

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/116724/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Machielsen, Jan 2019. The making of a teen wolf: Pierre de Lancre's confrontation with Jean Grenier (1603–1610). *Folklore* 130 (3) , pp. 237-257.
10.1080/0015587X.2019.1587935

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0015587X.2019.1587935>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



The Making of a Teen Wolf: Pierre de Lancre's Confrontation with Jean Grenier (1603–1610)

It is a paradox that werewolf histories are both exceedingly well-known and remarkably little studied. As a subject of historical research, the early modern werewolf remains much neglected, certainly when compared to allied or related super- or preternatural creatures. The subject's foremost recent historian has claimed that there still is 'no academic history of werewolves' (Blécourt 2015, 2). At the same time, however, individual cases (the present case included) have gained considerable notoriety, both at the time and since. This is partly due to the small number of known trials: there were perhaps no more than 300 across Europe during the entire period (Blécourt 2009, 207). Even so, werewolf trials constituted a significant phenomenon in areas prone to wolf-attacks, such as Lorraine, Carinthia, Livonia, and especially the Franche-Comté.¹ (Conversely, early modern England, which had no wolves, saw no werewolf trials.) Yet, methodological difficulties have also played a role complicating cross-regional comparisons. Many aspects of werewolf lore—transformations by full moonlight, infection through biting—were inventions by novelists popularized during the modern TV era. The coherence of the modern-day werewolf myth, then, has covered or camouflaged a repertoire of different, often incompatible, culturally specific 'werewolf genres' across the continent (Blécourt 2015). A final, yet related factor complicating the historical study of werewolves also confounded the judicial proceedings of the case studied in this article: the difficult philosophical questions raised by apparent bodily transformations saw the Bordeaux magistrates, who issued the final ruling, plumbing (in Robert Mandrou's words) 'the depths of their libraries' in order to resolve them (Mandrou 1979, 35).

Within this still limited historiography, attention has generally focused on the ways werewolves were represented and discussed at the elite level (e.g. Jacques-Lefèvre 2002; Dillinger 2015). There have been few academic case studies of individual werewolf trials, with the notable exception of the 1589 case of Peeter Stump, 'the werewolf of Bedburg' (near Cologne), which had already become a media sensation at the time. Even these accounts have focussed, however, on how news of Stump's particularly violent crimes and gruesome torture spread across the continent (Machielsen 2015, 207–9). The 1603 trial of 13-year old Jean Grenier, likely the youngest person to be convicted as a werewolf (De Lancre 1612, 265), attracted much less attention at the time, but has since become emblematic of the profusion of (sensationalist) literary representations and the dearth of historical study (the exception is Oates 1988). The shepherd boy, who was widely deemed small and slow for his age, had confessed his running with the wolves to three female cowherds. A highly fictionalized 1865 account by Sabine Baring-Gould recreated this scene with references to 'the freshness of the air puffing up off the blue twinkling Bay of Biscay', despite events taking place more than fifty miles inland (Baring-Gould 1865, 85). Not only was Baring-Gould's creative retelling included in Charlotte F. Otten's *Lycanthropy Reader* (1986), it also directly or indirectly fed into recent popularizing portrayals (C. F. Otten 1986, 62–68; Steiger 2011, 127; Konstantinos 2010, 53–55).

Grenier's trial thus illustrates the paradox sketched out above: it ranks amongst early modern Europe's best-known werewolf cases, while remaining poorly understood.

Rather than focussing on cultural representations or elite debates—already discussed by others—this article, firstly, intends to uncover the origins of the Grenier case and to make sense, to the extent that it is possible, of the thirteen-year old's voluntary confession, which very nearly caused his death by hanging and led to his perpetual confinement in a Bordeaux monastery. The old-fashioned historical question 'what really happened' has itself had a vexed history where confessions to (imaginary) crimes are concerned, as historians of crime and witchcraft are especially well-aware. Pioneering works of micro- and witchcraft history by Natalie Zemon Davis and Lyndal Roper sparked rebuttals which questioned the limits of the agency of those involved in the trials and the extent to which scholars who seek to speak for the victims are interpolating their own voice (Davis 1983; Finlay 1988; Davis 1988; Roper 1994; Arnold 1998). John Arnold, in particular, charged that historians were substituting the voices of inquisitors with their own, creating no more than a 'golem ... a creature given life only by the words placed into its head' (Arnold 1998, 384).

This miniature microhistory is inspired, in part, by powerful interpretations put forth by historians, Roper foremost among them, which showed how children and teenagers drew on witchcraft beliefs to make sense of their own experiences and (re-)define their relations with their parents (Walker and Dickerman 1996; Roper 2000). Despite its sympathies for Roper's position, this article explicitly does not seek to decide whether subaltern voices can be recovered in general—the answer is dependent on the evidence available and each historian must answer it for herself. Instead, this article will draw on arguments from either side and, in a rather Janus-faced fashion, it will look two ways. If judicial sources shed light on the inquisitorial mindset, as Arnold suggests, then study of the accused werewolf should also help us get into mind of the trial's best-known chronicler.

Although he did not take part in the 1603 trial, the Bordeaux magistrate Pierre de Lancre (1556–1631) was intimately involved in a 1609 witch-hunt that took place in the Pays de Labourd, a territory on France's border with Spain, in which perhaps as many as 80 women and men were condemned to death. This witch-hunt, which ranks amongst early modern Europe's most notorious, was the result of a royal commission authorized by King Henry IV which visited the Basque-speaking territory during the summer and autumn of 1609. De Lancre had served as one of its two judges. His subsequent account, the *Tableau de l'inconstance des mauvais anges et démons* (Account of the Inconstancy of Evil Angels and Demons, 1612, 2nd ed. 1613), is well-known for its detailed description of the witches' sabbat, vividly illustrated by the Polish artist Jan Ziarnko (Communay 1890; McGowan 1977; Houdard 1992). Yet, the *Tableau* discussed more than the Basque witch-hunt alone. Prompted by his experiences in the Basque country, De Lancre also sought out the self-confessed werewolf upon his return to Bordeaux, shortly before Grenier's death in November 1610, aged 20 or 21. (De Lancre 1612, 328). Study of the Grenier trial therefore can also teach us a great deal about the pre-occupations and attitudes of its most notorious chronicler.

This article will thus collate De Lancre's account of the Grenier trial with other reports, some of which were previously unknown but are suggestive of the ways in which legal testimony spilled out of the law courts of early modern France (Houllemare 2011, esp. 325–82). The philological approach adopted here is inspired by recent work done by French literature specialists, but it also strangely mirrors the contemporary approach adopted by French legal humanists (the so-called *mos gallicus*) in their study of Roman law (Krause 2015; Ferguson 2016; Maus de Rolley forthcoming). Approaching the surviving records comparatively and systematically will get us closer to understanding both Grenier's perspective and De Lancre's personal and intellectual interests—preoccupations which shaped his attitudes and actions towards the Basque witches he interrogated as well.

