

and Edmund Dudley, efficient taskmasters for Henry VII who were sacrificed at the beginning of Henry VIII's reign for their rapaciousness. But equally important were Sir Andrew Windsor, Sir Thomas Lovell, Sir Thomas Brandon (whose nephew Charles later became Henry VIII's boon companion), and Sir Henry Wyatt, whose son Thomas was a noted poet, and whose grandson, also named Thomas, led a rebellion against Mary Tudor in 1554.

What tied all these men together was the fortunate outcome of Bosworth, which ushered in the Tudor regime, and a fierce sense of loyalty to Henry VII. He trusted these men as much as he trusted anybody, which is to say that even these men were still required to enter into bonds and recognizances for their good behavior, just like members of the nobility, the principle means by which Henry VII kept potentially over-mighty subjects on a tight leash. Whether 1485 signaled a substantive change in English governance, as sixteenth century commentators like Edward Hall would have you believe, remains a venerable old point of debate. Gunn's work illustrates the lines of continuity with the previous Yorkist regimes. Henry VII's approach to providing an ample fiscal base for his monarchy was essentially feudal; he researched and vigorously prosecuted all viable forms of crown income, and in the process, he enlarged the boundaries and categories of crown income and modernized the means of enforcement, a process that reached its apotheosis with Charles I's ship money tax in the 1620s.

Henry VII's new men helped him achieve these goals. They were all truly Renaissance men, performing military service, legal duties, serving as justices of the peace in the shires, and creating myriads of affinities that had the result of importing crown power and influence into the localities on a scale that Henry VII's Yorkist father-in-law Edward IV could only have dreamed of. Their efficiency, and their recognition of their places in the social hierarchy, allowed them to work well with both the nobility and its clerical corollary, the high-ranking members of the church, classes that had traditionally supplied kings with counselors and administrators. In his book's final chapters, however, in his descriptions of the landed and financial holdings of these men, Gunn does not sugarcoat the fact that they were often rapacious jackals; even the bones of relatives were picked clean, as Gunn's description of the dismemberment of the estate of the Earl of Kent amply illustrates. Or consider the fact that Wyatt, whose image grins on the book's dust jacket, was wealthy and influential enough to get Henry VIII's court painter Hans Holbein to paint him, the Tudor equivalent of getting renowned photographer Annie Leibovitz to come to one's home to take the family portrait.

Nevertheless, Gunn's analysis finds balance in his descriptions of their collective roles as servants of the state and masters of their own destinies. Gunn's singular achievement with *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* is the way he takes a wide body of manuscript sources and deploys them to bring alive these men who seem so modern in their approach to business, service, leisure, and legacy building.

Charles Beem
 University of North Carolina
charles.beem@uncp.edu

CATHERINE HANLEY. *Louis: The French Prince Who Invaded England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. Pp. 296. \$40.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.102

Louis VIII, "the Lion," son of Philip Augustus and father to Saint Louis, ruled France for only three years (1223–26). Sandwiched between two of the great kings of medieval France, Louis VIII is usually known, not from studies dedicated to him, but as part of histories of his father or his son, or in histories of the Albigensian crusade, in which he played an important part.

And yet, he was an undoubtedly talented figure, a strong military leader with the capacity for leadership, and, if he had not died at thirty-nine while returning from a campaign in the south, might have had a profound role in the shaping of the Capetian monarchy and French history.

Louis VIII is the hero of Catherine Hanley's *Louis*, a narrative history of, as the book's subtitle announces, an important but not very well-known event in early thirteenth-century French and English history that touched on all the major political and military events of the day: the French invasion of England after the signing of Magna Carta. In 1216, the barons' increasing displeasure with King John led to an invitation to the young French prince to invade England and take the crown. Louis mustered forces and made it all the way to London. He received the fealty of some of the most noteworthy figures, including the king of Scotland. Initial efforts at military consolidation were, ironically, forestalled by John's death in October 1216. John's death changed the political calculation of the initial invitation, and a portion of political support shifted to John's son, the young Henry III. Louis—a pretender and usurper, now, rather than the righteous enemy of a tyrant—was then excommunicated. He continued the effort to conquer the island, mastering at one point almost two-thirds of royal territory, but he failed to be crowned and never gained legitimacy. In 1217 he returned to France to garner support and reinforcements, an effort taken up by his young wife, Blanche of Castille, rather than his father the king. But in the spring months of that year, when Louis was directing the war from London, his forces suffered two military defeats, one on land at Lincoln and one on sea at Sandwich. Terms, desired by Pope Honorius III, who wanted Louis for his crusading plans in the East, were then negotiated. Louis returned to Paris, having failed in his bid at gaining the English crown but not vanquished, and thus with his reputation basically intact.

