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WITCH HUNTING IN SPAIN

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

Lu Ann Homza

When compared to research on northern Europe, the study of witch hunting in Spain has a rather more limited history: investigations of it are fewer; the vocabulary and concepts that govern it have arisen from work conducted on witchcraft in the Basque country. The emphases within the scholarship have practical and intellectual causes. Obviously, research can only go so far when sources are missing or were never generated from the start.¹ Weighty nineteenth-century academics – such as Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo and Henry Charles Lea – stressed that Basque territories were the classic lands of Spanish witches and highlighted Spanish Inquisition records as the proper medium for studying them.² Beginning in 1933, the prolific and persuasive Julio Caro Baroja edited primary sources, offered typologies, and relayed case histories, many grounded on inquisition materials, in his studies of Spanish and especially Basque witchcraft.³ Significantly, all three men – Menéndez Pelayo, Lea, and Caro Baroja – highlighted a Basque episode of witch hunting that occurred between December 1608 and 1614, which had a heroic sequence of events. At the end of 1608, a serving girl returned from France to her native town of Zugarramurdi, in the Navarrese Pyrenees.⁴ She insisted she could identify witches and went on to name members of her village. The Spanish Inquisition took over the investigation, which rapidly grew wider; its inquisitors conducted an *auto de fe* in Logroño in November 1610, in which six persons were sentenced to death at the stake; five who had died in prison were burned in effigy, and eighteen more penanced. Eventually, the tribunal was forced to send its personnel into the field to quell the mass denunciations of witch suspects, which reached into the thousands. The last inquisitor to sally forth, named Alonso Salazar y Frías, spent more than seven months in 1611 listening to confessions and examining witnesses. By the time he returned to the Logroño tribunal in January 1612, Salazar had turned into a “witches’ advocate” who ultimately refuted his inquisitorial colleagues and persuaded the Royal General Council of the Inquisition (the *Suprema*) to issue reforms in 1614 on witchcraft prosecutions.⁵

Salazar’s actions were not only well known in his own epoch, but have also been emphasized in every survey of European witch hunting in the early modern period. His case has affected the study of Spanish witchcraft in profound ways, even though the episode in which he was involved was anomalous.⁶ Because scholars have been accustomed to expect consistency in the Spanish Inquisition, they have presumed
inquisitors’ skepticism toward witchcraft on the basis of Salazar’s example and the Suprema’s endorsement of his point of view. (In other words, out of the three inquisitors in the Logroño tribunal, Salazar was the one who counted.) Binary constructions have a long reach in Spanish history, and researchers became accustomed to dividing Spaniards into hard-and-fast camps of incredulous and credulous onlookers where witches were concerned: a dichotomy that, again, was personified in Salazar’s conflict with his colleagues. In keeping with the prestige of the Salazar episode—which pointed to modernity within the Inquisition, rather than the reverse—students have tried to find other Salazar-like figures in their investigations. They often have applied the vocabulary and concepts that seemed to be present in the 1609–14 witch hunt to Spanish witchcraft as a whole, while continuing to prefer inquisition materials as the basis for research.

Yet twentieth-century studies have also proven two somewhat clashing facts: first, that Spanish inquisitors never viewed witchcraft as a high priority for prosecution anywhere on the mainland; second, that inquisitors and secular justices in Navarre, Aragón, and Catalonia were more interested in the crime than their counterparts in Castile. Authorities in Pamplona and Logroño became embroiled in witch hunting in 1525, 1539–40, 1575–76, and 1595. The witch they pursued was vivid: she, and less frequently he, venerated the Devil, attended sabbats, raised storms, killed infants, damaged livestock, and robbed graves. Because such witches only rarely appeared by name—brujas or xorguinas—in inquisition trial summaries for the southern part of the country, scholars have hypothesized that there was a geographic demarcation between the “classic” witches of the North, and sorcerers in Castile, Andalusia, and Valencia, who shared a Mediterranean culture of love magic and treasure-hunting. The same partition has been ventured for urban versus rural practices, with love magic occurring in cities, maleficia in the countryside. Though such distinctions may make sense when the sources can be turned into quantitative data, attention to the trials, rather than the trial summaries, also illustrates the presence of the classic witch in places beyond northern Spain.

