....	82
3.9.3. Vocabulary.....	84
3.9.4. Structure.....	84
3.9.5. Conclusion.....	86
CONCLUSION.....	87
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDICES.....	101
Appendix 1.....	101
Appendix 2.....	102
Appendix 3.....	105
Appendix 4.....	109
Appendix 5.....	114
Appendix 6.....	118
Appendix 7.....	123
Appendix 8.....	131
Appendix 9.....	135

INTRODUCTION

In 1692, Salem Village in Massachusetts witnessed one of the most infamous events in American history: the witchcraft hysteria. Over the course of several months, more than 200 people were accused of witchcraft, and 20 were executed. The trials were characterized by a frenzied atmosphere of hysteria and suspicion, fueled by superstition, religious extremism, and social tensions. They left an indelible mark on American culture and inspired countless works of literature, art, and film.

However, the court records of the Salem Witch Trials are a unique historical source that provides invaluable insights into the legal, social, and cultural aspects of this dark chapter in American history since they comprise a vast collection of documents, including depositions, testimonies, warrants, and verdicts, that were produced during the trials and subsequent legal proceedings. What is even more important, these records offer a window into the peculiarities of the American legal English of the time, as well as a rich area for linguistic investigation.

The topicality of the research lies in the fact that the analysis of court proceedings of the Salem Witch Trials can provide valuable insight into the origins of the American legal language. In particular, it will help with uncovering the linguistic intricacies and nuances of the New World's colonial period.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive analysis of American legal English on the basis of court records of the Salem Witch Trials. By conducting a thorough examination of the language used in the court records, this paper seeks to contribute to our understanding of the development of language during the 17th century and provide insights into the linguistic practices of the time.

The purpose of the course paper entails the accomplishment of the following **tasks**:

- to identify the linguistic features and patterns of American legal English in the 17th century;
- to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the legal language utilized in court records of the Salem Witch Trials, classified by different genres;
- to examine orthographic features of American legal English and gain a deeper understanding of the spelling conventions and patterns in the 17th century;
- to conduct a lexical analysis of the language characteristics, present in the court records of the Salem Witch Trials;
- to investigate the grammatical features of 17th-century legal language in America;
- to inquire into the structural features of genres encountered in the court records of the Salem Witch Trials;
- to ascertain the probable impact of the social, cultural and historical context on the language used in the court records.

The object of this paper is American legal English employed in the 17th century.

The subject of our paper is the characteristics of legal genres presented in the court records of the Salem Witch Trials, which are to be analyzed based on their orthography, vocabulary, grammar, and structure.

The material for this study is drawn from the Documentary Archive of Salem Witch Trials, which comprises a digital collection of primary source documents pertaining to the Salem witch trials of 1692, as well as an updated transcription of the court records. The data chosen for analysis consists of 1 plea, 8 mittimuses, 10 summonses, 10 recognizances, 10 warrants, 10 testimonies, 10 examinations, 10 indictments and 10 depositions which in overall amounts to 39 pages, 24 799 words or 108 993 characters. This archive will provide us with ample data for observing American legal English across various legal genres, thereby enabling us to draw informed conclusions about its characteristics.

The methodology employed in this research is a combination of synchronic and diachronic approaches, which serve as complementary means for analyzing historical legal language. Diachronic analysis will provide insights into the historical background of the development of legal language in America, while synchronic analysis will enable us to explore legal language specifically in the 17th-century period and describe its unique characteristics at that time.

The scientific novelty of the paper is predicted by the assumption that despite the historical and cultural significance of the Salem Witch Trials, there has been a notable lack of attention to the view that the language employed in the Salem Witch Trials could serve as a basis for the formation and development of American legal English. Furthermore, the few existing studies that have analyzed language during this period have only explored a limited range of linguistic features. This research seeks to broaden our understanding of the legal language used during the Salem Witch Trials and should provide a comprehensive view of the language in a variety of legal genres of the 17th century.

The practical value of the research is attributed to the fact that its results may be implemented in the following studies of historical varieties of languages used in the field of law and could be of great use for the reconstruction of the development of legal language in various periods and as a result for the prediction of what awaits modern language of the law.

This paper is divided into three parts. The theoretical structure of legal language is presented in the first chapter. The research methods and materials are discussed in the second chapter. The third chapter examines American legal English within various genres with a focus on its orthographical, lexical, grammatical, and structural features. An introduction, conclusions, a list of references, and appendices are also included in the research.

CHAPTER I Historical Legal English

1.1. Legal Discourse

Laws are created, interpreted, and applied everywhere. And the majority of legal procedures are carried out primarily via the use of language. Moreover, written legislation is a major source of legal discourse. Among other crucial sources, one can name the activities that precede and result in the issue of regulations as well as the procedures for putting provisions into effect. As a result, the legal discourse has been of great interest to scientists from multifarious disciplines such as law, sociology, linguistics, semiotics and psychology.

Additionally, according to David Crystal, “legal language has a great deal in common with science (a concern for coherence and precision) and religion (a respect for ritual and historical tradition)” [17, p. 374].

In order to regulate social interactions, legal discourse emphasizes facts over values, the need for unbiased information, and the superiority of the logical over the emotional. Among the primary purposes of legal writing, one can name formulation, clarification, and application of the norms that should govern relationships between members of society. Law-related legal texts often address four topics: codification, explanation, exemplification, and application of laws [34, p. 89].

Legal discourse can have one of three purposes, according to Šarčević: it can be primarily prescriptive, primarily descriptive and prescriptive, or only descriptive. For instance, the first category includes laws, rules, codes, contracts, treaties, and conventions; the second category comprises judicial rulings, actions, pleadings, briefs, appeals, requests, and petitions; whereas legal opinions, law textbooks, and scholarly articles are purely descriptive in nature [69, p. 11].

David Crystal also claims that the use of language in the law is always being pushed in new directions. For example, its arguments must be worded in a way that allows people to recognize their general applicability while being precise enough to fit particular situations. They must be both stable and adaptable enough to stand the test of time and ensure that cases are handled consistently and fairly in all circumstances. Moreover, they must be stated in a way that assures citizens that the law respects their rights and obligations. In other words, no other language type is required to shoulder such a burden [16, p. 374].

1.1.1. Terms and Definitions

Legal language works as a functional variation of everyday language, with its own sphere of application and linguistic principles. It has a variety of unique morphosyntactic, semantic, and functional characteristics. This language is utilized for specific social contexts, such as appealing, claiming, etc. Moreover, it is obvious that legal language is derived from a common language. Consequently, legal language contains the same syntax, grammar and vocabulary as in everyday language [51, p. 2].

If there is one important feature of the study of law, it is the study of discourse. The term “*legal discourse*” may be used to refer to a wide range of research on legal phenomena, including written, spoken and non-verbal aspects, such as physical evidence, courtroom setting, interactions in court and spoken regulations [61, pp. 17-34].

In his work “*Language and the Law*”, Gibbons divides legal discourse into two separate sub-discourses: grapho-phonetic discourse and lexico-grammatical discourse. The grapho-phonetic sub-discourse includes the texts that make up the regulations and the judge's directions to the jury. The spoken language and structures of the legal discourse are part of the lexico-grammatical discourse [30, pp. 156-157].

Written legal discourse, compared to any other type of professional discourse, provides a rich and fascinating textual resource for corpus-based research since it is quite easy to find some integrity among various genres, taking into account the conventionalized and nearly standardized correlations between lexico-syntactic forms and their syntactic position in legal texts, as well as the common legal implications these qualifiers convey.

Legal discourse, as is well known, spans a continuum from legislation adopted at various levels (e.g., state, federal), judicial rulings (decisions, orders, or directives), law reports, petitions, various contractual documents, wills, power of attorney to oral genres including witness examination, jury conclusion, judge's summation, etc. The increasing number of legal corpora and their many kinds largely reflect the incredible diversity of legal discourse [33, p. 97].

Before starting a discussion on how various legal texts represent legal discourse, it is of paramount importance to define what a *legal text* is.

Any text that pertains to the law may be regarded as a special-purpose text in the legal discourse. Due to their text-internal and text-external aspects, i.e., their linguistic, structural, and functional characteristics, legal texts differ from other types of texts.

Additionally, recognizing that legal discourse is extraordinarily complex and immersed in various institutional spaces of different legal systems prompted a number of research in an attempt to give more accurate and meaningful descriptions of legal language and its taxonomies.

Tiersma, for instance, suggests classifying legal texts into three primary categories: operational legal texts (those that establish or alter legal relations, such as petitions, decrees, contracts, wills, etc.), explanatory texts, and other documents [78, pp. 78-82].

However, according to Asensio, the context in which a text is generated defines whether it is a legal document or not. To be more specific, a text may be regarded

as a legal text if it appears in a legislative, court, contractual, or administrative setting [52, pp. 45-46].

Moreover, Depraetere contends that in order to distinguish a legal text from other texts, it is important to take into account the text's entire discourse environment, including the sender, recipient, register, and objective [22, pp. 123-124].

All things considered, a legal text may be defined as any text created using legal language and/or utilized for legal purposes in legal contexts by both professionals and non-specialists in the field of law.

1.1.2. Modern Legal English

The use of legal language is now a universal phenomenon, much like the English language. There are some particular elements in it that have to do with terminology, linguistic structure, language standards, and punctuation:

One of the most important characteristics of modern legal English is the value of accuracy. Written legal materials, like all sorts of writing, should be concise, precise, and clear. In order to avoid any misunderstandings, it is important that both the reader and the writer interpret the same term in the same manner, and that both parties express the same meaning.

The usage of legal doublets is another aspect of legal language which refers to phrases consisting of two synonyms connected by the conjunction “and”. Among the examples of such phrases, one should mention “*ways and means*”, “*power and authority*”, “*fit and proper*”, etc. Doublets may have arisen either due to the fact that the terms were from various languages and these synonymic phrases were utilized to make the situation clear or because legal papers used to be written by attorneys and clerks who were paid by the word and as a result, tended to promote verbosity [77, pp. 51-54].

The legal jargon, often known as Legalese, is still used in legal documents because its meaning is generally understood in legal settings despite being considered obsolete in modern English. The basic terms of this jargon, which is primarily

used by attorneys, are Latin, French, and Old English words that are not commonly used in daily speech. For example, Latin is credited with introducing the usage of the following expressions: *versus*, among other things, *status quo*, *amicus curiae*, etc. The French influence is seen not only in terms of French origin, but also in the employment of adjectives following the nouns that they modify in expressions such as *attorney general*, *court-martial*, and *malice aforethought*.

In legal English, older terms like *“hereof”*, *“thereof”*, *“whereof”* and their other derivatives are frequently used to avoid repeating names or phrases. So, instead of the *“parties to this agreement”*, one uses the *“parties hereto”*.

Additionally, it's noteworthy to note how often adjectives like *“the above-mentioned”*, *“the said”*, and *“the same”* are applied in legal documents to describe nouns rather than to replace them (e.g., *the aforementioned Mr. John*).

Also, such endings as *“-ee”*, *“-er”*, and *“-or”* are widely used in various legal English titles with the aim of underlining the contrasting nature of someone's relationship. (e.g., *“lessor”* and *“lessee”*; *“addresser”* and *“addressee”*) [37, pp. 6-12].

One should also mention that the most noticeable syntactic characteristics of modern legal English are the length and intricacy of sentences. However, recently lawyers have been recommended to assess the length of their sentences and eliminate unnecessary words or phrases.

Moreover, legal English is full of nominalized structures such as *“to be in agreement”* instead of *“to agree”*, *“to conduct an investigation”* instead of *“to investigate”*, etc.

Legal experts frequently employ characteristics that conceal the agent's identity while highlighting their actions. An extremely impersonal writing style is characterized by the passive voice and uncommon pronoun use. Laws and court rulings typically include a verb in the passive voice, especially when an obligation or condition is imposed. They have a tendency to give the idea that such laws are

unchangeable since they take place independently of human agents [37, pp. 25-40].

The common-law culture of today reflects this historical background and the meticulous approach of lawyers to language: English and American attorneys still diligently observe the language forms in legal acts. Today's common-law practitioners reiterate all the words and expressions customarily used in documents and other papers they draft for better clarity [51, p. 234].

Furthermore, since the primary goal of legal language is to impact readers' or listeners' understanding rather than their emotions, the terminology used is as neutral as possible. This is why some researchers describe the language used in law as "cold": it denies all feelings and excludes all emotional components. As a result, legal documents hardly ever use exclamation or question marks.

The language used in law today is not metaphorical like it was in the Middle Ages. The colourful legal language of the past is only faintly still present, mostly in the shape of legal maxims. And although metaphors are typically uncommon in contemporary legal discourse, there are a few exceptions. As one of the examples of metaphors in legal language, we may consider the "*burden of proof*", which denotes the "requirement that the claimant establishes (if these are contested) the facts on which the success of his claim depends". Additionally, the use of metaphors that appeal to the emotions of readers or listeners is also particularly common among advocates. For instance, the phrase "*lion's share*" is widely used in American legal English as a traditional expression that traces its origins to Aesop's fables.

Legal documents have meticulously designed structures. The logical organization of these documents, among other things, aids in arranging legal content in order: from the abstract to the tangible, from the substance to the procedure. The text's organization should be constant, with the main points appearing before any supporting details and general principles coming before any unique circumstances or exceptions. It should be emphasized, though, that this formalism extends

beyond how the text is organized; it also includes set rules at the level of terms and phrases. As a result, legal documents frequently use pre-made sentences and fixed phrases [51, pp. 75-90].

Additionally, each legal document serves a certain purpose and has a unique structure that is distinctive to it. For example, Varo and Hughes use the term “macrostructure” to describe the overall structure of a certain genre of legal documents. The authors also claim that the majority of legal genres follow a standard format that takes into account not only how a text is organized and divided into sections, but also how it is laid out on the page, which would include spacing, paragraphing, punctuation, and even typographic aspects like capitalization, font type, italics, and underlying [81, pp. 102-115].

Nevertheless, Richard Wydick, a legal writing scholar, has criticised modern legal English in the following way: “We use eight words to say what could be said in two. We use arcane phrases to express commonplace ideas. Seeking to be precise, we become redundant. Seeking to explain, we become verbose. Our sentences twist on, phrase within clause within a clause, glazing the eyes and numbing the minds of our readers”.

At the same time, he has also observed a new tendency of plain English being used in legal texts. Nowadays, legal drafters are particularly impacted by the plain English movement because they are urged to make their sentences shorter and simpler. Although there is a certain promotion of legal texts in plain English, there are still many areas that need to be addressed. Clearly, legal English has progressed, but many believe that these improvements are occurring extremely slowly. So, in modern legal English, a document that a lawyer produces should be accurate, comprehensive, clear, and exact while also taking the client's intentions into account [85, p. 34].

1.1.3. Legal Genres

Despite the fact that there are multifarious legal text genres, there is no comprehensive classification. This might be explained by the general nature of law, which makes it difficult to define the typology of legal documents.

Legal documents can be categorized based on a variety of factors, such as the areas of the law they belong to or their functions. For instance, according to Sarcevi's classification, there are three main categories for legal genres:

- 1) the language of the law in normative legal documents (which is primarily prescriptive);
- 2) the language of the courtroom (which is primarily descriptive but also prescriptive);
- 3) the language of law textbooks (purely descriptive) [69, p. 12].

Since our research deals with court records of the Salem Witch Trials, we are more interested in the primarily descriptive but also prescriptive genres of legal texts such as an indictment, examination, warrant, recognizance, mittimus, testimony, deposition, plea, summon.

Indictment

According to Cambridge Dictionary, an indictment is “a formal statement of accusing someone of something” [40].

Rule 7(c)(1) of the US Federal Rules of Criminal Procedures provides the following information:

“The indictment or the information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offence charged. It shall be signed by the attorney for the government. It need not contain a formal commencement, a formal conclusion or any other matter not necessary to such a statement”.

However, an indictment should include counts, which are often known as “charges”. Each count relates to a specific law that is allegedly broken. The narrative, which is often divided into numbered paragraphs and aims to more

thoroughly portray the acts the defendants are accused of doing, is another crucial component of the indictment. There may occasionally be an introductory narrative that provides background information, such as biographical details of those engaged in the case [25].

Examination

In accordance with the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, an examination might be described as “a formal interrogation” [19].

Certain characteristics are present in the discourse used during the examination. The examiner's use of tactics to progress the conversation in his or her own manner is one of the most central topics in the examination process.

According to Holt and Johnson, examples of such methods include the use of question formulation, repeated questions, quotation clauses, and contrast [38, p. 35].

It should be highlighted, nonetheless, that because the discourse of examination has so many variants and elements, both in terms of form and function, it is hard to list specific characteristics of an examination process.

Warrant

According to the Legal Information Institute of Cornell Law School, a warrant is a document issued by a court or magistrate authorizing police to detain someone suspected of committing a crime. The responsible authority issues an arrest warrant based on probable cause, if it is believed that the evidence at hand is sufficient enough to imply criminal activity [3].

A warrant, according to the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, should specifically identify the location to be searched and the individuals or items to be taken. A U.S. warrant must typically include the name of the court issuing the warrant, the person to be arrested, the offence, the date of issuance, the officer whom the warrant is addressed, and the magistrate's signature [26, p. 247].

Recognizance

Pursuant to Cambridge Dictionary, recognizance is “a promise made by someone in a court of law, especially a promise to return to the court at a later date. If they break their promise, they have to pay money to the court” [65].

Usually, the following information must be included on the recognizance worksheet:

- Court order for recognizance;
- Name and address of the accused;
- Date and place of birth of the accused;
- Gender and civil status of the accused;
- Offense charged and name of presiding judge;
- Date;
- Name and address of the custodian [59].

Mittimus

Mittimus is a legal term that refers to a court order that directs a police officer to deliver a person. It also includes written directives under the seal of a judge or competent official directing police to locate and bring a person accused of a criminal offence to jail.

Additionally, a mittimus also provides instructions for the warden or other authorized court representative on how to take custody of the accused and keep them safe until their case can be heard in line with the proper justice process [47].

Testimony

According to the Legal Information Institute of Cornell Law School, testimony is “oral or written evidence given by the witness under oath, affidavit, or deposition during a trial or other legal procedures” [76].

While courts prefer that witnesses testify in person, they realize that this is not always practical. Where state law and evidence standards allow, courts will frequently accept written testimony from witnesses. Depending on whether a person testifies as an eyewitness or an expert, their letter of testimony will contain different information.

However, all written testimonies should include the witness's name, address, position in the company, company name, source of information (e.g. personal experience, company documents), date of testimony, facts the witness is testifying about, event or issue they've experienced, documentary evidence to back up the statement, reasons for sharing the story, suggestions for resolving the issue, thanks to the Councilmembers, and the statement of truth (“I believe that the facts stated in this witness testimony are true”) [79].

Deposition

Pursuant to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, deposition is “out-of-court testimony made under oath and recorded by an authorized officer for later use in court” [18].

Depositions can either be written or oral. Oral depositions are held in person with all concerned parties, allowing the party that requested the deposition to perform a direct examination and the other parties to undertake cross-examination. In written depositions, the party who initiated the deposition sends written questions to the deponent, who responds under the supervision of a reporter. Following that, all other parties are given the opportunity to submit written cross-examination questions.

Depositions often include information such as a person's age, date of birth, full name, residence history, educational background, marriage and legal history. A person may be questioned by the deposing attorney about their preparation for the deposition. After this, the deposition will follow with a number of incredibly detailed questions concerning the case [84].

Plea

In Cambridge Dictionary, it is stated that a plea is “the answer that a person gives in court when they have been accused of committing a crime” [62].

“Guilty” and “not guilty” pleas are the two most common forms.

By entering a plea of not guilty, a person is telling the court that they are innocent or that they have a strong defence. A guilty plea indicates that the act for which they are being prosecuted is illegal, that they committed it, and that they have no plausible excuse for doing so [82].

Summons

According to the Legal Information Institute of Cornell Law School, a summons is “a form prepared by the plaintiff and issued by a court that informs the defendant that they are being sued or are required to appear in court” [75].

The summons normally informs the person it is addressed to that a legal process has been initiated against them and that a case has been started in the court. Summons should contain the name of the court, the litigants, the address of the plaintiff's lawyer, etc. Additionally, the summons specifies a deadline by which the individual or individuals mentioned in the summons must appear in court or submit a written response to the court or the opposing party. It must also include a notification that if the defendant fails to appear, a default judgment will be entered against them [83].

1.1.4. American Tradition of Legal Discourse

American language of law has a long and complex history that dates back to the country's colonial period. The language of the legislation has changed and developed over time to reflect shifts in American society and culture.

It is of paramount importance to mention that English common law was one of the oldest sources of impact on the American legal language. The English language and judicial system were introduced to North America by the English

when they colonized the continent in the seventeenth century. This type of language was distinguished by its formal and antiquated vocabulary, Latin phrases, and complicated grammar. What is more, English common law continued to influence American legal vocabulary even after the country earned independence [29, p. 485].

Legal language in the early days of the United States was mostly focused on contract law and property law. But as the country developed, the scope of the law broadened, and the vocabulary of the legislation became increasingly specialized and technical. According to Lawrence Friedman, this was especially the case in the 19th and 20th centuries as the state industrialized and “new kinds of commerce” evolved [28, p. 334].

American law language had a formal and ceremonial tone, with attorneys and judges utilizing wording that was frequently difficult to grasp for individuals who were not versed in the law. Lawrence M. Friedman, a law scholar, asserts that legal language was intended to impress the masses with the intricacy and grandeur of the legal system and was considered a language of power and authority [28, p. 330].

Since the American legal system was based on English common law, which itself was centred on centuries-old legal traditions and norms, the vocabulary used in legal language was archaic. Additionally, the usage of Latin terms was a crucial aspect of the American legal language due to the fact that the legal systems of Europe used to heavily incorporate Latin which was the source of many legal concepts [29, pp. 19-26].

Nevertheless, in recent years, law officials have acquired the tendency of using simple language since it has been proven to lower the chance of legal disputes and lawsuits due to the fact parties are much more likely to comprehend the terms of their agreement. Additionally, one should mention the absence of specialized terminology or legalese in today’s court papers. What is more, the American legal language has evolved to be more inclusive and approachable. For example, there

has been a trend for more inclusive terminology with the implementation of non-binary pronouns and gender-neutral language in legal papers and court processes [44, pp. 56-58].

To sum up, traditional American legal discourse was distinguished by its formality, archaic vocabulary and Latin terminology. Additionally, this language was based on the English common law system and was aimed to preserve the authority and hierarchy of law officials. However, the US's modern legal discourse has developed with time and become more accessible and comprehensible for common people.

1.2. Historical Varieties of English

1.2.1. Terms and Definitions of Diachronic Linguistics

Each language functions as an archive since the words and their meanings have a history. It is typically possible to trace the origins of specific terms in a language's lexicon back several centuries. In other words, they are historical relics. Their historical occurrence in the language and their associated meanings provide us with information about the knowledge, practices, and topics that people in prior eras engaged in conversation about. It is of paramount importance for linguists to be able to identify the historical periods during which meaning changes in words occurred, evaluate what these word histories reveal about societal and cultural changes, and determine whether inner evolution or contact with other societies mediated them. All the aforementioned items are encompassed by the study of diachronic linguistics.

The discipline of diachronic linguistics examines how a language changes through time. It entails the historical study of language, either starting from the present perspective and moving to former, unrecorded phases or from earlier stages of language development to the contemporary ones [73, pp. 15-17].

In the book "Introducing Language and Society", it is stated that "change occurs at all levels of language, though it is not equally observable. Relatively rapid

changes in vocabulary are easily observed; relatively slower changes in grammar are less easily observed” [80, pp. 22-27].

According to William O’Grady, “all components of the grammar, from phonology to semantics, are subject to change over time. A change can simultaneously affect all instances of a particular sound or form, or it can spread through the language word by word by means of lexical diffusion”. He also adds that whether or not a language change is eventually embraced by the linguistic community as a whole might depend significantly on sociological factors. Moreover, since language evolution is systematic, it is possible to retrace linguistic history and infer the origins of subsequent forms by recognizing the changes that a specific language or dialect has undergone [57, pp. 290-295].

Diachronic linguistics’ primary interests are as follows:

- describing and explaining apparent linguistic changes in certain languages;
- retracing the origins of languages, figuring out their relationships, and classifying them into language families;
- creating broad theories about language development and its causes;
- describing speech communities' history;
- studying the evolution of language [55, pp. 118-119].

As is seen, there are several areas that the study of diachronic linguistics addresses:

- Comparative philology is concerned with comparing cross-linguistic traits in order to determine language relatedness.
- Etymology is the investigation of word origins.
- Dialectology is the study of dialects throughout history. Grammatical differences between two dialects and phonological changes within a dialect are two aspects that are frequently subject to discussion.

- Phonology refers to the study of acoustic systems that exist or have existed in a particular language. Studies in phonology may also rely on comparative methods for examining languages from various historical eras.
- The study of morphology and syntax focuses on how a language's ways of expression change through time. Typically, it concentrates on word order, grammar forms, and inflectional systems [55, pp. 118-119].

In his paper “Historical Linguistics”, Brian D. Joseph argues that competence in a wide range of linguistics subfields is a prerequisite for doing historical linguistics effectively. Understanding what has changed and what hasn’t requires a thorough comprehension of the “synchronic system of a language” at various stages; sociolinguistics must be employed to fully grasp the circumstances in which changes take place; phonetics is important for comprehending sound shifts; and so on. So, while not being at the core of the discipline, historical linguistics makes use of almost all of its aspects in a manner that other subdisciplines don’t [42, pp. 34-39].

To sum up, diachronic linguistics is an important area of study that focuses on the historical development of language over time. There are several practical uses for the study of diachronic linguistics. It may be used, for instance, to comprehend how languages have changed through time and to determine the historical connections between various languages. This information can be especially useful in the domains of language teaching and translation. It may also be used to recognize shifts in language usage through time, which can have significant effects on social and cultural processes.

1.2.1.1. Early Modern English Characteristics

Early modern English is the earliest variety of the English we use today. It may be characterized as the period of English from the start of the Tudor era to the late 17th century when it underwent the transition to modern English. Middle English, which was widely spoken between the 11th and the 15th centuries, gave rise to this variety of English. Unlike the shift from Old to Middle English, this alteration

was more than just an alteration in vocabulary or pronunciation; it marked the beginning of a new century for the English people, their impact on the globe, and the English language [4, p. 28].

For example, in Early Modern English, two second-person personal pronouns were used: “*ye*” (formal and informal plural pronoun) and “*thou*” (the informal singular pronoun). “*Thou*” and “*ye*” had also distinct variants depending on their grammatical case. For instance, the objective form of the personal pronoun “*thou*” was “*thee*” while its possessive forms were “*thy*” and “*thine*”. The objective form of “*ye*” was “*you*” with its possessive forms “*your*” and “*yours*”. Similarly, the earlier variants “*mine*” and “*thine*” had become “*my*” and “*thy*” before nouns starting with a consonant other than “*h*” [68, p. 40].

Additionally, the only consistent noun inflexion in Early Modern English was the “-*s*” ending in the possessive case or plural form. In the sixteenth century, adding an apostrophe to the end of the genitive singular nouns was possible, however, it was more common in the seventeenth century. It wasn't until around 1700 that this form became standard. What is also interesting is the fact that apostrophes were not used in the possessive plural during this time.

As to the adjectives, the three options “*harder*”, “*more hard*”, and “*more harder*” were all appropriate during this period. The standard that “-*er*” and “-*est*” are chosen in monosyllabic words while “*more*” and “*most*” in polysyllabic ones were formed only by the late seventeenth century. Nevertheless, people who spoke regional dialects persisted to favor the ending “-*er*” for all adjectives. In addition, one should highlight the fact that it was a common practice to emphasize statements with double comparison [6, p. 163].

At the beginning of the period, the common third-person singular ending was “-*eth*”. However, during the 17th century, it was mostly substituted by the variant “-(*e*)*s*”. The third-person plural was indicated with the ending “-*en*”, which was likely only applied as a stylistic device to denote rustic or archaic speaking. As to

the second-person singular, it was denoted by “-st” or “-est” in both the present and past tenses [68, p. 46].

Additionally, the modal auxiliaries solidified their unique syntactical traits at the beginning of the Early Modern era. As a consequence, it became uncommon to use modals without an infinitive. Moreover, during this period, some verbs lost their ability to act as modals. For example, “dare” developed a new past form (“dared”) while losing the syntactical properties of a modal auxiliary.

By the end of this period, modern form for the progressive aspect had taken over, though other forms, like the affix “-a-” (“I am a-doing”) and the infinitive with the verb “do” (do-support) were also widely used. Besides that, the “to be + -ing” verb form could be employed to convey a passive meaning without using any additional markers [68, p. 59].

The major feature of Early Modern English is the Great Vowel Shift, which caused long vowel sounds to be produced higher and farther in the mouth while short vowel sounds were mostly intact [24, p. 14].

Along with modifications to vowel sounds, English also saw additional spelling and pronunciation changes, such as the removal of the Old English “-x” and its replacement with the suffixes “-burgh” and “-borough” in place names; silent “b” was introduced to the words “debt and doubt”, “s” to the “island”, “c” to “scissors”, “o” to “people”, and “l” to “fault” and “assault” [71, pp. 1-2].

Additionally, due to the massive amount of classical works that were translated into English during this time, the vocabulary was mostly composed of intentional borrowings. What is more, writers debated about this issue despite being well conscious of it. Some people preferred using loanwords, particularly those from Latin, to convey new ideas. Others suggested using new compound forms of existing English terms or simply existing words [7, pp. 147-148].

While phrases with foreign roots greatly expanded the English language’s lexicon, word-building methods of all kinds were also used frequently. For example, all

parts of speech exhibit some degree of derivation. The period's most effective prefixes were noun-suffix “-er”. Apart from this, the previous suffix “-our”, which was French in origin, gained the same form “-er” or changed into “-or” during this time. It is also fascinating how suffix “-ster” (from the feminine “-estre”) has gained negative implications and was no longer used to indicate gender [72, p. 113].

1.2.2. Historical Varieties of American English

The earliest English colonists in North America arrived around 1600, which indicates that they used Shakespearean or Early Modern English. These immigrants were primarily British people of the upper-lower and lower-middle classes, with a few educated men, priests, attorneys, and even a few young sons of the nobility. They were not ignorant peasants [10, p. 209]. Despite regional variations in pronunciation and vocabulary, the colonists’ English was heavily affected by the literary style that had developed in London. Additionally, while in Britain English pronunciation and language rules kept evolving, in America they stayed intact. Therefore, American English is more similar to Early Modern English than Modern British English to Early Modern English. However, naturally, the encounter with the Native Americans introduced quite a few terms to the language, mostly words for native animals, foods, and ways of life [71, pp. 2-3].

Since emigrants from specific parts of England typically settled together in the new country, particular areas along the Atlantic coast adopted the English accents these emigrants spoke. As a result, America produced three main dialect regions: New England, the North Central States, and the Chesapeake Bay South [12, pp. 10-12].

The emigrants who came from northern England lived primarily in Pennsylvania but migrated west in large numbers, establishing their North British pronunciation in the North Central States, whereas those who came from southern England brought their dialect to New England. The dialect of south-eastern England was

represented in the third dialect region, which stretched from Chesapeake Bay South [11, pp. 10-11].

Since our research is focused on the city of Salem which was founded in the state of Massachusetts, one should explore the New England cluster.

The majority of New Englanders are thought to be derived from the 21,000 people who had settled there by 1640. According to history, the populace at the time was as pure and unmixed as any shire in England [2, p. 82]. In the New England region, Massachusetts Bay stands out since two-thirds of its original inhabitants emerged from the southeast counties of England, particularly East Anglia, which served as the main Puritanism centre point. Thus, one can state that Massachusetts was dominated by southern British English [46, p. 76]. One should also mention the fact that many dialectal and standard varieties of English from the seventeenth century that were later dropped in the mother country still existed in the speech of rural New Englanders [35, pp. 23-24]. Moreover, settlers in these areas were eager to develop or incorporate many new terms and phrases that were related to the sea, fishing, and marine trade into their lexicon since waterways in these areas were essential for trade, transit, and communication [23, pp. 93-94].

Additionally, the Early Modern English of New England cluster was widely used in religious literature. When Puritan immigrants came to America, EME was widely employed in Puritan religious literature and rituals [15, p. 37]. For instance, the Bay Psalm Book, the first book printed in America, was released in 1640 and was written in Early Modern English [53, p. 134].

Finally, Early Modern English in America was influenced by other European languages, especially French and Spanish. A distinctive American vocabulary was created as a consequence of adopting several French and Spanish terms and expressions as well as some adaptations of these words to English spelling and pronunciation [20, pp. 34-35]. Additionally, Early American English was influenced by the Dutch language due to the fact that the Pilgrim group on the Mayflower first travelled to Amsterdam, where they inevitably came into touch

with Dutch people and adapted to the Dutch way of life [14, p. 19]. The Pilgrims were somewhat linguistically acclimated to Dutch in a brief amount of time and even altered their names and signatures to Dutch forms. However, only French had a widely recognized prestige value among the other new languages that the colonists were to come into touch with. The fact that Calvin, a French theologian and church reformer, used to publish his works in French made the language significant in New England [56, pp. 8-9].

The colonists' interactions with other indigenous residents also had an impact on the American language, particularly its vocabulary. The first words that were borrowed into American English came from the languages of the American Indians who coexisted with the early colonizers. Algonquian was one of the most significant groups of tribal languages among the many Indian dialects that the colonizers encountered [32, pp. 22-23]. This language group was the first language that English settlers in Virginia and Massachusetts came into contact with. Early borrowings from Indians included terms designating meals, traditions, relationships, or items unique to the Indians at the time of borrowing [27, p. 137]. Nevertheless, according to Bryson, the majority of the early immigrants were determined to resolve on a single way of speaking and this was due to social pressures and the eagerness for a "common national identity" among them. This unified speech was maintained throughout the New World despite the influence of various European dominant immigrant groups. In other words, despite the fact that the early American English language was characterized by a variety of regional dialects across the country, they tended to exhibit a high level of consistency and uniformity, making it easier for immigrants who spoke different languages to communicate [8, pp. 31-34].