Philology Meets Folklore

The modicum of academic attention Jean Grenier has thus far received is due to the discovery of a manuscript opinion in the Bibliothèque nationale de France. This manuscript summarized the case up to the moment that it reached Bordeaux, after which its author, 'Mr Filesac', provided his opinion.² Robert Mandrou based his short version of events in his classical *Magistrats et sorciers en France* (Magistrates and witches in France, 1968) on this manuscript, wrongly assuming the author to be one of the Bordeaux judges involved in the trial (Mandrou 1980 [first ed. 1968], 185–88).³ Caroline Oates has identified the author as the Sorbonne doctor Jean Filesac (1556–1638), the author of *De idolatria magica dissertatio* (Dissertation on magical idolatry, 1609) (Oates 1988, 25). This identification is credible. The *avis* or opinion displays considerable knowledge both of sacred history and medical theory, subjects that recurred in Filesac's many other occasional writings (e.g. Filesac 1617).⁴ He did not, however, double as a local curate in the Bordeaux region, as Oates assumed, but rose to become dean of the Paris theology faculty. (Filesac was a curate of St.-Jean-en-Grève, a now demolished church in Paris, not a village near Cognac.) He therefore had no first-hand knowledge of either the trial or Grenier.

This raises the first two in a series of questions, none of which can be answered with complete confidence: how did the Sorbonne theologian obtain access to the trial records he summarized? And why did he write it? Filesac's summary of the trial ends, shortly after the case reached the Bordeaux parlement, after the court received conflicting medical opinions and found itself divided (Mandrou 1979, 60). There was no tradition in France, as there was in the Holy Roman Empire, of law courts turning to universities for expert advice (e.g. Zagolla 2007; Sauter 2010). It is possible that Bordeaux turned to Paris for advice, especially as its parlement had confined a self-confessed werewolf to a mental institution in 1598 (Oates 1993, 176–80, 238–41). The problem with this possible solution is that the Bordeaux magistrates clearly did not wait for Filesac's *avis*. Bordeaux physicians cannot have examined Grenier before July 1603, while the parlement's final *arrêt* or judgement is dated 6 September of the same year. Filesac's opinion ends, quite abruptly, with the judgement which confined the teenager to life imprisonment in a monastery.⁵

It is possible that the Sorbonne theologian composed his avis out of his own volition, perhaps hoping to influence future judgements (in the way De Lancre would later with his *Tableau*). This does not solve the question of Filesac's sources, however, and there are good reasons to continue to suspect a connection with the Bordeaux parlement. There is a strong case for considering it the oldest surviving account of the trial. Oates, following Mandrou, based her interpretation of the trial entirely on Filesac's account, rightly observing that De Lancre 'substantially reproduced' the theologian's commentary (Oates 1988, 25). De Lancre did indeed replicate the second half of the avis—that is, the part containing the theologian's opinion—almost word for word. This apparent act of plagiarism proves that a copy reached a member of the Bordeaux parlement, sometime after 1603 (because De Lancre's version, like Filesac's, ends with the arrêt) and before 1610.

This leads to two further questions: why did De Lancre publish this avis under his own name? And how did he obtain it to begin with? Careful reading of the *Tableau* actually does provide reasonably clear answers here. De Lancre had obtained the avis from the estate of Guillaume Daffis, the late first president of the Bordeaux parlement, most likely in 1610, 'just as I was at the point of researching exactly and intently what the good books say about lycanthropy.'⁶ The document in De Lancre's possession had been a complete mess: 'so badly and falsely arranged, as if it had passed through an infinity of different hands, that I could hardly recognize the workman in the work.'⁷ The poor state of the manuscript as well as the arrêt on the final page led De Lancre suppose that Daffis, who pronounced the final verdict, had been the 'workman' in question. When he reproduced most of Filesac's avis with the heading 'judgement [*arrest*] of a werewolf pronounced in red robes [*en robe rouge*, worn only on ceremonial occasions] at the Bordeaux parlement on 6 September 1603,' he professed himself in awe of his late colleague's erudition, entirely unaware of the theologian's authorship (De Lancre 1612, 255, 264). The fact that, in De Lancre's mind, this was 'a piece which [Daffis] delivered and did not write' (*une piece qu'il a prononcee et non escrite*) gave him licence to make changes (De Lancre 1612, 255).

One crucial difference between the disfigured (and lost) version in De Lancre's possession and the copy surviving in the Bibliothèque nationale is that it very likely did not include the first half—that is, the summary of the trial that served as the foundation for Filesac's discourse. At least, De Lancre considered it 'very necessary to set down here the principal and most important points which explain what has been said, taken word for word from the trial, everything as it is in the registers of the court of the parlement of Bordeaux, without adding or taking away anything.'⁸ Although, as we shall see, we should not take him at his word, the Bordeaux magistrate provides evidence *not* included in the Paris manuscript, starting with some of the key dates of the original local trial (De Lancre 1612, 257, 261).

There are two important conclusions that flow from our discussion so far. Although Filesac's avis predated De Lancre's account, we should regard De Lancre's version, which claims to be based on the original trial documents, as an independent witness. Filesac was not, as Oates assumed, an eye witness. Although both the source and objective of his avis

remain unclear, the fact that a copy reached the library of the presiding judge (though likely only after the trial concluded) suggests that he too may well have had access to the court records. Neither account, then, deserves to be privileged over the other and a philological approach that studies them comparatively is in order.

In addition to the accounts provided by De Lancre and Filesac, two other sources can be brought to bear on the story as well. The werewolf case is briefly discussed in the manuscript *Chronique bordelaise* (Bordeaux chronicle), composed by Jean de Gaufreteau (1572–1639). All the details of the trial itself, including Grenier’s claim that ‘the flesh of children is very tasty’ can be found in the other versions and were likely taken from De Lancre’s published account.⁹ The *Chronique* identifies the Bordeaux convent to which Grenier was confined and reports that ‘several’ men went to see him there, raising the possibility that De Lancre’s visit was not unusual and that the teen wolf may have been something of a tourist attraction (Gaufretau 1877–78, 2:45).

Both lengthier and more significant is the account provided by Bernard Automne’s *La Conférence du droit françois avec le droit romain* (The comparison of French and Roman law, Paris, 1610). Dedicated to Nicolas Brûlart de Sillery, the Chancellor of France (as De Lancre’s *Tableau* would be two years later), *La Conférence* showed how royal ordinances and French case law had adapted and modified Roman law. In his preface to the reader, the lawyer explained that he had hand-selected ‘almost three thousand as it were oracles’ out of the Bordeaux archives, which included an eight-page quarto account of the Grenier case.¹⁰ Although it does not promise a ‘word for word’ transcription of the case, as De Lancre had, and summarizes the record significantly in parts, it nevertheless serves as a third independent witness to the lost trial records and includes details omitted by Filesac and De Lancre.

The original witness evidence by the female cowherds (Table 1) demonstrates the value of collating these three accounts. It is immediately apparent that all three men were working from the same documents, although their precise words differ. The passages highlighted in bold underscore the similarities: Grenier had told the witnesses that he transformed himself into a wolf, that he had killed dogs, had taken a bite out of one of them and drank its blood, and that dog meat was not as good as that of young children. He also boasted of entering a home, taking an infant, and leaving most of the body for a nearby wolf to consume.

