Ney makes a strong case for Hutchinson's affinities with Newton, in spite of Hutchinson's self-proclaimed anti-Newtonianism. Less compelling is Ney's insistence that the failure of both Newton's and Hutchinson's defenses of the Old Testament can be attributed to the "devolutionary philosophy of history" they shared (135 et passim). This is Ney's term for the view that human history is the story of a fall from an original understanding of divine truth into ignorance and idolatry. However, this view was widely held in early modern and eighteenth-century European thought, and was considered compatible with belief in history as the unfolding of divine Providence. The contrast that Ney draws between "devolutionary" and "providentialist" views of history seems either artificial or anachronistic.

Regardless of Hutchinson's own shortcomings, Ney argues, he bequeathed to his followers the precious legacy of his scriptural emblematicism. In the hands of the later Hutchinsonians, unencumbered by the Newtonian–Hutchinsonian dread of the corrupting influence of history, scriptural emblematicism was transformed into a mode of exegesis that combined a providentialist understanding of history with a theophanic vision of the created world. As most fully articulated by William Jones (1726–1800), Hutchinsonian scriptural emblematicism offered a viable alternative to the "anemic natural-philosophic apologetic" of Newton and later of William Paley (260). It gave back to the Christian reader not only the Old and New Testaments, but also the Book of Nature. This, Ney suggests, is why Hutchinsonianism was a powerful force for Anglican revitalization in the early nineteenth century.

Presumably in order to make his work accessible to non-historians, Ney has relegated much substantive material to the footnotes, which take up on average half of each page, and carry on a lively discussion of their own. This, however, is a minor flaw in a very readable and perceptive study which finally accords the Hutchinsonians the recognition they deserve.

doi:10.1017/jbr.2024.16

Joanne Paul. The House of Dudley. A New History of Tudor England

London: Michael Joseph, 2022. Pp. 506. $35.00 (cloth).

James Ross

University of Winchester
James.Ross@winchester.ac.uk

(Received 3 March 2023; accepted 19 February 2024)

Joanne Paul's *The House of Dudley* is a historical trade book. The term is not intended in a derogatory way; it is a useful way of categorizing work that aims at a general market, in part through a focus on narrative and story rather than theme or argument. This is not to categorize such works as popular or simplistic. A good trade book is not a short popular history—*The House of Dudley* is just over 500 pages long and is not a textbook or an entry level study—and can embody research of real significance to academic historians. Not unimportant also, in an age of pressure on history (and the humanities more generally) at almost every level, is the fact that such works interest and involve new readers in history. While this review will focus on the academic merits of the work, its wider context and audience is important and should be appreciated.

The House of Dudley recounts the story of the Dudley family from the late fifteenth century until the later sixteenth. Much of the story focuses on the three leading figures, Edmund Dudley, executed in 1510, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, executed in 1553, and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, who died—unusually for a Dudley—of natural causes in 1588. However, the wider Dudley family are also covered, with a notable emphasis on the role of the women who by birth or marriage were part of the clan. Part one details the rise of Edmund Dudley from fairly lowly origins to Henry VII's minister through his own talents, ambition, and ruthlessness, exploiting the unique opportunities of the last, grim years of Henry VII's reign. Yet in his single-minded concentration on squeezing all of Henry's subjects who came within his orbit for cash, he neglected his own alliances and at the king's death was left friendless and an easy scapegoat for a new regime keen to cast off the shadow of the old. Part two, from 1509 to 1547, covering the minority of Edmund's eldest son, John, and his ascent, through military and courtly service, to prestige at court and (through inheritance) the title of Viscount Lisle, is the least satisfying. It is the second longest section at almost a hundred pages (part one on Edmund Dudley is 56 pages) and very episodic. John Dudley is not the major player in most of the events described; much more central is the well-known narrative of Henry VIII's reign and tortuous marital history. While some background to John's eminence by 1547 is essential, one wonders if this could have been done in a more concise and focused way.

Part three, covering Edward VI's reign feels more coherent, given the central importance of John Dudley to the dramatic events of the reign and its immediate aftermath. While Dudley's hard-nosed approach to politics and warfare does come through, Paul does not push the evidence too far in reading character and motives. Indeed, there are times when perhaps a little more speculation, and a little more authorial voice, could be offered, notably in part four, covering the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I. The potential physical relationship between Robert Dudley and Elizabeth is left simply as recounted gossip and it is not clear if Paul thinks there was more to it than the emotional bond, which is certainly sympathetically outlined.