1.2.2.1. Historical and Linguistic Background of Salem

During the spring of 1692, a group of young girls in Salem Village, Massachusetts, claimed to be possessed by the demon and accused numerous local women of witchcraft. When panic swept throughout Massachusetts, a court

gathered in Salem to evaluate the accusations and as a result, Bridget Bishop, the first condemned witch, was hung. 18 more joined Bishop, while 150 more persons were convicted during the following months [13, pp. 21-26].

Belief in the supernatural — specifically, the devil’s practice of bestowing power on some people (witches) in exchange for their loyalty — had arisen in Europe in the 14th century and was common in colonial New England [49, 92-93]. Furthermore, the hardships of life in the rural Puritan society of Salem Town included the aftermath of a British conflict with France in the American colonies, a recent chicken pox outbreak, concerns as to the intrusions from Native American tribes, and an enduring conflict with the wealthy of Salem Town [9, pp. 80-81].

Additionally, the Bible fostered this belief with legends like the Witch of Endor and the statement “Thou shalt not let a witch to live” from the Book of Exodus. The Bible was thought to be God’s unquestionable truth, and it stated clearly that witches were real; doubting the existence of witchcraft meant denying the supreme power of the Bible [74, pp. 15-17].

According to Diane Purkiss, one positive consequence of this grim period was the enormous number of documents left behind recording the trials, which can be viewed as an essential heritage considering that the Puritans left quite a few written documents. This provides us with an ideal opportunity to investigate the language of this age [63, p. 15].

The Salem Witch Trials records have been crucial in demonstrating the evolution of the English language in America. These texts are especially interesting due to their confused grammar and spelling since they were primarily transcripts of interviews that brought together a diverse spectrum of views and experiences [43, pp. 100-101]. Adding to this confusion, the authors themselves also stemmed from a blend of origins and education levels [31, pp. 99-101].

John Demos also claims that the perplexing spelling, particularly from the “recorders” with less formal education, is also what makes the documents so valuable. Linguists think that some writing variations are phonetic. The majority of the Puritans were either born in England or in the families of the first-generation immigrants and therefore, brought a diverse variety of regional English dialects [21, pp. 3-4].

1.2.2.2. 17th Century American English

British English from the seventeenth century, which the English colonists introduced to the initial thirteen colonies, served as the basis for early American English. Therefore, a lot of characteristics of Early Modern English mentioned in the previous part of this research were present in 17th-century American English. For instance, along with spelling normalization, among the most dramatic developments within that period were the introduction of the auxiliary “do” in questions and negations, the formation of the “be + -ing” structure, pronoun “ye” and subsequently “you”, simplification in the use of modal auxiliaries, including “shall” and “will”, etc.

Nevertheless, it was inevitable that it would diverge from British English in its later evolution. It should be also mentioned that the majority of Colonial English's grammar, vocabulary, and spelling are still familiar to a contemporary American. However, it doesn't mean there weren't noticeable variations. Early American English wasn't systematic at all, which illustrates how this language was still in flux and, moreover, hadn't yet become standardized.

For example, there were numerous instances of lexical verbs that showed up in wh-questions and negative constructions without the auxiliary “do”. By the eighteenth century, most American speakers used a form of “do” for statements with the word “not” [45, pp. 10-12]. With frequent verbs like “know” and “think”, however, as well as with “have”, “do” was frequently dropped. What is more, other verbs have been occasionally negated without the auxiliary “do” as well [5, p. 5].

Additionally, while contemporary English uses the Subject-Verb-Object word order, Early Modern English and Colonial American English still contained traces of the V2 word order, which requires the verb to appear in the second place after the subject.

What is more, the negation of the verb “*be*” also allows us to examine the variety of American speech. For instance, in eighteenth-century English, both “*an't I*” and non-first-person “*an't*” were very frequently used.

In addition, the distinction between unergative and unaccusative verbs is one of the more intriguing variations. One should mention that unaccusative verbs describe actions that the subject did not initiate, whereas ergative verbs characterize actions that the person initiated willingly. Therefore, in 1700s American English, unaccusative verbs were distinguished by the use of the auxiliary verb “*to be*” rather than “*to have*”.

It is also interesting how Early American English used the word phrase “*methinks*” and its related version, “*methought*”, frequently. Both phrases minimized the subject by switching the first-person subject to a prefix [60, pp. 18-27].

Another distinguishing feature of early American English is the vocabulary which was rich in new phrases and borrowings. In principle, there are three key ways that colonists in the New World expanded and enriched their vocabulary. First, when they arrived on the mainland, they encountered a peculiar, vast landscape and numerous strange forms of nature that they had never observed before. In order to communicate their ideas, settlers were engaged in creating new words or adapting old ones to new contexts. Second, many terms that describe creatures, vegetation, foods, or aspects of Indian culture were appropriated by settlers from American Indian communities. Third, immigrants had no reservations concerning incorporating terms from other languages like French, Dutch, and German [39, pp. 2-3].

As to the spelling, there doesn't seem to have been much focus on this topic in the American colonies while they were still dependent on the mother country. Spelling was undoubtedly taken for granted as a luxury to be accepted without inquiry. However, as new terms entered the American language, whimsy began to rule the spelling of these new words. Similar to those in Europe, printers in the New World were infamously autonomous when choosing how to spell a word. For instance, in America, the term "*both*" was spelt "*both*" or "*bothe*" [64, pp. 189-190].

To sum up, the 16th and 17th centuries were of paramount importance for the evolution of the American English language. During this period, syntactic and dialectal diversity and complexity of Middle English progressively gave way to more conventional variants of English, and the language's structure became somewhat fixed, with much morphological simplification.

Chapter Conclusions

Taking all the foregoing into account, we should highlight the fact that the word "legal discourse" can be used to describe a variety of studies on legal processes, including written, spoken, and non-verbal elements like tangible proof, the setting of the courtroom, interactions between participants, and spoken instructions. Moreover, even though there are numerous different legal genres, there is no complete classification. Therefore, the primary focus of our research will revolve around American legal texts such as an indictment, examination, warrant, recognizance, mittimus, testimony, deposition, plea, and summons.

For that reason, it is of paramount importance to mention that American legal discourse is particularly distinguished by its formality, outdated language, and Latin terms. Moreover, this variety of language, which was founded on the English common law system, was intended to maintain the power and authority of legal authorities. Thanks to the Salem Witch Trials records and with the help of diachronic linguistics, we will be able to obtain critical information about the American legal English of the 17th century.

CHAPTER II SYNCHRONIC AND DIACHRONIC APPROACHES IN VARIETY STUDIES

2.1. Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches

Ferdinand de Saussure, a Swiss linguist, first put forth the concept of the diachronic approach. He claimed that every aspect of language is subject to change. Diachronic linguistics, in the words of Ferdinand de Saussure, examines “relations between successive terms that are substituted for each other” [70, pp. 15-17].

According to Berg and Lune, the diachronic method deals with the “examination of historical facts”. In addition, they point out that there may be a wide range of underlying motives for conducting diachronic research, such as to identify something that had previously been unknown, to find the connections between the past and the present, to assess the achievements of particular figures, or to comprehend human nature [50, pp, 39-51]. Neil J. Salkind supported this claim by stating that scholars who employ the diachronic approach are frequently interested in something beyond basic accounts of events and prefer to focus on the impact one event might have on another [67, p. 23].

In addition, in the book by W.H. McDowell “Historical Research. A Guide”, it is noted that the diachronic approach “represents a systematic enquiry into the past”. McDowell continues by stating that those with a deeper understanding of the past are better equipped “to recognize the shift in the present”. However, McDowell also believes that more interpretations of historical events might emerge as we learn more about the past. It's also important to note that McDowell proposes a modified version of the diachronic approach that should explore “local, cultural, urban, economic, ethnic, scientific, and philosophical” subjects [54, pp. 55].

According to Leedy and Ormrod, the “heart of the diachronic approach” is the “interpretation of the facts” and not the accumulation of them. The diachronic approach seeks to identify the connections between current and previous events.

Additionally, this method focuses on outlining not only what actually occurred but also why and how it might have happened. Furthermore, the diachronic approach can be applied in the fields of political science, anthropology, economics, literature, psychology, and linguistics [48, p. 87].

The synchronic approach, on the other hand, is descriptive and examines how a language or grammar constituent parts interact and how proper syntax gives a sentence meaning. It doesn't take into account how English has changed over time. Saussure claims that the goal of the synchronic approach is to describe a language at a particular moment [70, pp. 15-17].

According to David Crystal, the synchronic approach studies language at a specific period and describes the language system as it is at that moment [16, p. 374].

Additionally, researchers in this area implement a wide range of techniques in order to examine language, including its phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics.

One should also mention that within the synchronic approach, corpus linguistics has attracted a lot of interest lately. This approach involves studying corpora or compilations of text, in order to recognize linguistic patterns and consistencies.

Nevertheless, “Genetic Linguistic Connections of Ancient Egypt and the Rest of Africa” by Théophile Obenga asserts that “diachronic and synchronic languages actually interact” [58, pp. 112-113]. What is more, Keith Allan in his book “The Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics” supports this claim by stating that “any synchronic description not embedded in wider historical context is just as deficient as any description without typological background” [1, p. 21].

It is also interesting that the aforementioned overlap between synchronic and diachronic approaches is historically predetermined. It has been claimed that the synchronic approach preceded the diachronic approach since historical linguists were expected to compile some accounts of a language at different periods in time,

depending heavily on the previous works of synchronic linguists. Then, by contrasting the different synchronic phases, they looked at the changes that had occurred [41, pp. 14-19].

2.2. Legal Linguistics

Scholars have long been intrigued by phenomena associated with human speech, but modern linguistics didn't emerge until the first decades of the 20th century. This has made it possible to analyze legal language from a linguistics-specific perspective.

Legal language is a relatively new academic field in the contemporary sense. Nevertheless, there has been a long history of varying interests in the field of legal language. Given that language and law are inextricably linked, legal language has existed for as long as there has been law [51, p. 2].

Legal language research is commonly synchronic since it often concentrates on modern language. For example, in Canada, this study consists of a comparative analysis of the two legal languages: French and English. The German linguistic field has seen specific development in research comparing the features and uses of different kinds of languages used for special objectives.

Nowadays, linguistic scholars frequently employ quantitative approaches in their study, often with the assistance of a computer system.

Lawyers, on the other hand, have a unique perspective on the language used in their field. Their research frequently has a diachronic focus and is closely related to the history of law. It is uncommon for attorneys studying a legal language to numerically count the frequency of words or other linguistic constructions. Instead, they want to make sure that the terminology and linguistic features of legal English are understandable to non-legal professionals. Nevertheless, in this paper, we will try to conduct quantitative analysis by utilizing the Online NGram Analyzer which counts the most frequently occurring words.

According to Mattila, legal linguistics studies the origins, traits, and application of legal language. Studies in this field may focus evenly on language semantics, syntax, or vocabulary. It cannot be defined as a linguistics branch. It would be more accurate to state that legal linguistics examines the legislative language in the context of linguistic findings. Consequently, legal linguistics may be described as a synthesis between applied linguistics and legal science [51, p. 11].

It is important to consider how legal linguistics relates to the wider linguistics landscape. Firstly, there is a strong link between this discipline and semantics since lexicology does hold a prominent place in legal languages. This is explained by the fact that the main way legal language distinguishes from common speech is via vocabulary. In terms of syntax, legal linguistics studies sentence length and the prevalence of subordinate clauses. However, in contrast to semantics and syntax, “morphology, phonology, and phonetics” are further removed from legal linguistics and have less significance in legal settings.

In the study of legal linguistics, historical and social approaches are commonly useful, if not always essential. Mattila states that “Areas of study include how the vocabulary of legal language has changed over time (there have also been complete language changes); what are the countries and epochs of origin of borrowed legal words; how is the legal language used in the various legal sub-cultures; to what extent is legal terminology known by the general public?” [51, p. 13].

2.3. Salem Witchcraft Records

In order to conduct our research, we will use the Documentary Archive of Salem Witch Trials, which contains an electronic compilation of original source documents pertaining to the 1692 Salem witch trials and an updated transcription of the court records.

Anyone with an interest in the Salem witchcraft incident will be amazed by the large variety of judicial papers that have endured. The deposition, which makes

up about 40% of the overall amount of content, is by far the most prevalent genre. It is followed by arrest warrants, petitions, examinations and confessions, and indictments, with a total amount that is equal to that of depositions. There is also a third category, which includes smaller genres like recognisances, summonses, and complaints [36, p. 21].

It should be mentioned that the majority of the data that is currently available comes from the pretrial procedures, which were conducted to decide whether an accused witch should be officially charged, detained, and judged. Despite some similarities, examination records should not be mistaken for witness depositions since examination records captured the questioning of an accused witch during a preliminary proceeding and were recorded by a clerk chosen by the presiding judges. Depositions for or against an accused witch, on the other hand, were submitted to the court by witnesses [36, p. 37].

Additionally, the Salem documents captured the English language at the end of the 17th century, when the era of quick and dramatic change had ended and the written norm had become widely settled. Moreover, these records provide us with critical information about the early evolution of a new colonial variety of English. The formation of language in general is filled with contradictions, opposing and conflicting factors, and this is particularly true of regional variations like American English. Colonial delay slowed the progress while new connections, surroundings, and forms of control tended to advance it [66, pp. 209-212].

In this paper, we will analyse 1 plea, 8 mittimuses, 10 summonses, 10 recognisances, 10 warrants, 10 testimonies, 10 examinations, 10 indictments and 10 depositions (see Appendices 1-9). The selection of texts was motivated by the observation of a notable discrepancy between the total quantity and size of texts. Typically, genres with smaller text sizes are encountered less frequently. In light of this, it was deemed appropriate to analyze 10 representative texts from each genre, with the exception of plea and mittimuses, which have less than ten texts available for analysis.

CHAPTER III CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF SALEM WITCH TRIALS ARCHIVES

3.1. Plea

There was only one instance of a plea in the archive. It was composed by Mary Bradbury, who was accused of practising witchcraft. (see Appendix 1)

3.1.1. Spelling

In this text, there are a few spelling features that we can highlight:

- Words with traditional British spelling: “*saviour*”, “*endevo'red*”;
- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*unavoydable*” (*Middle English*), “*contineu*” (*Middle English*), “*my self*” (*Old English*), “*my selfe*” (*Old English*), “*divell*” (*Middle English*), “*brethren*” (*Middle English*), “*complayne*” (*Middle English*);
- Non-standard variations:
 - Doubled consonant: “*practiss*”, “*diligent*”, “*familiarity*”;
 - Omitted consonant: “*innocent*”, “*horid*”;
 - Replaced vowel: “*detestible*”;
 - Added “e”: “*doe*”, “*mee*”.

3.1.2. Grammar

Among the noticeable grammatical peculiarities of this text, one should mention:

- Do-support: “*I doe plead not guilty*”;
- Uninflected auxiliary: “*through the goodness of god that have kept mee hitherto*”.

3.1.3. Vocabulary

Given the scarcity of pleas in the archive and the brevity of the provided text, conducting a word frequency analysis may not yield significant insights. Nevertheless, a salient feature of the text is the presence of religious vocabulary,

which includes words such as “*divine*”, “*goodness*”, “*servant*”, “*Jesus Christ*”, “*lord*”, “*saviour*”, “*holy*”, “*devil*”, “*faith*”, and “*God*”.

3.1.4. Structure

Due to the limited availability of plea instances in the archive, drawing conclusions about the structural characteristics of this genre is challenging. Nevertheless, it is observable that the genre follows a pattern consisting of an introductory segment that includes the date and a statement of innocence, which identifies the accused individual (“*The Answer of Mary Bradbury in the charge of Witchcraft or familiarity with the Divell I doe plead not guilty*”). The body of the plea is composed in the first person narrative, describing the events and relevant details, while the closing part consists of a signature.

Below you may see the example of plea structure based on the text of “Plea of Mary Bradbury”.

Structure	Text
Opening	
Date	[+ <i>September 9, 1692</i>]
Statement of innocence	<i>The Answer of Mary Bradbury in the charge of Witchcraft or familiarity with the Divell I doe plead not guilty.</i>
Statement	
Description of events	<i>I am wholly inocent of any such wickedness through the goodness of god that have kept mee hitherto) I am the servant of Jesus Christ & Have given my self up to him as my only lord & saviour: and to the dilligent attendance upon him in all his holy ordinances, in utter contempt &</i>

	<i>defiance of the divell, and all his works as horid & detestible; and accordingly have endevo'ed to frame my life; & conversation according to the rules of his holy word, & in that faith & practise resolve by the help and assistance of god to contineu to my lifes end: for the truth of what I say as to matter of practiss I humbly refer my self, #[my selfe,] to my brethren & neighbors that know mee and unto the searcher of all hearts for the truth & uprightness of my heart therein: (human frailties, & unavoydable infirmities excepted) of which i bitterly complayne every day:/</i>
Conclusion	
Signature	<i>Mary Bradbury</i>

3.1.5. Conclusion

After conducting an analysis, it can be deduced that the 17th-century plea displayed non-standard variations, words with Middle English spelling, and those that preserved traditional British spelling. The pleas also exhibited grammatical peculiarities such as the usage of do-support and uninflected auxiliary verbs, along with the vocabulary related to religion. All the above-mentioned features are characteristic of Early American English. Despite this, the plea adheres to a strict format that includes a date and a statement of innocence in the opening, a first-person narrative that describes the events and relevant details in the body, and a closing with a signature, indicating that the text belongs to the legal genre.

3.2. Mittimus

Within the Salem Witch Trials Documentary Archive, the number of mittimuses present amounts to a total of eight. (see Appendix 2)

3.2.1. Spelling

In the aforementioned texts, several orthographic characteristics can be discerned and brought to attention.

- Words with traditional British spelling: “Goven'r”;
- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*theire*” (*Middle English*), “*farmes*” (*Middle English*), “*behalfe*” (*Middle English*), “*whome*” (*Middle English*), “*untill*” (*Middle English*), “*faile*” (*Middle English*), “*wiffe*” (*Middle English*), “*sayd*” (*Middle English*), “*suspition*” (*obsolete*), “*dammage*” (*Middle English*), “*tryall*” (*obsolete*)
- Non-standard variations:
 - Doubled consonant: “*donne*”, “*att*”;
 - Omitted consonant: “*daugter*”, “*tis*”, “*Provice*”, “*ino*”, “*ffarmes*”;
 - Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “*afores'd*”, “*Majest's*”, “*wom'n*”, “*yo'r*”, “*w'th*”, “*o'r*”, “*Jan'a*”, “*spesefy'd*”;
 - Replaced vowel: “*bodys*”, “*thay*”, “*Minester*”, “*Bushop*”, “*hear*”;
 - Added “e”: “*beene*”, “*Sheriffe*”.

3.2.2. Grammar

If we consider the grammatical features of the mittimuses, we should mention the following:

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: “*farmes husbandman*”;
- “-th” as a third-person singular ending: “*hath*”
- Capitalised words: “*Husbandman*”, “*Committeing Sundry Acts of Witchcraft Lately*”, “*Wee Command*”, “*safe and sure Conduct*”, “*To Do and receive*”, “*Brought the Bodyes of those Persons*”, “*great Hurt and Damage*”, “*the Bodies of the said Persons*”, “*their further Examination*”, “*sayd Goale*”, “*further Examination or Tryall*”, “*by them and Every one of them*”;

- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: *“francs Nurce”, “peter Cloyce”, “John procter”, “Ann putnam”, “france and Ireland”, “Samuell parris”, Nathaniell putnam”, “phillip English”, “Allice parker”, “John parker”, “Ann pudeattor”, “Beverly widdow”, “Thomas putnam”, “Thomas farrer”*;
- Use of passive voice: *“You are in their Majest's names hereby required”, “whereby great hurt hath beene donne to their bodys”, “untill they shall be delivered”, “as tis said & Detained”, “be conveyed”, “stand Charged”, “Sundry Acts of Witchcraft, done or committed by them”*;
- Use of the modals: *“they shall thence be delivered”, “this shall be your sufficient Warrant”, “Court shall Consider”*.

3.2.3. Vocabulary

In the texts of the mittimuses provided among the most frequent words and phrases one can mention: *“Salem” (38), “Majests” (16), “husbandman” (12), “witchcraft” (7), “to take into care” (6), “Sundry Acts of Witchcraft” (6), “you are not to fail” (6)*.

Moreover, since the documents were authored by the village officials, numerous expressions employed therein pertain to the terminology utilized in the realm of law: *“accuse”, “suspect”, “custody”, “Law”, “Warrant”, “Constable”, “bail”, “tryals”, “evidence”, “Superior Court”, “detain”, “witness”, “charged”, “high suspicion”, “examination”*.

Furthermore, due to the fact that mittimuses are prescriptive legal documents, a considerable quantity of allusions to the governing bodies and their titles can be observed: *“Keeper of the Prison”, “Esquire”, “King”, “Queen”, “Sovereign Lord and Lady”, “Constable”, “Sheriffe of the County”*.

In addition, it can be noticed that the use of doublets, which are pairs of words joined by the conjunction “and”, is an early feature of legal discourse: *“accused and suspected”, “made and provided”, “care and custody”, “all and every one*

of them”, “safe and sure”, “all and every of those”, “then and there”, “hurt and damage”, “safe and sure”.

3.2.4. Structure

The mittimus document typically comprises three main sections: the Opening, the Statement, and the Conclusion. The Opening section provides information about the date, addressee, and venue of the document. The wording of this part is typically consistent across all the texts: *“To the Keeper of their Majest's Goale in Boston”* or *“To their Majesties Goal-keeper in Salem”*.

The Statement section outlines the instructions for the addressee regarding the detention of the accused person and the charges against them. This section also includes details about the social status of the accused, the offence, and the victim, which are typically presented using established formulaic phrases that have become standardized across mittimuses.

The mittimus document ends with the Conclusion section, which restates the instructions for the addressee in the form of a standardized wording: *“you are well to secure untill thay shall thence be delivered by due order of Law and hereof you are not to faile”*; as well as includes date, venue and the signature of the official who issued the document.

Below, you may see the typical mittimus structure on the example of “Mittimus for Sarah Good and Tituba”:

Structure	Text
Opening	
Date	<i>[May 25, 1692]</i>
Addressee and venue	<i>To the Keeper of their Majests Goale in Boston</i>

Statement	
Instruction	<i>You are in their Majests names hereby required, to take into your care and safe Custody</i>
Name of the accused and their personal details	<i>the Bodys of Sarah Good the wife of W'm Good of Salem farmes husbandman and Titiba an Indian Woman, belonging unto mr. Samuell parris of Salem Village Minester</i>
Offence	<i>who stand Charged on behalfe of their Majests. for their feloniously Committing Sundry acts of Witchcraft at Salem Village</i>
Victim	<i>on the Bodys of Elizabeth parris Eliz Hubbert Abigail Williams And Ann putnam of Salem Village.</i>
Conclusion	
Instruction	<i>you are well to secure untill thay shall thence be delivered by due order of Law and hereof you are not to faile.</i>
Date and venue	<i>Dated Boston May the 25t 1692</i>
Signature	<i>*John Hathorne] Assists. *Jonathan Corwin] Assists (O. R.) Mittimus</i>

3.2.5. Conclusion

After analyzing eight mittimuses, it was observed that they possess linguistic features typical of Early American English, such as non-standard variations and spellings of Middle English. Additionally, the absence of apostrophes in possessive singular and plural forms, the use of “-th” as a third-person singular

ending, and capitalized words were also noted as grammatical characteristics common for Early American English.

Moreover, the mittimus exhibited features that are commonly found in legal language, such as legal terminology, allusions to governing bodies, doublets, and the use of passive voice. The three-part structure further confirms the legal nature of the texts.

3.3. Summons

In this section, we will analyse the first 10 summons proved in the archive. (see Appendix 3)

3.3.1. Spelling

These are some of the most noticeable spelling peculiarities that could be observed in the summons:

- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*severall*” (*obsolete*), “*yeare*” (*obsolete*), “*appeare*” (*obsolete*), “*perill*” (*Middle English*), “*shewd*” (*obsolete*), “*garison*” (*Old French*), “*thair*” (*Middle English*), “*personall*” (*obsolete*), “*returme*” (*obsolete*), “*haue*” (*obsolete*), “*nemed*” (*Old Dutch*).
- Non-standard variations:
 - Doubled consonant: “*att*”, “*suspission*”, “*nott*”, “*perril*”;
 - Omitted consonant: “*personaly*”, “*sumoned*”, “*comand*”, “*hose*”, “*writen*”, “*sumons*”, “*somensed*”, “*acordenely*”, “*atested*”;
 - Replaced consonant: “*notis*”, “*suspission*”, “*dauthters*”;
 - Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “*defend^rs*”, “*Aug^t*”, “*app^r*”, “*s^d*”, “*pr^sent*”, “*w^thin*”;
 - Replaced vowel: “*lycense*”, “*thier*”, “*thay*”, “*somensed*”, “*acordenely*”;
 - Added “e”: “*testifye*”, “*hee*”, “*aprile*”, “*Sheriffe*”;
 - Omitted vowel: “*obedenc*”, “*answr*”, “*apperance*”, “*wch*”, “*notis*”.

3.3.2. Grammar

Taking into consideration grammatical features of the summons, one should mention the following:

- The second-person personal pronouns: “*ye Worshipfull Maj'r Sam'll Appleton*”;
- Capitalised words: “*Wee Command*”, “*all Excuses Set apart*”, “*to be Tried*”, “*hereof Make return*”, “*There to Testify the Truth*”, “*On penalty of One hundred pounds*”, “*fail Not*”, “*I have Sumoned*”, “*in the Morning*”, “*to Warn & give Notice*”, “*on Certaine Indictments to be Exhibited*”, “*they Nor you*”, “*To make Your personall apperance*”, “*grounds of Suspission*”, “*So make Your apperance*”, “*According to Time & Place*”;
- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: “*mrs Mary Bradbury*”, “*france*”, “*Ralph farnum*”, “*Ralph farnum Jun'r*”;
- Use of passive voice: “*every of them sumoned to appeare as above by me*”, “*names are herein written*”;
- Use of subjunctive mood: “*they & Every of them be & personally app'r*”, “*if his garison may guarded*”;
- Archaic past participle: “*holden*”, “*shew*”;
- Archaic word building: “*of the Clock*”.

3.3.3. Vocabulary

As to the vocabulary of the summons, the most frequent words and phrases are: “*Salem*” (22), “*England Scotland France & Ireland*” (16), “*Court*” (12), “*Summons*” (11), “*Constable*” (10), “*God*” (9), “*faith*” (9), “*Grace of God*” (9).

Furthermore, given that the Salem officials authored these summonses, a considerable number of phrases and terms used within them belong to the legal lexicon. For example, “*court*”, “*testify*”, “*Indictments*”, “*prisoners*”, “*crime*”, “*lycence*”, “*on penalty*”, “*within Subpena*”, “*Give in his Evidence*”, “*warrant*”, “*Suspission*”, “*upon further Examination*”, “*as ye Law Directs*”.

Additionally, the summonses also contain such terms like “*hereof*”, “*thereof*”, “*whereof*” and their other derivatives since it is one of the characteristics of legal English: “*hereof Make return*”, “*hereof fail not*”, “*make return of your doings herein*”, “*each of you are hereby Required*”, “*Make Returne thereof*”.

Moreover, the early adoption of doublets, a linguistic construct consisting of pairs of words connected by the conjunction “*and*”, can be observed as a characteristic of legal language: “*to be and personally appear*”, “*att the time and place*”, “*to Warn & give Notice*”, “*they & Every of them*”, “*you & each of you*”, “*Then and There*”, “*Sumonsed and warned*”.

In addition, one should mention the frequency with which legal documents use adjectives such as “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*” to describe nouns instead of replacing them: “*The persons above Named*”, “*leave of s'd Court*”, “*the within named James Greinslett*”, “*time and place within mentioned*”, “*I have Sumoned the above name*”, “*place above written*”, “*to ye said person*”, “*According to this within written*”, “*al the parsons with in nemed as as atested by me*”.

One should also mention a number of references to the governing bodies and their titles that are used due to the fact that summonses are prescriptive legal papers: “*King & Queen defend'rs of the faith*”, “*Sheriff of Essex*”, “*Constables of Andover Haverill*”, “*Capt William Worwood*”, “*Dep't Sheriff*”, “*Constable of Manchester*”, “*Constable of Billrica*”, “*Capt Danforth*”, “*Sarje't John Choate*”, “*Worshipfull Maj'r*”, “*Constable of Ipswich*”, “*Constables of Salem*”.

3.3.4. Structure

The summonses, like mittimuses, typically consist of three main parts: the Opening, the Statement, and the Conclusion. The Opening section includes the date, formulaic phrase of endorsement of the monarch and the intended recipient. The wording of this part is typically consistent across all the texts: “*William &*

Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen defend'rs of the faith &ca. To the Constable of Billrica Greeting”.

The Statement section of the summonses gives directives to the addressee concerning notification for individuals to attend a scheduled court meeting, including the date and time of the hearing, the reason for it, the name of the accused, and their alleged offence.

The Concluding part of the summons reiterates the previously outlined instructions to the addressee, employing standardized wording: “*hereof they Nor you are to fail at your utmost perill making return hereof under your hand*”. This portion also features the date, location, and signature of the official responsible for issuing the document.

The structure of a typical summons is exemplified below, using the “Summons for Witnesses To the Constable of Billrica” as a reference:

Structure	Text
Opening	
Date	<i>[July 30, 1692]</i>
Formulaic phrase of endorsement of the monarch	<i>William & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen defend'rs of the faith &ca</i>
Addressee	<i>To the Constable of Billrica Greeting</i>
Statement	
Instruction	<i>Wee Comand you to Warn & give Notice unto Capt Danforth -- John Rogers & that they & Every of them be and personaly appear at the Court of Oyer & Terminer to be held by Adjurnment Att Salem</i>

Date and time of the hearing	<i>on Tuesday Next at Ten of the Clock in the Morning</i>
Reason	<i>to testify the truth to the best of their knowledge on Certaine Indict- ments to be Exhibited against</i>
Name of the accused	<i>Martha Carrier of Andover</i>
Conclusion	
Instruction	<i>hereof they Nor you are to fail at your utmost perill making return hereof under your hand</i>
Date and venue	<i>Dated in Salem July 30'th 1692 & in the fourth year of Our Reign</i>
Signature	<i>*Stephen Sewall Cler.</i>

3.3.5. Conclusion

Upon examining the summonses, we have observed that the texts possess linguistic features that are representative of Early American English. They include non-standard variations, words with Middle English spelling, the second-person personal pronouns “ye”, capitalized words, archaic past participle and archaic word building.

Nevertheless, the summonses have shown standard traits of legal language, such as legal lexicon, terms like “*hereof*”, “*thereof*”, “*whereof*” and their other derivatives, allusions to governing bodies, doublets, adjectives “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*” and the use of passive voice and subjunctive mood. The legal character of summonses is further confirmed by the strict three-part structure of the texts.

3.4. Recognizance

In this section, we will conduct an analysis of the initial 10 recognizances that have been presented in the archive. (see Appendix 4)

3.4.1. Spelling

Within the aforementioned texts, numerous spelling characteristics can be identified and subsequently highlighted.

- Words with traditional British spelling: “*Superiour*”, “*Survivour*”, “*Labourer*”;
- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*heires*” (*Middle English*), “*divers*” (*Old French*), “*forme*” (*Middle English*), “*behalfe*” (*Middle English*), “*Joyntly*” (*Middle English*), “*Suspition*” (*obsolete*), “*personall*” (*obsolete*), “*Generall*” (*Middle English*), “*Injoynd*” (*obsolete*), “*firmely*” (*Middle English*), “*hundrid*” (*Middle English*), “*fifeteenth*” (*obsolete*), “*thowsand*” (*Middle English*), “*theire*” (*Middle English*), “*her selfe*” (*Middle English*), “*Whome*” (*obsolete*), “*Bownd*” (*Middle English*), “*Some*” (*Middle English*), “*Answer*” (*Middle English*), “*elce*” (*obsolete*), “*himselpe*” (*Middle English*), “*behaveour*” (*obsolete*), “*Deffenders*” (*Middle English*), “*Untill*” (*Middle English*), “*alleadged*” (*obsolete*), “*summe*” (*Middle English*), “*Soveraign*” (*obsolete*), “*vertue*” (*obsolete*);
- Non-standard variations:
 - Doubled consonant: “*p'rmisses*”, “*Tenniments*”, “*afforesaid*”, “*Scotland*”, “*Executtors*”, “*Confessed*”, “*Sett*”, “*Councill*”, “*Goall*”, “*delliver*”, “*Wittness*”;
 - Omitted consonant: “*Apeared*”, “*Comitted*”;
 - Replaced consonant: “*Recogniscance*”, “*Cownty*”, “*Pownds*”, “*Massathuttets*”;
 - Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “*Decemb'r*”, “*p'sonally*”, “*p'formance*”, “*Jan'ry*”;
 - Replaced vowel: “*cheife*”, “*Tenniments*”, “*Custodye*”, “*forfieture*”, “*leavied*”, “*Currant*”;

- Added “e”: “Sovereigne”, “Towne”, “Goale”, “doe”, “Juste”, “Reigne”, “Bodye”, “Witchcrafte”, “Sundrye”, “Defaulte”, “Nowe”, “Sheriffe”, “Remaine”, “departe”;
- Omitted vowel: “p'rmisses”, “sd”, “Jun'r”, “Adminstrators”.