Yet, two further observations must also be made: when they report the same facts the language differs, and as the parts of the text that are not highlighted make clear, they each omit different details. The account of Filesac is actually the most condensed: Filesac did not identify thirteen-year-old Marguerite Poirier, as both Automne and De Lancre did, as one of the cowherds to come forward. This is a significant omission as Marguerite had recently escaped a wolf attack (later believed to be Grenier), as Automne already makes clear in this passage and De Lancre in the subsequent paragraph not excerpted in the table below. No account includes all the details. Some elements are present in only one or two of the accounts—down to the colour of a dog Grenier had attacked (white), the location where the boy’s body was consumed (by a hedge in the garden), and the number of bites he had taken (two). Automne’s version, for instance, references the wolf skin that

enabled Grenier’s transformation, which features prominently in all three accounts later—the judges would search in vain for it. Such magical skins would still be an important part of the local folklore in the nineteenth century (Oates 1988, 23).

[[Insert Table Here]]

Table 1. Comparison of the Original Witness Testimony

A collation of these three accounts thus yields more than the sum of its parts. It both provides additional detail about the (genuine) wolf attacks that formed the backdrop for Grenier’s confession and throws additional light on the ways the local judges went about procuring it. To be sure, this philological approach is not problem-free. Some details, notably the names of the local judges, which none of the three versions bothered to include, still elude us.¹¹ The accounts also conflict in some minor points of detail—Automne, for instance, dates the original witness testimony the ‘penultimate’ day of May, De Lancre 29 May (Automne 1610, 1001; De Lancre 1612, 257). Still, the contested nature of these details would have remained obscured without such collation, and a more complete account will allow us to better understand the Grenier case. The interpretation which follows is based on precisely such a systematic reading of all three accounts together. In turn, this fuller record will also help us identify omissions and emphases in De Lancre’s account, helping us identify his working methods as an editor and his interests and actions as a judge.

The Mental World of a Teen Wolf

Wolves had unsurprisingly thrived during the violence and bloodshed of the Wars of Religion (1562–1598). They had become particularly prominent and audacious in the area surrounding Bordeaux. In 1587, the Franciscan friar Claude Prieur was urged against proceeding further on a road near Rions, some twenty miles outside of Bordeaux, by a devastated woman, who told him that ‘less than half an hour earlier a wolf had snatched a little girl right from the threshold of her door.’¹² After his departure from the region, Prieur learned that several men, women, and children had vanished. Their skin and bones were found only during the harvesting season—or not at all (Prieur 1596, fol. 32r). Even within the city of Bordeaux itself wolves were reported to have killed dogs in clear day light and in full view of everyone (Mandrou 1979, 60; De Lancre 1612, 264).

The spring of 1603 had also seen a number of especially vicious wolf attacks in the area of La Roche-Chalais, a small barony in the Dordogne region of no more than 100 households (De Lancre 1612, 257, 261).¹³ When thirteen-year-old Marguerite Poirier, eighteen-year-old Jeanne Gaboriaut and a third unnamed girl met on the fields with their cows, the subject had been inevitable. Several young children had been seized while guarding a variety of sheep, geese and pigs, and a wolf had even entered a home and taken an infant boy from its crib. Poirier herself had been attacked three or four weeks earlier while herding her flock, when a wolf jumped her and tore her dress and cloak. Some of the injuries on her face still had not healed (De Lancre 1612, 262). To the judges, Poirier described the savage animal as both fatter and shorter than an ordinary wolf, with a

smaller head, a reddish fur, and a short tail. Thankfully, she had been able to hit the animal on its back with her walking stick, which caused it to retreat ten or twelve feet and sit on its hind legs like a dog, glaring at her with a 'frightful look' (*un regard furieux*). She and her cows then made a lucky escape (Mandrou 1979, 43; Automne 1610, 994[=1002]; De Lancre 1612, 257).

The cowherds had encountered Jean Grenier in the fields several times before. He had been tending to a flock of animals for Pierre Combaut, a farmer in the small hamlet of Paulet for about a month, after having left his father's home at the end of February 'to beg' (De Lancre 1612, 258–59). Grenier was evidently mal-nourished and looked considerably younger than his nearly fourteen years (Mandrou 1979, 47; De Lancre 1612, 259). The Bordeaux judges, when they interrogated him, deemed him to be 'so stupid and idiotic that children of seven or eight years old normally testify with greater judgement' and so small that one would take him to be only ten years old.¹⁴ Grenier's father Pierre, as we shall see, made similar comments. When De Lancre interviewed Grenier seven years later, he still judged him rather small for his age and 'somewhat stupid'—he struggled with 'simple things which were common sense.'¹⁵ He may have been undernourished even before he left home to fend for himself. His father had beaten Jean severely after he had cooked and eaten some bacon and cabbages during Lent, items which he had begged from neighbours. He also fed this stew to his younger brother (Mandrou 1979, 47, 49; De Lancre 1612, 262–63). It was this—very different—illicit consumption of meat and the violent punishment that followed which prompted Grenier to leave home and set events into motion that ultimately led the boy to confess to the consumption of human flesh. (The sources do not address why neighbours would hand out meat during Lent.)

One could quite plausibly describe the claims Grenier made to the older and more mature cowherds as immature bragging, but this misses the underlying dynamic of the conversation. According to eighteen-year-old Jeanne Gaboriaut, Grenier approaching the three cowherds asked which of them was the most beautiful: 'because (he said) I want to marry her, so if it is you, I want to marry you.'¹⁶ Discovering that the three women would not take him seriously, Grenier inserted himself into their original topic of conversation, declaring that he was afraid of no wolves (Automne 1610, 994[=1002]). He attempted to impress Jeanne by claiming that his father was a priest (De Lancre 1612, 257). Grenier seems to have overcome their scepticism by gradually doubling down on his boasts, however fantastic they may seem to us. He first claimed to have run with the wolves, then to have attacked dogs, before confessing a preference for human flesh, declaring that 'boys and girls were much more pleasant and delicate to eat.'¹⁷ When Jeanne asked about the origin and whereabouts of the wolf-skin, he said it was kept by a certain Pierre Labouraut whose 'big black' house in the forest he described as an inferno in which men were being burnt and roasted (Mandrou 1979, 44; Automne 1610, 994[=1002]; De Lancre 1612, 258). He promised one witness, presumably Gaboriaut, that she could accompany him when he went to fetch it (Automne 1610, 994[=1002]). Grenier also took responsibility for the attack on Marguerite (Mandrou 1979, 43). During a later judicial

confrontation, he told Poirier that ‘if he had been able to throw her to the ground, he would have bitten her well.’¹⁸

Whether or not the three young women believed Grenier is unclear, but they reported it to the *procureur d’office*, the local prosecutor, and it was on the basis of their testimony that the judge of La Roche ordered the thirteen-year old’s arrest. Their original evidence also provides historians with one line of questioning to be pursued further: the extent to which physical violence shades into sexual conquest in Grenier’s imagination. Abandoned by his own family, Grenier’s reference to marriage offers us another clue: his relationship with his father, whom he would implicate, became an animating force behind the trial.