The point of this chapter is to relay what is currently known about Spanish witch hunting, while avoiding overly blunt classifications. For the sake of clarity, the term “witch hunting” ought to mean the prosecution of persons who were suspected of worshipping the Devil and performing harmful magic, called maleficia. The difficulty for Spain is that ecclesiastical, inquisitorial, and secular authorities between 1500 and 1700 viewed witchcraft and sorcery through the same conceptual lens (see pp. 137–138 below), and inquisitors and the episcopate used the overarching label supersticiones to encompass a wide range of offenses. Given that the legal vocabulary frequently did not distinguish one kind of superstition from another; that individuals could be tried for more than one offense at a time; and that most records of the Spanish Inquisition no longer exist before 1540, historians’ attempts to enumerate the numbers of Spanish witches in any given moment always result in figures that turn out to be more or less provisional.

Conditionality aside, studies of Granada in the sixteenth century have found that out of some 3033 trials conducted by the Inquisition from 1550 to 1590, only twenty-four—less than 1 percent—involving “superstition.” During the thirteen visitations that Granada’s inquisitors conducted in their district in the sixteenth century, when they indicted 1465 persons for heresy, only eighty-one, or less than 6 percent,
were for superstition. The crime was prosecuted more frequently in Málaga, ranging from 9 to 13 percent of indictments in the second half of the sixteenth century. The frequency of trials for superstition rose in the seventeenth century, climbing to slightly more than 10 percent of the 3572 prosecutions for which we have data; investigators tie this rise to the dissemination of the Tridentine decrees. Across the board, women made up 65 percent of the indicted.\textsuperscript{13} As for the activities of Granada’s witches, they engaged in spells, love magic, poisoning, sex with demons, and explicit demonic pacts. A leading investigator declines to separate rural and urban magical practices because the city of Granada sustained many accusations of maleficia.\textsuperscript{14}

In contrast, Cuenca, in New Castile, has been studied in a descriptive rather than quantitative way. The first appearance of a suspected witch before the Inquisition tribunal occurred in 1515, with the first witch hunt starting in 1519, after the deaths of multiple children.\textsuperscript{15} Cuenca’s inquisitors prosecuted a mixture of classical witchcraft and sorcery. The district’s witch hunts of 1519, 1526, 1555, and 1567 featured witches who flew into houses through chimneys and closed windows, killed children with maleficia, rejected their baptismal vows, attended sabbats, and venerated the Devil.\textsuperscript{16}

For northern Spain, we have more data, though again it is disputable.\textsuperscript{17} In Navarre, a recent investigator found that the viceroy’s court indicted fifty-six suspects in 1525; forty-six between 1539 and 1570; and thirty-seven between 1575 and 1595. The Inquisition tribunal in turn purportedly handled fifty-three witchcraft cases between 1539 and 1570, and seventy between 1575 and 1595; in its most famous case, which began in Zugarramurdi in 1609, its inquisitors heard the confessions of more than 1,585 suspects.\textsuperscript{18} Witches in Navarre could engage in the most extreme and complete inversion of Christianity anywhere on the Spanish mainland. In the accusations of 1609–1610, they participated in Black Masses in which the Eucharist and Lord’s Prayer were reversed; beyond the usual maleficia, they also practiced cannibalism and actively recruited child-witches into their entourage. Meanwhile, insights into Aragonese witch hunting come from a combination of inquisition trials, inquisition trial summaries, episcopal trials when they exist, and documentation that either relays or mentions secular prosecutions.\textsuperscript{19} For the region of Huesca, for example, researchers have surveyed twenty-five inquisition summaries for superstition and witchcraft and found that eighteen of the individuals tried were male, some of those men were French, and several were prosecuted multiple times, which probably ought to raise the question of the effectiveness of the Inquisition’s sentences.\textsuperscript{20} Here, witches were essentially necromancers. For other parts of Aragón, suspects again were often French, while others were clerics.\textsuperscript{21} There were saludadores, men reputed to be adept at curing, some of whom succeeded in gaining episcopal licenses for their work. Muslims who had converted to Christianity were often cited for diabolical invocations or for teaching the spells to others. Belief in the evil eye was widespread; other maleficia included halting a woman’s lactation. Night terrors – in which witches flew into houses via closed doors or through chimneys, cast sleeping spells on the inhabitants, and then wounded them – were common.\textsuperscript{22} Some of the strongest evidence for the urban/rural divide in types of witchcraft comes from Zaragoza.\textsuperscript{23} Recent research has concluded that the worst witch hunt in Spanish mainland history occurred in Catalonia in the seventeenth century; the first wave lasted from 1618 to 1622, with two more occurring in 1626–27 and 1643.\textsuperscript{24} Historians have suggested that hundreds of
Catalan women were executed for this crime in what amounted to local rather than centralized prosecutions. The only agents promoting witch hunting in these cases were secular justices attached to baronial tribunals, who were allowed to act with complete impunity by their local lords. They were helped along the way by witch-finders. Suggestively, Catalan witches engaged in identical activities as their Navarrese counterparts: they too killed children, created hail, renounced God, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints, and flew to the devil’s gathering, where they kissed his anus and had sexual relations with him. It should be noted that for secular justice in both Aragón and Catalonia, trial records are often missing because judges and towns were not bound to create them. Instead, towns could agree that witches posed an exceptional threat, disavow their own town privileges, and treat suspects according to summary justice by hanging or exile.