3.4.2. Grammar

When considering the grammatical features of the recognizances, it is important to note the following:

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: “*One of their Ma'ties Justices*”, “*their Ma'ties Goal*”, “*their Maj'ties behalf*”, “*their Maj'ies Province*”;
- Capitalised words: “*Thirty First day*”, “*the Fourth year of the Reign*”, “*of the Condition underwritten*”, “*accused and Suspected*”, “*his Escape If Therefore*”, “*be Enjoyned him*”, “*void and of none Effect*”, “*firmely Bownd Joyntly & Sevirally*”, “*Juste Sum*”, “*have Taken into their Care & Custodye*”, “*also Confessed the same*”, “*in the Some of*”, “*True & Just payment*”, “*Condition of this Obligation is Such*”, “*Upon the Bodyes of Sundrye persons*”, “*one thousand six hundred Ninty & two*”, “*one Thousand six hundred Ninty*”;
- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: “*october*”, “*france*”, “*Dorothy faukner*”, “*james Fry*”;
- Use of passive voice: “*what shall be objected*”, “*shall be alledged*”, “*who was Comited*”, “*who is Suspected*”, “*Shall be objected*”, “*shall be then & there Injoyned*”;
- Use of subjunctive mood: “*if Default be made*”;
- Archaic present participle: “*haveing*”, “*oweing*”;
- Archaic past participle: “*holden*”;
- Use of the modals: “*shall personally appear*”, “*what shall be objected*”, “*shall do and receive*”, “*Court shall then & there be Enjoyned him*”, “*shall make their personall appearance*”, “*shall in their Maj'ies behalfe*”;

be alledged”, “*Shall Well & Truely keep*”, “*they Shall forthwith deliver*”, “*shall pay*”, “*Shall be objected*”;

- Do-support: “*Wee do Bind our Selves*”, “*if the Above Bownd do perform*”, “*Wee do bind Our Heires*”, “*do make her Personall Appearance*”;
- “-th” as a third-person singular ending: “*hath*”;
- Uninflected auxiliary for plural noun: “*who was both Committed*”.

3.4.3. Vocabulary

Regarding the recognizances’ vocabulary, the words and phrases that appear most frequently are: “*Queen*” (34), “*King*” (33), “*Lord*” (32), “*Lady*” (28), “*England*” (25), “*Essex*” (19), “*Court*” (16), “*Salem*” (12), “*Sovereigne*” (11), “*faith*” (10), “*Justices*” (10), “*God*” (7).

In addition, these recognizances contain a significant number of phrases and terms that belong to the legal topic. For instance, “*Memorandum*”, “*Justices*”, “*Superiour Court of Judicature*”, “*accused and Suspected*”, “*Statute*”, “*Court of Assize*”, “*cheife Justice*”, “*Committed for Suspition*”, “*licence*”, “*Executtors Administrators*”, “*Confessed*”, “*Receive Order*”, “*Above mentioned Articles*”, “*this Obligation*”, “*Wittness*”, “*Majests Councill*”, “*forfieture*”, “*severally Indebted*”, “*alledged against*”, “*imprisoned on Suspicion of her being Guilty of the Crime*”, “*Let to Bail*”.

Additionally, the recognizances also contain such terms like “*hereof*”, “*thereof*”, “*whereof*” and their other derivatives, although their number is smaller than in the aforementioned genres: “*In Wittness hereof*”, “*herunto sett*”, “*Condition hereafter Named*”.

Moreover, one can find a much larger variety of word doublets than in the previously discussed genres: “*came and appeared*”, “*themselves and each of them*”, “*heires and Successors*”, “*their or either of their*”, “*accused and Suspected*”, “*made and provided*”, “*taken up and committed*”, “*do and receive*”, “*then & there*”, “*void and of none Effect*”, “*in full force and virtue*”, “*Joyntly &*

Severally”, “*matters and things*”, “*full & Juste*”, “*True & Juste*”, “*Well & Truely*”, “*practised & Comitted*”, “*Care & Custodye*”, “*themselves & Each of them*”, “*their or Either of their*”, “*oweing and Indebted*”, “*Lands and Tenements*”, “*goods and Chattles*”, “*holden & firmly Bownd*”, “*hands & Seals*”.

In addition, it is of paramount importance to mention the much more frequent occurrence of adjectives such as “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, “*the same*”, *etc.* used for the description of nouns: “*the said County of Suffolk*”, “*our said Lord and Lady*”, “*the above Recogniscance*”, “*the abovebounden John Alden*”, “*the said John Alden*”, “*the said Court*”, “*this abovementioned Recogniscance*”, “*sd Sovereigne*”, “*the sd Court*”, “*the above named Jno Osgood Sen'r*”, “*the Abovesaid John Bridges*”, “*Aforesaid husbandman*”, “*the Aforesaid Mary Bridges*”, “*the Aforesaid George Corwin*”, “*the Same Mary Bridges*”, “*the Above mentioned Articles*”, “*the Sheriff Aforesaid*”, “*the Aforesaid Bethya Carter*”, “*s'd Sum*”, “*the Abovenamed John Osgood Sen'r*”, “*the Aforesaid John Osgood*”, “*the Same Dorothy faukner*”, “*S'd Bond*”, “*the aboves'd Decon John Fry*”, “*Underwritten One*”.

It is worth noting that, similar to the genres discussed above, recognizances are legally prescriptive documents, which is why it is necessary for them to include references to the governing bodies: “*Lord & Lady*”, “*King and Queen*”, “*Esq'r*”, “*Ma'ties*”, “*Sherriff of the Cownty*”, “*Keeper of their Maj'es Goale*”, “*High Sheriffe*”.

It's also noteworthy that within these texts, there are Latin and French phrases present, which may serve as an indicator of the legal genre: “*Oyer & Terminer*”, “*Annoq Dom*”.

3.4.4. Structure

The structure of a recognizance can be broken down into three primary parts: the Opening, the Statement, and the Conclusion. The Opening section solely includes the date.

In contrast to previous genres, the Statement section of the recognizances is much more extensive. It includes a comprehensive statement indicating the date of the person's appearance before the authorities, the name and full title of the authority, the name of the person, details of the debt acknowledgement, the conditions outlining a range of details about the charged person, their offense, their obligations, etc.

The Concluding part of the recognizances contains the signature and the outcome of the entire procedure. A typical example of a recognizance structure is illustrated below in the “Recognizance for Dorothy Faulkner and Abigail Faulkner, Jr. by Francis Faulkner & Joseph Marble”:

Structure	Text
Opening	
Date	<i>[January 13, 1693]</i>
Statement	
Full date	<i>on the Thirteenth day of Jan'ry 1692 in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady William & Mary the Grace of God of England &c: King & Queen Defenders of the faith</i>
Name and full title of the authority	<i>Personally appeared before William Stoughton Esq'r cheife Justice of their Maj'ies Province of the Massachusets bay in New England</i>

Name of the person	<i>Francis Falkner Husbandman & Joseph Marble Mason both of Andiver in the County of Essex</i>
Details of the debt acknowledgement	<i>acknowledged themselves to be joyntly & severally Indebted unto our s'd: sovereigne Lord & Lady & the survivor of them their Heires & Successors in the sum of One Hundred Pounds to be levied on their or either of their Lands and Tenniments, goods & Chattles for the use of our s'd: sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen or survivor of them</i>
Condition	<i>on Condition that Dorathy Forkner and Abigaile Forkner haveing stood committed for Suspition of Witchcraft shall make their p'sonall appearance before the Justices of our s'd: Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen at the next Court of Assizes and Generall Goal Delivery to be holden for the County of Essex then & there to answer to all such matters & things as shall in their Maj'ies behalfe be alleadged against them and to do and receive that which by the s'd: Court shall be then & there injoynd them & thence not to depart without licence</i>
Conclusion	
Signature	<i>Attest *Jona Elatson Cler.</i>
Outcome of the entire procedure	<i>10 May Apear'd</i>

3.4.5. Conclusion

The analysis of the recognizances has shown that there is a large number of words with Middle English spelling and non-standard variation which was very common in Early American English. Among other typical Early American English features, there is the absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural, capitalized words, archaic present and past participles, do-support, “-th” as a third-person singular ending and uninflected auxiliary for plural nouns.

Furthermore, recognisances possess linguistic traits which indicate that they belong to the legal genre, such as legal terms, words like “*hereof*”, “*thereof*”, “*whereof*” and their derivatives, doublets, adjectives “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*”, references to the governing bodies, Latin and French phrases, the use of passive voice and subjunctive mood and a three-part pattern of the texts.

3.5. Warrant

In this segment, we shall carry out an analysis of the first ten warrants that have been included in the archive. (see Appendix 5)

3.5.1. Spelling

In the warrants presented, several spelling features can be identified and highlighted accordingly.

- Words with traditional British spelling: “*Govern'r*”, “*honoures*”, “*labourer*”;
- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*severall*” (*obsolete*), “*behalf*” (*Middle English*), “*obedience*” (*Old French*), “*warrant*” (*Middle English*), “*theire*” (*Middle English*), “*faile*” (*Middle English*), “*aledged*” (*obsolete*), “*provence*” (*Old French*), “*Examened*” (*Middle English*), “*peticuler*” (*obsolete*), “*Delievered*” (*obsolete*), “*returne*” (*obsolete*), “*Sherriffe*” (*obsolete*), “*premisses*” (*Middle English*), “*Serch*” (*Middle English*), “*popetts*” (*Middle English*), “*yor*” (*Middle English*), “*sayd*” (*Middle English*), “*appeare*” (*obsolete*), “*suspition*” (*obsolete*), “*ffeloniously*”

(*Middle English*), “*Seavententh*” (*obsolete*), “*theyr*” (*Middle English*), “*shee*” (*obsolete*), “*ofe*” (*Middle English*), “*a clock*” (*obsolete*);

- Non-standard variations:
 - Doubled consonant: “*Worshippl*”, “*Exhibbitted*”, “*perrill*”, “*ffelonioulsly*”, “*Tenne*”, “*nott*”;
 - Omitted consonant: “*Comand*”, “*Imediately*”, “*aprehended*”, “*opressing*”, “*Masathusets*”, “*Comitted*”, “*wichcraft*”, “*Worshippl*”, “*Riten*”;
 - Replaced consonant: “*suffitient*”, “*Masathusets*”, “*Souereigne*”, “*Suspision*”, “*procecut*”, “*shipt*”;
 - Added consonant: “*virture*”;
 - Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “*ag't*”, “*yo'r*”, “*sen'r*”, “*jun'r*”, “*o'r*”, “*und'r*”, “*s'd*”, “*dep'y*”, “*w'th*”;
 - Replaced vowel: “*Magestrates*”, “*Bodys*”, “*siese*”, “*derects*”, “*hur*”, “*severeall*”, “*bin*”;
 - Added “e”: “*tortureing*”, “*Sovereigne*”, “*accordeing*”, “*soone*”, “*Relateing*”, “*reigne*”, “*bringe*”, “*warne*”, “*Cleare*”, “*honoures*”, “*Tenne*”, “*aforenoone*”, “*att*”, “*woeman*”, “*whoe*”, “*bee*”, “*Countery*”;
 - Omitted vowel: “*mentined*”, “*Receved*”, “*provenc*”, “*aforesd*”, “*sd*”, “*Worshippl*”, “*abovesd*”, “*undr*”, “*wth*”, “*sezed*”, “*sid*”, “*procecut*”, “*appointed*”, “*ben*”.

3.5.2. Grammar

The following grammatical peculiarities should be mentioned:

- Idiosyncratic use of “ye” as definite determiner: “*in ye County of Essex*”, “*on ye bodys of timothy Swan of Andover*”, “*to ye peace of or Souereigne Lord*”, “*siese ye body*”;

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: “*Queen Maryes name*”, “*their Majes'ts Laws*”, “*in their Majes'ts names*”, “*their Majes'ts justices*”, “*their Maj'sts Colony*”;
- Capitalised words: “*several of their Children*”, “*to Authorize & Comand*”, “*forthwith to Apprehend*”, “*in that Case provided*”, “*safely Convey*”, “*who stands Charged*”, “*acts of Witchcraft Lately on the Body*”, “*Examination Relating to the abovesaid Premises*”, “*You are Required*”, “*with all Speed*”, “*I having Receved perticuler Order*”, “*have Brought him*”, “*this Instant mo[nth]*”, “*her Examination Relateing*”, “*hereof Faile not*”, “*she is Highly suspected*”, “*Whereas There is Complaint Exhibbitted*”, “*at Eight a Clock In order to*”, “*to Cleare up the Grounds of Suspition*”, “*Did Sometimes one of them & Sometimes Both*”;
- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: “*Rose foster*”, “*andover*”, “*mr George Buroughs*”, “*portsmouth*”, “*newhansher and maine*”, “*martha Carrier*”, “*abi[gail] williams*”, “*richard carier and andrew carier*”, “*timothy Swan*”, “*haveril*”;
- Use of passive voice: “*Complaint hath been made*”, “*what shall be objected*”, “*to be examined & proceeded*”, “*You are in their Majest's names hereby required*”, “*to be Examened*”, “*in order to bee shipt*”;
- Archaic present participle: “*tortureing*”, “*haveing*”, “*Relateing*”;
- Archaic past participle: “*holden*”;
- Use of the modals: “*what shall be objected*”, “*this shall be yo'r sufficient warrant*”, “*shall be aledged against her*”, “*you may not faile*”, “*as soon as may be*”, “*may relate to witchcraft*”, “*shall Call for hur*”, “*I could not find*”;
- “-th” as a third-person singular ending: “*hath*”, “*standeth*”.

3.5.3. Vocabulary

The most common words and phrases found in the warrants' vocabulary are: "*Salem*" (24), "*Warrant*" (20), "*ye*" (14), "*Constable*" (12), "*Majesties*" (11), "*apprehension*" (9), "*witchcraft*" (6).

Additionally, it should be noted that these warrants exhibit a substantial abundance of phrases and terms pertaining to the domain of law. For instance, "*Complaint*", "*guilty of witchcraft*", "*to Authorize*", "*to Apprehend*", "*Laws*". "*justices of the peace*", "*to be examined & proceeded with according to law*", "*to prosecute*", "*stands Charged*", "*Suspected for a Confederacy*", "*Delievered him to the Authority*", "*to inquire after & make Serch*", "*according to Law*", "*Honored Court*", "*Recognizance is Enterd*", "*Conviction*", "*as the Law derects*", "*to Cleare up the Grounds of Suspition*", "*ffeloniously afflict*".

Moreover, it is worth noting that the warrants encompass lexemes such as "*hereof*", "*thereof*", "*whereof*" and their respective variations: "*upon sight hereof*", "*hereof You are not to faile*", "*you may not faile herein*", "*hereby required*", "*By virture hereof*", "*whereby great hurt*", "*whereof I make my Returne*".

Furthermore, the warrants provided exhibit a considerable amount of word doublets: "*tortureing & afflicting*", "*Authorize & Comand*", "*afflicted & abused*", "*apprehend & seize*", "*to be examined & proceeded with*", "*hand & seal*", "*to apprehend and secure*", "*hurt & [injury]*", "*inquire & make Serch*", "*seize & bringe*", "*warne & Require*", "*to Apprehend & bring*", "*done or Committed*".

Additionally, it is noteworthy to mention the frequency with which adjectives such as "*the above-mentioned*", "*the said*" and "*the same*", etc. are employed in the warrants: "*the said John Alden*", "*the aboves'd William Barker*", "*The s'd Martin & Tyler*", "*the within Riten persons*", "*the abovesaid Premises*", "*the w'tin named parson*", "*sd Mary Clerke*", "*abovesd Justices*", "*the sayd Rachell Clenton*", "*the Said Hannah Carrell*", "*said Complaint*", "*Sarah Cole within named*", "*the above named Elizabeth Collson*".

It is pertinent to observe that since warrants represent legally prescriptive documents, they include a lot of references to the relevant regulatory authorities: “Constable of Salem”, “King William & Queen Mary”, “the Sherriff of the County of Essex”, “dep’y or Constable in Andover”, “field Marshal”, “Magestrates”, “the Govern’r & Council”, “marshall of the Provence of newhansher and maine”, “the Marshall of Essex”, “Constables of Andover”, “Constable of Haverhill”, “Honored Court”.

It is also of significance that these warrants incorporate Latin and archaic phrases, which may function as a signal of the legal genre: “tener”, “Anno Domini”, “morrow morning”.

3.5.4. Structure

The warrant is composed of three parts: the Opening, the Statement, and the Conclusion.

The Opening part provides details regarding the date and addressee of the document.

In the Statement, instructions are given to the addressee concerning the apprehension of the accused person and the charges levelled against them. This part also includes details about the offence and the victim.

The Conclusion sums up the warrant with a restatement of the instructions for the addressee in a standard format, specifically, “*And that in order to her Examination Relating to the abovesaid Premises and hereof You are not to faile*”; as well as contains the date, venue and signature of the issuing official.

Furthermore, the warrant is accompanied by the officer's response, which verifies the arrest, identifies the detainee, specifies the authority and includes the officer's signature. The standard warrant structure can be seen in the example of “Warrant for apprehension of Mary Bridges, Sr. and Officer's Return”:

Structure	Text
-----------	------

Opening	
Date	<i>[July 28, 1692]</i>
Addressee	<i>To The Sherriff of the County of Essex or dep'y or Constable in Andover</i>
Statement	
Instruction	<i>You are in their Majest's names hereby required to apprehend & forthwith, or as soone as May be, bring before us</i>
Name of the accused	<i>Mary Bridges the wife of John Bridges of Andover</i>
Offence	<i>who stands Charged in behalfe of their Majest's w'th haveing Committed Sundry acts of Witchcraft Lately</i>
Victim	<i>on the Body of Timothy Swan of Andover and others to their great hurt</i>
Conclusion	
Instruction	<i>And that in order to her Examination Relating to the abovesaid Premises and hereof You are not to faile</i>
Date and venue	<i>Dated Salem July the 28'th 1692</i>
Signature	<i>*Bartho Gedney</i> <i>*John: Hathorne</i> <i>*Jonathan. Corwin</i> <i>*John Higginson Esq</i>
Officer's response	

Verification of the arrest, name of the detainee, the authority, the officer's signature	<i>in obedience to this writ I have Seased the Body of Marie Bridges wife of John Bridges and have brought her to #[the worshipfull] answer John hathron] at Sailom what shall be aledged against her this 28 of July 1692</i> <i>By mee *John Ballard constable of andover</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.5.5. Conclusion

Upon analysis of the warrants, it was noted that they exhibit linguistic characteristics that are typical of Early American English, such as the use of traditional British and Middle English spellings, non-standard variations, the archaic form of the article “the”, absence of apostrophes in possessive singular and plural, capitalized words, archaic present and past participles, and the third-person singular ending “th”. However, these warrants also contain features that indicate their legal nature, such as the use of passive voice, legal terminology, lexemes like “*hereof*”, “*thereof*”, and “*whereof*” and their derivatives, doublets, adjectives such as “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*” references to governing bodies, Latin and archaic phrases, and a three-part structure.

3.6. Testimony

Below, we will conduct an examination of the initial ten warrants that have been incorporated into the archive. (see Appendix 6)

3.6.1. Spelling

Within the testimonies, various orthographic characteristics can be discerned.

- Words with traditional British spelling: “*neighbo'rs*”;
- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*Somtime*” (*Middle English*), “*shee*” (*obsolete*), “*behalfe*” (*Middle English*), “*hous*” (*Middle English*), “*thos*” (*Middle English*), “*wen*” (*Old Dutch*), “*hor*” (*Middle English*), “*horselife*” (*Middle English*), “*amonkes*” (*Middle English*), “*coud*” (*obsolete*), “*neare*” (*obsolete*), “*betwene*” (*Middle English*), “*knese*” (*Middle*

English), “testifie” (Middle English), “aboute” (obsolete), “yeares” (obsolete), “agee” (obsolete), “benne” (Old Dutch), “dor” (Middle English), “dore” (Middle English), “again” (obsolete), “seene” (obsolete), “betweene” (obsolete), “howres” (obsolete), “tyme” (Middle English), “moneths” (Middle English), “weeke” (obsolete), “verry” (Middle English), “maner” (Middle English), “purpos” (Middle English), “peeces” (Middle English), “som” (Middle English), “mony” (obsolete), “gon” (Middle English), “drawne” (obsolete), “allways” (Middle English), “aforesaide” (obsolete), “folke” (Middle English), “downe” (obsolete), “Childe” (obsolete), “moor” (Middle English), “hed” (Middle English), “fier” (obsolete), “uneasie” (obsolete), “restles” (Middle English), “Evill” (obsolete), “seaven” (obsolete), “stomake” (Middle English), “myselfe” (Middle English), “cume” (Middle English), “brest” (Middle English), “itt” (obsolete), “ware” (obsolete), “trobled” (Middle English), “foote” (obsolete), “creture” (Middle English), “owne” (obsolete), “yeers” (Middle English), “Imployed” (obsolete), “fift” (Middle English), “throate” (obsolete), “Satterday” (Middle English), “bothe” (Middle English), “hir” (Middle English), “deafe” (Old English), “Lett” (obsolete), “won” (obsolete);

- Non-standard variations:

- Doubled consonant: “fitts”, “chilldren”, “allso”, “tolld”, “quiett”, “Yett”, “invisibile”, “miserable”, “almost”, “forreigners”, “Condittion”, “satt”, “shutt”, “gott”, “vallue”;
- Omitted consonant: “tatling”, “obsanely”, “nayborhud”, “witnes”, “disapeared”, “Sicknes”, “ofered”, “Ilnes”, “puting”, “strenth”, “afirmed”, “Imediatly”, “headles”;
- Replaced consonant: “aflicketed”, “althow”, “uce”, “thurtey”;
- Added consonant: “wichshing”, “abouts”, “Shewld”, “owld”;
- Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “prison^rs”, “o^r”, “wth”, “yo^r”, “rememb^r”, “s^d”;

- Replaced vowel: “*mischeif*”, “*testymony*”, “*testyfy*”, “*mery*”, “*obsanely*”, “*rever*”, “*nayborhud*”, “*aftor*”, “*hes*”, “*thay*”, “*Evedence*”, “*bin*”, “*Shewld*”, “*beleive*”, “*Docters*”, “*Munky*”, “*Endeavered*”, “*popitts*”, “*togather*”;
- Added vowel: “*liveued*”, “*bereaft*”;
- Added “e”: “*aflicketed*”, “*sawe*”, “*doe*”, “*lipes*”, “*wee*”, “*bye*”, “*noe*”, “*goe*”, “*mye*”, “*clearly*”, “*plainely*”, “*Roome*”, “*feete*”, “*feare*”, “*arme*”;
- Omitted vowel: “*chilld*”, “*althow*”, “*wors*”, “*Com*”, “*Caus*”, “*tru*”.

3.6.2. Grammar

The following grammatical peculiarities ought to be noted:

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: “*natures strength*”, “*Lords day*”, “*face somewhat more like a mans than a Munkies*”;
- Informal singular 2nd person pronoun: “*thou roague w't dost thou bring*”;
- Capitalised words: “*woman of An unruly turbulent Spirit*”, “*pins out of her Close*”, “*went to the Entry dore*”, “*same Woman in the same Garb and Cloaths*”, “*in a sad Condition*”, “*in very Slighty Errants*”, “*for Ever Since he has bin Stupified*”, “*thurtey two Yeares*”, “*seaven or Eight yeares*”, “*owld wall Belonging To the s'd sellar*”, “*aboute Eight yeares Since*”, “*in the Latter end of May or the Begining of June*”, “*in her Red paragon Bodys*”;
- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: “*Sarah vibber*”, “*Joseph fowler*”, “*good bibbor*”, “*John bibbor*”, “*goodwife bibber*”, “*goodwife Oliver*”, “*Sarah phillips*”, “*goody hinderson*”;
- Use of passive voice: “*that is now counted*”, “*candles were lighted*”, “*was taken in a very drooping Condition*”, “*he had bin thrust out*”, “*this child was taken*”, “*he was helped*”, “*wee are all borne*”, “*he is born to be*”;

- bewitched and is bewitched*”, “*you will be Ruled*”, “*the dores ware shutt*”, “*I was struck dumb*”, “*he #[he] was Immediatly strook speechless*”;
- Archaic present participle: “*Bareing*”, “*makeing*”, “*spekeking*”, “*goeing*”, “*sleepeing & wakeing*”, “*takeing*”, “*thriveing*”, “*Liveing*”, “*haveing*”, “*adjoyneing*”, “*Comeing*”, “*burneing*”, “*following*”, “*heareing*”, “*giveing*”;
 - Archaic past participle: “*crost*”, “*Claspt*”, “*Cryed*”, “*pittyed*”, “*replied*”, “*layd*”, “*denyed*”, “*spake*”, “*strook*”, “*broak*”, “*cryed*”, “*sayd*”;
 - Archaic 2nd person singular simple present form: “*dost*”;
 - Use of the modals: “*coud fall*”, “*could not quiett it*”, “*i could not judge them*”. “*he Could not tell how*”, “*he Shewld have none*”, “*you shall want for Nothing*”, “*could feale noe substance*”, “*he could not speake*”, “*could not move*”;
 - Use of subjunctive mood: “*if he be not*”, “*the whole armor of god be between mee and You*”;
 - Do-support: “*I did observe*”, “*his wife doth testyfy*”, “*he did then see*”, “*he did Rise up*”, “*Child did pine away*”, “*doth Testifie*”, “*Edward Bishop did Come*”, “*he did know*”, “*I paused in my Selfe & did rememb'r*”, “*this man did Say*”, “*his very Countenance did bespeak Compassion*”, “*doe beleive that*”, “*bright moon: light did clearely see*”, “*I did plainely see her*”, “*did see a black thing*”, “*the oath that he had taken did owne*”, “*she then usually did ware*”, “*she did use to goe in*”, “*did clearely & plainely know her*”, “*he did Rise*”, “*wee did then Apprehend*”;
 - Archaic form of pronouns: “*any thing*”, “*any where*”;
 - “-th” as a third-person singular ending: “*Testifieth*”, “*sayth*”, “*doth*”, “*saith*”, “*affirmeth*”.

3.6.3. Vocabulary

Since the document has a testimonial nature, one can observe the abundance of the words “*testifieth*” (12), “*saith*”(10) and “*testimony*” (10) in the text.

Given that testimony is categorized as a descriptive legal genre and is composed based on the utterances of the witness, the style and content of the document are diverse. Consequently, the text employs colloquial and informal speech, and, unlike the prescriptive genres previously analysed, there is a scarcity of legal jargon or terminology featured in the narratives.

However, there is a noticeable frequency of word doublets in the provided testimonies: “*Testifieth & sayth*”, “*observe and take notice*”, “*tatling & tale Baring*”, “*vanished or disappeared*”, “*Garb and Cloaths*”, “*Countenance & garb*”, “*crying & moaning*”, “*uneasie and restles*”, “*said or affirmed*”, “*clearly & plainely*”.

Additionally, one can observe that adjectives such as “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*” and “*the same*”, etc. are often used in the testimonies: “*the abovesaid Oliver*”, “*the aforesaid Stranger*”, “*the aforesaid Bridged Oliver*”, “*s'd Bridget Bushop*”, “*the s'd owld wall*”, “*the s'd sellar*”, “*s'd Jn'o Bly*”, “*said Edward Bushop*”.

3.6.4. Structure

While testimonies lack a rigid structure due to their descriptive nature, they can be broadly categorized into three parts: the Opening, the Statement, and the Conclusion. The Opening segment typically includes the document's date.

In the Statement, the witness's name is mentioned, usually followed by the phrase “*testifyeth & saith*”. This part also includes a detailed account of all the events, wherein the witness narrates the actions of the suspected individual.

The Conclusion part comprises the witness's signature, along with the date and signature of the official who recorded the testimony.

Below is the example of testimony’s general structure based on the “*Testimony of Joseph Fowler Regarding Sarah Bibber*”:

Structure	Text
-----------	------

Opening	
Date	<i>[++ June 29, 1692]</i>
Statement	
Detailed account of all the events	<i>The Testimony of Joseph fowler, who Testifieth that Goodman Bibber & his wife, Lived at my house, and I did observe and take notice, that Goodwife Bibber was a woman, who was very idle in her calling And very much given to tatling & tale Bareing makeing mischeif amongst her neighbo'rs, & very much given to speak bad words and would call her husband bad names & was a woman of a very turbulent unruly spirit</i>
Conclusion	
Witness's signature	<i>Joseph fowler</i>
Date	<i>Sworne Salem June 29th 1692</i>
Official's signature	<i>*Jonathan. Corwin</i>

3.6.5. Conclusion

After analyzing the testimonies, it was observed that they display linguistic traits that are characteristic of Early American English. These traits include the use of traditional British and Middle English spellings, non-standard variations, absence of apostrophes in possessive singular and plural, informal singular 2nd person pronoun, capitalized words, archaic present and past participles, do-support, obsolete form of pronouns, and the third-person singular ending “th”. Additionally, the text employs informal and colloquial language.

Despite their linguistic features of Early American English, these testimonies also exhibit legal characteristics, although with less frequency, such as the use of

doublets, adjectives such as “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*” and a three-part structure.

3.7. Examination

In this section, we will review the first ten examinations included in the archive. (see Appendix 7)

3.7.1. Spelling

- Words with traditional British spelling: “*Superiour*”;
- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*gratifie*” (*Old French*), “*Tryals*” (*obsolete*), “*sumer*” (*Middle English*), “*persones*” (*Old French*), “*unkle*” (*obsolete*), “*theire*” (*Middle English*), “*myle*” (*Middle English*), “*stomack*” (*obsolete*), “*afrayd*” (*Middle English*), “*beleeve*” (*obsolete*), “*promessed*” (*Old French*), “*pardone*” (*Old French*), “*tyme*” (*Middle English*), “*peeces*” (*Middle English*), “*speake*” (*obsolete*), “*cliver*” (*Middle English*), “*acused*” (*Middle English*), “*yeares*” (*obsolete*), “*lyke*” (*Middle English*), “*syne*” (*Middle English*), “*neare*” (*obsolete*), “*countrey*” (*obsolete*), “*wyne*” (*obsolete*), “*Kingdome*” (*obsolete*), “*harme*” (*obsolete*), “*wittnese*” (*Middle English*), “*severall*” (*obsolete*), “*dayes*” (*obsolete*), “*mynd*” (*Old English*), “*cloaths*” (*obsolete*), “*appoynted*” (*obsolete*), “*sute*” (*Middle English*), “*devill*” (*obsolete*), “*baptisme*” (*Old French*), “*stomak*” (*Middle English*), “*answere*” (*Middle English*), “*alledged*” (*obsolete*), “*Aprill*” (*Middle English*), “*coate*” (*Middle English*), “*stricking*” (*obsolete*), “*wayes*” (*obsolete*), “*shee*” (*obsolete*), “*goode*” (*obsolete*), “*then*” (*obsolete*), “*evill*” (*obsolete*), “*Examinacon*” (*Old French*), “*dores*” (*Middle English*), “*mony*” (*obsolete*), “*potts*” (*Old English*), “*Divels*” (*Middle English*), “*Mening*” (*Middle English*), “*Signe*” (*Middle English*), “*promis*” (*Middle English*), “*bred*” (*Middle English*), “*Inocent*” (*Old French*), “*Ware*” (*obsolete*), “*untill*” (*Middle English*), “*shap*” (*Middle English*);
- Non-standard variations:

- Doubled consonant: “*blott*”, “*mett*”, “*equall*”, “*fitt*”, “*barrill*”, “*Sett*”, “*yett*”;
- Omitted consonant: “*wen*”, “*jugling*”, “*resurection*”, “*aflicted*”, “*litle*”, “*affliced*”, “*committed*”, “*likenes*”, “*confese*”, “*Inocencey*”, “*strenth*”;
- Replaced consonant:
 - Added consonant: “*Wrighting*”;
 - Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “*look'd*”, “*s'd*”;
- Replaced vowel: “*hes*”, “*dipt*”, “*efter*”, “*sais*”, “*lye*”, “*togather*”, “*scabberd*”, “*probablie*”, “*angrie*”, “*whither*”, “*bin*”, “*barrill*”, “*falswhood*”;
- Added vowel: “*doo*”, “*Inocencey*”;
- Added “e”: “*teare*”, “*doe*”, “*goe*”, “*promaised*”, “*judgement*”, “*prisone*”, “*bodyes*”, “*cowes*”, “*morneing*”, “*wee*”, “*Looke*”, “*toren*”, “*strucke*”, “*sine*”, “*Booke*”, “*confese*”, “*throwne*”;
- Omitted vowel: “*threatned*”, “*suspicon*”, “*apperance*”, “*ben*”, “*Strangly*”, “*privatly*”, “*wer*”.