Jean’s answers when he was first questioned by the local magistrate on 2 June 1603 may dispel the mystery of his intimate knowledge of the local wolf attacks (De Lancre 1612, 258). In his first answers to the officials, before they exhorted him to tell the truth and he confessed, he testified that he had seen an animal resembling a greyhound carry a child in Chenaud and had heard of another attack elsewhere (Mandrou 1979, 44). Grenier had spent a month and a half roaming across La Roche-Chalais and its neighbouring parishes on his own, before being taken on as a shepherd boy (see De Lancre 1612, 258 for a list of parishes Grenier visited). Later testimony also places him near some of the attacks. Grenier had obtained some bread from one of the houses in Puy Arnaud, near the fields where a young boy was attacked on 17 May, as his father and uncle were pruning vines nearby (Mandrou 1979, 48; Automne 1610, 995[=1003]). Grenier had stayed for about two weeks near the village of La Reynerie, possibly as a herdsman, where a three-year-old girl called Guyonne had been eaten nearly whole on 28 March (Mandrou 1979, 49; Automne 1610, 995[=1003]).¹⁹

There was another reason, however, for the remarkable consistency of the witness testimony, praised and admired by De Lancre: the local officials involved worked hard to make all the evidence line up (De Lancre 1612, 261). Even when the judge of La Roche-Chalais deemed ‘that the process was complete and all that remained was for judgement to be passed,’ he still ordered the *procureur* to verify the existence of two stacks of firewood in the village of Côte which Grenier passed in wolf form when he attacked Marguerite Poirier.²⁰ In the case of the vine growers of Puy Arnaud, the father testified that the (were)wolf had attempted to take off with the ‘fattest’ (*le plus gras*) of his three children, until the boy’s uncle chased it away shouting ‘I will get you!’ (*je t’attourrai bien!*)—the judge, as if by way of confirmation, noted that the boy attacked was indeed the fattest of the three children that appeared before him (De Lancre 1612, 262). As part of this process, Grenier was taken on various expeditions, including to his father’s home, which was one of a number of places searched for the presence of the magical wolf-skin (Mandrou 1979, 53; Automne 1610, 1004). Grenier was made to identify those who survived his attacks, which cannot have been difficult given the bodily injuries they suffered (e.g. the boy’s identification of Poirier: De Lancre 1612, 262). Re-enactments and confrontations, often in front of a crowd of locals, provided testimony by both witnesses and the accused that was ‘word for word’ identical (Mandrou 1979, 55; Automne 1610, 1005). Given the circumstances—the public nature of the events and the notoriety of the

wolf attacks—such similarities are hardly surprising and officials further aided the process. In Puy Arnaud, for instance, Grenier was confronted with the witnesses and their statements before being interrogated himself. The final depositions were then read ‘reciprocally’ and confirmed by all (Automne 1610, 995[=1003]).

There are good reasons, then, to think that Grenier’s confession was less ‘voluntary’ than Filesac in particular made it out to be (see the references on Mandrou 1979, 46, 47, 48). One such confession emerged after he was heard three times on the contents of the depositions against him (Mandrou 1979, 48). According to De Lancre, the length and misery of his imprisonment had also made the boy ‘somewhat slow’ (*aucunement hebeté*) (De Lancre 1612, 263). It is impossible to fully reconstruct the social and emotional pressures placed on Grenier, at the centre of a public spectacle and expected to perform his role (see esp. Automne 1610, 1005). After his initial confession, Grenier started sobbing (Mandrou 1979, 45; Automne 1610, 994[=1002]). Physicians, both at La Roche and later in Bordeaux, inspected and pierced the mark on the top of the boy’s left thigh for any insensitivity, where the ‘black’ owner of the ‘big black’ house in the forest, whom the shepherd boy initially identified as Pierre Labouraut and under questioning as a ‘Monsieur de la Forest’, had marked him (Mandrou 1979, 51, 59; Automne 1610, 1004, 1007). The extent to which Grenier’s confession was a product of the judicial process should not be underestimated nor should it, given Arnold’s warnings, surprise us.

Still, these considerations provide no reason for us to question the wider context of persistent wolf attacks, especially on young children, nor do they cast doubt on Grenier’s initial encounter with the three cowherds that prompted them to report him. As we shall see, they also do not impugn on the two lines of questioning identified above. Grenier’s gratuitous implication of his father Pierre and a certain Pierre du Tilhaire reveals a level of agency that unsettled the judges. His confession, then, remained to some extent a vehicle for psychic content even as the judicial process transformed him into a self-confessed werewolf. His relationship with his father, which stumped both the local and Bordeaux judges, provided both the emotional underpinning of the trial as a whole and the context for Grenier’s own fantasies about sex and marriage.

Grenier’s anger at the father who caused him to leave home ran deep and lasted for the remainder of his short life. Jean would hide in the convent every time his father attempted to see him (De Lancre 1612, 317). It was not, however, his father who had introduced Jean to the clearly demonic Monsieur de la Forest, but Pierre du Tilhaire, described as a *garçon*, a young man, from ‘a good and rich house’ in Saint-Antoine-sur-l’Isle, where the Grenier family also lived (De Lancre 1612, 258–59). It was Du Tilhaire, who was first alleged to have taken Jean, then aged 10 or 11, to the nearby forest to speak with the black man on the black horse (Mandrou 1979, 44; Automne 1610, 994[=1002]; De Lancre 1612, 259). Only when asked if his father knew, did Jean implicate him, telling the judge of La Roche that on three occasions his father had greased his body and helped him put on the wolf-skin which Monsieur de la Forest had given him (Mandrou 1979, 46; Automne 1610, 994–95[=1002–3]; De Lancre 1612, 260). These comments, made during the first interrogation, led to both men being taken into custody.

Grenier's feelings towards his father, however, cannot simply be reduced to mere anger. The description of his father helping to dress him already suggests a desire for intimacy. As wolves, they also used to run together. In May, two years earlier, they had jointly attacked a young girl in a white dress guarding geese and they consumed her in a wheat field, but according to Grenier, now 'his father no longer took him along' (Mandrou 1979, 50–51; Automne 1610, 1004; De Lancre 1612, 263). Jean's feelings towards his family, and his father in particular, were complex; a desire for closeness conflicted with the reality of domestic violence. Jean's stories may have been fantastical and almost lethal, but they also transformed his father's aggression into a bonding exercise. The same fantasy also gave voice to his feelings of abandonment, blaming them on his father's wolf-like transgressions. Jean's mother had passed away at an unknown date. Pierre Grenier had re-married but his second wife had also left. According to his son, she had left because one day she saw her husband vomit up 'dog feet and the hands of little children' (*des pieds de chien et des mains de petits enfants*) (Automne 1610, 1004; De Lancre 1612, 263). We should not forget that the original encounter in the fields that caused his arrest began with Jean Grenier's wish to start a family of his own. (Both Pierre and his unnamed wife later explained that she left to protect a legal claim to a property she owned but that they still saw each other (Mandrou 1979, 47, 53; Automne 1610, 1005)).

Despite its best efforts, the judicial machinery could neither control nor fix Grenier's feelings towards his father. One morning the teen wolf asked to speak to the judge of La Roche on his own initiative with the wish to discharge his conscience. His principal aim was to re-affirm his testimony against his father:

all what he has said is true, even about Pierre du Tilhaire and his father, and that his stepmother has left his father because she saw him vomit the hands of little children and dog feet, that they have run together and two years ago they ate a girl together at Grillaux and that since then he did not take him running with him.

Grenier added that he had gone without running for two years and only started running again during the last three months—coinciding with the moment he left home.²¹ (We might wonder whether Pierre Grenier's refusal to take his son 'running' coincided with his remarriage.)