Hanley's a narrative history is based overwhelmingly on narrative sources from both sides of the channel. She offers a sympathetic portrait of Louis VIII, and an appealing and easy narrative of the events of 1216–17 (along with framing chapters dealing with Louis' childhood, and then the short years after the invasion). But it is not a book for the serious historian. The storytelling imperative manufactures unnecessary or undocumented tensions, as for instance, with Louis' purported resentment that Philip Augustus elected not to co-crown him, or delayed his formal knighting (an interpretation that Hanley then herself refutes on page 228). And there is a fair amount of speculation: we should imagine Louis “with his fist clenched” (175); Blanche must have been “both pleased and dismayed” when Louis returned to France in 1217 (140). The sentence of excommunication “had weighed heavily on him for so many months” (177). Louis spent time in Paris “giving him at last some time in which to enjoy family life” (208). All reasonable, and I do not dispute their likelihood, but these are storytelling strategies rather than historical analyses. Additionally, because Louis VIII is, for all intents and purposes the hero of this book, Hanley goes to some length to soften criticism, for instance, attributing his military losses to the incompetence of his subordinates (175) and seeking to explain or justify acts of violence antipathetic to twenty-first century sensibilities (185–88). Hanley, for the most part, does not offer an argument *per se*, and her tone is more discursive than analytical. More important for scholars, there are no footnotes. In the introduction Hanley does include a discussion of the contemporary sources she used and a “note on sources” gives a five-page discussion of primary and secondary sources. But for the serious scholar the book offers little.

That is an observation, not a criticism, because the book was not written for a scholarly audience. It was written to recount a little-known but compelling medieval story to a contemporary audience. Hanley uses the events of 1216–17 as an architecture to discuss siege warfare, practices of kingship, marital strategies, papal and royal politics, and a host of other contextual issues. That is, Hanley, who has published both an academic monograph and historical murder mysteries, has sought to bring together the skills of the historian and the talents of the novelist and use this important moment in both French and English history as a window onto the period. Throughout, Hanley includes helpful and succinct discussions that help explain events (such as the distribution of political and military power in England,

pp. 66–67, or the nature of siege warfare, pp. 109–11), along with concise explanations of complicated events. The French invasion of 1216–17 is certainly an episode that deserves more attention from historians of both sides of the channel, and with this book Hanley has made this history widely available to an English-speaking audience.

M. Cecilia Gaposchkin
Dartmouth College
m.cecilia.gaposchkin@dartmouth.edu

LIZANNE HENDERSON. *Witchcraft and Folk Belief in the Age of Enlightenment: Scotland, 1670–1740*. Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic. London: Palgrave, 2016. Pp. 382. \$110.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.103

In 1750, three men appeared before the presbytery of Tain, charged with a series of assaults. In one post-midnight rampage, they had attacked three separate households, roughing up six women and one man. They dragged several of the women out of bed and threw them on the floor, calling them “witches and devils,” ripping and taking pieces of their clothing and scratching them on their foreheads until they bled. At least one of the women was repeatedly punched. The men apparently thought they were taking action in response to a previous magical attack. One of them, John Monro from Obsdale, blamed some or all of the women for the respiratory disease that would eventually kill him. He saw himself as a classic victim of *maleficia*, and in an earlier era, might have found a sympathetic audience in the presbytery. Not so this time: he and his confederates were given public rebukes in their home parishes for this “grievous scandal.” While this might strike modern readers as a light punishment, Lizanne Henderson, recounting the event in *Witchcraft and Folk Belief in the Age of Enlightenment: Scotland, 1670–1740*, demonstrates that it represents a change in thinking among the ministers and elders of the presbytery. Rather than investigating the allegations of witchcraft, as so many ministers and elders had in the previous 190 years, they, in Henderson’s words, “were clearly siding with the supposed witches rather than the alleged victims,” and condemned the latter for, in the presbytery’s words “recourse to diabolical means and methods, so contrary to the faith” and giving Christianity a bad name (144–45). Witchcraft itself had ceased to be a capital crime, having been recategorized as a type of fraud in a statute applying throughout the United Kingdom in 1735.

This case comes toward the end of, and few years after, the period under study in Henderson’s book, but it is representative of one of her central claims: that belief in witchcraft persisted well into and through the Scottish Enlightenment, particularly among the common people in rural communities. The Scottish witch-hunt itself ended in the early eighteenth century, having gradually declined for several decades as lawyers and judges lost faith in the legal system’s ability to identify and punish witches and as central government officials took control over witchcraft cases away from local courts. This trend (and its causation) has long been established in the various works of Brian Levack. But Henderson’s focus is on those farther down the social and institutional ladder: ministers, elders, and, ultimately, the men and women who inhabited Scotland’s villages and hamlets, particularly in the rural southwest, from which much of her material (but not the above example) comes.

One of Henderson’s primary lenses is “folk belief,” a concept that, despite her criticism of Peter Burke’s model of popular culture, was something not really shared by eighteenth-century intellectuals, even if they were aware of some of its facets. This belies the claim in her conclusion that the “mood of suspicion and terror” that nurtured witch-hunting “continued to linger