3.7.2. Grammar

In the examinations provided, we may observe the following grammatical characteristics:

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: “*Peoples Faces*”, “*in the devils book*”, “*Mary Barkers apparition*”, “*ministe'rs house*”, “*Satans design*”, “*Sam'll wardell*”, “*Divels [Snare]*”, “*at Ballards house*”, “*ballards wife*”;
- Capitalised words: “*upon the Accusation of a company*”, “*possessed Creatures or Witches*”, “*the same Accuser had a Man*”, “*he stooped down to her Ear*”, “*he sells Powder and Shot*”, “*to stand upon a Chair*”, “*look upon the Accusers*”, “*these Creatures to accuse Innocent persons*”, “*no Bail would be taken for him*”, “*he remained Fifteen Weeks*”, “*soul &*

Body”, “*confirmation of the Covenant with the devil*”, “*the above Said is the Truth as wittnese my hand*”, “*there was such a load upon his Stomack*”, “*I am not guilty of Murder*”, “*the Last night*”, “*she Answered about a month*”, “*hoped God would Clear her Inocencey*”, “*afflict me Such atime in Such a place in Such amaner*”;

- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: “*mary marston*”, “*Lost of god*”, “*Goody falkner*”, “*Sprague foster and martin*”, “*Kingdome of christ*”, “*Rose foster*”, “*Abigall martin*”, “*mercy Lewes*”, “*mary walcoate*”, “*good Bishop*”, “*suzanna Post*”, “*ann Putnam*”;
- Use of passive voice: “*you are suspected*”, “*she was taken with a fit*”, “*he was sent forth till several others were examined*”, “*he was brought in again*”, “*he was ordered to be abroad*”, “*who it was of all the People in the Room*”, “*one of these Accusers*”, “*a Ring was made*”, “*Aldin was sent for to the Meeting*”, “*what Reason there could be given*”, “*Aldin was again committed*”, “*no Bail would be taken for him*”, “*she was baptised*”, “*she was Lost*”, “*she should never be brought out*”, “*It was proposed*”, “*The sound is heard many myles off*”, “*he hes been informed*”, “*witches are much disturbed*”, “*their Society is brought under*”, “*He is accused*”, “*he was much disturbed*”, “*You are now brought*”, “*what was alledged was found*”, “*the afflicted were tortured*”, “*you are permitted*”, “*who have been examined before you*”, “*she was not troubled*”, “*afflicted persons are now dreadfully afflicted*”, “*they were not hurt*”, “*She was throwne of her horse*”, “*testimonys wer read*”;
- Archaic present participle: “*squeezeing*”, “*speakeing*”, “*pincheing*”, “*Clincheing*”, “*exerciseing*”, “*goeing*”, “*layeing*”, “*doeing*”, “*comeing*”, “*sayeing*”;
- Archaic past simple: “*plaid*”, “*spake*”, “*stopt*”, “*dipt*”, “*had tore*”, “*bewicht*”, “*have not wrote*”, “*toren*”, “*prickt*”;

- Use of the modals: “*I should confess this*”, “*I must confess*”, “*you may not hide you guilt*”, “*the accusers could not have*”, “*he might not pinch*”, “*hey should think that he should come to that Village*”, “*he should give glory to God*”, “*that might give suspicion*”, “*he should with Job maintain his Integrity*”, “*he could assure him*”, “*I can assure you*”, “*she should never be brought out*”, “*he should live comfortably*”, “*all persones should be equal*”, “*could not sleep well*”, “*he could not think of his baptisme before*”, “*the Devil cannot hurt her*”, “*You may threaten, but you can do no more*”, “*they Could not Shed*”, “*I can help thee with strength*”;
- Use of subjunctive mood: “*unless it be he*”, “*if this be the woman*”;
- Do-support: “*I never did hurt them*”, “*the afflicted did describe*”, “*Aldin did pinch them*”, “*he did see cause to alter his judgment*”, “*which did speake to her*”, “*and did also renounce his former baptisme*”, “*wee did then see*”, “*I never did hurt them in my life I did never see these persons*”, “*mary walcoate did tell*”, “*I doe tell the truth*”, “*afflicted persons doe charge this woman*”, “*She did Sign the book*”, “*they did answer*”;
- Archaic form of pronouns: “*any thing*”, “*Some body*”;
- “-th” as a third-person singular ending: “*Doth*”, “*hath*”, “*sayth*”, “*saith*”, “*supposeth*”, “*sayeth*”;
- Uninflected verb: “*be you the man?*”, “*If it please your worship*”, “*She shake her head*”;
- Singular pronoun for plural noun: “*all this people*”;
- Archaic objective form of the singular 2nd person pronoun: “*I can help thee with strenth*”.

3.7.3. Vocabulary

Among the words and phrases frequently encountered in examinations, there are: “*afflicted*” (42), “*witch*” (27), “*1692*” (21), “*persons*” (21), “*Examination*” (17), “*Goody*” (16), “*hurt*” (16), “*God*” (12), “*witchcraft*” (10), “*eyes*” (7).

Furthermore, given that the examination constitutes a narrative derived from the testimonies of lay witnesses who were affiliated with the Puritan community of Salem, there exists a notable presence of a lexicon pertaining to religious themes: *“I say before God”, “if you would find mercy of God”, “God knows”, “I speak before God”, “give glory to God”, “gratifie the Devil”, “he hoped God would clear up his Innocency”, “Providence of God”, “a lying Spirit”, “she was baptized”, “to pardone her sins”, “she was Lost of god”, “in the snare of the devil”, “Covenant with the devil”, “Sacrament”, “the Kingdome of christ”, “renounce the devil”, “shee calls the devill her God”, “hoped God would Clear her Inocencey”, “His name Was Jesus”, “Renounce god & Christ”.*

Moreover, the examinations comprise a considerable amount of terminology that belongs to the legal domain. For instance, *“accusation”, “guilty”, “confess”, “accusers”, “magistrates”, “afflicted”, “Marshal's Custody”, “suspected”, “Innocency”, “committed to the Marshal”, “no Bail would be taken”, “observing the manner of Tryals”, “Evidence then taken”, “cleared by Proclamation”, “Examined before their Majesties Justices”.*

Additionally, the recognizances also contain such terms like *“hereof”, “thereof,” “whereof”* and their other derivatives: *“she shall hereafter remember”, “he dipt his finger therein”, “thereupon set his hand”, “putting his finger thereon”, “therewith made a red mark”.*

It is also possible to find a variety of word doublets: *“one and all”, “by-standers and observers”, “Powder and Shot”, “load & weight”, “soul & body”, “bread & wyne”, “Serve & worship”, “god & Christ”.*

In addition, adjectives such as *“the above-mentioned”, “the said”, “the same”, etc.* can also be found in the examinations: *“as aforesaid”, “the above three persones”, “the above Said is the Truth”, “Signed & owned the abovesaid”, “to take the above examination”, “owned the above: written”.*

3.7.4. Structure

Examinations, due to their descriptive nature, lack a strict format, yet can be broadly classified into three major segments: the Opening, the Statement, and the Conclusion.

The Opening component usually encompasses pertinent details such as the date, title, subject, location, and authority of the document.

The Statement, known for its minimal structure, commonly entails an elaborate narrative provided by the accused individual, outlining all events associated with their alleged witchcraft involvement.

The Conclusion entails the signature of the accused person, along with the date and signature of the official who recorded the testimony.

“Examination of Mary Barker” serves as a representative model of the aforementioned examination framework:

Structure	Text
Opening	
Date, subject, location, authority	<p><i>[August 29, 1692.]</i></p> <p><i>29 August 1692. Before Maj'r Gidney Mr. Hawthorn and Mr. Corwin</i></p> <p><i>The Examination and confession of Mary Barker of Andover</i></p>
Statement	
Detailed account of all the events	<p><i>After severall questiones propounded and negative answe'rs Returned she at last acknowledged that Goody Johnson made her a witch, And that #[this] sometine last #[spring] sumer she made a red mark in the devils book with the forefinger of her Left hand, And the Devil would</i></p>

have her hurt martha Sprague Rose foster and Abigail martin which she did upon Saturnday and Sabath day last, she said she was not above a quarter of an hour in comeing down from Andover to Salem to afflict, she sayes she afflicted the above three persones bye squeezeing her hands. she confesses she was at the witch meeting at Salem Village with her unkle, there was a great many theire, and of her company their was only her unkle, W'm Barker and mary marston Martha Sprague said that Mary Barkers apparition told that she was baptised at five myle pond.

said Mary Barker said there was such a load & weight at her stomack that hindered her from speakeing And is afrayd she hes given up her self soul & body to the devil she sayes she promised to serve worship and beleeve in him And he promessed to pardone her sins, but finds he hes deserved her, and that she was Lost of god and all good people, That Goody Jonson and Goody falkner appeared at the same tyme and threatned to teare her in peeces if she did not doo what she then did. she further sayth that she hes seen no appearance since but a fly which did speake to her, and bid her afflict these poor creatu'rs. which she did by pincheing with, and Clincheing of her hands for which she is sorry, And further the Devil told her it would be very brave and cliver for her to come down here to Salem among these accused persones. And that she should never be brought out. She promises to confess what more she shall hereafter remember.

Conclusion	
Signature of the accused person, date, signature of the official	<p><i>Mary Barker Signed and owned THE X MARKE</i></p> <p><i>the abovesaid Examination & Confesion of Mary.</i></p> <p><i>Barker:</i></p> <p><i>17 Sep't 1692 before me</i></p> <p><i>*John Higginson Jus'e peace</i></p>

3.7.5. Conclusion

Upon conducting an analysis of examinations, it becomes evident that they possess linguistic characteristics that are typical of Early American English. These include Middle English spellings and non-standard variations, capitalized words, archaic present and past participles, do-support, obsolete forms of pronouns, and the third-person singular ending “-th”. Additionally, the examinations contain lexicon related to religious themes, as they are based on lay people’s testimonies. Furthermore, the examinations exhibit features that are common in the legal genre, such as the use of legal terminology, doublets, adjectives such as “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*”, the use of passive voice and subjunctive mood, and a three-part structure. Additionally, the text employs words such as “*hereof*”, “*thereof*”, “*whereof*” and their derivatives, further emphasizing their legal nature.

3.8. Indictment

This section will cover the initial ten indictments that have been added to the archive. (see Appendix 8)

3.8.1. Spelling

The indictments provided exhibit the following spelling traits:

- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*yeare*” (*obsolete*), “*divers*” (*Old French*), “*Certaine*” (*obsolete*), “*mallitiously*” (*obsolete*), “*Soveraigne*” (*obsolete*),

“theire” (Middle English), “dayes” (obsolete), “Lawes” (Middle English), “Deuill” (obsolete), “Signe” (Middle English), “himselfe” (Middle English), “Soule” (Middle English), “maner” (Middle English), “forme” (Middle English), “moneth” (Middle English), “Nyneteenth” (Middle English), “als” (Middle English), “Aprill” (Middle English);

- Non-standard variations:

- Doubled consonant: *“felloniously”, “diabollicall”, “Att”, “witnesses”;*
- Omitted consonant: *“Aflicted”, “Comitted”;*
- Replaced consonant: *“Baptizme”;*
- Added consonant: *“Excercised”, “Tourtered”;*
- Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): *“Jur'rs”, “o'r”, “Sov'r”, “afors'd”, “form'r”, “ag't”, “Defend'r”;*
- Replaced vowel: *“Jurie”;*
- Added vowel: *“Juriors”, “Jurie”;*
- Added “e”: *“Towne”, “Crowne”, “doe”, “Towneship”, “Booke”, “Baptizme”;*
- Omitted vowel: *“aforsaid”, “aforsd”.*

3.8.2. Grammar

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: *“the Devills Booke”, “promised to be the Devills”;*
- Capitalised words: *“Sov'r lord and Lady”, “present That”, “after Certaine detestable arts Called Witchcrafts”, “is Tortured Aflicted Consumed pined Wasted and Tormented”, “Exercised At and in the Towne of Andivo'r”, “done before and Since”, “And Divers other Dayes & times”, “Single Woman By which Wicked Arts”, “in the Yeare 1692”, “Wickedly Mallishly & feloniously”, “their Crowne & dignity”;*
- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: *“Rose foster”;*

- Use of passive voice: “*was & is Tortured*”, “*by the Devill was Baptized*”, “*Mary Walcott is Tortured afflicted Tormented Consumed wasted & pined*”, “*was & is hurt*”, “*was, and is tortured Afflicted*”;
- Do-support: “*King & Queen doe present*”, “*A Covenant with the Devill did make*”, “*did Signe*”;
- “-th” as a third-person singular ending: “*hath used*”.

3.8.3. Vocabulary

Some of the words and phrases that are most often seen in indictments include: “*King*” (23), “*Queen*” (22), “*County*” (18), “*aforesaid*” (17), “*Lady*” (17), “*Lord*” (14), “*felloniously*” (9).

A significant amount of word doublets can also be found in indictments: “*In & upon*”, “*days & Times*”, “*Witchcrafts & Sorcerys*”, “*mallitiously & felloniously*”, “*practised & Exercised*”, “*at & in*”, “*Wasted and Tormented*”, “*made & provided*”, “*at and within the Township*”, “*afflicted and Tormented*”, “*Soule & body*”, “*Wicked & diabollicall*”, “*maner & forme*”.

Additionally, adjectives like “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, “*the same*” and others are commonly present in indictments: “*in the yeare aforesaid*”, “*Towne of Andivor aforesaid*”, “*County of Essex aforesaid*”, “*Said Wicked Arts*”, “*the Said Rose foster*”, “*the said Abigaill Martin*”, “*the day aforesaid*”, “*The Said William Barker*”, “*the Said Martha Sprague*”, “*The Said Mary Walcott*”, “*the said Mercy Lewis*”, “*the s'd Nyneteenth Day of April*”, “*in the fourth Year aboves'd*”.

It's worth noting that indictments often incorporate Latin and archaic phrases, which serve as a marker of the legal genre: “*Anno RR's & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c Quarto Ansq'e \ Dom :*”, “*quarto Anno Domini*”, “*Billa vera*”, “*last Anno*”, “*Ignoramus*”.

3.8.4. Structure

Indictments follow a three-part structure, comprising an Opening, Statement, and Conclusion. The Opening includes a formal statement of the date and venue, with

the date often provided in the form of a Latin phrase, such as “Anno Regis et Reginae Willm et Mariae nuc Angliae &c Quarto”. The purpose of this opening formula is to establish the court's authority to try the indictment.

The Statement aims to present all of the charges against the accused individual. It achieves this by summarizing the relevant facts and circumstances that constitute the alleged crime. Specific formulaic phrases are used to provide information about the accused, the offense, and the victim. Once adopted, these patterns became standard and were repeated across various indictments.

Finally, the Conclusion of the indictment specifies that the offense is a breach against the peace of the King and Queen, as well as the relevant statute of the law.

Below, you may see an example of the typical indictment structure:

Structure	Text
Opening	
Date and venue	<i>Essex in the Province of the Massachusetts bay In New England ss//Anno RR's & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c Quarto Anoq'e \ Dom : 1692</i>
Statement	
Charges	<i>The Jur'rs for o'r Sov'r lord and Lady the King and Queen present That Abigaill Barker Wife of Ebenezer Barker of Andivor In & upon the Eighth day of September last in the yeare aforesaid & divers other days & Times as well before as after Certaine detestable arts Called Witchcrafts & Sorcerys wickedly mallitiously & felloniously hath used practised & Exercised at & in the Towne of Andivor aforesaid in the County of Essex aforesaid #[in] upon & Against One Rose foster of</i>

	<i>Andivor by which Said Wicked Arts the Said Rose foster the day & year afors'd & divers others days & times both before & after was & is Tortured Afflicted Consumed pined Wasted and Tormented.</i>
Conclusion	
Breach against the the peace of the King and Queen	<i>Against the peace of o'r Sov'r lord & lady the King & Queen their Crowne & dignity & the laws & Acts in that Case made & provided</i>

3.8.5. Conclusion

Upon analysis of the indictments, it is evident that they display linguistic characteristics that are typical of Early American English, including Middle English spellings and non-standard variations, absence of apostrophes in possessive singular and plural, capitalized words, do-support, and the third-person singular ending “-th”.

Moreover, the indictments exhibit common legal features, such as the use of passive voice, doublets, and adjectives like “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, and “*the same*”. Additionally, the text utilizes Latin and archaic phrases. What is also notable is the rigid structure of indictments, which repetitively use patterns and structures.

3.9. Deposition

In this segment, we'll discuss the first ten depositions that were included in the archive. (see Appendix 9)

3.9.1. Spelling

- Archaic or obsolete forms: “*thereaboutes*” (*Middle English*), “*fourteene*” (*obsolete*), “*again*” (*obsolete*), “*downe*” (*obsolete*), “*grownd*” (*obsolete*), “*betweene*” (*obsolete*), “*coate*” (*Middle English*), “*severall*”

(*obsolete*), “*answared*” (*Old English*), “*Elce*” (*obsolete*), “*howse*” (*obsolete*), “*Peices*” (*Middle English*), “*Corne*” (*Old French*), “*Instumentall*” (*Middle English*), “*agoe*” (*obsolete*), “*unusuall*” (*obsolete*), “*Immediatly*” (*obsolete*), “*appered*” (*Middle English*), “*ware*” (*obsolete*), “*tould*” (*obsolete*), “*murthered*” (*obsolete*), “*wherof*” (*Middle English*), “*yeares*” (*obsolete*), “*comunion*” (*Old French*), “*entertaine*” (*obsolete*), “*houres*” (*Middle English*), “*fynding*” (*obsolete*), “*putt*” (*obsolete*), “*shee*” (*obsolete*), “*rationall*” (*obsolete*), “*evill*” (*obsolete*), “*intervalls*” (*Middle English*), “*owne*” (*obsolete*), “*cutt*” (*Middle English*), “*veine*” (*Middle English*), “*devill*” (*obsolete*), “*severall*” (*obsolete*), “*hous*” (*Middle English*), “*thare*” (*Middle English*), “*aboute*” (*obsolete*), “*Cominge*” (*Middle English*), “*behinde*” (*Middle English*), “*suspition*” (*obsolete*), “*kinde*” (*obsolete*), “*Dureing*” (*obsolete*), “*Redy*” (*Middle English*), “*sence*” (*obsolete*), “*beleve*” (*Middle English*), “*dreadfull*” (*obsolete*), “*hir*” (*Middle English*), “*evidens*” (*Latin*), “*halfe*” (*Middle English*), “*weekes*” (*obsolete*), “*magotts*” (*Middle English*), “*dayes*” (*obsolete*), “*sayle*” (*Middle English*), “*fifeteen*” (*obsolete*), “*arived*” (*Middle English*), “*vessell*” (*Middle English*), “*wholy*” (*obsolete*), “*wayes*” (*obsolete*), “*Choak*” (*obsolete*), “*accidently*” (*Middle English*), “*thether*” (*obsolete*), “*semeing*” (*obsolete*), “*maner*” (*Middle English*), “*sumthing*” (*obsolete*), “*hart*” (*obsolete*);

- Non-standard variations:

- Doubled consonant: “*Visitt*”, “*Pockett*”, “*gett*”, “*Leggs*”, “*mett*”, “*Bagg*”, “*bushells*”, “*prophainness*”, “*fitts*”, “*threww*”, “*wittness*”, “*Childdren*”, “*almost*”, “*Thatt*”, “*att*”, “*barr*”, “*nott*”, “*itt*”, “*runn*”, “*Shipp*”, “*sevrall*”, “*stopp*”, “*butt*”, “*affter*”, “*widdow*”, “*afterwards*”, “*deall*”, “*catt*”, “*hedd*”
- Omitted consonant: “*sudenly*”, “*seting*”, “*cissars*”, “*apearance*”, “*kiled*”, “*Diferance*”, “*answed*”;

- Replaced consonant: “*Apperishtion*”, “*prophainness*”, “*councelling*”, “*wicth*”;
- Added consonant: “*Deposistion*”, “*affafflicted*”, “*stanck*”;
- Contraction with superscript letters (after apostrophe): “*s'd*”, “*o'r*”, “*disturb'd*”, “*p'rson*”;
- Replaced vowel: “*Deponant*”, “*whither*”, “*denigh*”, “*beleive*”, “*veryly*”, “*testife*”, “*Apperishtion*”, “*thay*”, “*fyre*”, “*Sabboth*”, “*desturbance*”, “*prophecys*”, “*befere*”, “*cissars*”, “*afflecting*”, “*Siptember*”, “*vioage*”, “*tunns*”, “*sume*”, “*Diferance*”, “*derted*”, “*suter*”, “*tare*”;
- Added vowel: “*tiwins*”, “*reproved*”, “*befour*”, “*affafflicted*”, “*angury*”;
- Added “e”: “*Towne*”, “*wheele*”, “*Roome*”, “*doe*”, “*desiered*”, “*tooke*”, “*noe*”, “*sate*”, “*neede*”, “*leake*”, “*looke*”, “*moone*”, “*goe*”, “*turne*”, “*tare*”;
- Omitted vowel: “*mone*”, “*thretned*”, “*aversness*”, “*vengance*”, “*befour*”, “*ben*”, “*wer*”, “*Apperance*”, “*com*”, “*sevrall*”, “*answed*”, “*se*”, “*grate*”, “*hedd*”.

3.9.2. Grammar

- The absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural: “*Bishops shape*”, “*Deponents Horse*”, “*Prisillas Death*”, “*Lords Supper*”, “*Bishops Dwelling house*”, “*Bishops wife*”, “*her husbands Discourse*”, “*fathers horses*”, “*Mr Gorge Carrs horses*”, “*mis Bradberys window*”, “*mr Bradberys gate*”;
- Capitalised words: “*withall Professed a great Love*”, “*in his Affliction*”, “*it had been good Money*”, “*in his Pockett*”, “*why she Asked*”, “*he did not Question*”, “*this Depon't went Back*”, “*more Mischief*”, “*throwed Down a Bank*”, “*he had Passed*”, “*draw All his Gears*”, “*other of her Pranks*”, “*she saw my two Childdren Laying before her*”, “*words of Difference*”,

- “of Late”, “all the night Long”, “very Little reply”, “almost Redy to kill”, “she or hir Apperance”, “there came up a Shipp”, “almost Choak me”, “sume Diferance”, “and Immediately there”;*
- Omission of capitalization in proper nouns: *“William stacy”, “John hues”, “elezebeth Balch”, “Abigail walden”, “Anna putnam”, “mis mary Bradbery”, “mary wallcott”, “Sarah vibber”, “mary warrin”, “mr carrs”, “mr wheleright”, “william Bradbery”, “doctor crosbe”, “goody mertin”;*
 - Use of passive voice: *“Deponant was Visited”, “this Depon't was forced”, “who was suddenly taken”, “she was distracted”, “Lord was pleased”, “shee had been bewitched”, “I was then troubled”, “Bishop might be sent”, “shee might make friends”, “they ware put in to there Coffins”, “Georg Curwin was buried”, “what was Done”, “they were marryed”, “we were forct”, “he was shook”, “I was taken”, “I was behaged”;*
 - Archaic present participle: *“agoeing”, “askeing”, “haveing”, “goeing”, “striveing”, “tackeing”, “Thriveing”, “beeing”, “continueing”, “hopeing”, “Rideing”, “semeing”, “liveing”;*
 - Archaic past simple: *“hopt”, “they were marryed”;*
 - Use of the modals: *“could not find any hole”, “Bishop Jun'r might not be permitted”, “Bishop might be sent”;*
 - Use of subjunctive mood: *“she dare”;*
 - Do-support: *“Bridget Bishop did give him a Visitt”, “it did awake him”, “Bishop did entertaine people”, “discord did arise”, “I doe fear”, “it did manifest strong”, “she did evill”, “I then judge & still doe apprehend it impossible”, Deponant Did reprove”, “she then did most curtuously invite”, “the widdow did so corsely treat”, “liveing creature did run”, “he did beleve”, “I did strick at it”;*
 - Archaic form of pronouns: *“her selfe”;*
 - “-th” as a third-person singular ending: *“Deposeth and Saith”, “hath”, “doth”, “testyfieth & saith”.*

3.9.3. Vocabulary

In depositions, the most frequent words that one can come across are: “*Bishop*” (39), “*Deposition*” (12), “*house*” (11), “*saith*” (9), “*Deponent*” (7), “*Salem*” (6).

Moreover, considering that the deposition comprises a narrative of non-expert witnesses who were part of the Puritan community of Salem, one can notice a significant presence of a religious vocabulary: “*full comunion in o'r Church*”, “*Lords Supper*”, “*wee sought the Lord by fasting & prayer*”, “*the Lord was pleased*”, “*on a Sabboth day*”, “*shee earnestly desired prayer*”, “*work of the devill or witchcraft*”, “*he Devill Did Come bodyly unto her*”, “*she was familiar with the Devill & that she sate up all the night Long with the Devill*”.

One should also mention a large number of word doublets: “*Deposeth and Saith*”, “*prophainness & iniquity*”, “*afflecting and tormenting*”.

In addition, adjectives “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, “*the same*”, etc. are also frequently encountered in the examinations: “*he Looked #[on the Said mone*”, “*the said [] Bishop*”, “*the said Bridgett Bishop*”, “*whither that #[above written] which he had reported was true*”, “*the said Trask*”, “*s'd Goody Bishop*”, “*s'd Day*”, “*s'd Salem*”, “*s'd Beverly*”, “*the aforsaid two legs*”, “*the said widdow*”, “*the s'd william Bradbery*”.

It is noteworthy that depositions frequently integrate Latin expressions, which function as an indicator of the legal genre: “*Jurat in Curia*”, “*Billa vera*”.

3.9.4. Structure

Depositions adhere to a tripartite structure, which comprises an Opening, Statement, and Conclusion.

The Opening is composed of a standardized, legal clause that includes the date, introduces the individual and establishes the validity of the subsequent text. This section asserts that the forthcoming text is the “*verbatim*” testimony of the deponent, thereby conferring legal status on their words.

The Statements in depositions exhibit considerable variation in style and content, but most are conveyed in the first person and employ informal, idiomatic language. Legal terminology is generally absent from this part.

The third section of the deposition, the Conclusion, consistently includes the date of the document, signature, as well as employs phraseology that reinforces the legal status of the document.

Below, you may see the typical structure of the deposition based on the example of “Deposition of Mary Warren v. Mary Bradbury”.

Structure	Text
Opening	
Standardized, legal clause	<p><i>[September 9, 1692]</i></p> <p><i>The Deposition of mary warren who testifieth and saith that</i></p>
Statement	
Narrative	<p><i>I have been along time afflected by a woman which tould me hir name was Mis Bradbery and that she came from Salisbury but on the 2'th day of July 1692 : being the day of the examinat[ion of] mis mary Bradbery I then saw that she was the very woman which tould me hir name was mis Bradbery and [she did] most [gre]viously Afflect and torment me dureing [the time of hir] examination for if she did but #[strick] look upon [me she would] strick me down or allmost Choak me also on the da[y of her exa]mination I saw mis Bradbery or hir Apperance mo[st greviously] afflect and torment mary wallcott Sarah vibberE[liz Hubbard] and Ann putnam and I beleve in</i></p>

	<i>my heart that mi[s] Bradbery is [a witch] and that she has very often afflicted an[d tormented me] and several others by hir acts of wicthcraft</i>
Conclusion	
Reinforcement of the legal status of the document	<i>mary warrin ownid this har testimony one the oath whic[h] she hath taken before the grand Inquest this.</i>
Date	<i>9th of September 92</i>
Signature	<i>Mary Warren Depostion</i>

3.9.5. Conclusion

After conducting an analysis, it can be deduced that the 17th-century deposition displayed non-standard variations and words with Middle English spelling. The depositions also exhibited grammatical peculiarities such as the absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural, capitalised words, archaic present and past participles, do-support, obsolete forms of pronouns, “-th” as a third-person singular ending and uninflected verbs. As to the vocabulary of the deposition, one of its prominent features is the abundancy of the religious lexicon. All the above-mentioned features are characteristic of Early American English. Despite this, the deposition adheres to a strict structure, includes the use of passive voice, word doublets, adjectives “*the above-mentioned*”, “*the said*”, “*the same*” and Latin expressions which is an indicator of the legal nature of the texts.

CONCLUSION

Since legal language is not only a means of communication, but also a reflection of the social, political, and cultural context in which it is used, it is of paramount importance to understand what lies behind its origins.

Therefore, the purpose of our study was to provide a comprehensive analysis of American legal English used in the court records of the Salem Witch Trials and gain a deeper understanding of its features and the factors that influenced its development. To do so, we have completed all the tasks set at the beginning of our paper: we have analysed the linguistic traits and trends of American juridical language of the 17th century; have executed a thorough evaluation of the legal language categorized by assorted genres in the Salem Witch Trials; have researched orthographical traits, lexical peculiarities, grammatical attributes and structural characteristics of genres encountered in the court records of the Salem Witch Trials; have determined the possible influence of the societal, cultural, and historical context on the American legal English of the 17th century.

In order to accomplish the aforementioned tasks, we have covered theoretical material on the definitions of terms that pertain to the field of legal discourse and the different characteristics of modern legal English.

In Chapter 2, we have made a choice as to the methods for the research and helping materials necessary for carrying out the analysis.

To complete our tasks, we have applied diachronic and synchronic approaches which are deemed to be complementary means necessary for analyzing historical legal language. As the basis for the analysis, we have chosen 1 plea, 8 mittimus, 10 summonses, 10 recognizances, 10 warrants, 10 testimonies, 10 examinations, 10 indictments and 10 depositions drawn from the Documentary Archive of Salem Witch Trials, which includes a digital collection of primary source documents pertaining to the Salem witch trials.

In Chapter 3, we have conducted an analysis and drawn certain inferences (see below).

Having analysed the orthographical characteristics of legal genres, we can state the following. As to the traces of traditional British spelling (“-our” ending, e.g., “*saviour*”, “*endevo’red*”), which could be noticed in the pleas, mittimuses, recognizances, warrants, testimonies and examinations, one should bear in mind that British English served as the basis for Early American English. What is more, although there was already a tendency in Early American English to omit “u” in “-our” ending, this spelling form was set only in 1828 with the publication of Webster’s dictionary. Considering the prevalence of archaic and Middle English forms, which exhibit the highest frequency across all genres, it is imperative to acknowledge the swift evolution of language in Britain. This evolution was accompanied by the implementation of prescriptive grammar, which deemed variations in spelling as abnormal. Conversely, in America, language transformations occurred at a comparatively slow pace within the conservative and tightly-knit Puritan communities. Consequently, many spelling forms that were considered outdated elsewhere remained in use and were preferred. Additionally, such conservatism in relation to language is also supported by the fact that some words in Early American English preserved the spelling of Old French (which was considered very prestigious) and Old Dutch (since Pilgrims first travelled to Amsterdam).

Additionally, the clerks tended to write in a manner that reflected the spoken language or their own sense of orthography, which is also called “eye dialect” (nonstandard spelling for standard pronunciation). For instance, every genre contains such non-standard variations as doubled consonants, omitted consonants, replaced consonants, contraction with superscript letters, replaced vowels, added “e”, omitted vowels. As a result, we may see that before the introduction of “An American Dictionary of the English Language” by Noah Webster in 1828, spelling was not systematic and relied heavily on the phonetical pronunciation of

the words. Therefore, the aforementioned non-standard spelling variations may give us a glimpse into how the people of Salem pronounced words. For example, it is possible to observe that Early American English was influenced by the dialects of lower classes which resulted in some vowels moving up, e.g., [e] was pronounced as [i], [o] and [a] as [ə] (“*seaven or Eight yeares*”).

What is more, an attempt was made to conduct quantitative research by utilizing the Online NGram Analyzer to count the most frequently occurring words. However, this approach was hindered by the lack of strict spelling conventions for most words, which rendered it impossible to accurately determine their frequency and draw specific conclusions.

Another peculiar spelling feature, which we should pay attention to, is the contraction with superscript letters. The superscript letters are a particular kind of abbreviation where the last letter of the shortened word is put above the line. They were particularly common abbreviations used by medieval scribes, especially in Latin, Greek and Old English, mainly for the purpose of saving space and time.

As to the grammatical peculiarities, they might be explained by several facts. For example, the utilization of distinct capitalization rules, which has been encountered in every analysed text, can be rationalized by the prevalence of historical English-language practice in the 17th and 18th centuries which involved the capitalization of initial letters of nouns. This trend was further encouraged by John Hart, who advocated for capital letters to be utilized at the commencement of each sentence, for proper nouns, and noteworthy common nouns. Over time, words and phrases that were intended to be emphasized were often designated with capital letters. In due course, certain authors employed capitalization for any word they deemed to be significant. Consequently, it can be inferred that in the court records of the Salem Witch Trials, the clerks employed capitalization to signify words they considered significant or requiring emphasis during reading. Nowadays, we similarly place an emphasis on specific words by utilising Caps Lock feature in the text.

It was also possible to note the frequent use of grammatical forms of archaic English, which were typical for this language period. For example, the repetitive occurrence of do-support, peculiar forms of second-person pronouns (“*ye*”, “*thou*”), archaic past participles (“*holden*”), present participles (“*having*”), pronouns (“*any thing*”), word forms (“*of the Clock*”), articles (“*ye*”), “-th” ending in the third-person singular verbs (“*hath*”), uninflected verbs (“*she shake*”). Moreover, in the course of our analysis, we have also encountered the archaic form of the definite determiner “*ye*”. However, when discussing the article “*ye*”, it is important to note that this form is found exclusively in the writings of a single individual, Thomas Wade. Hence, it can be considered more as an idiosyncratic occurrence rather than an adopted grammatical form.

As to the statements with do-support, it is vitally important to note that in Early American English, they were not used for emphasis. Only in contemporary legal discussions did their meaning shift, resulting in such sentences appearing emphatic to us as present-day speakers. However, the writers of that era did not intend to convey emphasis through the utilization of do-support. Consequently, when do-support is employed in modern legal English, the language appears to possess a greater emotional colouring than in the past.

Other grammatical features that are encountered in the texts is the absence of an apostrophe in possessive singular and plural and the use of subjunctive mood, which are an example of grammatical archaism, since at that time, the British have already adopted the rules for using apostrophe and replaced subjunctive mood with present tense. As has been already stated above, this may be explained by the fact that the Puritan community was extremely conservative and their language was in a state of near-stagnation. Therefore, while in Britain such grammatical features were forced out with the adoption of prescriptive grammatical rules, in America they were still very much in use.

Apart from the conservatism of the Puritan community in relation to the language, some of the grammatical features may be explained by the regional and social

peculiarities of the speakers. For example, due to the fact that Pilgrims, who mostly belonged to the lower and lower-middle classes, came from Southern Britain, we may see language traits which were typical for this region and were preserved by the Puritans, such as the above-mentioned “-th” ending in the third-person singular verbs, peculiar forms of pronouns (“*her selfe*”) and archaic 2nd person singular simple present form (“*dost*”).

In addition, since the texts available in the archive belong to the legal field, we were able to observe some features that are typical for this domain even today, such as the use of passive voice, which was employed in order to conceal the agent’s identity while highlighting their action. We should also mention that although in Britain 2nd person pronoun “ye” was already disappearing, Early American English retained the distinction between formal (“ye”) and informal (“*thou*”) 2nd person pronouns. What is more, the formal pronoun “ye” was predominantly employed to address governing bodies as a means of demonstrating respect towards them (e.g., “*ye Worshipfull Maj'r Sam'll Appleton*”). Therefore, it is possible to state that American legal English operated with the category of politeness expressed through the differentiation between the 2nd person pronouns. And although modern legal English lacks such differentiation, it has been replaced by various forms of address in order to mark the power hierarchy in court (e.g., *Your Honour, Your Excellency, etc.*).