Still, whenever the thirteen-year old was confronted with his dad, or with Du Tilhaire, he quickly revoked that part of his testimony that concerned them, only to repeat it later. Before the judge at La Roche passed sentence, Grenier repeated his accusations in the presence of 'three or four noblemen', explaining his earlier refutation because he had feared being beaten by the two men (Mandrou 1979, 57; Automne 1610, 1007). The Bordeaux judges similarly found that Grenier 'persisted in what concerned himself, although several times he was found to vary as far as his father and Pierre du Tilhaire are concerned.'²² These variations in the boy's testimony would ultimately cause the Bordeaux parlement, on 6 September 1603, to release the two men. Yet, Grenier never wavered regarding his own activities. In the face of his father's denunciations of his 'stupidity', Jean persisted that he really had killed as a werewolf but reduced the

culpability of his two accomplices. As wolves, they had merely sought girls 'to enjoy and not to eat, but as for himself, he persisted in having eaten girls.'²³

There is much about the Grenier trial that is unknown and unknowable. The precise relation between Du Tilhaire and the two Greniers is one such factor. During one confrontation, Du Tilhaire claimed not to have seen Jean in two years, rather incredibly given that they lived in the same village (Mandrou 1610, 53). During another, he insisted that he had become aware of the teenager's stupidity three years ago but had never seen any harm in him (Mandrou 1610, 53, 58). At this confrontation, which took place as Grenier was being transported to Bordeaux, the teenager maintained that they had run through the forests, heaths and roads together, 'searching for girls to embrace but did not find any and that, as for himself, he had deflowered three.'²⁴ If Pierre Grenier had remarried only two years earlier, Pierre du Tilhaire could have assisted in the period of courtship that preceded it. Although the dates are suggestive, we lack sufficient evidence and should be careful not to enter Arnold's golem territory.

Werewolves have been associated with sexual deviancy (Blécourt 2007a), and the ways that physical violence shaded over into sexual possession in Grenier's testimony is striking. Grenier discussed in some detail the clothes of his female victims and how he lowered their dresses (usually) without tearing them, a subject that, as we shall see, interested De Lancre greatly (Mandrou 1979, 43, 50, 56; De Lancre 1612, 260). The sexual undertones may well have been picked up on by his father when he called his son an idiot who 'for an apple will tell you what you want' and for fun could be made to confess 'that he had slept with all the women they mentioned to him.'²⁵ Certainly, Grenier's supposed female victims outnumbered male ones.²⁶ Years later, when interviewed by De Lancre, he expressed a preference of little girls over boys 'because they are more tender' (De Lancre 1612, 317). These same sexual undertones help make sense of that original encounter in the fields. When his marriage offer was made light of and Grenier took credit for attacking Marguerite Poirier, he assured the three women that 'had she not put up a defence and had he been alone, he would have eaten and brutalized her.'²⁷ He was implying more than physical violence alone.

The Mental World of a Bordeaux Magistrate

If collating these three accounts illuminates our understanding of Grenier and his trial, such a comparison also lays bare emphases and omissions in each of these narratives of which we might otherwise have been ignorant. As suggested at the outset, Pierre de Lancre's treatment of the case is of especial interest as it may shed light on the attitudes and interests that he brought to bear in his pursuit of witches in the French Basque country as well.

The Bordeaux magistrate returned from the Pays de Labourd after his witchcraft commission expired on 1 November 1609 (De Lancre 1612, 451). He would have been familiar with lycanthropy through his reading of other demonologists, notably Henri Boguet, who had encountered numerous werewolves in the Franche-Comté (Oates 1993). It is unlikely that his actions in the French Basque country were informed by the Grenier trial, however. His seeking out of Grenier after receiving the case documents

suggests as much. He also would not have confused Filesac's avis for Daffis's arrêt if he had been a close observer of the original trial. Instead, in his *Tableau* De Lancre used the trial to confirm the validity of his earlier findings. The fact that 'the deposition and testimony of a thirteen-year-old son is received against his father' showed the special status of cases involving demons, confirming similar actions De Lancre had taken in the Labourd.²⁸ Grenier's unwillingness to challenge the witnesses against him matched the judge's own experience that only two out of hundred witches do so, 'and if they object, they are always without cause' (*tousiours impertinens*) (De Lancre 1612, 261).

De Lancre's treatment of the Grenier case teaches us something valuable as to how the *Tableau* was constructed. As already noted, the magistrate had promised a faithful record 'taken word for word from the trial ... without adding or taking away anything.' This transcription is by no means complete. Excluding a brief and, given the outcome of the case, virtually obligatory discussion of Grenier's confrontation with his father, De Lancre ends his account about mid-trial, omitting a number of alleged attacks as well as the many detailed site visits.²⁹ At the same time, the questioning he did record was usually the most complete of the three versions, providing the dates and content in an *interrogé-dict que/respond que* ('asked'-'says/replies that') format consistent with an official interrogation. This has implications for our understanding of the *Tableau*. Although scholars have often bemoaned the loss of the original trial documents of the Pays de Labourd witch-hunt (e.g. Pearl 1999, 134), they overlook the fact that the *Tableau* is built around trial documents that De Lancre decided to leave them in their original form (*en leur naïveté*) (De Lancre 1612, sig. ē3v). Organized around the themes that interested the author, this witness testimony is often fragmentary and scattered across the *Tableau's* almost 600 pages. While there are considerably fewer additional sources to bring to bear on the account provided in the *Tableau*, parts of the original testimony can still be reconstructed. Study of the Grenier trial, then, can provide us with clues as to De Lancre's particular interests and what might be missing in any such reconstruction.

To begin with Filesac's opinion itself, its inclusion in the *Tableau* should come as no surprise even to cursory readers of that work. The type of erudition displayed, which roamed widely across the mainstays of a typical classical education and cited freely from pagan and Christian authors, is precisely the sort of, often unstructured, free-wheeling learning that De Lancre himself vaunted elsewhere in the *Tableau* and in his other writings.³⁰ Grenier's trial and conviction also served a wider purpose, cementing De Lancre's case for action against witchcraft. Although Grenier had, quite uniquely, been sentenced to life imprisonment rather than death, it remained a case of witchcraft recently decided by the court of which De Lancre was a member. Around the time of his interview with Grenier, the judges of La Tournelle, the parlement's criminal chamber, were interrogating Basque witches whose cases De Lancre's commission had been unable to finalize (see e.g. De Lancre 1612, 143, 566). De Lancre had also opened his preface with a reference to the case of Isaac du Queyran, a 25-year old Protestant, sentenced to death for witchcraft by the Bordeaux court just before De Lancre's mission to the Labourd (De Lancre 1612, sig. ē1v). It would be wrong to assume that the Bordeaux parlement was as lenient and sceptical in witchcraft cases as its famous Paris counterpart (Soman 1978).