Given the legal and emotional energy that went into witch hunting, it makes sense that it was a sporadic exercise, and such holds true for mainland Spain from 1500–1650. It is fair to say that the attention of Spanish inquisitors ebbed and flowed over the early modern period where witches were concerned. When secular justices became transfixed by witchcraft cases, inquisitors tended to follow their lead, though sometimes, as in Catalonia in the seventeenth century, inquisitorial attention could be missing altogether. Episcopal cases from this time period have been studied to a much lesser degree, so extrapolations about such sources are risky: still, in areas where witchcraft had a substantial history and presence, such as Pamplona, bishops seem to have been attentive, at least when they were in residence.

When it comes to large, theoretical causes for witch hunting, historians of early modern Spain have rarely accepted the older, now usually discredited axiom that European intellectuals promoted witch hunting in order to amass power, and did so via the dissemination of elite concepts about the Devil. Spanish elites wrote treatises on witchcraft and superstition in both Latin and the vernacular, across both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and their works tended either toward the encyclopedic (Martin del Río) or the pastoral (Pedro Ciruelo). While it is sometimes possible to trace the popularity and potential influence of these works – either through the quantity of print runs or the works’ presence in the libraries of learned men – no historian would be so naive as to draw a straight line from written treatises to oral accusations. Instead, we prefer to think of the interactions between elite and popular as more dialogical in their communications, even in a courtroom setting. Rather than seeing the accused as helpless victims parroting back what their interrogators wanted to hear, we prefer to imagine that more intricate and subtle interactions were possible, in which both parties took away cues and information about concepts, rhetoric, and acceptable discourse. Luckily, the language of the courts in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was most often Spanish in any jurisdiction, which helps contemporary scholars feel relatively confident that trial testimony has some trustworthy connection to the statements offered by witnesses and the accused. At the same time, when Spanish-language trial records from northern Spain feature deponents who spoke only Basque, there is an additional layer of mediation because that witness testimony was translated in the field, as witnesses deposed.

Conceptually, scholars agree that early modern Spanish elites were particularly receptive to the Augustinian notion of an implicit or explicit demonic pact which underlay all magic and witchcraft. It was known via Scripture that the Devil – Spanish
elites did not distinguish between the Devil and demons – actively sought the destruction of human souls and always worked as the father of lies. Witches who explicitly sought pacts with the Devil were engaging in treason against God, because such diabolical relationships broke a Christian’s baptismal vows. At the same time, individuals who performed ceremonies that had no natural or divine reason for success were also implicitly asking the Devil to assist them; given the Devil’s character, he might invade the process even without an invitation. Thus, the most innocent-looking rituals or ceremonies could involve the Devil unless there were clear expectations for the rituals to succeed on the basis of divine or natural law. From a clerical point of view, witches, love magic, and spells to detect hidden treasure were all linked to the Devil and to enmity with God, and “the literature attacking the agents of maleficium thus blended imperceptibly into a more general campaign.”