It is also noteworthy that through the analysis of the use of modal verbs, it was possible to observe that American legal English of the 17th century didn’t contract words (“*could not quiett it*”, “*i could not judge them*”, “*he Could not tell how*”). Consequently, this trait became an anachronism that has been embraced in contemporary legal discourse.

After carrying out the analysis of the vocabulary of the chosen texts, we have found that almost all genres contain characteristics that are representative of the field of law. For example, legal terms and the first legal clichés, some of which are found even in modern legal English: “*to take into care*”, “*plead guilty*”,

“upon further examination”, “to take into custody”, “due course of law”, “Given under our hands”, “stand charged”, “make personal appearance”, “to be void”, “to the best of their knowledge”.

Additionally, the court records of the Salem Witch Trials featured a notable presence of word doublets or binomials (*“Sumonsed and warned”, “to Warn & give Notice”*), which were used to ensure the preciseness and definiteness in the documents’ meaning. These linguistic constructions continue to be widely utilized in contemporary legal discourse. Similarly, the Salem legal texts employed adjectives such as *“the above-mentioned”, “the said”, and “the same”* to serve the same purpose (which are also typical for modern legal discourse). The determiner “the” + adjectives expressing precision, were instrumental in avoiding any potential vagueness or ambiguity in the written content, thereby maintaining clarity and accuracy.

The documents also contained a significant amount of such terms as *“hereof”, “thereof”, “whereof”* and their other derivatives. It should be mentioned, however, that although these terms are typical for modern legal discourse, they were also prevalent in everyday American English up until the 19th century.

As to the Latin terms and phrases, which are typical for modern legal language, their proportion in the documents of the Salem Witch Trials is rather low, which might be explained by the religious beliefs of Puritans and their rejection of the Roman Catholic Church, which conducted services in Latin.

It is also noteworthy that religious vocabulary was present not only in the genres that consist of a narrative of non-expert witnesses who were part of the Puritan community, such as in pleas, examinations and depositions. Rather, it permeated other genres as well. This observation suggests that the church played a substantial role in the administration of justice, and religious vocabulary constituted a vital component of American legal English and its corresponding legal genres.

Having considered the structural features of the texts, it was possible to observe that legal genres of the 17th century hadn't yet acquired a rigid form and the wording of texts could vary within one genre. The only consistency that could be found across all genres is the division of the text into three parts: Opening, Statement and Closing.

Nevertheless, the only genre where the structural conventions were adhered to was indictment. In regard to this genre, it was evident for us that meticulous drafting of the documents was crucial. The consistency of the wording across indictments further highlighted the importance of precise phrasing.

What is more, in order to prove our theory that Salem indictments were drafted, we decided to explore a bit further and reviewed the original manuscripts and they revealed a high level of care in their preparation. It was possible to state that most indictments in Salem were composed in two stages, with a preliminary "template" created and spaces left for specific details to be added by the magistrate who drafted the final indictment. It is interesting to note that modern indictments still follow this practice of leaving blank spaces for information to be supplied when drawn up.

The Salem Witch Trials archive has given us a glimpse into the origins of the American legal language and the historical background for its emergence. We hope the research we have carried out provides a better understanding of the Early American English used in the legal setting in the 17th century and proves helpful and insightful in further research in this area.

REFERENCES

1. Allan K. Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics. Oxford University Press, 2013. 896 p.
2. Allen D. G. In English Ways: The Movement of Societies and the Transferral of English Local Law and Custom to Massachusetts Bay in the Seventeenth Century. New York : W.W. Norton, 1982. 312 p.
3. arrest warrant. *LII / Legal Information Institute*. URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/arrest_warrant.
4. Ashley C. What is Early Modern English and Why is it so Important?. Cornell University Press, 2005. 98 p.
5. Bailey R. W. Speaking American: A History of English in the United States. Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2015. 232 p.
6. Barber C. L. Early modern English. London : Deutsch, 1976. 360 p.
7. Baugh. A. History of English Language. Prentice-Hall, 1989. 565 p.
8. Bill B. Mother Tongue: English and How It Got That Way. Penguin Books, Limited, 2008. 288 p.
9. Boyer P. Salem Town and Salem Village: The Dynamics of Factional Conflict. Da Capo Press, 2006. 99 p.
10. Breen T. H. Moving to the New World: The Character of Early Massachusetts Immigration. New York : Pearson/Longman, 2004. 387 p.
11. Bronow S. Characteristics of Early American English. University Press, 1879. 81 p.
12. Campbell M. Social Origins of Some Early Americans. London : Merlin Press, 1983. 453 p.
13. Caporeal L. Ergotism: The Satan Loosed in Salem? Osaka University Press, 2002. 141 p.
14. Claxton A. O. D. The Suffolk Dialect of the 20th Century. Ipswich : N. Adlard, 1954. 111 p.

15. Cooley M. Emerging Standard and Subdialectal Variation in Early American English. Austin : Eakin Press, 1984. 240 p.
16. Crystal D. Encyclopedia of the English. Cambridge University Press, 2003. 506 p.
17. Crystal D. The Cambridge Dictionary of English Language. Bangor : Cambridge University Press, 2018. 489 p.
18. Definition of DEPOSITION. Dictionary by Merriam-Webster: America's most-trusted online dictionary. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/deposition>.
19. Definition of EXAMINATION. Dictionary by Merriam-Webster: America's most-trusted online dictionary. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/examination>.
20. Demos J. A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony. New York : Oxford University Press, 1970. 201 p.
21. Demos J. Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England. Oxford University Press, 1983. 289 p.
22. Depraetere I. Perspectives on Translation Quality. Boston : DE GRUYTER, 2011. 213 p.
23. Dillard L. Toward a Social History of American English. Berlin : Mouton, 1985. 301 p.
24. Ekwall E. A History of Modern English Sounds and Morphology. Oxford : Blackwell, 1975. 133 p.
25. Federal Indictments: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions. Burnham & Gorokhov. URL: <https://www.burnhamgorokhov.com/criminal-defense-resources/federal-criminal-process/federal-indictments-faqs/>
26. Ferdico J. N. Criminal Procedure for the Criminal Justice Professional. 3rd ed. St. Paul : West Pub. Co., 1985. 405 p.
27. Fisher W. Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture. Cambridge University Press, 2010. 240 p.

28. Friedman L. M. History of American Law. Oxford University Press, 2019. 858 p.
29. Garner B. A. The Elements of Legal Style. 2nd ed. New York : Oxford University Press, 2002. 268 p.
30. Gibbons J. Language Law. Pearson ESL, 1999. 476 p.
31. Gibson M. Witchcraft and Society in England and America, 1550-1750. Cornell University Press, 2003. 256 p.
32. Gorlach M. Colonial Lag?: The Alleged Conservative Character of American English and Other 'Colonial' Varieties. Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 1987. 281 p.
33. Gozdz-Roszkowski S. Patterns of Linguistic Variation in American Legal English: A Corpus-Based Study. Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, Peter, 2012. 280 p.
34. Gracia J. J. E. A Theory of Textuality: The Logic and Epistemology. Albany : State University of New York Press, 1995. 309 p.
35. Greven P. J. Four generations: Population, Land and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts. Ithaca : Cornell U.P., 1970. 329 p.
36. Grund P. J. Editing the Salem Witchcraft Records: an Exploration of a Linguistic Treasury. Benjamins Publishing Company, 2021. 235 p.
37. Haigh R. Legal English. Routledge, 2015. 360 p.
38. Holt E. Formulating the Facts: Questions and Repeats in Police-Suspect Interviews. Queen's University Press, 2006. 115 p.
39. Hurt J. British and American, Continuity and Divergence. PowerHouse Books, 2000. 288 p.
40. indictment. Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/indictment>.
41. Jean A. Language change: Progress or decay? New York : Universe Books, 1985. 264 p.
42. Joseph B. D. Historical linguistics. New York : Routledge, 2013. 225 p.

43. Karlsen C. F. Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England. Norton & Company, Incorporated, W. W., 1998. 384 p.
44. Kimble J. Writing for Dollars, Writing to Please: The Case for Plain Language in Business, Government, and Law. Carolina Academic Press, 2012. 223 p.
45. Klemola J. Non-Standard Periphrastic Do: A Study in Variation and Change. Oxford University Press, 2016. 76 p.
46. Kurath H. Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England. Providence : Brown University, 1939. 240 p.
47. LaMance K. Mittimus Legal Definition. LegalMatch Law Library. URL: <https://www.legalmatch.com/law-library/article/mittimus-definition.html>.
48. Leedy P. D. Practical Research: Planning and Design. 3rd ed. New York : Macmillan, 1985. 313 p.
49. Luger H.-H. Some Aspects of Ritual Communication. Peter Lang Publishing, 2001. 352 p.
50. Lune H., Berg B. L. Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences. Pearson Education, Limited, 2011. 448 p.
51. Mattila H. E. S. Comparative Legal Linguistics. Ashgate Publishing, 2006. 347 p.
52. Mayoral Asensio R. Translating Official Documents. Routledge, 2014. 79 p.
53. McDavid R. I. Varieties of American English. Stanford, Calif : Stanford University Press, 1980. 383 p.
54. McDowell B. Historical Research: A Guide. Taylor & Francis Group, 2013. 273 p.
55. McDowell W. H. Historical research: A Guide. London : Longman, 2002. 273 p.
56. McIntyre D. History of English: A Resource Book for Students. Taylor & Francis Group, 2020. 280 p.

57. O'Grady W. *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. St Martins Pr, 1993. 620 p.
58. Obenga T. *Genetic Linguistic Connections of Ancient Egypt and the Rest of Africa*. Senegal : Per Ankh, 2004. 671 p.
59. Parole and Probation Administration-Redeeming Lives.Restoring Relationships. URL: <https://probation.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2014/10/Implementing-Guidelines-ROR.pdf>
60. Pederson L. *Dialects. English in North America*. Atlanta : Emory University, 1977. 203 p.
61. Pei J. *Discursive Profile of International Telecommunication Regulations as Institutional Dialogue: A Sociosemiotic Perspective*. *Social Semiotics*, 2019. 147 p.
62. plea. *Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus*. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/plea?q=plea+>.
63. Purkiss D. *Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth-Century Representations*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2003. 304 p.
64. Pyles T. *Words and Ways of American English*. New York : Random House, 1952. 310 p.
65. recognizance. *Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus*. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/recognizance?q=Recognizance>.
66. Rissanen M. *Salem Witchcraft Papers as Evidence of Early American English*. Helsinki : Société néophilologique, 1967. 325 p.
67. Salkind N. J. *Exploring Research*. New York : Macmillan Pub. Co., 1991. 361 p.
68. Salmon V. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Creative Media Partners, LLC, 2018. 178 p.

69. Šarčević S. *New Approach to Legal Translation*. The Hague : Kluwer Law International, 1997. 308 p.
70. Saussure F. d. *Course in General Linguistics*. LaSalle, Ill : Open Court, 1991. 236 p.
71. Sijeta B. *Early Modern English*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2018. 164 p.
72. Skeat W. *Principles of English Etymology*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1891. 269 p.
73. Smelser N. J. *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier Science & Technology Books, 2001. 628 p.
74. Spanos N. *Ergotism and the Salem Village Witch Trials*. The University of Chicago Press, 2010. 216 p.
75. Summons. LII / Legal Information Institute. URL: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/summons>.
76. testimony. LII / Legal Information Institute. URL: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/testimony>.
77. Thornton G. C. *Legislative Drafting*. 3rd ed. London : Butterworth, 1987. 396 p.
78. Tiersma P. M. *Legal Language*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1999. 314 p.
79. *Tips and Template for Written and Oral/Recorded Testimony*. ACLU of DC. URL: <https://www.acludc.org/en/tips-and-template-written-and-oralrecorded-testimony>.
80. Trudgill P. *Introducing Language and Society*. Penguin Books Ltd, 1992. 80 p.
81. Varo E. A. *Legal Translation Explained*. Manchester : St. Jerome Pub., 2002. 204 p.
82. Welcome to Legal Aid ACT. URL: https://www.legalaidact.org.au/sites/default/files/files/publications/First_time_court_plea_guilty.pdf.

83. What Is a Summons? URL: <https://www.hg.org/legal-articles/what-is-a-summons-34255>.
84. What Questions Are Asked During a Deposition?. Morgan & Morgan Lawyers | America's Largest Personal Injury Law Firm. URL: <https://www.forthepeople.com/personal-injury-lawsuits/what-questions-are-asked-during-a-deposition/>.
85. Wydick R. C. Plain English for Lawyers. 3rd ed. Durham : Carolina Academic Press, 1994. 150 p.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Plea

(Plea of Mary Bradbury)

[+ September 9, 1692]

The Answer of Mary Bradbury in the charge of Witchcraft or familiarity with the Divell I doe plead not guilty. I am wholly inocent of any such wickedness through the goodness of god that have kept mee hitherto) I am the servant of Jesus Christ & Have given my self up to him as my only lord & saviour: and to the dilligent attendance upon him in all his holy ordinances, in utter contempt & defiance of the divell, and all his works as horid & detestible; and accordingly have endevo'red to frame my life; & conversation according to the rules of his holy word, & in that faith & practise resolve by the help and assistance of god to contineu to my lifes end: for the truth of what I say as to matter of practiss I humbly refer my self, #[my selfe,] to my brethren & neighbors that know mee and unto the searcher of all hearts for the truth & uprightness of my heart therein: (human frailties, & unavoydable infirmities excepted) of which i bitterly complayne every day: /

Mary Bradbury

Appendix 2

Mittimus

(Mittimus for John Alden and Sarah Rice, as Published by Robert Calef)

To Mr. John Arnold, Keeper of the Prison in Boston, in the County of Suffolk.

[May 31, 1692]

Whereas Captain John Aldin of Boston, Marriner, and Sarah Rice , Wife of Nicholas Rice of Reding, Husbandman, have been this day brought before us, John Hathorn and Jonathan Curwin , Esquires; being accused and suspected of perpetrating divers acts of Witchcraft, contrary to the form of the Statute, in that Case made and provided: These are therefore in Their Majesties, King William and Queen Marys Names, to Will and require you, to take into your Custody, the bodies of the said John Aldin , and Sarah Rice , and them safely keep, until they shall thence be delivered by due course of Law; as you will answer the contrary at your peril; and this shall be your sufficient Warrant. Given under our hands at Salem Village, the 31st of May, in the Fourth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord and Lady, William and Mary, now King and Queen over England, etc., Anno Dom. 1692.

John Hathorn , Jonathan Curwin , { Assistants . To Boston Aldin was carried by a Constable, no Bail would be taken for him; but was delivered to the Prison-keeper, where he remained Fifteen Weeks; and then observing the manner of Tryals, and Evidence then taken, was at length prevailed with to make his Escape, and being returned, was bound over to Answer at the Superior Court at Boston, the last Tuesday in April, Anno 1693. And was there cleared by Proclamation, none appearing against him.

Per John Aldin.

(Mittimus for Martha Corey, Giles Corey, Rebecca Nurse, Dorothy Good, Sarah Cloyce, John Proctor, & Elizabeth Proctor)

[May 25, 1692]

To the Keeper of their Majest's Goale in Boston

You are in their Majest's names hereby required to take into your care and safe Custody the Bodys of Martha Cory the wife of Giles Cory of Salem farmes husbandman Rebecka Nurse the wife of francs Nurce of Salem Village husbandman. Dorothy Good the daughter of Wm Good afores'd husbandman. Sarah Cloyce the wife of peter Cloyce of Salem Village husbandman. John procter of Salem farmes husbandman and Elizabeth the wife of s d John Procter of Salem farmes Husbandman who all and every one of them stand charged in behalfe of their Majest's for feloniously Committeing Sundry Acts of Witchcraft Lately, at Salem Village, on the bodys of Ann putnam the daughter of Thomas putnam Abigail Williams Eliz. Hubbert & others of Salem Village afores'd whereby great hurt hath beene donne to their bodys Contrary to the peace of our Sov'r L'd & Lady Wm & Mary of England &c King & Queen, whome you are all well to secure untill thay shall be delivered by due order of Law And hereof you are not to faile

Dated Boston, May 25't 1692.

*John Hathorne

per vs *Jonathan. Corwin Assis'ts

(Reverse) Sarah Good

Rebecca Nurss

Jno Willard

John Proctor

Eliza Proctor

SuSanah Martin

Bridget Bishop all Oliver

Alice Parker

Tittuba Indian

(Mittimus for Lydia Dustin, Sarah Dustin, Mary Colson, Elizabeth Colson, and Sarah Cole, and Officer's Return)

[December 31, 1692]

Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England

Mid'x Ss: William and Mary by the Grace of God King and Queen of England, Scotland, france and Ireland Defend'rs of the faith &c. to the Sheriffe of the County of Middlesex Greeting Wee Command you that you have the Body of Lidia Dastin of Reading widow Sarah Dastin single-woman Mary

Coulson widow Elizabeth Colson single wom'n: all of Reading and Sarah Cole. in the prison of Cambridge under yo'r Custody as tis said & Detained, and under safe and sure Conduct together w'th the Cause of their Caption under what name or names so ever the said Lidia Dastin , Sarah Dastin , Mary Coulson , Elizabeth Coulson and Sarah Cole be conveyed in the same before o'r Justices of o'r Court of Assize and Goal Delivery at Salem in o'r County of Essex in o'r Provice of the Massachusetts Bay in New England upon Tuesday the 3'd Day of Jan'a next in the fourth year o'r Reigne. To Do and receive all and every of those things w'ch the justices of o'r Court shall Consider of in that behalfe. And then and there you have this Writt Witness William Stoughton Esq'e in Boston the 31'st of December in the fourth year of o'r Reigne Annoq'e Dom. 1692

*Jon'a Elatson, Cler.

(Reverse) By Vertue of this Writt I have hear Brought the Bodyes of those Persons within spesefy'd and Delivered hear att Salem to the under Sheriffe
p me Tim Phillips Sheriffe for Mid.

The Return of Habes Corpus from the Sheriffe of Middlesex

(Mittimus for Sarah Good and Tituba ; List of Witnesses)

[May 25, 1692]

To the Keeper of there Majests Goale in Boston

You are in there Majests names hereby required, to take into your care and safe Custody the Bodys of Sarah Good the wife of W'm Good of Salem farmes husbandman and Titiba an Indian Woman, belonging unto mr. Samuell parris of Salem Village Minester, who stand Charged on behalfe of there Majests. for there feloniously Committing Sundry acts of Witchcraft at Salem Village on the Bodys of Elizabeth parris Eliz Hubbert Abigail Williams And Ann putnam of Salem Village. whereby great hurt hath beene donne to there Body contrary to the peace of our Sov'r L'd and Lady W'm & Mary of England &c King & Queen home you are well to secure untill thay shall thence be delivered by due order of Law and hereof you are not to faile

Dated Boston May the 25t 1692

*John Hathorne] Assists.

*Jonathan Corwin] Assists (O. R.) Mittimus

(Mittimus for William Hobbs, Deliverance Hobbs, Mary Esty, Sarah Wilds, Edward Bishop, Sarah Bishop, Mary Black, and Mary English)

[April 22, 1692]

To their Majesties Goal-keeper in Salem

You are in Their Majesties Names hereby required to take into your care, and safe custody, the Bodies of William Hobs , and Deborah his Wife, Mary Easty , the Wife of Isaac Easty , and Sarah Wild , the Wife of John Wild , all of Topsfield; and Edward Bishop of Salem Village, Husbandman, and Sarah his Wife, and Mary Black , a Negro of Lieutenant Nathaniel Putmans of Salem-Village; also Mary English the Wife of Philip English, Merchant in Salem; who stand charged with High Suspicion of Sundry Acts of Witchcraft, done or committed by them lately upon the Bodies of Ann Putman , Mercy Lewis and Abigail Williams , of Salem-Village, whereby great Hurt and Damage hath been done to the Bodies of the said Persons, [as] according to the complaint of Thomas Putman and John Buxton of Salem-Village, Exhibited Salem, Apr 21, 1692, appears, whom you are to secure in order to their further Examination. Fail not.

John Hathorn ,] Assistants.

Jona. Curwin, ,] Assistants.

Dated Salem, April 22, 1692

To Marshal George Herrick of Salem Essex.

You are in their Majesties Names hereby required to convey the above-named to the Goal at Salem. Fail not.

John Hathorn ,] Assistants .

Jona. Curwin ,] Assistants

Dated Salem, Apr 22, 1692.

(Mittimus for George Jacobs, Sr., William Hobbs, Edward Bishop, Bridget Bishop, Sarah Wilds, Mary Black, Mary English, Alice Parker, and Ann Pudeator.)

[May 12, 1692]

To the Keeper of there [Torn]

You are in their Majests names her [Torn] to take into your care and safe Custody [Torn] of George Jacobs Sen'r of Salem husbandman (Torn) of Salem ffarmes husbandman William Hobs of [Torn] husbandman, Edward Bushop of Salem Village Husband. [Torn] Bushop Alias Olliver the wife of Edward Bushop of Salem Sawyer Sarah Wild: the wife of John Wild: of Topsfeild, Mary a Negro Woman of Lt Nathaniell putnams of Salem Village Mary English the wife of phillip English of Salem Merchant; Alice parker the wiffe of John parker of Salem Seaman, and Ann pudeattor of Salem Widdow, who all and Everyone of them: Stand Charged in behalfe of their Majests: With sundry acts of Witchcraft, Latly donne or Committed by them on the Bodys of Mary Walcot Abigail Williams Marcy Lewis Ann Putnam Eliz Hubberd Susannah Sheldon and Others of Salem Village and ffarmes, whereby great hurt hath bene donne them, Whome you are well to secure in sayd Goale untill they shall be thence delivered by and order of Law, and here of you are not to faile Dated Salem May the 12th 1692

P'r us *John Hathorne Assists.

*Jonathan. Corwin] Assists.

(Mittimus for Susannah Martin, Lydia Dustin, Dorcas Hoar, and Sarah Morey)

[May 2, 1692]

To the Keeper of their Majests Goale in Boston

You are in their Majests names hereby required to take into, your care and safe Custody the Bodys of Susanah Martin of Amesbury Widdow, Lydia Dastin of Reding Wi[ddow], Dorcas Hoare of Beverly widdow and Sarah Murrill also of Beverly who all stand Charged with high Suspition of Sundry acts of Witchcraft donne or Committed by them upon the Bodys of Mary Walcot Marcy Lewis Abigail Williams Ann putnam Elizabeth Hubbert and Susannah Sheldon and Goody Viber of Salem Village or ffarmes whereby great hurt and dammage hath bene donne to the bodys [lost - of] said persons according to Complaint of Capt Jonathan Walcot and Serj't Thomas putnam of Salem Village Yeoman Exhibited Salem April the 30th. 1692: Whome you are to secure in order to their further Examination or Tryall and hereof you are not to faile Dated Salem Village May 2d. 1692

*John Hathorne] Assists

*Jonathan. Corwin] Assists

(Mittimus for Roger Toothaker, John Willard, Thomas Farrer, & Elizabeth Hart)

[May 18, 1692]

To the Keeper of Their Majest's Goale in Boston

You are in their Majest's names hereby required to take into your care and safe Custody the Bodys of Roger Toothaker of Bilrica. John Willard of Salem Village, husbandman Thomas farrer of Lyn husbandman, and Elizabet Hart the wife of Isaac Hart of Lyn husbandman, who all stand charged with Sundry acts of Witchcraft, by them and Every one of them Committed, on the Bodys of Mary Walcot Abigail Williams Mary Lewis Ann Putnam and others of Salem Village or ffarmes, whom you are well to secure in order to their tryall for the same. and untill they shall be delivered by due order of Law and hereof you are not to faile Dated Salem May 18'th 1692

*John Hathorne

*Jonathan. Corwin]

by order of the Goven'r & Councill

(Reverse) Toothaker Hart

(Summons for Witnesses v. Mary Bradbury)

Wm & Mary by the Grace of God of England

Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen defend'rs of the faith &c. a

[September 5, 1692]

To Thomas Ring of Amesbury or Salsbury Timothy Swann of Andover Richard Carr & James Carr of Salsbury.

Greeting Wee Command you all Excuses Set apart to be and personally appear at the Next Court of Oyer & Terminer holden at Salem On Tuesday Next at Twelve of the Clock or as soon after as possible There to Testify the truth on Severall Indictments to be Exhibited against mrs Mary Bradbury & other prisoners to be Tried for the horrible Crime of Witchcraft, hereof Make return fail not dated in Salem Sep'r 5th 1692 & in the fourth year of Our Reign

To the Sheriff of Essex or Constables of Andover Haverill

Salsbury Amesbery, Bradford or Newbury.

*Stephen Sewall Cle[rk]

(Reverse)

Zerub. Endecot

Sam. Endecot

James Carr

Rich'd Carr

Timo: Swan

Jos: Ringg

(Summons for Witnesses v. George Burroughs, and Officer's Return)

[August 5, 1692]

William & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen defend'rs of the faith &ca

mr Jno Ruck mrs Eliz: Ruck mr Thomas Ruck & Samuel Ruck

To Capt William Worwood Greeting.

Wee Comand you all Excuses set apart to be and personally appear at the present Court of Oyer & Terminer held at Salem there to Testify the truth to the best of your knowledge on certain Indictm'ts Exhibited against mr George Burrough: hereof fail not dated in Salem. Aug't 5th 1692. & in the fourth yeare of Our Reign

*Stephen Sewall Cler

August 5th The persons above Named where all every of them sumoned to appeare as above by me

*Joseph Neale

Const'b in [in] Salem.

(Reverse) G. Burroughs. Sumons Ruck etal

(Summons for James Greenslit as Witness Against George Burroughs, and Officer's Return)

[July 26, 1692]

Wm & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King defend'r of the faith &ca To James Greenslit Greeting. --

Wee comand you all Excuses set apart to be & personally app'r at the Next Court of Oyer & Terminer held at Salem on the first Tuesday in August Next There to Testify the Truth on certain Indictments to be Exhibited against George Burroughs & not depart the Court without lycense or leave of s'd Court hereof fail not On penalty of One hundred pounds money to be levied on your Goods Chattels &ca Dated in Salem July 26th 1692. *Step. Sewall, Cle

To the Sheriffe of Essex

(Reverse) July 26th 1692 I have Sumoned the within named James Greinslett according to this Within Sub pena to Give in his Evidence att the time and place within mentioned by me

*Geo. Herrick Dep't Sheriff

(Summons for John Pierce and John Lane)

[August 4, 1692]

Wm & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & queen defend'rs of the faith &ca --

Wee Comand you to Warn & give Notice unto John Pierce and John lane that they & Every of them be & personally app'r forthwith at the pr'sent Court of Oyer & Termin'r holden at Salem to Testify the truth to the best of thier knowledge on certain Indicm'ts Exhibited against mr George Burrough hereof Make return fail Not dated in Salem Aug't 4'th 1692 in the fourth year of Our Reign

*Stephen Sewall, Cler.

To the Constable of Manchester August 4'th I have Sumoned the above named that thay and Each of them att time and place above written by me *John Ley

(Reverse) A Summons for

John Pierce and

John lane

Contra Geo

Burroughs

(Summons for Witnesses and Officer's Return)

[July 30, 1692]

Wm & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland

King & Queen defend'rs of the faith &ca

To the Constable or Constables of Andover Greeting

Wee Comand you to Warn & give Notice unto Allen Toothaker Ralph farnum Jun'r John farnum son of Ralph farnum sen'r Benjamin Abbot & his wife Andrew foster Phebe Chandler daughter of Wm Chandler: Sam'l Holt Sen'r Samuel Preston Jun'r

that they & Every of them be and personally appear at the Court of Oyer & Terminer to be held by adjournment on Tuesday Next at Ten of the Clock in the Morning there to testifye the truth to the best of their knowledge on certain Indictments to be Exhibited against Marth Carrier of Andover hereof fail not at your utmost perill & make return of your doings herein

Dated in Salem July 30'th 1692 --- *Stephen Sewall Cle.

(Reverse) In obedenc to this writ I have timely warned the persons hose names are herein writen and every one of them this I day of august 1692

By mee *John Ballard

constable of Andover

(Summons for Witnesses)

[July 30, 1692]

William & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland

France & Ireland King & Queen defend'rs of the faith &ca

To the Constable of Billrica Greeting. --

Wee Comand you to Warn & give Notice unto

Capt Danforth -- John Rogers &

that they & Every of them be and personally appear at the Court of Oyer & Terminer to be held by Adjurnment Att Salem on Tuesday Next at Ten of the Clock in the Morning there to testify the truth to the best of their knowledge on Certaine Indict- ments to be Exhibited against Martha Carrier of Andover and hereof they Nor you are to fail at your utmost perill making return hereof under your hand. --

Dated in Salem July 30'th 1692 & in the fourth year of Our Reign

*Stephen Sewall Cler.

(Reverse)According to this warrant I have shewd it to Capt Danforth, & his Answr is, that hee can say nothing in yt case, that is worth mentioning, I have warned John Rogers, & he saith he will attend if his garison may guarded in his absence Billerica Ahgr August 1st. 92 James paterson, Cconst:

(Summons for Witnesses to the Examination of Rachel Clinton, and Officer's Return)

[April 21, 1692]

To Sarje't John Choate, sen'r. To Jonas Gregory, To James Burnam, all of Ipswich, Mary Andrews, Sarah Rogors, Marguriet Lord, Sary Halwell you & each of you are hereby Required in thair majesties names To make Your personall apperance before ye Worshipfull Maj'r Sam'll Appleton Esq., & ye Clerk

of ye Court to be at ye house of Mr. John Spark in Ipswich on ye 22d Day of This Instant aprile, at two o'clock afternoon. Then and There to Give in Your severall respective Evidences in behalf of their majesties concerning wch Clearing up of ye grounds of Suspission of Rachell Clentons being a witch, who is Then and Thair to be upon further Examination. Therefore So make Your apperance according to this Sumons fail nott at your perril.

Ipswich, Dated aprill 21st, 1692

Curiam Tho's Wade, Clerk.

Ye Constable of Ipswich is alike Required to Give notis to ye said person, & to make returne as ye Law Directs. Curr T. W. Clk.

According to this within written I haue Sumonsed and warned them: to Apere According to Time & Place by me William Baker, Constable.

Dated this 22d of april, 1692.

(Summons for Witnesses v. Mary Esty, Sarah Cloyce, Giles Corey, & Martha Corey, and Officer's Return)

[September 5, 1692]

Wm & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen defenders of the faith &c.

To the Sheriffe of Essex or deputy or Constable or Constables of Salem, Topsfield & Boxford Greeting Wee Comand you & Either of you to warn and give Notice unto Jonathan Putman James Darlin Samuel Abbey of Salem Daniel Clarke of Topsfield & Samuel Smith of Boxford Edward Putman Ez: Cheever Jno Parker Sen'r Sam'll Braybrooke Mary Wolcot Ann Putman Sarah Vibber Marcey lewis Eli: Hubbard that they & Every of them be at the Next Court of Oyer & Terminer holden at Salem on Tuesday Next at Twelve of the Clock, or as soon after as may be there to testify the truth to the best of their knowledge on Severall Indictments Exhibited against Mary Easty & Sarah Cloyce Giles Corey & Martha Corey his wife hereof Make Return fail not

dated in Salem: Sep'r 5'th 1692. & in the fourth year of Our Reign

Stephin Sewall Cler

(Reverse) To the Clark of Salem I have acordenely

to warent Sommand danile clake of topsfield

And Samuel Smith

*Joseph Andrews Constable

of Boxford

(Summons for Witnesses v. Giles Cory, and Officer's Return)

[September 7, 1692]

Wm & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King and Queen defend'rs of the faith &c

To the Constable of Salem Greeting

Wee Comand you to Warn & give notice unto Jno Derick the wife of Stephen Small the Widow Adams & Goody Golthite that they & Every of them be and personaly Appear at the pr'sent Court of Oyer & Terminer holden at Salem forthwith there to Testify the Truth to the best of thier knowledge On Certain Indictments Exhibited against Giles Cory hereof make return fail not Salem Sep'r 7'th 1692:

*Stephen Sewall Cl

(Reverse) Sept 7'th 1692: I Deput'd mr John Tomkins to serve this within Sumons and Make Returne thereof: by mee

*Peter Osgood Constable in Salem

I have warned the w'thin

persons to appear att the time

and place within

written by *Jno Tomkins

Deputed

(Summons for Witnesses)

[September 6, 1692]

W'm & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen defend'r of the faith &c'a.

To the Constable of Topsfield Greeting Wee Command you to Warn & Give Notice unto the Wife of Abraham Reddington. Mary Towne Widow William Towne & Samuel Towne Sons of s'd Mary Towne

Rebecka & Elizabeth Towne daughters of s'd Widow Towne that they & Every of them all Excuses set apart be and personally appear at the Court of Oyer & Terminer holden at Salem to Morrow by Twelve of the Clock hereof make return fail not dated in Salem Sep'r. 6.th 1692 & in the fourth yeare of Our Reign

*Stephen Sewall Cler

(Reverse) I haue somensed and warned al the parsons with in nemed as as atested by me
Ephraim Willdes constabell o topsfeld

Appendix 4

Recognizance

(Recognizance for John Alden)

[December 31, 1692]

Suffolk Ss.

Memorandum, That on the Thirty First day of Decemb'r 1692. In the Fourth year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord & Lady William and Mary by the grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King and Queen &c p'sonally came and appeared Before me John Richards Esq'r One of their Ma'ties Justices of the Superiour Court of Judicature within the Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, John Alden #[of] Marrin'r Nathanael Williams & Samuel Chechley, Shopkeepers all of Boston within the said County of Suffolk.

and acknowledged themselves and each of them to be indebted unto our said Lord and Lady the King and Queen, and the Survivour of them, their heires and Successors in the Sum of Two hundred pounds To be levied on their or either of their Goods, Chattels, Lands or Tenements for the use of our said Lord & Lady the King and Queen or the Survivour of them, if default be made in the performance of the Condition underwritten.