Yet, there were also aspects of the case itself that would have attracted De Lancre's attention. De Lancre, who explicitly identifies 'Monsieur de la Forest'—the black man in black clothes on a black horse—as the devil, included the lengthiest description of his black residence with its roasting, burning, and blazing residents (De Lancre 1612, 264, 258). This fanciful description may have drawn on folkloric traditions or may simply demonstrate a child-like inventiveness not normally shown by adults.³¹ The judge would extensively interrogate Grenier about the 'Monsieur', a discussion which provided the launching pad for a wider discussion of this particular demonic incarnation. The lengthy discussion of the residence should also not surprise us, given the extent to which the *Tableau* is devoted to the description of the witches' sabbat—Margaret McGowan's essay on De Lancre is entitled 'The Sabbat Sensationalised' (McGowan 1977). Given Robin Briggs's pithy summary of the *Tableau* as a 'kind of scholarly pornography', it was also inevitable for the *Tableau* to pick up on the undertones of sexual violence that permeated the trial (Briggs 1998, 32). De Lancre alone mentions that Grenier confessed 'that he took' Marguerite Poirier, the girl he attacked, 'wanting to kill her ... and marry her.'³²

By contrast, the concern of *maleficia* which so dominated fears at the popular level barely feature in the *Tableau* at all, even though these must have played a considerable role in causing the witchcraft panic in the Pays de Labourd. De Lancre's interest in the alleged werewolf attacks is limited and fits well within his own interests. The limited excerpts focussed, first of all, on the appearance of Monsieur de la Forest at the time of the attacks. The demonic figure would appear whenever Grenier had identified a prey to hand him his wolf-skin (De Lancre 1612, 260, 262). However, it is Grenier's method of undressing his victims that prompted De Lancre's lengthiest intervention in his transcription of the trial record:

what he said about lowering the [girl's] dress is remarkable because he had not torn it. This is something that has been observed that, although real wolves tear with their claws, werewolves tear with their teeth. Being men, they know how to undress the girls they want to eat without tearing their dresses.³³

Many of the Basque witnesses interrogated by De Lancre's commission had been teenagers, much as Grenier had been. During their testimony the judge studied their bodies and faces, looking for signs of emotions, perhaps because it provided an additional form of verification. (The words themselves passed through an, at times very uncomfortable, Basque translator (De Lancre 1612, 216).) During their meeting, De Lancre scrutinized Grenier's body in much the same way, perhaps predictably reporting on his teeth and nails. The former were longer and wider than normal and stuck out somewhat. They had turned half back from being used on animals and people. The nails had also gone completely black from the root up and had been half worn, 'which demonstrates clearly that he had been a werewolf and that he used his hands both for running and for grabbing children and dogs by their throats.'³⁴ The encounter also brought back memories of an unnamed boy De Lancre had interrogated in the Basque village of St-Pée who, like Grenier, had possessed a special skill of running on all fours,

which he had taken ‘a singular pleasure’ in demonstrating to the judge (De Lancre 1612, 315–16).

Finally, De Lancre’s encounter with Grenier gets us closer to understanding as to why he actually believed the fantastical stories with which he was confronted, because demonic illusions by their very nature were *meant* to be fantastical. The judge was well-aware that his colleagues deemed Grenier to have the mental age of a seven- or eight-year old at the time of his conviction (De Lancre 1612, 307). Filesac’s seemingly empathetic depiction of Grenier as ‘a young boy abandoned and driven out by his father, who had a stepmother for a mother, who roamed the fields without a guide and without anyone in the world who cared for him, begging for bread’ was included in the *Tableau* as part of Daffis’s judgement.³⁵ Yet, Grenier’s terrible circumstances and diminished mental capacity inspired neither scepticism nor compassion, either in Filesac or De Lancre. Rather, they were conditions that the devil could and would exploit. De Lancre expressed discomfort at the modicum of mercy shown to Grenier already, even worrying that it might bring into question the death sentences he had imposed on ‘old and well-trained witches’ (*vieux sorciers qui ont long temps faict le mestier*) (De Lancre 1612, 313).

Reflections

The role children and adolescents played in the early modern witch-hunt is both its most shocking and least studied feature (Behringer and Opitz 2016). The highly uncomfortable topic cannot be approached without recognition of the awful reality of child abuse, then and now. It is almost impossible to reflect sensibly on the execution of children as witches—the cases of 10 or 11-year old Claudel Perrin in Lorraine and 12-year old Heylken Brycken in the Spanish Netherlands, for instance (Briggs 2007, 164–65; J. Otten 2015, 25). Reducing their roles to those of passive victims does not aid our understanding of what happened but it nevertheless almost feels necessary. The image of the child witch—or teen wolf—is antithetical to powerful contemporary societal impulses to regard children as innocent and truthful (Bühler-Niederberger 2015). Making these unfortunates guiltless, however, would be to make them into Arnold’s golems, having them represent the world as we would wish it to be.

As we have seen, however, we cannot deny Jean Grenier a measure of agency nor should we overlook the dangers in which he placed his two alleged accomplices. Claudel Perrin, orphaned after his father’s execution as a witch, used threats of witchcraft to beg for food.³⁶ Heylken Brycken, whose mother had a reputation as a witch, sought to impress other children with her magical knowledge, spelling doom for them both (J. Otten 2015, 39–40). In these three cases at least, their actions are understandable. When studied carefully, we can—*pace* Arnold—recover the subaltern voices of the children involved in these trials.

There is another lesson here as well. Grenier’s words have passed through a number of lenses before reaching us, yet his mental world is more comprehensible than that of the elite contemporaries who judged him. Pierre de Lancre and Jean Filesac were highly aware of Jean Grenier’s malnourishment and ‘stupidity’. They were even able to empathize with the desperate situation in which the boy found himself. Yet, to them, this

provided only further proof that he was susceptible to demonic temptation and thus worthy of punishment. It is ironic that the thought processes of the Bordeaux judge who speaks to us directly are much more difficult to access, let alone empathize with, than those of Grenier, the self-confessed teen wolf who wanted a family of his own.

Notes

¹ On Lorraine, see Briggs (2007, 122–26). For the ‘Wolf-banner’ of Carinthia, see Schulte (2009,