It also seems clear that Spanish elites paid special attention to the crucial canon law text called the *Canon episcopi*, which was included in the *Decretum*, the twelfth-century collection of canon law compiled by the Italian monk, Gratian. Though the *Canon episcopi* dates from only the ninth century, Gratian and his peers believed the text came from the age of the Church Fathers and was composed at the Council of Ancyra in 314; this mistaken belief in the *Canon*’s antiquity helped to give it weight with medieval and early modern intellectuals. The *Canon episcopi* reported that certain women thought they could fly through the air with the goddess Diana, but noted that such females were mistaken, and probably deluded by the Devil himself. By raising the question of night flight – also known as transvection – and linking it to women and the Devil, the *Canon episcopi* provided a touchstone for identifying witches: they flew. Because there were episodes in the New Testament in which Jesus and Paul ascended into the air, no early modern Catholic theologian would have denied the possibility of transvection altogether; instead, the *Canon episcopi* allowed women who flew to be deceived. Early modern Spaniards could extrapolate from the *Canon episcopi* to raise questions about witches’ delusions in general, or they could pin the question of fantasy onto flight alone. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Inquisition authorities asked their officers in the field to try and prove whether witches had actually accomplished what they had confessed, whether those admissions concerned harmful magic, flight, or Devil-worship. Sometimes, Spanish elites extended the possibility of mistakes beyond the witches themselves, by raising the prospect that the authors of Europe’s most notorious treatise on witchcraft, the *Malleus maleficarum*, had been misled in their conclusions. In a 1537 instruction from the *Suprema*, it was noted that the *Malleus*’s material was extremely subtle and complex, to the point that even experts could be misled by what they heard.

Even if European intellectuals did not purposefully create the phenomenon of witch hunting to gain authority, the fact remains that the heresy of witchcraft required definitions of orthodoxy, and then laws, to make it into an indictable offense. As St. Paul noted in Romans, one must know what the law is before one can be prosecuted for breaking it. For heresies which arose in the twelfth century, such as Waldensianism and Catharism, medieval theologians and popes eventually defined sufficiently the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church for religious and royal hierarchies to act against the offenders. When it came to Spanish witches in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there already was a large body of authoritative literature which spelled out the forms and characteristics of demonic homage and
deemed all of it heretical. But witches were presumed to do more than worship the devil, for they allegedly practiced *maleficia* to destroy crops, livestock, adult enemies, and children. When witchcraft resulted in bodily harm and the ruination of real or movable property, the crime pertained to secular courts. But it also belonged to bishops’ courts if the episcopate chose to try to exercise its ancient pastoral rights. Patristic Christian literature, particularly in the East, charged bishops to care for their flocks’ souls; that charge was reiterated in the Council of Trent’s decrees in the middle of the sixteenth century. Thus, bishops had reasons to notice witchcraft and superstition in their dioceses, as did priests in their parishes. In the end, three court systems in early modern Spain – the secular, the episcopal, and the inquisitorial – had cause to pursue maleficiant witchcraft.

There is no question that these justice systems clashed. From the *Archivo Histórico Nacional* in Madrid, the central repository for most Spanish inquisition sources, there is ample evidence that inquisitors disagreed with secular judges and bishops over jurisdiction. Inquisitors were highly attentive to their privileges. They were convinced that charges of heresy should outweigh charges of *maleficia* and hence affect the proper sequence of trials. The 1526 inquisition congregation in Granada was unanimous that suspected witches should be tried first by the Inquisition, perform first the penances ordered by the Inquisition, and only afterwards be released to secular authorities to make amends for the “deaths, damages, and other crimes they have committed.” Not surprisingly, the Inquisition’s sensitivity did not stop other courts from attempting to become involved in witchcraft prosecution. For example, the bishop’s court in Pamplona investigated clerics who traveled the diocese as healers, wives whose husbands alleged they were demonically possessed, and parish priests who refused to conjure clouds. Secular magistrates as well as inquisitors interrogated witnesses arising from the witchcraft allegations in Navarre in 1609–11. While Catalan witchcraft was prosecuted only by secular courts in the seventeenth century, when it reached a fever pitch in 1619–20, King Philip IV asked the region’s nine bishops to consider whether the Inquisition alone should take charge of the prosecutions. In Huesca, bishops were not involved in witch hunting, but secular and inquisitorial authorities routinely clashed over it, as every intrusion by inquisitors appeared to be a threat to traditional liberties.