The Condition of the above Recognizance is such That whereas the abovebounden John Alden , being accused and Suspected of perpetrating divers Acts of Witchcrafts contrary to the forme of the Statute in that case made and provided, was taken up and committed for the same unto their Ma'ties Goal in Boston, from whence he made his Escape If Therefore the said John Alden shall personally appear before their Ma'ties Justices, at the next Superiour Court of Judicature and Court of Assize to be held at Boston within the said County of Suffolke, to answer what shall be objected against him on their Maj'ties behalfe referring unto the p'rmisses, And shall do and receive that which by the said Court shall then & there be Enjoyned him, Then this abovewritten Recognizance to be void and of none Effect; Or else to abide and remain in full force and virtue./.

Recognit die predict.

Cor. me. *John Richards

(Recognizance for William Barker, Jr., and Mary Barker by John Barker & John Osgood Sr.)

[+ January 13, 1693]

Memorandum

That on the Thirteenth day of Jan'ry 1692 In the Fourth Year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord and Lady William and Mary by the Grace of God of England &c King & Queen defenders of the faith &c Personally appeared before W'm Stoughton Esq'r cheife Justice of their Maj'ies Province of the Massachusetts bay in New England Jn'o Barker and Jn'o Osgood both of the Towne of Andiver in the County of Essex Husbandmen and acknowledged themselves to be Joyntly & Severally indebted unto our sd Sovereigne Lord & Lady and the Survivor of them their Heires & Successors in the Sum of one Hundred Pounds to be levied on their or either of their lands & Tenniments goods & chattles for the use of our sd Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen or Survivor of them on Condition that W'm Barker Jun'r & Mary Barker haveing stood Committed for Suspition of Witchcraft shall make their personall appearance before the Justices of our sd Lord & Lady the King & Queen at the next Court of Assizes and Generall Goale Delivery to be holden for the County of Essex then & their to answer to all such matters and things as shall in their Maj'ies behalfe be alledged against them and to doe & receive that which by the sd Court shall be then & there Injoyned them and thence not to departe without licence

Attest

*Jon'a Elatson Cler

(Reverse

Recognizance of Jn'o Barker

&

Jn'o Osgood {

for W'm Barker Jun'r

& #[Mary Tyler]

Mary Barker

May 10'th Apeared

(Recognizance for Mary Bridges, Jr.)

[October 15, 1692]

Know All Men By these presents That I John Bridges of Andover in the Cownty of Essex in New England Blacksmith And John Osgood Sen'r of the Same Towne & Cownty afforesaid Husbandman, Are Holden And firmly Bownd Joyntly & Sevirally to there Maj'es King William And Queen Mary of England Scotland France And Ireland King & Queen Defenders of the faith in the full & Juste Sum of five hundrid Pownds Sterling, for the True & Juste payments of w'ch Said Sum of five hundrid pownds to there Maj'es King William And Queen Mary Wee do Bind our Selves Our heires Executtors Administrators & Assignes firmly by these presents, Dated in Salem the fifeteenth day of October in the year of Our Lord One thowsand Six hundrid Ninety and Two And in the fourth Year of there Maj'es Reigne of King William & Queen Mary King & Queen of England Scotland France & Ireland Defenders of the faith --

The Condition of this Obligation is Such that Whereas the above named Jno Osgood Sen'r & John Bridges Both of the Towne of Andever in the County of Essex in New England have Taken into there Care & Custodye the Bodye of Mary Bridges Aged about Twelve yeares who was Comited to there Maj'es Goale in Salem in the Cownty of Essex in New England for havinge used practised & Comitted Divers Acts of Witchcrafte Upon the Bodyes of Sundry persons who her Selfe hath also Confessed the same, is that the Abovesaid John Bridges Blacksmith & John Osgood Sen'r , Aforesaid husbandman Shall Well & Truely keep the Aforesaid Mary Bridges & Them Secure Untill they Shall Receive Order from George Corwin Sherriff of the Cownty of Essex to deliver the Aforesaid Mary Bridges Unto William Downton Now Keeper of there Maj'es Goale in Salem Or to Any Other Whome the Aforesaid George Corwin Shall Appointe, that then they Shall forthwith deliver the Same Mary Bridges According to his Order -- And if the Above Bownd do perform the Above mentioned Articles, And shall pay Unto George Corwin the Sheriff Afforesaid, the forfeiture of Said Bond for there Maj'es Use in Case of Default then this Obligation shall be Void & of None Effect Or Otherwise To Stand in full force & Virtue, In Wittness hereof we have Sett to Our hands & Seals this fifetenth day of October One thowsand Six hundrid Ninety & Two And in the fourth year of there Maj'es Reigne --

Wittness

*Jno Turner

*Thomas Gardner Jun'r

* John Bridge Seal

*John Osgood Seal

(Recognizance for Bethia Carter, Sr. by John Pierson & George Lilly)

[December 8, 1692]

Memorandum.

That on the 8'th. Day of Decemb'r 1692 in the fowert Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord & Lady William & Mary by the Grace of God of England &c King & Queen Defenders of the faith personally Appeared before us James Russell & Sam'll Heman Esq'r of their Majests Councill & province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England & Justices of Peace within the Same John Pierson & George Lylly of Lin in the County of Essex husbandman, And acknowledged themselves & Each of them to be indebted unto our Said Lord & Lady the King & Queen & the Survivor of them their Heires & Successors in the Some of (two hundred pounds to be leavied on their or Either of their goods or Chattels Lands or Tennements for the use of our Said Lord & Lady the King & Queen or Survivor of them if Default be made in the p'formance of the Condition underwritten --

The Condition of the Above Recognizance is Such that where as Bethya Carter of Wooburn Widdow in the County of Middlesex Stands Charged with Suspition of the horrible Sin of witchcraft & was Committed to Goale for the same; If therefore the Aforesaid Bethya Carter who is Suspected as Abovs'd, Shall make her personall Appearance before the Justices of our Said Lord & Lady the King & Queen at the Next Court of Assize Oyer & Terminer & Generall Goall delivery to be holden for & within the County of Middlesex. Afores'd to Answere what Shall be objected against her in their Majests behalf refering to Witchcraft & to do & receive that w'ch by Said Court shall be then & there injoned her & not depart without licence then the Above Recognizance to be void or elce to remain in full force & virtue Capt & Recognit Die prediet Cor. --

*Ja: Russell JP:

*Samuell Hayman

(Reverse) Bethya Carter, Recognizance appearance at Middlesex Ct.

(Recognizance for Sarah Cole (of Salem) by Abraham Coal)

[January 14, 1693]

Memor'm.

That on the fourteenth day of January 1692 in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady William and Mary by the Grace of God of [of] England &c King and Queen Defenders of the faith &c Personally appeared before Jno Ha[] Esq'r one of their Maj'ties Justices for the County of Essex #[There] Abraham Cole of Salem Taylor and acknowledged himselfe to be oweing and Indebted unto our said Sovereigne Lord and Lady and the survivor of them their Heires and Successors in the su[mbar]le of fifty pounds money to be Levied on his Lands and Tenements goods and Chattles for the use of our s'd Sovereigne Lord and Lady the King and Queen or the Survivor them on Condition That -- Sarah Cole his wife [shall] personally appear before the Justices of our s'd Lord and Lady the King & Queen at the next Court of Assizes & Gen'll Goall Delivery to be holden for the County of Essex and in the mean time to be of Good behaveour and then and there to answer to all Such matters and things as shall in their Maj'ties behaffe be alledged against her and to do and receive that w'ch by the said Court shall be then and there Injoynd her and thence not to depart without Lycence

Attest *Joha. Elatson Cler

(Reverse) Recognizance Abraham Coal of Salem

for Sarah Coal his wife

appeared & clear'd by proclamation

(Recognizance for Dorothy Faulkner and Abigail Faulkner Jr. by John Osgood Sr. & Nathaniel Dane Sr.)

[October 6, 1692]

Know all Men by these presents That I John Osgood sen'r. of Andover in the Cownty of Essex in New England And Nathan'll: Dean Sen'r of the Same Town & Cownty afforesaid Husbandmen Are holden & firmly Bownd Joyntly & Sevirally to their Majesties King William & Queen Mary of England & Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen Defenders of the faith in the full & Juste Sum of five hundrid pounds Sterling for the True & Just payment of which s'd Sum of five hundrid Pownds to their Majesties King William & Queen Mary Wee do bind Our Heires Executtors Adminstrators & Assignes firmly & By these presents Dated in Salem the Sixth day of october in the Year of Our Lord One thousand six hundrid & Ninety & to and in the fourth Year of the Reign of Our Majesties King William & Queen Mary King & Queen of England Scotland france & Ireland Deffenders of the faith --

The Condition of this Obligation is Such that whereas the Abovenamed John Osgood Sen'r , & Nathan'll: Dean Sen'r , Husbandmen Both of The Towne of Andover in the Cownty of Essex in New England have Taken into Their Care and Custody the Bodyes of Dorothy Faulkner Aged about Ten Yeares And Abigail Faulkner Aged about Eight Yeares who was both Committed to their Majesties Goale in Salem in the Cownty of Essex in New England for Having Used practised & Committed Divers Acts of witchcraft Upon the Bodyes of Sundrye persons who themselves also have Confessed the Same If that the Aforesaid John Osgood Sen'r , & Nathan'll Dean Sen'r. Aforesaid Husbandmen shall well & Truly keep the Aforesaid Dorothy faukner & Abigail faukner & Them Secure Untill they shall Receive Order from George Corwin Sherriff of the County of Essex to deliver the Aforesaid Dorothy faukner & Abigail faukner Unto William Downton Now keeper of their Majesties Goale in Salem or to Any Other Whome the Afforesaid George Corwin shall Appoint, that then they shall forthwith delliver the Same Dorothy faukner & Abigail faukner According to his Order -- And if the Above bownd do performe the Above Mentioned Articles & shall pay Unto George Corwin the Sherrif aforesaid the forfeiture of S'd Bond for there Maj'ties Use in Case of Defaulte then this Obligation shall be void & of Nowe Efect Or Otherwise to stand in full force & Virtue -- In Wittness hereof we have sett Our hands & Seals this Six Day of October in the Year of Our Lord One thowsand Six hundrid Ninety & two and in the fourth year of their Majesties Reigne

Witnis

*John Osgood *Joseph Phippen Jun'r.

*Nathaniel Dane *Joshua Conant

*Elizur Keysar

(Recognizance for Dorothy Faulkner and Abigail Faulkner, Jr. by Francis Faulkner & Joseph Marble)

[January 13, 1693]

Memorandum

That on the Thirteenth day of Jan'ry 1692 in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady William & Mary the Grace of God of England &c: King & Queen Defenders of the faith &c: Personally appeared before William Stoughton Esq'r cheife Justice of their Maj'ies Province of the Massachusets bay in New England Francis Falkner Husbandman & Joseph Marble Mason both of Andiver in the County of Essex and acknowledged themselves to be joyntly & severally Indebted unto our s'd: sovereigne Lord & Lady & the survivor of them their Heires & Successors in the sum of One Hundred Pounds to be levied on their or either of their Lands and Tenniments, goods & Chattles for the use of our s'd: sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen or survivor of them on Condition that Dorathy Forkner and Abigaile Forkner haveing stood committed for Suspition of Witchcraft shall make their p'sonall appearance before the Justices of our s'd: Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen at the next Court of Assizes and Generall Goal Delivery to be holden for the County of Essex then & there to answer to all such matters & things as shall in their Maj'ies behalfe be alleadged against them and to do and receive that which by the s'd: Court shall be then & there enjoyned them & thence not to depart without licence

Attest

*Jona Elatson Cler.

(Reverse)

Recog'e;

Francis Falkner

Joseph Marble

for

Dorathy Falkner

&

abigaill Faulkner

10 May Apear'd

Cleared by proclamation paying fees.

(Recognizance for Eunice Fry by John Frye & John Osgood Sr.)

[December 20, 1692]

Memorandum

That on the Twentieth Day of December Annoq Dom one thousand six hundred Ninty & two in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady William & Mary by the Grace of God of England &c: King & Queen Defenders of the faith &c: Personally came & Appeared before me George Corwin High Sheriffe for the County of Essex of the Province of the Massathuttets Bay in New England -- Deacon John Fry and John Osgood both of Andaver. Yeomen and Acknowledged themselves & Each of them Indebted Unto our sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen or the Survivors of them their Heires & Successors: in the summe of two hundred pounds to be leaved on their goods & Chattles, Lands & Tenements for the Use of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen or the Survior of them If default be made in the Performance of the Condition Underwritten./.

Vizdellisett

The Condition of the above written Recognizance is such That whereas Unis Fry Wife to the aboves'd Decon John Fry of Andaver afores'd is suspected & Accused of Committing Diverse Acts of Witchcrafts if therfore the: s'd: Unis fry afores'd: shall & do make her Personall Appearance before the Justices of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen at the Next Court of Assize of Oyer & Terminer next Generall Goal Delivery to be held for or within the County of Essex afores'd: to answer w't: shall be objected ag't: her on their Maj'ties behalfe Refering to the: witchcrafts and to do & Receive that: by which said Court shall be then & there Injoyned & not to depart without Lycence Then the above Recognizan[c] e to be void or Else to abide & Remaine in full force & virtue In Wittness whereof the above Named Persons: John Fry & John Ossgood have herunto sett their hand & seals this Twentieth Day of December in the year of our Lord one Thousand six hundred Ninty & two & in the forth year of their Maj'ties Reigne./.

Witessed.

(Recognizance for Eunice Fry by by John Frye & John Osgood Sr.)

[January 12, 1693]

Memorandum

That on the: Twelfth day of Jan'ry 1692 in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady -- William & Mary by the Grace of God of England &c: King & Queen Defenders of the faith &c:

Personally appeared before William Stoughton Esq'r. cheife Justice of their Maj'ies Province of the Massachusets bay in New England John Osgood of Andiver in the County of Essex Husbandman and #[Jahms] James Fry of the same Towne and acknowledged themselves to be joyntly & Severally indebted unto our sd: Sovereigne Lord & Lady & the survivor of them their Heires & Successors in the sum of One Hundred Pounds to be levied on their or either of their lands and Tennem'ts goods & Chattles for the use of our s'd: Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen or Survivor of them on Condition that Eunice Fry the wife of Jno: Fry of Andivor haveing stood committed for suspition of Witchcraft shall make her personall appearance before the Justices of our s'd: Lord & Lady the King & Queen at the next Court of Assizes & General Goal Delivery to be holden for the County of Essex then and there to answer to all such matters and things as shall in their Maj'ies behalfe be alledged against her and to doe & receive that which by the s'd: Court shall be then & there enjoyned her & thence not to departe without licence

attest

*Jona Elatson Clec

(Reverse) John Osgood

& James Fry for Eunice Fry t

he wife of John Fry of Andover.

Apeared May 10th 1692

Recognizance

(Recognizance for Dorothy Good)

[December 10, 1692]

Memorandum

That on the Tenth day of Decemter 1692 Samuel Ray of Salem. appeared before me Underwritten One of the Councill for their Maj:tis Province of the Massachusets Bay in New England and acknowledged himselfe Indebted unto Our Soveraign Lord & Lady the king & Queen the Sume of fifty pounds Currant Money of New: England on the Condition hereafter Named --

Vid't: That Dorothy Good Daughter of William Good of Salem Labourer being Imprisoned on Suspicion of her being Guilty of the Crime of Witchcraft & being Now Let to Bail. that if the Said Dorothy Good Shall appear at the Next assize & Gener'll Goal Delivery to be holden at Salem & abide the Courts Judgment then the above Recognisance to be void Else to remain in force & vertue

(Reverse) Recog'ce not copied

Appendix 5

Warrant

(Warrant for the Apprehension of John Alden & Officer's Return)

[May 31, 1692]

To the Constable of Salem

Essex Ss Whereas Complaint hath been made unto us John Hathorne & Jonathan Corwin Esq'rs by severall persons of Salem Village that Cap't John Alden of Boston Marrin'r # [that he] is guilty of witchcraft in cruelly tortureing & afflicting several of their Children & others these are therefore in their Maj'ties King William & Queen Maryes name to Authorize & Comand you forthwith to Apprehend the body of the said John Alden and Imediately bring him before us to Answer what shall be objected ag't him in that behalfe and this shall be yo'r sufficient warrant Given under our hands the 31st day of May 1692 And in the fourth year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord and Lady William & Mary now King and Queen over England &c

Per us * John Hathorne

* Jonathan. Corwin { Assis'ts

Persons Complaining viz't

Mary Walcott

Mercy Lewis

Abigail Williams

Ann putnam

Elizabeth Booth

Mary Warren

(Reverse) In obedience to the within written warant I have Apprehended the Body of Cap't John Alden accordeing to tener of this warant

(In right margin) John Alden

(Warrant for apprehension of William Barker, Sr., Mary Marston, and Mary Barker, and Officer's Return)

[August 25, 1692]

Essex To the Constables of Andov'r

Complaint being made to me this day, by Sam'l Martin of Andover & Moses Tyler sen'r of Boxford, against Willia Barker sen'r Mary Marstone the wife of John Marstone jun'r & Mary Barker the daughter of Lef't John Barker , all of Andov'r in that the aboves'd William Barker Mary Marstone & Mary Barker, have woefully afflicted & abused, Abigail Martin & Rose foster of Andov'r, & Martha Sprague of Boxford by witchcraft, Contrary to the peace of o'r sovereigne Lord & Lady #[King] William & Mary King & Queen of England &c: & to their Majes'ts Laws in that Case provided:

These therefore require you in their Majes'ts names upon sight hereof, to apprehend & seize the bodies of William Barker sen'r Mary Marstone the wife of John Marstone jun'r & Mary Barker the daughter of Lef't John Barker all of Andov'r & them safely Convey to Salem, before their Majes'ts justices of the peace there, to be examined & proceeded with according to law, for which this shall be yo'r warrant: given und'r my hand & seal this #[eighteenth] 25'th [25] day of August Anno Domini 1692: in the fourth year of their Majes'ts Reigne: /

*Dudley Bradstreet justice of Peace

The s'd Martin & Tyler have given suffitient bond to prosecute s'd persons to effect, which bond remains with me:

(Reverse) [torn] In Obediance Two this warant I have apprehended the within Riten persons and have brought them to Salom the 29'th of August 1692 Before their honours mentined in the Rit:

pere me *Ephraim Foster

Constable of Andover

W'm Barker

Mary Marston

Mary Barker

Exa'd 29: 6. 92

(Warrant for apprehension of Mary Bridges, Sr. and Officer's Return)

[July 28, 1692]

To The Sherriff of the County of Essex or dep'y or Constable in Andover
You are in their Majest's names hereby required to apprehend & forthwith, or as soone as May be, bring before us, Mary Bridges the wife of John Bridges of Andover who stands Charged in behalfe of their Majest's w'th having Committed Sundry acts of Witchcraft Lately on the Body of Timothy Swan of Andover and others to their great hurt, And that in order to her Examination Relating to the abovesaid Premises and hereof You are not to faile Dated Salem July the 28'th 1692

*Bartho Gedney

*John: Hathorne

*Jonathan. Corwin

*John Higginson Esq

Just'es Peace

in obedience to this writ I have Seased the Body of Marie Bridges wife of John Bridges and have brought her to #[the worshipfull] answer John hathron] at Sailom what shall be alledged against her this 28 of July 1692

By mee *John Ballard constable of andover

(Warrant for apprehension of George Burroughs, and Officer's Return)

[April 30, 1692]

To Jno Partredg field Marshal

You are Required in their Maj'sts names to aprehend the body of mr George Buroughs at present preacher at Wells in the provence of Maine, & Convay him with all Speed to Salem before the Magestrates there, to be Examened, he being Suspected for a Confederacy with the devil in oppressing of Sundry about Salem as they relate. I having Received perticuler Order from the Govern'r & Council of their Maj'sts Colony of the Masathusets, for the Same, you may not faile herein, Dated in portsmouth in the provenc of Hamshire. Aprel.30'th 1692

*Elisha Hutchinson Maj'r

By Virtue of this warrant I Apprehended s'd George Burroughs and have Brought him to Salem and Delievered him to the Authority there this fourth day of May 1692

*John Partridge feild

marshall of the Provence of newhansher and maine

(Reverse) Warrant agt Burroughs the Marchalls Returne

(Warrant for apprehension of Martha Carrier, and Officer's Return)

[May 28, 1692]

To the Marshall of Essex or his dept or to the Constables of Andover

You are in their Majests names hereby required [to] apprehend and forthwith secure, and bring before [us] martha Carrier the wife of Thomas Currier of An[doover] on Tuesday next being the 31't day of this Instant mo[nth] of May about ten of the clock in the forenoon or as soon as may be afterwards at [the] house of L't Nathaniell Ingersalls in Salem Village who stands charged with have- ing Committed Sundry [acts] of Witchcraft on the Bodys of Mary Walcot and abi[gail] williams of Salem Village to their great hurt & [injury] in order to her Examination Relateing to the prem[ises] abovesaid faile not Dated Salem May 28'th 1692.

per us *John Hathorne

*Jonathan. Corwin Assis'ts

(Reverse) I have apprehend the w'tin named parson

and brought her to the place appinted --

by me *John Ballard. const andover

(Warrant for the apprehension of Richard Carrier and Andrew Carrier and Officer's Return)

[July 21, 1692]

To the Sherriffe of the County of Essex or Deputy or Constable of Andover You are in their Majesties names hereby required to Apprehend and forthwith bring before us Richard Carrier and Andrew Carrier Son of Thomas Carier of Andivor Husbandman who Stands charged on behalfe of their Majesties with haveing Comitted Sundry acts of wichcraft on the body of Mary Warren of Salem &c & that in order to his Examination relating to the abovesaid premisses and hereof Faile not & you are likewise to inquire after & make Serch for any paper or popetts. that may relate to witchcraft.

Dated in Salem 21 July 1692

*Bartho' Gedney

*John Hathorn

*Jonathan. Corwin

*John Higginson Jus's Peace

in obedience to this warrant I have sessed
the body of richard carier and andrew carier
and have brought them to the house of Mr
Thomas [Beadle]: 22 July 1692

By me *John Ballard Constable in Andover

(Warrant for the apprehension of Mary Clark, & Officer's Return)

[August 3, 1692]

Essex To ye Constable of Haverhill:

This day Complaint being made to me ye Subscriber; by Robert Swan of Andover in ye County of Essex, against Mary Clerk of Haverhill in ye County aforesd, (that the wife of Edward Clerk,) that she is Highly suspected to be guilty of severall acts of witchcraft. & more lately some committed on ye bodys of timothy Swan of Andover: & Mary Wallcutt: & Anne Putnam of Salem Village in ye County aforesd: Contrary to ye peace of or Souereigne Lord & Lady William & Mary King & Queen of England Scotland &c: & to ye statutes in that Case provided, & sd Robert Swan having given bond according to Law, to prosecute sd Complaint (as he desires) before ye Worshippl Bartholmew Gedney John Hathorne: Jonathan Corwin & John Higginson Esqs: their Majests: Justices of ye peace in Salem [word crossed out] These therefore require you upon sight hereof, to ---- apprehend & siese ye body of sd Mary Clerke & here her ---- forthwith safely convey to Salem, before ye abovesd Justices of ye peace there: there to be examined, & proceeded with according to Law, for which this shall be yor warrant Given undr my hand & seal this 3d day of August Anno Domini 1692: & in ye 4th year of their Majests reigne &c

*Dudley Bradstreet justice of peace

By Vertue of this Warrant I have Seised the Body of Mary Clark and Brought her down wth mee Wm: Sterling Constable of haveril

(Reverse) Mary Clark Of Haveril 4: 6.-92

(Warrant for the apprehension of Rachel Clinton, and Summons for Witnesses v. Rachel Clinton, and Officer's Return)

[March 29, 1692]

To the Constable of Ipswich --

Whereas There is Complaint Exhibbitted to the Honored Court now holden at Ipswich -- In Behalfe of their majesties. against Rachell -- Formerly the Wife of Lawrence Clenton of Ipswich on grounded Suspision of witchcraft, & whereas Recognizance is Enterd, for prosecution --

You are hereby Required in their Majesties names forthwith or as soon as may be to apprehend seize & bringe before the Honored Court to be holden at Ipswich the sayd Rachell Clenton on the next morrow morning at Eight a Clock In order to an orderly Examination, & Conviction & hereof fail not at Your perrill & for so doing this shall be your warrant of which you are to make a true returne as the Law derects:

P[er] Curiam *Tho's Wade Cler

Ipswich March 29'th 1692)

To the Constable of Ipswich

You are hereby required In their Majesties names to Sumons warne & Require to appeare at the Court to be holden at Ipswich on the morrow morning Viz't Mary Fuller sen'r & Mary fuller Junior & Allexsander Thomson jur & Richard fitts & Doct: John Bridgham & Thomas Maning & Nathaniel Burnam all of Ipswich & Thomas Knowlton jur & Mary Thorne To Give in their severall Evidences before the Court to Cleare up the Grounds of Suspition of Rachell Clenton Being a Witch & hereof faile not at Your perrill but make a true returne under Your hand as the Law Directs --

P[er]. Curiam *Thos Wade Cler.

(Reverse) I have served this warrant and read it to Rechell Clinton: this morning : and seized hur Body: and Left hur in the hands of Samuella Ordeway: [to] have in the Court house Against your honoures shall Call for hur and I have Red the severall warrants one the other sid written this morning save only Richard fitts and Mary Thorne and Richard fitts I could not find and Mary Thorne is not well:
as witness my hand

*Joseph Fuller, Constable of

Ipswich: Dated this 29'th March 1692

(Warrant for apprehension of Hannah Carroll & Sarah Cole (of Salem) & Officer's Return)

[September 15, 1692]

To the Sheriffe of the County of Essex or #[their] his Deputy Complaint haveing ben made to us their Majesties Justices of the Peace in Salem by Henery Brage of Salem labourer against Hannah Carrell wife of Nathaniell Carell whele right. & Sarah Coale , wife of Abraham Coale of Salem Taylor. for that the Said Hannah Carrell Did Sometimes one of them & Sometimes Both. together Severall Times ffeloniously afflict Torture & Torment William Brage Son of Henr' Brage by that Diabollicall art of witchcraft, & the Said Henr' Brage hath given in bond to procecut his said Complaint to Effect./ These are therefore in their Majesties names to. -- require you forthwith to Apprehend & Seize the Bodyes of the Said Hanah Carrell & Sarah Coale & Bringe them before their Majesties Justices of the Peace in Salem in order to their Examination for w'ch this shall be your sufficient warrant

Dated in Salem: 10'th Sep'r 1692.

*Bartho Gedney

*John Hathorne

*Jonathan. Corwin

*John Higginson

(Reverse) Sep 15'th 1692 By viture hereof I have apprehended the body of Sarah Cole within named and left her under Guard in the town of salem in order to her Examination by me

*Geo. Herrick Dep'y sheriff

Sara: Coale. Exa: 16:7 92

(Warrant No. 1 for the apprehension of Elizabeth Colson, & Officer's Return)

[May 14, 1692]

To the Constable of Redding

You are in theÿr Majestyes Names hereby Required to Apprehend & bring before us (upon Tuesday next being the Seavententh day of this Instant May by Tenne of the Clock aforenoone att the house of Left Nathaniell Ingersolls in Salem Village) the body of Elizabeth Colson of Redding Single woeman, whoe standeth charged in behalfe of theyr Majestys w'th high Suspition of Sundry Acts of Witchcraft done or Committed upon the Bodyes of Mary. Walcott , Mercy Lewis & others in Salem Village, whereby great hurt hath bin done them: And hereof you are nott to faile

Salem dat'd Maÿ 14'th 1692

Per us *John Hathorne

*Jonathan. Corwin { Assis'ts

May 16'th 1692

I have made Diligent Search for the above named Elizabeth Collson and find shee is fled and by the best Information shee is att Boston in order to bee shipt ofe and by way of Escape to be transported to some other Country whereof I make my Returne per me *John Parker Constable for Redding

Appendix 6

Testimony

(Testimony of John Porter and Lydia Porter Regarding Sarah Bibber), in Support of Rebecca Nurse)

[++ June 29, 1692]

The Testimony of John Porter: And Lidia Porter These

The Testimony of John Porter, who Testifieth & sayth that Goodwife Biber Somtime living amongst us I did observe her to be a woman of An unruly turbulent Spirit; And shee would often fall into strange fitts; when shee was crost of her humor: Likewise Lidia Porter Testifieth, that Goodwife Bibber And her Husband would often quarrel & in their quarrels shee would call him, very bad names, And would have strange fitts when she was crost, And a woman of an unruly turbulent spirit, And double tongued (Reverse) Jn'o Porters Evidence in behalfe of the p'rson'es in Invalidating Sarah vibber

copy

copied

(Testimony of Joseph Fowler Regarding Sarah Bibber, in Support of Rebecca Nurse)

[+ June 29, 1692]

The Testimony of Joseph fowler, who Testifieth that Goodman Bibber & his wife, Lived at my house, and I did observe and take notice, that Goodwife Bibber was a woman, who was very idle in her calling And very much given to tatling & tale Bareing makeing mischeif amongst her neighbo'rs, & very much given to speak bad words and would call her husband bad names & was a woman of a very turbulent unruly spirit

(Reverse) Against Bibber & Wife

Joseph fowler

(Testimony of Thomas Jacobs and Mary Jacobs, Regarding Sarah Bibber), in Support of Rebecca Nurse)

[++ June 29, 1692]

The testymony of Thomas Jacob and mery his wife doth testyfy and say that good bibbor #[and] now that is now counted afflicketed parson she did for a time surgin in our hous and good bibber wood be very often spekeking against won and nother very obsanely and thos things that were very falls. and wichshing very bad wichchis and very often and she wichs that wen hor chill fell into the rever that she had never pull #[out] hor chilld out and good bibbor yous to wich ill wichches to horselpe and hor children and allso to others: the nayborhud werr she liveued amonkes aftor she bered: hor fust housbon hes tolld us that this John bibbor wife coud fall into fitts as often as she plesed ["d" written over "s"]

(In left margin) The Testimony of Richard Walker; who Testifieth; that Goodwife BibberSomtimes, Living neare to me, I did observe her to be a woman of an unruly turbulent spirit, And would often fall into strange fitts: when any thing crost her humor

(Reverse) Tho. Jacobs

goody fiber

(Testimony of Sarah Nurse Regarding Sarah Bibber, in Support of Rebecca Nurse)

[++ June 29, 1692]

the testimony of Sarah Nurs aged 28 years or th[ere]

abouts who testifieth and saith that being in the Cour[t] this 29 of June 1692 I

sawe goodwife bibber pull o[ut]

pins out of her Close and held them betwene h[er]

fingers and Claspt her hands round her knese and

then she Cryed out and said goody Nurs prict

her this I can testifie if Calld as witnes my mark

mark

Sarah S Nurs

her

(Reverse) Evidences in behalfe of the prison'rs

(Testimony of Samuel Gray v. Bridget Bishop)

[May 30, 1692]

Samuell Gray of Salem Aged aboute 42 yeares Testifieth and sayth that aboute fourteen yeare agoe, he goeing to bed well one Lords Day at night, and after he had benne asleep some time, he awakened & looking up, saw the house light as if a candle or candles were lighted in it and the dor locked & that little fire there, was Raked up he ["he" written over "I"] did then see a woman standing between the Cradle if] Roome. and the Bed side and seemed to look upon him soe he ["he" written over "I"] did Rise up in his ["his" written over "my"] bed and it vanished or disapeared then he ["he" written over "I"] went to the dor and found it locked. & unlocking and Opening the dore he ["he" written over "I"] went to the Entry dore and looked out, and then againe did see the same Woman he ["he" written over "I"] had a ["a" written over "just"] little before seene in the Rome, and in the same garbe she was in before, then he ["he" written over "I"] said to her in the name of God what doe you Come for. then she vanished away soe he ["he" written over "I"] Locked the dore againe & went to bed and between sleepeing & wakeing he ["he" written over "I"] felt some thing Come to his ["his" written over "my"] mouth or lipes cold, & there upon started & looked up & againe did see the same woman with some thing betweene both her hands holding before his ["his" written over "my"] mouth upon which she moved. and the Child in the Cradle gave a great screech out as if it was greatly hurt and she disappeared, and takeing the child up could not quiett it in some howres from which tyme, the child that before was a very Likely thriveing Child #[before] did pine away and was never well, althow it Lived some moneths after, yet in a sad Condition and soe dyed; some tyme after within a weeke or less he did see the same Woman in the same Garb and Cloaths, that appeared to him as aforesaid, and althow he knew not her, nor her name before, Yett ["Yett" written over "her"] both by her Countenance & garb doth Testifie that it was the same Woman that thay now Call Bridget Bishop Alias Oliver. of Salem

*Samell Gray

Sworne Salem May 30'th 1692

Before mee *John Hathorne Assis't

(Reverse) Sam'll Grays Evedence

Bridgett Bishopp

(Testimony of Samuel Shattuck and Sarah Shattuck v. Bridget Bishop)

[June 2, 1692]