- 57–58). On the Livonian werewolf, see Blécourt (2007b). For the Franche-Comté, see Oates (1993), Schulte (2009, 8–35).
- 2 BnF, MS Français 13346, fols. 280–320. The MS is available on the library's Gallica website. There are some minor errors in the transcriptions of names and places. Mandrou also updated French spelling in a rather inconsistent fashion.
 - 3 Mandrou (1979, 33) later changed his mind, identifying Filesac as 'un homme d'Eglise et de grande culture' [a highly cultured man of the Church].
 - 4 The observation in Moréri (1732, 3:632) that his writings are 'pleins de citations, et ne sont presque qu'un tissu de passages ... sans beaucoup d'ordre, ne de methode' [full of citations and almost nothing more than a tissue of quotations ... without much order or method] seems an apt description of the *avis* as well.
 - 5 Filesac interrupts his digressive account suddenly (Mandrou 1979, 104-105): 'Pour conclure cette prononciation, toutes ces raisons et plusieurs autres d'une part et d'autre ont esté examinées et posés, mais enfin la cour a eu égard à l'âge et imbecillité de cet enfant' [To conclude this pronouncement, all these reasons and several others for both sides were examined and discussed but finally the court had regard for the age and imbecility of this child]. For the *arrêt*, see Mandrou (1979, 109) and De Lancre (1612, 2[=3]11).
 - 6 De Lancre, *Tableau*, 254: 'Comme iestoy sur le point de rechercher curieusement et exactement ce que les bons livres disent de la Lycanthropie.' Daffis passed away in 1610 (Le Mao 2007, 365). To keep the number of endnotes to a manageable size only lengthier quotations are provided in full. With shorter translations, I have provided the original French in-line only when it seemed particularly relevant.
 - 7 De Lancre, *Tableau*, 255: 'tout si mal rangé & si faulsement, comme passé par une infinité de diverses mains, qu'a pene pouvoy ie reconnoistre l'ouvrier en son ouvrage.'
 - 8 De Lancre, *Tableau*, 256: 'tres-necessaire d'en coucher icy les principaux pointcs & les plus importants, qui esclairciront mesme ce qu'il en a dict, tirez mot à mot de la procedure, tout ainsi qu'elle est és registres de la Cour de Parlement de Bourdeaux, sans y rien adiouster ny diminuer.'
 - 9 Gaufretau, *Chronique bordelaise*, 2:45: 'la chair des enfants estoit grandement savoureuse.'
 - 10 Automne, *La Conférence*, sig. ē1^v: 'tria fere millia velut oracula.'
 - 11 The list of 'fonctionnaires et artisans' (officials and artisans) provided by Comte de Saint-Saud (1992, chap. 12, esp. pp 148, 153) suggests the name of the procureur d'office was Pierre Ardouin.
 - 12 Prieur, *Dialogue de la lycanthropie*, fol. 32r: 'qu'il n'y avoit pas encores demie heure que sur le seuil de sa porte luy avoit esté ravie du loup une petite fillette.'
 - 13 On the history of this region, which saw considerable conflict during the early years of the Wars of Religion, see Comte de Saint-Saud (1992). For population figures, the earliest of which date to 1709, see Florenty (1996, Dordogne:608).
 - 14 Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 105: 'si stupide et idiot que les enfans de sept à huit ans témoignent ordinairement plus de jugemens.'
 - 15 De Lancre, *Tableau*, 315: 'aucunement hebeté ... choses legeres qui consistent en sens commun.'
 - 16 De Lancre, *Tableau*, 257: 'Par ce (dict il) que ie me veux marier avec elle, si bien que si c'est vous ie me veux marier avec vous.'
 - 17 De Lancre, *Tableau*, 257, 258: 'les enfans et les filles estoient beaucoup plus plaisantes et delicates à manger.' Cf. Mandrou (1979, 43), Automne (1610, 994[=1002]).
 - 18 Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 50: 's'il eust pu la jeter par terre, il l'aurait bien mordue.'
 - 19 According to De Lancre (1612, 258), Grenier worked for two weeks as a herdsman before changing masters. This could have coincided with his two-week stay at La Reynerie. The date for the March assault is variously given as 'le premier vendredy de la lune de mars' [the first Friday of the moon of March] and 'le premier vendredy de la lune de Pasques' [the first Friday of the moon of Easter]. Assuming this refers to the full moon, this works out as the same date. I am grateful to Philipp Nothhaft for discussing this chronological puzzle with me.

- ²⁰ Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 53–54: 'le procès fut fait et parfait et qu'il ne restat qu'à donner la sentence.'
- ²¹ Automne, *La Conférence*, 1004: 'tout ce qu' il a dit est veritable, mesmes de Pierre del Tillaire et de son pere, et que sa belle mere a quitté son pere, parce qu' elle luy vit vomir des mains de petis enfans des des pieds de chien: qu'ils ont couru ensemble, mangerent une fille aux Grillaus, dont il ya deux, et depuis il ne la mené courir avec luy, comme aussi il a esté deux ans sans courir, et n'a couru que puis trois mois.' A road called the 'Chemin des Grillaux' is located 20 km to the west of Saint-Antoine-sur-l'Isle.
- ²² Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 58–59: 'il persiste en ce qui le concerne, bien qu'en plusieurs choses il soit trouvé variant mesme en ce qui regarde son père et Pierre du Tillaire.'
- ²³ Automne, *La Conférence*, 1007: 'ils ne cherchoyent des filles que pour eniouïer et non les manger, mais pour son regard ayant persisté d'avoir mangé des filles.' See also Mandrou (1979, 59), where Grenier declared that 'quelquefois qu'ils cherchaient des filles pour en abuser' [sometimes they looked for girls to abuse].
- ²⁴ Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 58: 'qu' ils couraient par les bois, brandes et chemins, cherchant des filles pour les embrasser, mais n'en trouvèrent, et que pour luy il en avait defloré trois.'
- ²⁵ Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 52: 'Jean fils est idiot, que pour une pomme il dire ce que l'on voudra, et pour témoignage de son imbecillité de cerveau, que tous ceux qui se voulaient donner du plaisir, luy faisaient confesser qu'il avait couché avec toutes les femmes qu'ils luy nommaient.'
- ²⁶ If we confine ourselves to the attacks Grenier confessed to carrying out alone, his victims consisted of two boys (the unnamed infant taken from its crib, the two-year old from Puy Arnaud) and four girls (an unnamed girl in a black dress, Marguerite Poirier, three-year old Guyonne, and an unnamed girl from La Ronce).
- ²⁷ Mandrou, ed., 'Jean Grenier', 43: 'sans qu'elle s'estait mise en défense et qu'il estait seul, il l'eut mangée et peignée mieux qu'avec un peigne de fer.'
- ²⁸ De Lancre, *Tableau*, 261: 'la deposition et tesmoignage d'un fils de treze ans est receu contre le pere.' Several of De Lancre's teenage witnesses were led to the sabbat by their parents (De Lancre 1612, 108, 143).
- ²⁹ Filesac's description of the case, as edited by Mandrou, takes up pages 42–60, Automne's pp. 1001–1008; leaving aside the confrontation with the father, the *Tableau* covers the same events until p. 51 and p. 1004 in these accounts respectively.
- ³⁰ Note, in particular, the opening 'discours' on 'l'inconstance des Demons' [on the inconstancy of demons] (De Lancre 1612, 1–25). One could also cite here De Lancre's earlier *Tableau de l'inconstance et instabilité de toutes choses* [Account of the inconstancy and instability of all things] (1607). The 1612 *Tableau* is styled as a follow-up to this earlier attempt at philosophy.
- ³¹ In Lorraine in 1624, a thirteen-year-old witness similarly described the sabbat as taking place 'dans une maison toute de fer ou tout brusloit, neanmoins ne sentoient aucune chaleur' [in a house made of steel where everything was on fire, but one nevertheless did not feel any heat] (Briggs 1993, 172).
- ³² De Lancre, *Tableau*, 259: 'Qu'il la print, la voulant tuer, ... qu' il se vouloit marier avec elle.'
- ³³ De Lancre, *Tableau*, 260: 'Mais il est remarquable qu'il dict que ce fut luy avant fait couler la robe en bas, car il ne la luy déchira pas: qui est une chose qu'on a observee, pour monstrier qu'encore que les vray loup déchirent avec les griffes, neantmoins les loups-garoux déchirent avec les dens, et comme hommes sçavant depouiller les robes aux filles qu'ils veulent manger, sans les déchirer.'
- ³⁴ De Lancre, *Tableau*, 315: 'qui monstre clairement qu'il a fait le mestier de loup-garou, et qu'il usoit de ses mains, et pour courir, et pour prendre les enfans et les chiens à la gorge.'
- ³⁵ De Lancre, *Tableau*, 307: 'un ieune garçon abandonné et chassé par son pere, qui a une marastre pour mere, vaguant par les champs, sans guide et sans personne du monde qui en ait du soing, mendiant son pain.' Cf. Mandrou (1979, 105).
- ³⁶ I am grateful to Robin Briggs for sharing his transcription of this case with me.