Throughout the early modern period, inquisitors were convinced of their expertise: they asserted that they not only had better legal processes, but superior investigative skills and far better prisons than their secular or ecclesiastical counterparts. Given such claims, it is difficult to know how to interpret the Inquisition’s inconsistent actions toward witch suspects across time. For example, inquisitors in the tribunals of Logroño and Zaragoza used the Suprema’s authority to remove cases from secular courts and to pardon witches when there was evidence of over-zealous prosecutions and forced confessions. But inquisitors in the same tribunals also declined to interfere with secular cases even when they should have known from past experience that witch suspects could have been confessing falsely out of torture. Some scholars have attempted to explain the discrepancy by noting that Spanish inquisitors were prohibited from confiscating a suspected witch’s property; consequently, those officials had a reason for refusing to prosecute, since there would be no financial benefit coming their way after the trial. At the same time, it would be farfetched to read inquisitors’ insistence on their superior skills and procedures as simply defensive rhetoric, when
we know they could act to have cases transferred. We seem to have two interpretative options before us: to allow for a wider context behind inquisitors’ decisions, involving personalities, circumstances, opinions on privilege, and the Suprema’s own willingness to tell its tribunals what to do; or to classify inquisitors, bishops, and secular judges as fundamentally engaged in the same disciplinary enterprise, and to discount the signs of more-or-less benevolence that the records often reveal.  

There is no doubt that where centralized authority was fragmented, Spanish witch hunts moved apace: contrary to an older, now discredited paradigm, we now know that witch hunting in early modern Europe happened primarily in the interstitial boundaries of territories, whether such borders were defined in terms of religion or geography. Navarre, Aragón, and Catalonia shared a frontier with France; in terms of space, the Navarrese and Aragonese inquisitorial districts extended far beyond the convenient reach of their respective inquisition tribunals. Catalonia was divided into *comarcas* ruled by local seigneurs, while Granada was only conquered in 1492. Furthermore, the timing of the most virulent witch hunting in Spain – from approximately 1575 to 1630 – coincides with rampant plague and what has been called the “Little Ice Age.” The latter was known in Catalonia as the “age of floods.” Putting aside functionalist explanations about the environment, it seems clear that fertility, writ large, was a constant factor in Spanish territories when it came to “classic” witchcraft: there are too many dead animals, ruined crops, and murdered infants in the sources from Navarre, Aragón, Catalonia, Cuenca, and Granada to suggest otherwise. Provocatively, there also seems to be a strong link between slander and witchcraft charges in Zaragoza, Navarre, and perhaps in Castile itself, much as historians have discovered for Germany.

There is no doubt that central authorities could be driven into witch hunting through popular pressure. Early modern Spain’s justifiable renown for orthodoxy, discipline, and bureaucracy did not inhibit its officials from listening empathetically to popular complaints. In Cuenca in 1519, the parents of dead children made the accusations and were taken seriously by inquisitors; throughout Navarre in the sixteenth century, owners of damaged property and parents of injured offspring went to secular, episcopal, and inquisitorial officials to complain, and obtained significant results. Neighbors in Catalonia, aided by witch-finders, incited secular prosecutions. Within the trials, we can sometimes find clues about the village conflicts that produced such accusations. Debt was a factor for one Navarrese accuser. Child witnesses could be bribed or forcibly inebriated into naming suspects: when they accused their own family members, their statements appeared that much more persuasive because they were so outrageous that they must have been true. No one has yet compiled the longitudinal evidence that would allow us to say confidently that women over a certain age, or widows, or the poor suffered disproportionately from accusations. But an equally compelling question would be how villagers lived with each other after a witch hunting episode such as the one in Elgorriaga, Navarre, in 1611, or Arrayoz, Navarre, in 1613, when perhaps a dozen women were imprisoned and tortured for days on the initiative of local justices, and released only after they had falsely confessed. Shifting our attention to deep readings of extant trials, no matter which court oversaw them, will allow us to capture these episodes in greater detail and thereby amplify our understanding of Spanish witch hunting.
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Notes