Sam'll Shattock aged 41 yeares testifieth that in the year 1680 Bridged Oliver formerly wife to old Goodman Oliver: now wife to Edward Bishop did Come to my hous pretending to buy an old hh'd w'ch tho I asked verry little for: & for all her pretended want She went away w'th out it: & Sundry other tymes she came in a Smooth flattering maner in very Slighty Errants; wee have thought Since on purpos to work mischeif: at or very near this tyme o'r Eldest Child who promised as much health & understanding both by Countenance and actions as any other Children of his yeares: was taken in a very drooping Condition and as She Came oftener to the hous he grew wors & wors: as he would be standing at the door would fall #[and] out & b[ruis] his face upon a great Step Stone. #[i] as if he had bin thrust out bye an invissible hand: often tymes falling & hitting his face ag'st the Sides of the #[h?] hous: bruising his face in a very misserable maner: after this the abovesaid Oliver brought me a pair of Sleeves to dye & after that Sundry peeces of lace Som of w'ch were Soe Short that i could not judge them fit for any uce: she p'd me 2'd for dying them w'ch 2'd I #[a] gave to Henery Will'ms w'ch lived w'th me he told me put it in a purs among Som other mony w'ch he locked up in a box & that the purs & money was gon out of the Box he Could not tell how; & never found it after just after the dying of these things this child was taken in a terrible fit; his mouth & Eyes drawne aside and gasped in Such a maner as if he was upon the point of death; after this he grew wors in his fits: and out of them would be allmost allways crying that for many months he would be crying till natures strenght was Spent & then would fall asleep and then awake & fall to crying & moaning; that his very Countenance did bespeak Compassion; and at lenght wee p'rceived his understanding decayed Soe that wee feared (as it has Since proved) that he would be quite bereaft of his witts; for Ever Since he has bin Stupified and voide of reason his fitts Still following of him; after he had bin in this kind of Sicknes Som tyme he has gon into the garden & has got upon a board of an inch thick w'ch lay flat upon the ground & wee have Called him; he would Com to the Edge of the board & hold out his hand & make as if he would Com but Could not till he was helped of the board; other tymes when he has got upon a board as aforesaide my wife has Said She has ofered him a Cake & mony to Com to her and he has held out his #[reach] hand & reach't after it but Could not Com till he has bin help't of the board; by w'ch i Judge Som inchantm kep't him on about 17 or 18 months after, the first of this Ilnes there Came a Stranger #[Came] to my hous & pittyed this Child and Said among other word's wee are all borne Som to one thing & Som to another; I asked him & w't doe you

Say this Child is borne too he replied he is born to be bewitched and is bewitched I told him he did not know; he said, he did know & Said to me you have a neighbo'r that lives not far of that is a witch: I told him wee had noe neighb'r but w't was honest folke; he replied you have a neighb'r that is a witch & She has had a falling out w'th yo'r wife. & Said in her hart y'r wife is a proud #[proud] woman & She#[ld] would bring downe her pride in this Childe: I paused in my Selfe & did rememb'r that my wif

(Reverse) [mye] wife had told me that goodwife Oliver had bin at the hous & spoke to her to beat Henry Will'ms that lived w'th us & that She went away muttering & She thought threatning; but little before o'r child was taken ill; I told the aforesaid Stranger that there was Such a woman as he Spoke of; he asked where She lived for he would goe & See her if he knew how: I gave him mony & bid him ask her for a pot of Syd'r; away he went & i Sent my boy w'th him who afte'r a short tyme: both returned; the boys face bleeding & i asked w't was the matter they told me the man #[kn] knock't at the door & goody oliver Came to the door & asked the Stranger w't he would have he told her a pot of Syd'r she Saide he Shewld have none & bid him get out & took up a Spade & made him goe out She followed him & when She came w'thout the poarch She Saw mye boy & run to him & Scratched his face & made it bleed; Saying to him thou roague w't dost thou bring this fellow here to plague me; now this man did Say before he went; that he would fetch blood of her And Ever Since this Child hath bin followed w'th greivous fitts as if he would never rcover moor: his hed & Eyes drawne aside Soe as if they would never Come to rights moor lying as if he were in a maner dead falling any where Either into fier or water if he be not Constantly looked too, and generally in Such an uneasie and restles frame allmost allways runing too & fro acting Soe Strange that I cannot judge otherwise but that he is bewitched and by these circumstances doe beleive that the aforesaid Bridged Oliver now Called Bishop is the Caus of it and it has bin the Judgem't of Docters Such as lived here & foreigners: that he is under an Evill hand of witchcraft

Eved. Against

Bridget Bishop. 9

per Sam'l Shaddock & wife

Sam'll Shattock &

Sarah Shattock

affirmeth upon the oath they have taken to the truth of

w't is above written

Jurat in Curia June 2'd 92

attest *Steph: Sewall Cler

(Testimony of John Louder v. Bridget Bishop)

[June 2, 1692]

John Louder of Salem Aged aboute thurtey two Yeares, Testifieth and sayth that aboute seaven or Eight yeares since I then Liveing w'th M'r John Gedney in Salem and haveing had some Controversy with Bridgett Bushop the wife of Edw'd Bushop of Salem Sawyer aboate her fowles that used to Come into our orchard or garden. Some little tyme after which, I goeing well to bed; aboute the dead of the night felt a great weight upon my Breast and awakening looked and it being bright moon: light did clearly see s'd Bridget Bushop -- or her likeness sitting upon my stomake and puting my Armes of of the bed to free myselfe from that great oppression she presently layd hold of my throat and almost Choa[ked] mee and I had noe strenth or power in my hands to resist or help my selfe, and in this Condition she held mee to almost day, some tyme after this, my Mistress Susannah Gedney was in our orchard and I was then with her. and s'd #[s'd]Bridget Bushop being then in her Orchard w'ch was next ad- joyneing to ours my Mistress told s'd Bridget. that I said or affirmed that she cume one night & satt upon my brest as afores'd which she denyed and I Affirmed to her face to be tru and that I did plainly see her. upon w'ch discourse with her she Threatened mee. And some tyme after that I being not very well stayed at #[w]home on a Lords day and on the after noon of s'd day the dores being shutt I did see a black pig in the Roome Comeing towards mee soe I went towards itt to kick it and it vanished away Immediately after I satt down in a Narrow Bar and did see a black thing Jump into the window and came & stood

Just before my face, upon the bar the body of itt looked like a Munky only the feete ware like a Cocks feete w'th Claws and the face somewhat more like a mans than a Munkies. and I being greatly affrighted not being able to c or help my selfe by Reason of feare I suppose, soe the thing spake to mee and said I am a Messenger sent to y'u for I understand you are trobled in mind, and if you will be Ruled by mee you shall want for Nothing in this world upon which I Endeavored to clap my hands upon itt, and sayd You devill I will Kill you. but could feale noe substance and itt Jumped out of the window againe. and Imediatly Came in by the porch althow the dores ware shutt. and sayd you had Better take my Councill, where upon I strook at it with a stick butt strook the Groundsill and broak the stick,

(Reverse) but felt noe Substance, and that arme with which I strook was presently disenabled, then it vanished away and I opened the back dore and Went out and goeing towards the house End I Espied s'd Bridget Bushop in her orchard goeing towards her house, and seing her had not power to set one foote forward but returned in againe and goeing to shutt the dore. I Againe did see that or the like creture that I before did see within dores, in such a posture as it seemed to be agoeing to fly at mee, up- on which I cryed. out; the whole armor of god be between mee and You. soe itt sprang back and flew over the apple tree flinging the dust w'th its feet against my stomake, upon which I was struck dumb and soe Continued for aboute three days tyme and also shook many of the apples of, from the tree w'ch it flu over:

John louder apearid before us this 2. dy of June 1692 and one the oath that he had taken did owne this testimony to be the truth before us the Jarris of Inquest

Jurat in Curia

(Reverse) Evidences ag't Br. Bishop.

Jn'o Loader

+ On her Tryall Bridget Bishop alias Olliver denied that she knew this deponent though #[their] the orchard of this depon't & the orchard of s'd Bishop Joined & they often had difference for Some yeares together

John Loader

(Testimony of John Bly, Sr., and William Bly v. Bridget Bishop)

[June 2, 1692]

June 2'th 1692 Jn'o Blye Senio'r aged about 57 yeers & William Blye aged about 15 yeares both of Salem Testifieth and saith that being Employed by Bridgitt Bushup Alies Oliver of Salem To help take downe the Celler wall of The owld house she formerly Lived in wee the s'd Deponants in holes of the s'd owld wall Belonging To the s'd sellar found severall popitts made up of Raggs And ["And" written over "w'th"] hoggs Brusells w'th headles pins in Them w'th the points outward & This was about seven yeares Last past

Jurat Curia

(Reverse) papers ag't B: B: n'o 16: 10

John Bly and W'm Bly

Court Oy'r & Term'r held at Salem

2'd June 92

poppets.

Olliver

(Testimony of Richard Coman v. Bridget Bishop)

[June 2, 1692]

Richard Coman aged aboute 32 yeares Testifieth that sometime aboute Eight yeares Since: I then being in bed with my wife at Salem. one fift day of the Weeke at night Either. in the Latter end of May or the Begining of June. and a light burneing in our Roome I being awake, did then see Bridget Bishop of Salem Alias Olliver come into the Roome wee Lay in and two Women more with her. w'ch Two Women ware strangers to mee I knew them not. but s'd Bishop came in her Red paragon Bodys and the rest of her cloathing that she then usually did ware, and I knowing of her well also the garb she did use to goe in. did clearly & plainly know her, and Testifieth that as he locked the dore of the house when he went to bed soe he found it after wards w'n he did Rise, and quickly after thay appeared the light was out, and the Curtaines at the foote of the bed opened where I did see her and presently came #[and as I] And lay upon my Brest or body and soe oppressed him that he could not speake nor stur noe not soe much as to awake his wife althow he Endeavored much soe to do itt; the next night thay all appeared againe in like

manner and she s'd Bishop Alias Oliver tooke hold of him by the throate and almost haled him out of the bed the Satterday night followeing; I haveing benne that day telling of what I had seene and how I suffered the two nights before, my Kinsman W'm Coman told mee he would stay with mee & Lodg with mee and see if thay would come againe and advised mee to lay my Sword on thurt my body. quickly after Wee Went to bed that s'd night and both well awake and discoursing together in came all the three women againe and s'd Bishop was the first as she had benne the Other two nights, soe I told him; W'm heere thay be all Come againe & he #[he] was Immediatly strook speechless & could not move hand or foote and Immediatly they gott hold of my sword & strived to take it from mee but I held soe fast as thay did not gett it away; and I had then Liberty of sp[ee]ch and called W'm. also my wife & Sarah phillips that [lay w]ith my wife. who all told mee af[terwards they heard] mee, but had not power to Speak [or stur]

(Reverse) afterwards And the first that spake was Sarah phillips. and said in the name of god Goodm Coman w't is the Matter with you, soe thay all vanished away

Sworne Salem June 2'd 1692

Before mee *John Hathorn[]

Jurat in Curia

Richard C[]

als Olliver.

(Testimony of John Bly, Sr and Rebecca Bly v. Bridget Bishop)

[June 2, 1692]

John Bly sen'r and Rebecka Bly his wife of Salem, bothe Testifie and say that s'd Jn'o Bly Bought a Sow of Edw'd Bushop of Salem #[Labourer] Sawyer and by agreement with s'd Bushop was to pay the price agreed upon, unto L't Jeremiah Neale of Salem, and Bridgett the wife of said Edward Bushop because she could not have the mony or vallue agreed for, payd unto her, she [] to the house of the deponents in Salem and Quarrelled w'th t[hem] aboute it. #[and also then Threatened them sayeing]

soon after which the Sow haveing piged she was taken with Strainge fitts Jumping up. and knocking hir head against the fence and seemed blind and deafe and would not Eat neither Lett her pigs suck but foamed at the mouth, which goody hinderson heareing of sayd she beleived she was over-looked, and that thay had theire cattle ill in such a manner at the Eastward when she lived there, and used to cure them by giveing of them Red Okar & Milk. which wee also gave the Sow. Quickly after eating of which she grew Better. and then for the Space of Neere Two howre[] together she getting into the street did sett of Jumping & runing betweene the house of s'd deponents and s'd Bushops as if she ware stark mad; and after that was well againe and wee did then Apprehend. or Judge & doe still that s'd Bishop had bewitched s'd Sow

Jurat in Curia

(Reverse) John Bly and wife

Jn'o Bligh

W'm Bligh

Rob. Bligh

Examination

(Examination of Nehemiah Abbott, Jr.)

[April 22, 1692]

The examination of Nehemiah Abbot, at a court at Salem village, by John Hawthorne and Jonathan Corwin Esqrs. 22nd April 1692 .

What say you, are you guilty of witchcraft, of which you are suspected, or not? No Sir, I say before God, before whom I stand, that I know nothing of witchcraft. Who is this man? Ann Putman named him. -- Mary Walcot said she had seen his shape. What do you say to this? I never did hurt them. Who hurt you Ann Putman? That man. I never hurt her. Ann Putman said, he is upon the beam. Just such a discovery of the person carried out, and she confessed; and if you would find mercy of God, you must confess. -- If I should confess this, I must confess what is false. Tell how far you have gone, who hurts you? I do not know, I am absolutely free. As you say, God knows. If you will confess the truth, we desire nothing else that you may not hide you guilt, if you are guilty, and therefore confess if so. I speak before God that I am clear from this accusation. What, in all respects? Yes in all respects. Doth this man hurt you? Their mouths were stopped. You hear several accuse you, though one cannot open her mouth. I am altogether free. Charge him not unless it be he. This is the man say some, and some say he is very like him. How did you know his name? He did not tell me himself, but other witches told me. Ann Putman said, it is the same man, and then she was taken with a fit. Mary Walcot, is this the man? He is like him, I cannot say it is he. Mercy Lewis said it is not the man. They all agreed, the man had a bunch on his eyes. Ann Putman, in a fit, said, be you the man? ay, do you say you be the man? did you put a mist before my eyes? Then he was sent forth till several others were examined. When he was brought in again, by reason of much people, and many in the windows so that the accusers could not have a clear view of him, he was ordered to be abroad, and the accusers to go forth to him and view him in the light, which they did, and in the presence of the magistrates and many others discoursed quietly with him, one and all acquitting him, but yet said he was like that man, but he had not the wen they saw in his apparition, Note, he was a hilly faced man and stood shaded by reason of his own hair, so that for a time he seemed to some by-standers and observers, to be considerably like the person the afflicted did describe.

Mr. Samuel Parris, being desired to take in writing the examination of Nehemiah Abbot, hath delivered it as aforesaid, and upon hearing the same did see cause to dismiss him.

John Hawthorne

Jona. Corwin { Assistants.

(Examination of John Alden, as Published by Robert Calef)

[May 31, 1692]

John Aldin Senior, of Boston, in the County of Suffolk, Mariner, on the 28th Day of May, 1692, was sent for by the Magistrates of Salem, in the County of Essex, upon the Accusation of a company of poor distracted, or possessed Creatures or Witches; and being sent by Mr. Stoughton, arrived there the 31st of May, and appeared at Salem-Village, before Mr. Gidney, Mr. Hathorn, and Mr. Curwin.

Those Wenches being present, who plaid their juggling tricks, falling down, crying out, and staring in Peoples Faces; the Magistrates demanded of them several times, who it was of all the People in the Room that hurt them? one of these Accusers pointed several times at one Captain Hill , there present, but spake nothing; the same Accuser had a Man standing at her back to hold her up; he stooped down to her Ear, then she cried out, Aldin , Aldin afflicted her; one of the Magistrates asked her if she had ever seen Aldin , she answered no, he asked her how she knew it was Aldin ? She said, the Man told her so.

Then all were ordered to go down into the Street, where a Ring was made; and the same Accuser cried out, "there stands Aldin, a bold fellow with his Hat on before the Judges, he sells Powder and Shot to the Indians and French, and lies with the Indian Squaes, and has Indian Papooses." Then was Aldin

committed to the Marshal's Custody, and his Sword taken from him; for they said he afflicted them with his Sword. After some hours Aldin was sent for to the Meeting-house in the Village before the Magistrates; who required Aldin to stand upon a Chair, to the open view of all the People.

The Accusers cried out that Aldin did pinch them, then, when he stood upon the Chair, in the sight of all the People, a good way distant from them, one of the Magistrates bid the Marshal to hold open Aldin's hands, that he might not pinch those Creatures. Aldin asked them why they should think that he should come to that Village to afflict those persons that he never knew or saw before? Mr. Gidney bid Aldin confess, and give glory to God; Aldin said he hoped he should give glory to God, and hoped he should never gratifie the Devil; but appealed to all that ever knew him, if they ever suspected him to be such a person, and challenged any one, that could bring in any thing upon their own knowledge, that might give suspicion of his being such an one. Mr. Gidney said he had known Aldin many Years, and had been at Sea with him, and al- ways look'd upon him to be an honest Man, but now he did see cause to alter his judgment: Aldin answered, he was sorry for that, but he hoped God would clear up his Innocency, that he would recall that judgment again, and added that he hoped that he should with Job maintain his Integrity till he died. They bid Aldin look upon the Accusers, which he did, and then they fell down. Aldin asked Mr. Gidney, what Reason there could be given, why Aldin's looking upon him did not strike him down as well; but no reason was given that I heard. But the Accusers were brought to Aldin to touch them, and this touch they said made them well. Aldin began to speak of the Providence of God in suffering these Creatures to accuse Innocent persons. Mr. Noyes asked Aldin why he would offer to speak of the Providence of God. God by his Providence (said Mr. Noyes) governs the World, and keeps it in peace; and so went on with Discourse, and stopt Aldin's mouth, as to that. Aldin told Mr. Gidney, that he could assure him that there was a lying Spirit in them, for I can assure you that there is not a word of truth in all these say of me. But Aldin was again committed to the Marshal, and his Mittimus written, which was as follows.

To Boston Aldin was carried by a Constable, no Bail would be taken for him; but was delivered to the Prison-keeper, where he remained Fifteen Weeks; and then observing the manner of Tryals, and Evidence then taken, was at length prevailed with to make his Escape, and being returned, was bound over to Answer at the Superiour Court at Boston, the last Tuesday in April,

Anno, 1693. And was there cleared by Proclamation, none appearing against him.

Per. John Aldin.

(Examination of Mary Barker)

[August 29, 1692.]

29 August 1692. Before Maj'r Gidney Mr. Hawthorn and Mr. Corwin
The Examination and confession of Mary Barker of Andover

After severall questiones propounded and negative answe'rs Returned she at last acknowledged that Goody Johnson made her a witch, And that #[this] sometime last #[spring] sumer she made a red mark in the devils book with the forefinger of her Left hand, And the Devil would have her hurt martha Sprague Rose foster and Abigail martin which she did upon Saturday and Sabath day last, she said she was not above a quarter of an hour in comeing down from Andover to Salem to afflict, she sayes she afflicted the above three persones bye squeezeing her hands. she confesses she was at the witch meeting at Salem Village with her unkle, there was a great many there, and of her company their was only her unkle, W'm Barker and mary marston Martha Sprague said that Mary Barkers apparition told that she was baptised at five myle pond.

said Mary Barker said there was such a load & weight at her stomack that hindered her from speakeing And is afrayd she hes given up her self soul & body to the devil she sayes she promised to serve worship and beleve in him And he promessed to pardone her sins, but finds he hes deserved her, and that she was Lost of god and all good people, That Goody Jonson and Goody falkner appeared at the same tyme and threatned to teare her in peeces if she did not doo what she then did. she further sayth that she hes seen no appearance since but a fly which did speake to her, and bid her afflict these poor creatu'rs. which she did by pincheing with, and Clincheing of her hands for which she is sorry, And further the Devil told her it would be very brave and cliver for her to come down here to Salem among these accused

persones. And that she should never be brought out. She promises to confess what more she shall hereafter remember.

Mary Barker Signed and owned THE X MARKE
the abovesaid Examination & Confesion of Mary. Barker:

17 Sep't 1692 before me

*John Higginson Jus'e peace

(Reverse) Confession of Mary Barker
acused.

w'm Barker Sen'r

Goody Johnson

Goody Falkner

Goody Marston

afflicted

Martha Sprage

Rose Foster

Abigall Martin

(Examination of William Barker, Sr.)

[August 29, 1692]

29. agust. 92. Coram Mag'r Gidney m'r hathorn m'r Corwin Cap't higginson

William Barker of Andove'rs examination & confession

He confesses he hes been in the snare of the devil three yeares, that the devil first appeared to him lyke a black man and perceived he had a cloven foot, That the devil demanded of him to give up himself soul & Body unto him, which he promesed to doe, He said he had a great family, the world went hard with him and was willing to pay every man his own, And the devil told him he would pay all his debts and he should live comfortably. -- He confesses he hes afflicted #[?]sed Sprague foster and martin, his three accusers. That he did syne the devils book with blood brought to him in a thing lyke an Inkhorn that he dipt his finger therein and made a blott in the book which was a confirmation of the Covenant with the devil. He confesses he was at a meeting of witches at Salem Village where he judges there was about a hundred of them, that the meeting was upon a green peece of ground neare the ministe'rs house, He said they mett there to destroy that place by reason of the peoples being divided & their differing with their ministe'rs

Satans design was to set up his own worship, abolish all the churches in the land, to fall next upon Salem and soe goe through the countrey, He sayth the devil promised that all his people should live bravely that all persones should be equall; that their should be no day of resurection or of judgement, and neither punishment nor shame for sin. -- He sayth there was a Sacrament at that meeting, there was also bread & wyne m'r Burse was a ringleader in that meeting and named several persones that were there at the meeting, It was proposed at the meeting to make as many witches as they could, And they were all by m'r Burse and the black man exhorted to pull down the Kingdome of christ and set up the Kingdome of the devil, He said he knew mr Burroughs and Goody How to be such persones, And that he heard a trumpet sounded at the meeting and thinks it was Burse that did it, The sound is heard many myles off, And then they all come one efter another -- In the spring of the yeare the witches came from Connecticut to afflict at Salem Village but now they have left it off And that he hes been informed by some of the grandees that there is about 307 witches in the country, -- He sayth the witches are much disturbed with the afflicted persones because they are discovered by them, They curse the judges because their Society is brought under, They wold have the afflicted persones count ed as witches But he thinks the afflicted persones are Innocent & that they doe god good service And that he hes not known or heard of one Innocent persone taken up & put in prisone -- He saith he is heartily sorry for what he has done and for hurting the afflicted persones his accuse'rs, prayes their forgiveness, desyres praye'rs for himself, promises to renounce the devil and all his works, And then he could take them all by the hand without any harme by his eye or any otherwise 5.7:92 the above Said is the Truth as wittnese my hand: -- *

William Barker ---

(In left margin) he owned this is the Court of Oyre & Terminer as on the back Side

(Reverse) Wm Barkers Exa.

acused.

mr Buse

mr Buroughs

Goody How

Coneticut witches & Severall others

afflicted

martha Sprage

Rose foster

Abigall martin

at A Court of Oyer & Termine'r held at Salem Sep'r 16 92.: owned in Court at Salem Sepr. 16. 1692

attest * St: Sewall

(Examination of William Barker, Jr.)

[+ September 1, 1693]

2nd Paper

[?]Sep't 92

Before Maj'r Gidney m'r Hawthorn m'r Corwin & Cap't Higginsone.

The Examination and confession of W'm Barker aged 14 yeares or #[there]about

He is accused for exercising acts of witchcraft upon the bodyes of Martha Sprague Rose foster and Abigail Martin, which he did not deny but could not remember it. ----

He confesses now that he hath not been in the snare of the devil above six dayes, That as he was goeing in the woods one evening to look efter coves he saw the shape of a black dog which looked very fiercely upon him And he was much disturbed in his mynd about it and could not sleep well that night

And betymes next morneing he mett with a black man (he calls him a black man because he had black cloaths and thinks he had a black skin) who bid him set his hand to a book and serve him as long as he the said Barker Lived, which he promised And thereupon set his hand to the book by putting his finger thereon, He saith the black man brought red stuff along with him in an Inkhorn And he the said Barker dipt his finger into it and therewith made a red mark on the paper He confesses he was to doe any service the black man appoynted him and was to have a sute of cloaths for it. he said further the black man would have him baptised but he never was. ----

He saith further that Goody Parker went with him last night to afflict martha Sprague, And that he afflicts by clincheing his hands together. He now Saith he is sorry & hates the devill but yet struck down the afflicted with his eyes, And martha Sprague being recovered out of a fitt said that Barkers apparition and Goody Parker rid upon a pole. and was baptised at five myle pond,----- He now sayes there was such a load upon his Stomack that he could not speak,

A litle after he owned he was baptised by the black man at five myle pond and did also renounce his former baptisme, he knowes Goody Parker to be a witch And sayes the devil dipt his head into the water & spoke these words that he the said Barker was his for ever and ever.

He said he could not think of his baptisme before, -----

And that the load that was upon his stomak is not so heavy as it was but just before He #[said] still afflicted martha Sprague & shut her mouth but by layeing his hand thereon opened it again. -- and afterwards confessed that there were of his Company Goody Parker Goody Parker Samuel Wardwell & his wife and two daughte'rs.

And then could take the afflicted persones by the hand without doeing them any harme.

W'm Barker Jun'r Signed & owned the abovesaid

Examination & Confession.

before me *John Higginson Just'e peace:

The marke X

of

William Barker Jun'r

(Reverse) Confession of William Barker Jun'r

acused.

Goody parker

Goody Johnson

Sam'll wardell. his wife & 2 Daughters

afflicted

martha. Sprage

(Examination of Bridget Bishop, as Recorded by Samuel Parris)

[April 19, 1692]

The Examination of Bridget

Byshop at Salem village

19. Apr. 1692 ["2" written over "3"]

By John Hawthorn & Jonath: Corwin Esq'rs

As soon as she came near all fell into fits

Bridget Byshop, You are now brought before Authority to give acc'o of what witchcrafts you are conversant in

I take all this people (turning her head & eyes about) to witness that I am clear.

Hath this woman hurt you speaking to the afflicted.

Eliz: Hubbard, Ann Putman, Abigail Williams, & Mercy Lewes affirmed she had hurt them.

You are here accused by 4. or .5. for hurting them, what do you say to it?

I never saw these persons before; nor I never was in this place before.

Mary Walcot sais that her brother Jonathan stroke her appearance & she saw that #[ha] he had tore her coat in striking, & she heard it tare.

Upon #[sea] some search in the Court, a rent that seems to answere what was alledged was found.

They say you bewicht your first husband to death.

If it please your worship I know nothing of it.

She shake her head & the afflicted were tortured.

The like again upon the motion of her head.

Sam: Braybrook affirmed that she told him to day that she had been accounted a Witch these .10. years, but she was no Witch, the Devil cannot hurt her.

I am no Witch.

Why if you have not wrote in the book, yet tell me how far you have gone? Have you not to do with familiar Spirits?

I have no familiarity with the Devil.

How is it then, that your appearance doth hurt these?

I am innocent.

Why you seem to act Witchcraft before us, by the motion of your body, which #[hasin] seems to have influence flunce upon the afflicted.

I know nothing of it. I am innocent to a Witch. I know not what a Witch is.

How do you know then that you are not a witch? #[and yet know not what a Witch is?]

I do not #[understand] know what you say.

How can you know, you are no Witch, & yet not know what a Witch is:

I am clear: if I were any such person you should know it.

You may threaten, but you can do no more than you are permitted.

I am innocent of a Witch.

What do you say of those murders you are charged with?

I hope, I am not guilty of Murder.

Then she turned up her eyes, & #[they] the eyes of the afflicted were turned up

It may be you do not know, that any have confessed to day, who have been examined before you, that they are Witches.

No, I know nothing of it.

John Hutchinson & John Hewes in open Court affirmed that they had told her

Why look you, you are taken now in a flat lye.

I did not hear them.

Note Sam: Gold saith that after this examination he ask't s'd Bridget Byshop if she were not troubled to see the afflicted persons so tormented, said Byshop answered no, she was not troubled for them: Then he ask't her whither she thought they were bewicht, she said she could not tell what to think about them. Will Good, & John Buxton jun'r was by, & he supposeth they hear(d) her also.

Salem Village Aprill the .19'th 1692

m'r Sam'l Parris being desired to take into

Wrighting the Examination of Bridget Bishop,

hath delivered it as aforesaid

And upon hearing the same, and seeing

what wee did then see, together wit[h]
the Charge of the afflicted persons th[en]
present; Wee Committed s'd Bridg[] Olliver --

*John Hathorne

(Reverse) The Examocon of Bridget Byshop 19. Apr 1692

(Examination of Bridget Bishop, as Recorded by Ezekiel Cheever.)

[April 19, 1692]

The examination of Bridget Bishop before the Worshipfull John Harthon and Jonathan Curren esq'rs
Bridget Bishop being now comeing in to be examined relating to her accusation of suspicion of sundry
acts of witchcrafts the afflicted persons are now dreadfully afflicted by her as they doe say
Bishop what doe you say you here stand charged with sundry acts of witchcraft by you done or committed
upon the bodyes of mercy Lewes and An Putnum and others

I am innocent I know nothing of it I have done no witchcraft

Looke upon this woman and see if this be the woman that you have seen hurting you mercy Lewes and
An Putnum and others doe doe now charge her to her face with hurting of them

M'r Harthon) what doe you say now you see they charge you to your face

I never did hurt them in my life I did never see these persons before I am as innocent as the child unborn
is not your coate cut

answers no but her garment being Looked upon they find #[] it cut or toren two wayes Jo#[h]nathan
walcoa[te] saith that the sword that he strucke at [goo#o]de Bishop[/tag/bishop_bridget.html] with was
not naked but was within the #[scab] scabberd so that the rent may very probablie be the very same that
mary walcoate #[tell] did tell that shee had in her coate by Jonathans striking at her apperance

The afflicted persons charge her, with having hurt them many wayes and by tempting them to sine to
the devils Booke at which charge shee seemed to be very angrie and shaking her head at them saying it
was false they are all greatly tormented (as I conceive) by the shaking of her head

good Bishop what contract have you made with the devill

I have made no contract with the devill I never saw him in my life. An Putnam sayeth that shee calls the
devill her God

what say you to all this that you are charged with can you not find in your []art to tell the truth

I doe tell the truth I never hurt these persons in []y life I never saw them before.

(Mercy Lewis) oh goode Bishop did you not come to our house the Last night and did you not tell me
that your master made you tell more then you were willing to tell

(Mr H) tell us the truth in this matter how comes these persons to be thus tormented and to charge you
with doing

(Bish) I am not come here to say I am a witch to take away my life

(Mr H) who is it that doth it if you doe not they say it is your likenes that comes and torments them and
tempts them to write in the booke what Booke is that you tempt them with.

(Bish)I know nothing of it I am innocent.

doe you not see how they are tormented you are acting witchcraft before us what doe you say to this
why have you not an heart to confese the truth

I am innocent I know nothing of it I am no witch I know not what a witch is.

have you not given consent that some evill spirit should doe this in your likenes.

no I am innocent of being a witch I know no man woman or child here

how came you into my bedchamber one morning then and asked me whither I had any curtains to sell
shee is by some of the afflicted persons charged with murder

what doe you say to these murders you are charged with

(B) I am innocent I know nothing #[about] of it

now shee lifts up her eyes and they are greatly tormented #[again]

(m'r Har) what doe you say to these things here horrible acts of witch craft

I know nothing of it I doe not know whither be any witches or no

no have you not heard that some have confessed.

no I did not. two men told her to her face that they had told her here shee is taken in a plain lie now shee
is going away they are dreadfully afflicted 5 afflicted persons doe charge this woman to be the very
#[w]woman that hurts them

[This] is a true account of what I have taken down at her examination according to best [un]derstanding and observation I have also in her examination taken notice that all her actions []e great influence upon the afflicted persons and that have ben tortered by her

*Ezekiel Cheever.

(Reverse) Examinacon ag't Bridget Bishop

(Examination of Mary Bridges, Jr.)

[August 25, 1692]

Mary Bridges: An Andover Maid was examined before Jno Hawthorn Esq'rs & other Their Majest'ies in Salem: August 25 1692

Mary Bridges you are acused here for acting witchcraft upon Martha Sprage & Rose foster how long have you bin in this Snare: she Answered about a month but after ward s'd was since the spring: She s'd a yellow bird appeared to her: out of dores: & bid her serve him: he promised me mony s'd she and fine Cloathes & I promised to serve him: & I was to afflict: Martha Spreag but: he gave me neither money nor fine Clothes: she s'd she thought when he appeared: it was the Devil & she was to serve him two years: then was: to be his body & soul: she owned she had bin babtized by him. Then she was bid to goe take the two afflicted persons by the hand & she did & they were not hurt. --

She s'd the next time she saw any such shape: it was a black bird & he would have her serve him & would have her to touch a paper: which she did with her fingers & it made a red mark: she s'd she did not dip her finger in any thing when she made the mark then she saw next a black man she owned she was at the witch meeting at Chandlers at Andover #[near a fortnight ago] last week & she thought there were near a hundred at it she s'd her shape was there: she s'd she knew not that her mother was a witch but she knew her sister suzanna Post & Sarah were so: the way of her afflicting was by sticking pins into things and Clothes & think of hurting them: & she s'd the Dead tought her this way of afflicting on the black man: she s'd she had afflicted only these 2; that complayned: only: she afflicted one the other night she knew not but that it might be Mary Warin: she thought it might be she: the Devil told her she should never be brought out: she s'd they Drank Sack at the witch meeting at Andover: it stood there in potts & they drawed it out of a barrill: she knew but few there but s'd Good wife foster & Carrier was there: she also s'd she rod to Salem village meeting upon a pole & the black man Carried the pole over the tops of the trees: & there they promised on another to afflict persons

I und'r written being appointed by Authority to take the above examination doe testify upon oath taken in Court: that this is a true copy of the substance of it to the best of my knowledge Jan'y 10'th 1692

*Simon Willard

Mary Bridges was Examined before their Majesties Justices of the peace in Salem

attest *John Higginson Just'e peace

Simon Willard owned the above: written: to be the truth: to the best of his knowledge

before: the grand Inquest Jan'y 10'th 1692

*Robert Payne

Foreman

(Examination of Sarah Bridges, Copy)

[August 25, 1692]

August 25'th 1692.