Beyond the narrative of the Dudleys, there is a wealth of contextual description to ensure the more general reader is comfortable in the surroundings of sixteenth-century England, ranging, for example, from marital sex in pre-Reformation England (26–27) to the defenses of Calais (77–79). There is overstatement, error, and omission at times. For example, Edmund Dudley's notebook of 1504–08 did indeed contain bonds and other financial instruments to the value of £220,000 but it did not double the crown's income—much of it was potential, not real, income, dependent on a whole set of conditions. The other "ravening wolf" in Henry VII's service alongside Edmund Dudley was Sir Richard Empson, but he is barely mentioned despite their close association before and after their fall, other than an imaginative description of their executions together on the block at Tower Hill. Paul has read widely, though there are some odd omissions in the bibliography. She has also engaged with a good deal of primary source material—some manuscript, some printed—particularly the copious correspondence of the period contained in the State Papers, and with the records of the material culture that the Dudleys liked to surround themselves with. A significant set of aids is offered, mainly aimed at the more general reader, including a timeline, glossary of names and terms, and notes on further reading and the sources. The more scholarly apparatus includes endnotes totaling 48 pages and a 25-page bibliography. It is much to be regretted, however, that an index is unaccountably omitted from the study.

The rise of the Dudley family was extraordinary; their leading figures were talented, ambitious, and prone to overreach. There is, however, no overarching argument beyond the family story. It is not quite, to quote the sub-title, "a new history of Tudor England." There is insufficient analysis, weighing of evidence, and insight into the broader political context to shape academic debate on Tudor politics. Nonetheless, assembling all the material on the Dudleys is valuable, and the alternative focus on a leading Tudor noble family is welcome. The study certainly demonstrates the multifaceted roles they were required to play.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2024.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The prose is lively and readable, though prone to convert recounted evidence in letters and other sources into direct speech and occasionally strays beyond what we can possibly know by way of coloring a scene. *The House of Dudley* is, fundamentally, a very good story well told.

doi:10.1017/jbr.2024.27

Jason Peacey, ed. Making the British Empire, 1660–1800

Studies in Imperialism. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022. Pp. 216. $29.95 (paper).

Jeremy Black

University of Exeter
jeremy.martin.black@gmail.com

(Received 12 March 2023; accepted 19 February 2024)

This interesting volume is an important contribution to the history of the first British Empire and one that richly deserves attention. Although it ranges widely across its period, there is a particular focus on the first 60 years, and that again is valuable because generally it is the latter years of this period that attracts attention. There is also a concentration on the Atlantic Empire, which reflects this earlier period. Indeed, India did not come to the fore in attention for British imperial policymakers, however defined, until late in the eighteenth century.

The introduction provides Jason Peacey with an opportunity to provide a historiographical scene-setting as well as to set the scene for this collection. He emphasizes the significance of political economy and scholarship thereon while also drawing attention to the contribution of Steven Pincus and, separately, the importance of religious thought and practice to the story of the British Empire. This adds a particular character to the political tensions that have profitably attracted Pincus's attention. So also with the corresponding need to locate discussions of sovereignty in a political context. Of course, Whig and Tory were neither coherent nor consistent identities, and that adds to the interest of the subject.

The chapter by Pincus centers his engaging and important discussion of the development of empire and imperial thought on the party politics and the Treaty of Utrecht. He offers much perception and wisdom, but his account, like much else in the book, could really do with bringing into the equation ideas and practices in other empires in this period. The British were not simply in competition and/or alliance with France, Spain, and the Netherlands. There was also a flow of ideas, and it is strange to see a collection without discussion of such figures as John Law and Jan Willem van Ripperda, or the interactions of imperial mercantile and colonial practice outside Europe, or the impact of large Dutch stakes in the British economy. Possibly this is a field for further work. It certainly highlights the abiding fault and folly of the various imperial "schools," namely their Anglophone character. In this book it is instructive therefore to see a response by John Elliott to Pincus's argument. It would be very valuable, at the least, to add contributions from Dutch and French scholarship.

Linked to this comes a major issue with sources. As I showed in my *Trade, Empire and British Foreign Policy, 1689–1815: The Politics of a Commercial State* (2007), there is a mass of material in the diplomatic archives, British and foreign, that is of very direct relevance for the framing and content of this subject. On the whole, there has been a failure to take this