1 For example, the witch trials conducted by the Logroño tribunal of the Inquisition from 1609 to 1610 were destroyed by Napoleon’s troops in the Spanish War of Independence; secular trials against witches in Catalonia and Aragón have left little documentation; episcopal and secular trials for witchcraft in the city of Zaragoza are few and far between. See notes below.


4 Because María Zimeldegui had been in France, the Labourd region was experiencing its own witch hunt under the guidance of Pierre de Lancre, and Spanish inquisitors would complain about the incursion into Navarre of French witches; numerous historians have claimed that the Zugarramurdi episode was galvanized by French influence. As anyone can see from Navarrese documents, that region required no French incentives to create a witch hunt. See Florencio Idoate, La brujería en Navarra y sus documentos (Pamplona: Institución Príncipe de Viana, CSIC, 1972).


7 For a forceful endorsement of the Inquisition’s skepticism vis-à-vis witchcraft, see Iraki Reguera, La inquisición Española en el País Vasco El tribunal de Calahorra, 1514–1570 (Donostia: Txertoa, 1984), 205. Also see William Monter, Frontiers of Heresy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 262; Idem, “Witchcraft in Iberia,” 268; and Jesús Usunáriz Garayo, “La caza de brujas en la Navarra moderna (siglos XVI-XVII.),” in Akelarre: la caza de brujas en el Pirineo (Siglos XIII-XIX) Homenaje al profesor Gustav Henningsen, Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos [RIERV] Cuadernos 9 (Donostia Eusko Ikaskuntza=Soctiedad de Estudios Vascos D.L., 2012), 343. Though the Suprema often urged caution on its officials during witchcraft investigations from 1521 onward, ultimately that skeptical voice was not inevitably present. Scholars have tended to overlook instances in which the Suprema actively supported inquisitors’ actions against witches, including 1609–1610, when Salazar and his colleagues were in agreement as to how to proceed and the Suprema backed them up with explicit encouragement.


11 As the reader will see, Devil-worshipping witches who committed maleficia were found in Granada and Cuenca, as well as in northern Spain. They were present in Córdoba – see


14 Ibid., 235.


17 Leading scholars on Navarre and Aragón do not agree on numbers of trials conducted by inquisitors. Episcopal cases in both Navarre and Aragón, and secular cases for Navarre in particular, remain understudied. SECULAR PROSECUTIONS AGAINST WITCHES IN ARAGON WERE CONDUCTED ACCORDING TO A TYPE OF SUMMARY JUSTICE WHICH LEFT ALMOST NO WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION (SEE P. 137). Certain relaciones de causas reveal the formal charge and punishment administered to culprits, as well as the indicted persons’ sex and age, but little more; others are significantly detailed. To see the range of documentation that can speak to witchcraft in this time and place, see Idoate, *La brujería en Navarra*. To see relaciones that are full of particulars, see the Appendices in Gari Lacruz, *Brujería e inquisición en el alto Aragón* (Zaragoza: Diputación General de Aragón, 1991).


19 Tausiet has found six episcopal cases from Zaragoza, dated between 1561 and 1605; six trials belonging to thequisition tribunal in the same city, dated between 1509 and 1648; at least 121 more inquisition cases documented in the relaciones de causas; eleven secular cases, and additional references in the Green Book of Aragón. Urban Magic, 23, 173–174, nn. 39–41.


23 Tausiet, *Urban Magic*, 36 n. 21; and chapter 5.


25 Pladevall i Font, *Persecucio de bruixes*, 32.

26 Ibid., 40–41, 44, 48–51.

27 The announcements of the desaforamiento were often in Latin. For their importance and their phrasing, see Tausiet, *Ponzoña en los ojos*, 202, 221–222, 233.