Sarah Bridges of Andivor Examined before the Justices of Salem -- She was told She was Charged for Hurting Martha Sprage by witchcraft but denied it & hoped God would Clear her Inocencey the afflicted persons were Struck Dwone into a fitt & helped up by the touch of her hand Rich'd Carrier S'd it was She that was Upon the afflicted in there fitt She disowned witchcraft Saying She had never Sett her hand to the Divels book nor been baptized by him though She was told that her Sister Hannah Post had Confesed that She was one of the Company that had been baptized w'th her at 5 Mile pond yett denied that She had any thing to doe w'th the Divel or that She had Seen or heard anything that was [tending] She was throwne of her horse once Indeed Coming from Ipswich & frighted by it but She thought it was by her aunt How, know nothing of Witchcraft She was Sensible the afflicted were Strangly Struck Dwone but She knew not the Mening of it -- Yett after [She owned] She owned She had been in the Divels [Snare] Ever Since the last winters & that the Divel Came to her like a man would have her Signe to his book & told His name Was Jesus & that She must Serve & worship him She did Sign the book & the Mark was Red he told me I must goe and afflict Some body & the Divel prickt her finger & She made a Red Mark in the book the Divel told her She must Renounce god & Christ & promis to Serve him & I did S'd She & She S'd the Divel Came Sometimes like a bird Som times like abare Sometimes

like aman but most frequently like aman he told me Since I Came here he would kill me if I Confessed She S'd her Compa. was Mary Post her Sister hanah & Mary Bridges that She used to afflict persons by Squezing her hands & Sticking pins in her Cloths She owned She had been baptized by the Divil w'th her Sister Susana post Mary Bridges & that She was to Serve the Divil 4 year Brought from over leafe

& he was to have body & Soul She owned She had been to the witch Meeting at Chandlers Garrison at Andivor & that She thought there ware @ 200 Witches their & that they Eat bred & Drank wine & that Some of the prisoners were there She S'd She had heard of but one Inocent man Imprisoned yet for witchcraft & that was abbott of Ipswich being asked w't She thought of the afflicted whether they Ware witches She S'd no they were Honest persons that helped to bring out the witches She owned She had Some times Rid upon a pole & being bid to goe and ask foregiveness of the afflicted She did & owned She had afflicted them but would Doe it no more but would Renounce the Divil & his Works & the afflicted persons forgave her & She could talk w'th them & not hurt them -- These two persons Hanah Post & Sarah Bridges have Confessed the Circumstances of what the afflicted S'd of them & not Saying falswhood to them or any one of their Charging of them as that they have afflicted the time when the way how they afflicted them the place where all agreeing w'th the afflicted have Charged them as thus the afflicted would Say did not you afflict me Such atime in Such a place in Such amaner they did answer Yes I did I am Sorry for it pray forgive me & forgivenes they asked w'th plenty of tears whereas they Could not Shed on tear before as was well observed Hannah Post owned her being Struck at her unkle Tilers by the Constab'e as the afflicted had Said and as to the number of witches the afflicted S'd their Saw @ 200 at Chandlers Metting Soe S'd those two they thought their was @ 200, Soe also Susana Post in her Confession Sayth She Saw @ 200, at a witch Metting at the Village Mary Bridges Said in her Confession Sayd She Saw @ 100 at a witch Metting that She was at --

(Examination of Hannah Bromage)

[July 30, 1692]

30 July 92

The Examination of Hannah Broomage [before] Major Gedney Esq'r & other their Majesties justices. Severall persons present who had not acused her being privatly desired to look on her & take her by the hand, They did the same without receiving any harm. But Mary Walcot & ann Putnam who had acused her being called, and s'd Broomage being required to look on them, She Essayeing so to Doe they wer Struck into fitts. & she re- covered them again by her touch.

s'd Mary Walcot & ann Putnams testimonys wer read. Ann Putnam being #[afected], in a fit. the rest of the afflicted s'd they saw Broomage upon her.

Goody Bridges said that Broomage was in her society at Ballards house telling to her face she was there in her spirit & urged her to confess, that being the way to eternal life. S'd Bridges said further that broomage hurt ballards wife by sitting on her breast. And Ann Putnam being in a violent fitt, said Bridges & lacey S'd they saw Broomage upon her and walcot s'd she saw broomage Stabb Putnam w'h a Spear. Said Bridges told Broomage that the devil would not Leave her untill she did confess and therefore urged her so to doe.

S'd Broomage said she had been under some dead nes w'h respect to the ordnances for the matter of 6 weeks, And a sudden sug- getion come into her heed sayeing I can help thee with strenth., To which she answered avoid satan.

she being asked what shap the devil appeared to her answered she believed the devil was in her heart And being asked severall other questions, she returned negative answers./

Indictment

(Indictment v. Abigail Barker for Afflicting Rose Foster)

[January 6, 1693]

Essex in the Province of the Massachusetts bay In New England ss// Anno RR's & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c Quarto Annoq'e \ Dom : 1692

The Jur'rs for o'r Sov'r lord and Lady the King and Queen present That Abigaill Barker Wife of Ebenezer Barker of Andivor In & upon the Eighth day of September last in the yeare aforesaid & divers other days & Times as well before as after Certaine detestable arts Called Witchcrafts & Sorcerys wickedly mallitiously & feloniously hath used practised & Exersised at & in the Towne of Andivor aforesaid in the County of Essex aforesaid #[in] upon & Against One Rose foster of Andivor by which Said Wicked Arts the Said Rose foster the day & year afors'd & divers others days & times both before & after was & is Tortured Afflicted Consumed pined Wasted and Tormented Against the peace of o'r Sov'r lord & lady the King & Queen their Crowne & dignity & the laws & Acts in that Case made & provided

(Reverse) Abigaill Barker for bewitching Rose foster

(Indictment v. Mary Barker, for Afflicting Abigail Martin)

[+ January 13, 1693]

2nd Paper

Essex in New England ss/Annoq'e RR's & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c quarto Anno Domini 1692//

The Juriors for our Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen doe present That Mary Barker of Andiver in the County of Essex aforesaid On or about the 29th Day of August last In the yeare 1692 aforsaid and divers other days and times both before and after, Certaine detestable Arts called Witchcraft & Sorceries Wickedly feloniously & Mallitiously hath used practised and Exercised in & upon the Body of Abigaill Martin of Andivor #[] at and within the Township of Andivor aforesaid, by which said Wicked Acts the said Abigaill Martin the day aforsaid in the yeare aforesaid And at Divers other days and times as well before as After was and is Tortured afflicted and Tormented. And injured ["And Injured" written over "and thereby"] consumed pined and wasted, Against the peace of our Sovereigne Lord and Lady King and Queen their Crowne and dignity and the Statute of the first of King James #[in] the first in that Case made and provided

(Reverse) Mary Barker for bewitching Abigaill Martin

Billa vera *Robert Payne foreman:

ponet se

Not Guilty

(Indictment v. Mary Barker, for Afflicting Rose Foster)

[+ January 13, 1693]

3rd Paper

Essex in the Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England ss/Anno RR's & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c'a Quarto Annoq'e Domini 1692//

The Jurors for our Sov'r Lord and Lady the King & Queen doe c'sent That Mary Barker of Andvor - - - In the County of Essex - - On or about the 29th day of August last #[1692] - - In the Yeare aforesaid and divers other days and times as well before as after Certaine detestable Arts Called Witchcraft and Sorceries Wickedly Mallitiously and feloniously hath used practised and Exercised At and in the Towne of Andivo'r in the County of Essex - - aforesaid in upon and against one Rose foster of [- - -] aforesaid - - - by which said Wicked Acts the said Rose foster the day & yeare - - aforesaid & divers other days and times both before and after was and is Tortured Afflicted Consumed Pined Wasted and Tormented #[and also for Sundry other Acts of Witchcraft by the said] #[Comitted and done before and Since that time Against] ["A" written over "a"] the Peace of our Sov'r Lord and Lady the King and Queen their Crowne and Dignity and the forme of the Stattute In that case made & Provided.

(Reverse) Mary Barker: bewitching Rose foster

Billa vera

foreman

ponet se

Not Guilty

(Indictment v. William Barker, Sr., for Afflicting Abigail Martin)

[+ January 13, 1693]

Province of the Massathutetts Bay in New England Essex Anno RRs & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c Quarto: Annoq'e Dm: 1692

The Juro'r for our Sov'r Lord and Lady the King & Queen Presents That William Barker Seino'r of Adivor in the County of Essex afore- said Husbandm Sometime in August last 1692 afors'd - - - - And Divers other Dayes & times as well before as after Certaine Detestable Arts called Witchcrafts & Sorceryes Wickedly Mallishiously & feloniously hath used Practised & Excercised at and in the Towne of Andivor -- in the County of Essex afores'd upon & against one Abagaiele Martin of Andivo'r Single Woman By which Wicked Arts the said Abagaill Martin -- the Day and Year afores'd and Divers other Dayes and Times as well before as after, was and is Tortured Afflicted. Tormented Consumed Pined & wasted ag't the Peace of Sov'r Lord & Lady the King and Queen their Crowne and Dignity & the Lawes in that case made & Provided:

Wittnesses: Rose foster --

Matha Tyler

(Reverse) William Barker Seino'r for afflicting Abigaill Martin Billa Vera

*Robert Payne foreman:

fled

fled Persons fled

(Indictment v. William Barker, Sr., for Covenanting)

[+ January 13, 1693]

Province of the Massachusetts Bay Essex In New England ss Anno RR's & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae &c Qua'rto Anaq'e Dom 1692

The Juro'rs for our Sov'r lord & lady the King & Queen p'rsent That William Barker senior of Andivo'r In the County of Essex aforsd Husbandman About Three years past in the Towneship of Andivo'r aforesd Wickedly mallitiously & felloniously A Covenant with the Devill did make, And did Signe the Devills Booke with Blood, & gave himselfe Soule & body to the Devill, By which Wicked & diabollicall Covenant with the Devill made in maner & forme Aforesaid The Said William Barker is become A A detestable Witch Against the peace of o'r Sove'r lord & Lady the King & Queen their Crowne & dignity & the laws in that Case made & provided. (Reverse) William Barker Senio'r for Covenanting with the Devill

Billa vera

*Robert: Payne

foreman

(Indictment of William Barker, Jr., for Covenanting)

[+ January 1693]

Province of the An'o RRs & Reginae Gulielmi &c

Massachusetts Bay in Mariae Angliae &c Quarto Anaq'e Dom 1692

New England Essex ss

The Ju'rors for o'r Sov'r lord & Lady the King & Queen p'rsent That William Barker Junio'r of Andvo'r in the County of Essex aforsaid Sometime in the moneth of August last in the yeare 1692 aforsd Att or in the Towneship of Andivo'r in the Country of Essex aforsd Wickedly mallitiously & felloniously A Covenant with#[e] the Devill did make & Signed the Devills Booke and by the Devill was Baptized & before him Renounced his form'r Baptizme & promised to be the Devills for ever and ever By which wicked & Diabollicall Covenant the Said William Barker is become A Detestable Witch Against the peace of o'r Sov'r lord & Lady the King & Queen their Crowne & dignity And the laws in that Case made & provided.

(Reverse) William Barker Jun'r for Covenanting w'th the Devill

Billa vera

*Robert. Payne foreman:

ponet Se #[fled]

Not Guilty

Court at Ipswich

Ipswich 2'd Tuesday May 1693

(Indictment of William Barker, Jr. for Afflicting Martha Sprague)

[+ January 13, 1693

Province of the Massathutetts Bay in New England Essex Anno RRs & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae. Angliae & c Quarto Annoq'e Dom: 1692

The Juro'r for our Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen Presents That William Barker Junio'r of Andivo'r in the County of Essex aforesaid - - - Sometime in the moneth of August last in the Yeare 1692 aforesaid - - - And Divers other Dayes & times as well before as after Certaine Detestable Arts called Witchcrafts & Sorceries: Wickedly Mallishiously & feloniously hath used Practised & Exercised at &: in the Towne of Salem -- in the County of Essex aforesaid upon and against one Martha Sprague Allias Martha Tyler -- by which Wicked Artes the Said Martha Sprague Alli Tyler the Day and Year aforesaid and Divers -- other Dayes & times as well before as after was & is Tourtered Afflicted Tormented Pined & wasted against the Peace of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen their Crowne & Dignity and the Lawes in that Case made & Provided./

(Reverse) William Barker Junio'r

for bewitching

Martha Sprague

Billa vera *Robert: Payne

foreman:

ponet Se

Not Guilty

(Indictment of Sarah Bassett, for Afflicting Mary Walcott)

[3'd January 3, 1693] Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England Essex ssAno RRs & Reginae Gulielmi & Mariae Angliae & c Quarto Anoq'e Dom 1692

The Juro'rs for o'r Sov'r lord & lady the King & Queen p'rsent That Sarah Bassett wife of William Basett of lyn in the County of Essex aforesaid upon or about the 23'd day of May last Anno: 1692 aforsaid And Divers other days & Times as well before #[and] as after Certaine detestable Arts Called Witchcraft & Sorceries wickedly mallitiously & feloniously hath used practised & Exercised at & in the Towne of Salem in the County of Essex aforesaid upon & Against One Mary Walcott of Salem Single Woman By which Wicked Arts The Said Mary Walcott is Tortured afflicted Tormented Consumed wasted & pined the day & yeare aforesaid & divers other days & times as well before as after Contrary to the peace of o'r Sov'r lord & lady the King & Queen their Crowne & dignity & the Laws in that Case made & provided

Wittness

An Putnam

Marcy lewis

(Reverse) Sarah Bassett

Ignoramus

*Robert: Payne

foreman

Salem Court 3'd Janu'a 1692/3

(Indictment No. 1 of Bridget Bishop, for Afflicting Mercy Lewis)

[+ June 2, 1692]

Anno Regni Regis et Reginae W[] Mariae nunc Angliae & c Quarto:

Essex ss

The Juro'r for our Sovereigne Lord & lady the King & Queen p'rsents that Bridgett Bishop als Olliver the wife of Edward Bishop of Salem in the County of Essex Sawyer the Nyneteenth Day of April in the fourth Year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord and Lady William and Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen Defenders of the faith & c and Divers other Dayes & times a well before as after. certaine Detestable Arts #[of] called Witchcrafts & Sorceries. wickedly, and feloniously #[ag't]. hath used Practised & Exercised, at and within the Towneship of Salem #[ab] in the County of Essex afores'd in #[and] upon, and ag't one, Mercy Lewis of Salem Village in the County afores'd singlewoman by which said wicked Arts the said Mercy Lewis -- the s'd Nyneteenth Day of April in the fourth Year aboves'd and divers other Dayes and times as well before as after, was & is hurt Tortured Afflicted. #[tormented] Pined, Consumed, wasted: & tormented, ag't the Peace of our said Sovereigne Lord And Lady the King & Queen and ag't the forme of the Statute in that Case made & provided/

wittnesses

Mercy. Lewis
Nathan'll Ingersoll
M'r Sam'll paris
Thomas puttnam Jun'r
Mary Walcott.
Ann puttnam Jun'r
Elizabeth Hubbard
Abigail Williams.
(Reverse) No (1) Bills ag't Bishop
Olliver Billa vera
*John Rucke foreman

in the name of the Rest of the Grand Jurie

(Indictment No. 2 of Bridget Bishop, for Afflicting Abigail Williams)

[+ June 2, 1692]

Anno Regni Regis et Reginae Willim et Mariae nunc Angliae &'c Quarto./

Essex ss

The Juro'r for our Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen p'rsent#[s] that Bridgett Bishop als Olliver the wife of Edward Bishop of Salem in the County of Essex Sawyer -- the #[Day] Nyneteenth Day of Aprill in the fourth Year of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord & Lady William & Mary by the Grace of God of England Scotland France & Ireland King & Queen Defend'r of the faith &'c and Divers other dayes & times as well before as after. certaine Detestable Arts #[of] called Witchcrafts & Sorceries. wickedly and feloniously hath used Practised & Exercised. at and within the Township of Salem in the County of Essex afores'd in upon and ag't one Abigail Williams of Salem Village in the County of Essex afores'd singlewoman by which said wicked Arts the said Abigail Williams the Nyneteenth Day of April afores'd in the fourth Year aboves'd and divers other Dayes and times as well before as after, was, and is tortured Afflicted. Pined Consumed wasted & tormented ag't the Peace of our said Sovereigne Lord & Lady the King & Queen and ag't the forme of the Statute in that Case made and Provided

Wittnesses

Abigail Williams

M'r Sam'll paris Sworne

Nathan'll Ingersoll Sworne

Thomas puttnam Sworne

Mercy Lewis

Ann puttnam Jun'r Sworne.

Mary #[Warren] Walcott Sworne

Elizabeth Hubbard Sworne.

Jn'o Bligh & Rebekah his wife Sworn

Samuel Shattock & Sarah his \wife Sworn

William Bligh Sworne

William Stacey Sworne

John Loader Sworne.

(Reverse) Billa vera

*John Ruck foreman in the name of the Rest

Appendix 9

Deposition

(Deposition of William Stacy v. Bridget Bishop)

[May 30, 1692]

William Stacey Of the Towne of Salem Aged: Thirty Six Years or thereaboutes Deposeth and Saith:/.

That about fourteene years agoe this Deponant was Visited with the Small Pox, then Bridget Bishop did give him a Visitt, and withall Professed a great Love for this Deponant in his Affliction. more then ordinary, at which this Deponant admired, some time after this Deponent was well, the said Bishop got him to do some work for her. for which she gave him three pence, which seemed to this Depo't as if it had been good Money: but he had not gone not above 3 or 4 Rods before he Looked #[on the Said mone againe] in his Pockett where he put it. for it; but could not find any some time after this deponent met the said [] Bishop: in the Street agoeing to Mill; she askeing this Deponent whether his father would grind her grist: he put it to the said Bishop why she Asked: she answered because folks counted her a witch this Depo't made answeare: he did not Question but that his fathe would grind it: but being gone about 6 Rod from her the said Bishop; with a small Load in his Cart: Suddenly the Off wheele Slumped or Sunk downe into a hole upon Plain grownd, that this Depon't was forced to gett one to help him gett the wheele out afterwards this Depon't went Back to look for said hole where his wheele sunk in but could not find any hole Some time after in the winter about midnight #[being awake] this Deponent felt something betweene his lips Pressing hard ag't his teeth: and withall was very Cold: insomuch that it did awake him so that he gott up and sat upon his beed: he at the same time seeing the said Bridgett Bishop sitting at the foot of his bed: being tozz his seeming, it was then as light as if it had been day: or one in the said Bishops shape: she haveing then a black cap, & a black hat, and a Red Coat with two Eakes of two Coulers. then she the said Bishop or her shape clapt her coate close to her Leggs. & hopt upon the bed and about the Roome and then went out: and then it was Dark: againe some time after the s'd Bishop went to this Depon't and asked him whither that #[above written] which he had reported was true, that he had told to severall: he answered that was true & that it was she, and bid her denigh it if she dare, the said Bishop #[could] did not denigh it. and went away very Angry and said that this Dep't did her more Mischief: then any other body he asked Why: she answared because folks would beleive him before anybody Elce: some time after the said Bishop thretned this Deponent and told him he was the occasion of bringing her out about the brass she stole: some time after this Dep't in a dark night: was goeing to the Barn who was suddenly taken or hoisted from the Ground & threw ag't a stone wall after that taken up againe a throwed Down a Bank at the End of his howse: some time after this Deponent mett the said Bishop by Issaac Sternes Brick Kill [= kiln]: after he had Passed buy her: this Deponents Horse stood still with a small load goeing #[along] up the Hill so that the Horse striveing to draw All his Gears & tacking flew in Peices. and the Cart fell downe afterward this Deponent went to lift a Bagg of Corne of about 2 bushells but could not budge it with all his might: This Deponent hath mett with severall other of her Pranks. at severall times: which would take up a great time to tell of: This Deponet doth verily beleive that the said Bridget Bishop was Instumentall to his Daughter Prisillas Death: aboute two years agoe; the Child was a likely Thriveing Child. And sudenly Screaked out and soe continued in an unusuall Manner for aboute. a fortnight & soe dyed in that lamentable manner

Sworne Salem May the 30'th 1692 before us

*John Hathorne) Assis'ts

*Jonathan. Corwin)

Jurat in Curia June. 2'd 1692/

William stacy

(Reverse) William Stacy

May 30/92

(Deposition of Susannah Sheldon v. Bridget Bishop)

[June 2, 1692]

The Deposition of Susannah Sheldin aged about 18 years who testife and saith that on this 2 June 1692 I saw the Apperishtion of Bridgit Bishop. and Immediatly appered to little children and said that they

ware Thomas Greens two tiwins and tould Bridget Bishop to hir face that she had murdered them in seting them into fits wherof they dyed
(Reverse) Susanna Sheldon Evid's
ag't Bridgett Bishop
(Deposition of the Rev. John Hale v. Sarah Bishop)
[May 20, 1692]

John Hale of Beverly aged about 56 yeares [torn] & saith that about 5 or 6 years ago e Christian the wife of John Trask (living in Salem bounds bordering on the abovesaid Beverly) beeing in full comunion in o'r Church came to me to [de] sier that Goodwife Bishop her Neighb'r wife of Edw: Bishop Jun'r might not be permitted to receive the Lords Supper in our church till she had given her the said Trask satisfaction for some offences that were against her.viz because the said Bishop did entertaine people in her house at unseasonable houres in the night to keep drinking and playing at shovel-board whereby discord did arise in other families & young people were in danger to bee corrupted & that the s'd Trask knew these things & had once gon into the house & fynding some at shovel-board had taken the peices thay played with & thrown them into the fyre & had reprooved the said Bishop for promoting such disorders, But received no satisfaction from her about it.

I gave s'd Christian Trask direction how to proceed farther in this matter if it were clearly proved And indeed by the information I have had otherwise I doe fear that if a stop had not been putt to those disorders s'd Edw. Bishop's house would have been a house of great prophainness & iniquity. But as to Christian Trask the next news I heard of her was that she was distracted & asking her husband Trask when she was so taken [he told] mee shee was taken distracted that night after shee [came from] my house when shee complained against Goody Bishop. She continueing some time Distracted wee sought the Lord by fasting & prayer & the Lord was pleased to restore the s'd [Trask] to the use of her reason agen. I was s'th her often in [her] distraction (& took it then to bee only distraction, yet fearing sometimes somw't worse) but since I have seen the fitts of those bewitched at Salem Village I call to mind some of hers to be much like some of theirs.

The said Trask when recovered as I understood it did manifest strong suspicion that shee had been bewitched by the s'd Bishop's wife & showed so much aversness from having any conversation that I was then troubled at it hopeing better of s'd Goody Bishop at that time for wee have since [torn] At length s'd Christian Trask [was] agen in a distracted fit on a Sabboth day in the forenoon at the publ[i]ck meeting to o'r public disturbance & so continued sometimes better sometimes worse unto her death, manifesting that shee under temptation to kill her selfe or somebody else. I enquired of Marg'rt Ring who kept at or nigh the house, what shee had observed of s'd Trask before this last distraction shee told [mee.] Goody Trask was much given to reading & search the prophecys of scrip[ture]. The day before shee made that disturbance in the meeting [house she[e] came home & said shee had been w'th Goody Bishop & that they two were now friend or to that effect.

I was oft praying w'th & counselling of Goody Trask before her death and not many days before her end being there shee seemed more rationally & earnestly desired Edw: Bishop might be sent for that shee might make friends with him, I asked her if shee had wronged Edw. Bishop shee said not that shee knew of unless it were in taking his shovel-board pieces when people were at play w'th them & throwing them into the fyre & if she did evill in it she was very sorry for it & desired he would be friends with her or forgive her. this was the very day before she dyed, or a few days before. Her distraction (or bewitching) continued about a month and in those intervalls wherein shee was better shee earnestly desired prayers & the Sabboth before she dyed I received a note for prayers on her behalf w'ch her husband said was written by her selfe & I judge was her owne hand writing beeing well acquainted with her hand.

As to the wounds she dyed of I observed 3 deadly ones; apeice of her wind pipe cutt out. & another wound above that threww the windpipe & Gullet & the veine they call jugular. So that I then judge & still doe apprehend it impossible for her w'th so short a pair of cissars to mangle her selfe so without some extraordinary work of the devill or witchcraft signed. 20. may 1692 by *John Hale.

To severall parts of this testimony can wittness Maj'r Gidney. Mr Paris Joseph Hirrek Ju'r & his wife Thomas Raiment & his wife John Traske Marget King, Hanah wife of Cornell Baker, [] Miles & others. As also about the s'd Goody Bishop Capt W'm Raiment, his son W'm Raiment about creatures strangely dying. James Kettle, & the abovs'd Jos: Hirreck & Tho: Raiment about sundry actions that [have] the appearance of witchcraft.

(Reverse) Jno. Hale John Hale agst. Sarah Bishop

(Deposition of James Kettle v. Sarah Bishop)

[+ May 20, 1692]

The deposition of James Kettle aged twenty seven years or there about testyfieth & saith that I was att Docter Grigs his hous on the tenth of this instant may & there saw Elizebeth Hubbard in severall Fitts: and after her fits ware over she told me that she saw my two Childdren Laying before her & that thay cry'd for vengance & that Sarah Bishop bid her Look on them & said that she kiled them & and thay were by her description much as they were when they ware put in to there Coffins [to?] be buried & she told me that Sarah bishop told her [th]at I was going to burn akiln of potts & that she would break them if she Could: & i took notice that while she was in her Fitts that she Cried & held her apron before her face saying that she would not se them Docter Grigs & his wife and John hues ware thare present

(Reverse) [Sar]ah Bishop

(Deposition of Elizabeth Balch & Abigail Waldon v. Sarah Bishop)

[+ May 20, 1692]

The Depotion of Elizabeth Balch of Beverly Aged aboute Eight & thirty years & wife unto Benjamin Balch ju'r

This Deponant Testifieth hereby & saith that she being at Salem on the very Day that Cap't Georg Curwin was buried & in the evening of s'd Day Cominge from s'd Salem unto s'd Beverly on horse back with her sister then known by the name of Abigaile Woodburie now Abigaile Waldon Living in Wenham wife unto Nathaniell Waldon Rideing behinde her & as they were Rideing as befour & were Come soe far as Crane River Common soe Called Edward Bishop & his wife over tooke us (on horse back) who are both now in prison under suspicion of witchcraft & had some words of Difference it seemed unto us. s'd Bishop rideing in to the brooke pretty hastily she finding fault with his soe doing & said that he would throw her in to the water or words to that purpose s'd Bishop Answered her that it was noe matter if he Did or words to that Effect: & soe wee Rode along all together toward Beverly & she blamed her husband for Rideing soe fast & that he would Doe her a mischeife or words to that purpose & he Answered her that it was noe matter what was Done unto her or words to that purpose: And then s'd Bishop Directed his speech unto us as we Rode along & s'd that she had ben a bad wife unto him ever since they were married & reckoned up many of her miscarriages towards him but now of Late she was worse then Ever she had ben unto him before (and that the Devill Did Come bodyly unto her & that she was familiar with the Devill & that she sate up all the night Long with the Devill) or words to that purpose & with such kinde of Discourse he filled up the time untill we Came to s'd Bishops Dwelling house & this Deponant Did reproove s'd Bishop for speaking in such a manner unto his wife s'd Bishop Answered it was nothing but what was truth & s'd Bishops wife made very Little reply to all her husbands Discourse Dureing all the time we wer with them & farther said not the mark of elezebeth Balch.

the mark of Abigail walden

her Answer

if it be soe, you had neede pray, for mee

(Deposition of Ann Putnam Jr. v. Mary Bradbury)

[September 8, 1692]

[The d]eposition of Ann putnam who testifieth and saith that I being at [A]ndeavour on the 26 day of July 1692 I saw there Mis Mary [Brad]bery the wife of Capt Tho: Bradbery of Salisbury or hir [App]erance most greivous afflecting and tormenting of Timothy Swan of Andevor allmost Redy to kill him also severall times before and sence that time I have seen mist. Bradbery or hir Apperance most greivously [aff] afflecting Timothy Swan and I beleve that Mis Bradbery is a most dreadfull wicth for sence she has been in prison she or hir Apperance has com to me and most greivously affaffected me

Ann Putnamownid before the grand Inquest this har evidens to be the truth one the oath that she hath taken: this: 8 day of Siptember 1692

(Reverse) Anna putnam

(Deposition of Samuel Endicott v. Mary Bradbury)

[September 9, 1692]

Sam'll Endecott aged thirty one years or thereabout Testifies Thatt about eleven years since being bound upon a vioage to sea w'th Capt Sam'll Smith Late of Boston Diceas'd, just before we sayl'd mrs Bradbery of Salisbury the prisoner now att the barr came to Boston w'th some firkins of butter of w'ch Capt Smith bought two, one of them proved halfe way butter and after wee had been att sea three weekes our men.

were nott able to eat itt, itt stanck soe and runn w'th magotts, w'ch made the men very much disturb'd about itt and would often say that they heard mrs Bradbury was a witch and thatt they verily beleived she was soe or else she would nott have served the Capt soe as to sell him such butter. And further this deponent Testifieth that in four dayes after they sett sayle they mett w'th such a violent storm that we lost our main mast and riggin & Lost fifeteen horses and thatt about a fortnight after we sett our jury mast and thatt very night there came up a Shipp by our side and Carried away two of the mizon shrouds and one of the Leaches of the mainsaile: and this deponent further sayth thatt after they arived att Barbados and went to Saltitudos & had Laden their vessell the next morning she sprang a leake in the hold w'ch wasted sevrall tunns of salt in soe much thatt we were forct to unlade our vessell again wholly to stopp our leake there was then four foot of water in the hold after we had taken in our lading again we had a good passage home butt when we came near the Land the Capt sent this deponent forward to looke out for land in a bright moone shining night and as he was

(Reverse) sitting upon the windless he heard a Rumbling noise under him w'th thatt he the s'd deponent Testifieth Thatt he looked one the side of the windless and saw the leggs of some p'rson being no wayes frighted & Thatt presently he was shook and looked over his shoulder, & saw the appearance of a woman from her middle upwards, haveing a white Capp and white neck-cloth on her, w'ch then affrighted him very much, and as he was turning of the windless he saw the aforesaid two leggs.

Jurat in Curia Sep'r 9th 1692

(Deposition of Mary Warren v. Mary Bradbury)

[September 9, 1692]

The Deposition of mary warren who testifieth and saith that I have been along time afflicted by a woman which tould me hir name was Mis Bradbery and that she came from Salisbury but on the 2th day of July 1692 : being the day of the examinat[ion of] mis mary Bradbery I then saw that she was the very woman which tould me hir name was mis Bradbery and [she did] most [gre]viously Afflect and torment me dureing [the time of hir] examination for if she did but ~~#[strick]~~ look upon [me she would] strick me down or allmost Choak me also on the da[y of her exa]mination I saw mis Bradbery or hir Apperance mo[st greviously] afflect and torment mary wallcott Sarah vibberE[liz Hubbard] and Ann putnam and I beleve in my heart that mi[s] Bradbery is [a witch] and that she has very often afflicted an[d tormented me] and several others by hir acts of witchcraft

mary warrin ownid this har testimony one the oath whic[h] she hath taken before the grand Inquest this. 9th of September 92

(Reverse) Mary Warren Depostion

(Deposition of Richard Carr and Zerubable Endicott v. Mary Bradbury)

[+ September 9, 1692]

The deposition of Richard: Carr who testifieth and saith. that about 13 years ago presently after sume Diferance that happened to be between my Hon'rd father mr George Carr: and Mis Bradbery the prisoner at the barr upon a Sabboth at noon as we ware riding hom by the house of Capt Tho: Bradbery I saw mis Bradbery goe into hir gate turne the corner of and Immediately there derted out of hir gate a blue boar and darted at my fathers horses ledgs which made him stumble but I saw it no more and my father said boys what doe you se: we both answed a blue bore:

Zorobabell Endicott testifieth and saith that I lived att mr George Carr: now deceased att the time above mentioned and was present with mr George Carr and mr Richard Carr and I also saw a blue bore dart out of mr Brdbery gate to Mr Gorge Carrs horses edges which mad him stumble affter a strange manr and I also saw the blue bore dart from mr carrs horses ledgs in att mis Bradberys window: and mr carr immediately said boys what did you see and we both said a blue bore then said he from whence came it and we said out of mr Bradberys gate. then said he I am glad you see itt as well as wel[I] as I.

Jurat in Curia Sep'r 9th 92

& they both further say on their Oathes that mr Carr discoursed w'th them as they went home about what had happened and they all concluded that it was mrs Bradbury that so app'rd as a blue boar.

(Reverse) Richard Carr

Zorobable Endecott

(Deposition of James Carr v. Mary Bradbury)

[September 9, 1692]

The Deposition of James carr. who testifieth and saith that about 20 years agoe one day as I was accidently att the house of mr whelerright and his daughter the widdow maverick then lived there: and she then did most curtuously invite me to com oftener to the house and wondered I was grown such a stranger and with in a few days affter one evening I went thether againe: and when I came thether againe: william Bradbery was there who was then a suter to the said widdow but I did not know it till affterwards; after I came in the widdow did so corsely treat the s'd william Bradbery that he went away semeing to be angury: presently after this I was taken affter a strange maner as if #[every] liveing creature did run about every part of my body redy to tare me to peaces and so I continued for about 3 quarters of a year by times & I applyed myself to doctor crosbe who gave me a grate deal of visek but could make non work tho he steept tobacco in [bofit] drink he could make non to work where upon he tould me that he beleved I was behaged: and I tould him I had thought so a good while: and he asked me by hom I tould him I did not care for spaking for one was counted an honest wom- an. but he uging I tould him and he said he did beleve that mis Bradbery was a grat deall worse then goody mertin: then presently affter this one night I being a bed and brod awake there came sumthing to me which I thought was a catt and went to strick it ofe the bed and was [seud] fast that I could not stir hedd nor foot but by and by coming to my strength I hard sumting a coming to me againe and I prepared myself to strick it: and it coming upon the bed I did strick at it and I beleve I hit it: and affter that visek would work on me and I beleve in my hart that mis Bradbery the prison'r att the bar has often afflected me by acts of wicthcraft Jurat in Curia Septm 9: 92.

(Reverse) James Carr Deposition