30 As Stuart Clark notes, the opposite dynamic is more often true, whereby witchcraft treatises were written after witchcraft episodes, as a reflective response, or a wish to justify an attack. “Brujería e imaginación histórica. Nuevas interpretaciones,” in *El Diablo en la Edad Moderna*, ed. James Amelang and María Tausiet (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2004), 35.


32 1 Peter 5:8.

33 On the implicit demonic pact, see Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, *Opera Corpus christianorum*, Latin Series 47, Part 14:1 (Turnholti: Brepols, 1955), Book 7, chap. 35; Book 8, chap. 19; Book 10, chaps. 8–9. Also see Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), Book 3, part 2, chap. 105, pp. 94–97. Jean Gerson, the highly influential chancellor of the University of Paris (d. 1429), also promulgated the implicit demonic pact in his writings.


35 For example, AHN, Secc. Inqu., Libro 319, f. 270r, 1521; ibid., Libro 320, ff. 51v-52, 1528; ibid., Libro 322, f. 146r, 1537. For such instructions to the Logroño tribunal after the Zugarramurdi cases began, see AHN, Secc. Inqu., Libro 332, ff. 231v-325r (11 March 1609); f. 251 v (21 July 1609); ff. 252v-253r (24 July 1609).

36 AHN, Secc. Inqu., Libro 322, ff. 216v-217r.


38 Sorcerers too could be construed as performing *maleficia* via the poisoning of enemies or rendering men sexually impotent.

39 AHN, Libro 319, f. 219v, 1526; Libro 320, f. 369r-v, 1530; ibid., f. 388v, 1531; Libro 323, ff. 226v-227r; Libro 327, 1r, 1576.

40 For example, Tausiet, *Ponzoña en los ojos*, 123.

41 A quote from future Inquisitor-General Fernando de Valdés; see Homza, *The Spanish Inquisition*, 157.

42 For these episcopal cases, *Archivo Diocesano de Pamplona* [ADP], Secr. Sojo C/107 – N 20, 1398; Secr. Garro. C/207-N. 1; Secr. Trevino C/415-N. 17, 1606.

43 My sources disagree with the conclusions of Jesús Usunáriz, who asserts that the only legal protagonist in the Zugarramurdi case was the Inquisition, “La caza de brujas,” 336. See AGN 100654, 1610; AGN 330569, 1612, with testimony collected in 1611; and finally, AGN 100796, 1611. Historians have not realized that multiple successful lawsuits were launched against the accusers of witches in the Zugarramurdi episode.


46 Monter and Tausiet weight this factor heavily; Monter, *Frontiers of Heresy*, 262; Tausiet, *Ponzoña en los ojos*, 121.

47 Tausiet, *Ponzoña en los ojos*, 245–248, also finds the inconsistency present in the episcopal court. Nevertheless, there was a long-standing record of episcopal opposition to the Spanish Inquisition’s methods: *Il vangelo e la spada. L’inquisizione di Castiglia e i suoi critici (1460–1598)* (Rome: Edizione di Storia e Letteratura, 2003).

48 Tausiet, *Ponzoña en los ojos*, argues strongly that witchcraft of all types should be attributed to conflicts of all sorts within communities and families: 253–257, 369–464. In *Urban Magic*, she writes “the myth of witchcraft represent[ed] an attempt to provide an explanation or
language that would both channel and alleviate all kinds of tension, as well as providing a way of interpreting misfortune in its broadest sense,” 158.

49 Alison Rowlands, *Witchcraft Narratives in Germany* (Rothenburg, 1561–1652) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003). Though Tausiet, *Urban Magic*, 159, asserts that the slander of calling someone a witch was an actual diminution of conflict, I have found the opposite to be true for Navarre, where lawsuits for slander over witchcraft were routine and resulted in severe penalties. That tradition of suing over slander helped confessed witches find justice in 1611–13. There are also appeals over “injuries” [injurias] in the Royal Chancellería in Valladolid which relate to witchcraft accusations.

50 AGN, Proceso 72902 (Arrayoz 1613), f. 14r.

51 In AGN, Proceso 069260, a 5-year-old testifies against his grandmother; for accusations of witchcraft from drunkenness, AGN 330569, f. 15r.

52 AGN, Procesos 100796 and 72902, respectively.
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