Acknowledgements

Early versions of this article were presented at ‘Bodies and Minds in the Early Modern Catholic Worlds’ (Warwick, 2017) and ‘Voice and Crime in Early Modern France’ (Trinity College, Cambridge, 2018). I would like to thank Elizabeth Tingle and Luc Racaut for the invitation to take part in a session on lycanthropy at the Warwick conference (without which this article would never have been written) and Tom Hamilton for inviting me to participate in the Cambridge workshop. I am also grateful to Willem de Blécourt, Robin Briggs, Tom Hamilton, Virginia Krause, Thibaut Maus de Rolley, and Caroline Oates, as well as the two anonymous reviewers, for their comments on drafts of this article. It has become a much richer study as a result. Special thanks are also due to the editors of *Folklore*, Antone Millard and Jessica Hemming, for their help and advice during the revision stage.

Archival Sources

BnF = Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, France.

References Cited

- Arnold, John H. 1998. ‘The Historian as Inquisitor: The Ethics of Interrogating Subaltern Voices’. *Rethinking History* 2 (3): 379–386. doi: 10.1080/13642529809408974.
- Automne, Bernard. 1610. *La Conférence du droit françois avec le droit romain*. Paris: Nicolas Buon.
- Baring-Gould, S. (Sabine). 1865. *The Book of Were-Wolves: Being an Account of a Terrible Superstition*. London: Smith, Elder.
- Behringer, Wolfgang, and Claudia Opitz, eds. 2016. *Hexenkinder, Kinderbanden, Straßenkinder*. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte.
- Blécourt, Willem de. 2007a. ‘“I Would Have Eaten You Too”: Werewolf Legends in the Flemish, Dutch and German Area’. *Folklore* 118 (1): 23–43. doi: 10.1080/00155870601097099.
- . 2007b. ‘A Journey to Hell: Reconsidering the Livonian “Werewolf”’. *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 2 (1): 49–67. doi: 10.1353/mrw.0.0002.
- . 2009. ‘The Werewolf, the Witch, and the Warlock: Aspects of Gender in the Early Modern Period’. In *Witchcraft and Masculinities in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Alison Rowlands, 191–213. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2015. ‘The Differentiated Werewolf: An Introduction to Cluster Methodology’. In *Werewolf Histories*, edited by Willem de Blécourt, 1–24. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Briggs, Robin. 1993. ‘Le Sabbat des sorciers en Lorraine’. In *Le Sabbat des sorciers en Europe: XVe-XVIIIe siècle*, edited by Nicole Jacques-Chaquin and Maxime Préaud, 155–81. Grenoble: J. Millon.
- . 2007. *The Witches of Lorraine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bühler-Niederberger, Doris. 2015. ‘Innocence and Childhood’. In *Oxford Bibliographies in Childhood Studies*, edited by Heather Montgomery. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/OBO/9780199791231-0161.
- Communay, Arnaud. 1890. *Le Conseiller Pierre de Lancre* [The councillor Pierre de Lancre]. Agen: Lamy.

- Comte de Saint-Saud. 1992 [orig. ed. 1938]. *Le Marquisat de La Roche-Chalais* [The marquisate of La Roche-Chalais]. Bayonne: Libro Liber.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. 1983. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1988. 'On the Lame'. *The American Historical Review* 93 (3): 572–603. doi: 10.2307/1868103.
- Lancre, Pierre de. 1607. *Tableau de l'inconstance et instabilité de toutes choses* [Account of the inconstancy and instability of all things]. Paris: Abel L'Angelier.
- . 1612. *Tableau de l'inconstance des mauvais anges et démons où il est amplement traité des sorciers et de la sorcellerie* [Account of the inconstancy of evil angels and demons in which witches and witchcraft are amply discussed]. Paris: Jean Berjon.
- Dillinger, Johannes. 2015. "Species", "Phantasia", "Raison": Werewolves and Shape-Shifters in Demonological Literature'. In *Werewolf Histories*, edited by Willem de Blécourt, 142–58. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferguson, Gary. 2016. *Same-Sex Marriage in Renaissance Rome: Sexuality, Identity, and Community in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Filesac, Jean. 1609. *De idolatria magica dissertatio* [Dissertation on magical idolatry]. Paris: Officina Nivelliana.
- . 1617. *Medicinae defensio adversus Plinium Maiorem* [Defence of medicine against Pliny the Elder]. Paris: Rolin Thierry.
- Finlay, Robert. 1988. 'The Refashioning of Martin Guerre'. *The American Historical Review* 93 (3): 553–71. doi: 10.2307/1868102.
- Florenty, Guy. 1996. *Paroisses et Communes de France: Dictionnaire d'histoire administrative et démographique* [Parishes and communes of France: Dictionary of administrative and demographical history]. Edited by Jean-Pierre Bardet and Claude Motte. Vol. Dordogne. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Gaufretau, Jean de. 1877–78. *Chronique bordelaise* [Bordeaux chronicle]. Edited by Jules Delpit. 2 vols. Bordeaux: Charles Lefebvre.
- Houdard, Sophie. 1992. *Les Sciences du diable: Quatre Discours sur la sorcellerie, XVe-XVIIe siècle* [The sciences of the devil: Four discourses on witchcraft, fifteenth to seventeenth centuries]. Paris: Cerf.
- Houllemare, Marie. 2011. *Politiques de la parole: Le Parlement de Paris au XVIe siècle* [Politics of the word: The parlement of Paris during the sixteenth century]. Geneva: Droz.
- Jacques-Lefèvre, Nicole. 2002. "Such an Impure, Cruel and Savage Beast...": Images of the Werewolf in Demonological Works'. In *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief & Folklore in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Kathryn A. Edwards. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press.
- Konstantinos. 2010. *Werewolves: The Occult Truth*. Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn Publications.
- Krause, Virginia. 2015. *Witchcraft, Demonology, and Confession in Early Modern France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Le Mao, Caroline. 2007. *Parlement et parlementaires: Bordeaux au grand siècle* [Parlement and parliamentarians: Bordeaux during the seventeenth century]. Seyssel: Champ Vallon.
- Machielsen, Jan. 2015. *Martin Delrio: Demonology and Scholarship in the Counter-Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Mandrou, Robert, ed. 1979. 'Jean Grenier, prétendu lycanthrope (Bordeaux, 1603)' [Jean Grenier, a supposed werewolf (Bordeaux, 1603)]. In *Possession et sorcellerie au XVIIe siècle: Textes inédits*, 33–110. Paris: Fayard.
- . 1980 [first ed. 1968]. *Magistrats et sorciers en France au XVIIe siècle: Une Analyse de psychologie historique* [Magistrates and witches in France during the seventeenth century: A historical-psychological analysis]. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Maus de Rolley, Thibaut. forthcoming. "'Moi, Louis Gaufridy, ayant soufflé plus de mille femmes": Un Examen de la confession de Louis Gaufridy (1611)' [‘I, Louis Gaufridy, having breathed over more than a thousand women’: An examination of the confession of Louis Gaufridy (1611)].
- McGowan, Margaret. 1977. 'Pierre de Lancre's Tableau de l'Inconstance Des Mauvais Anges et Demons: The Sabbat Sensationalized'. In *The Damned Art: Essays in the Literature of Witchcraft*, edited by Sydney Anglo, 182–201. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Moréri, Louis. 1732. *Le grand dictionnaire historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane* [The grand historical dictionary or the curious mix of sacred and profane history]. Vol. 3. Paris: Pierre-Augustin Le Mercier.
- Oates, Caroline. 1988. 'The Trial of a Teenage Werewolf, Bordeaux, 1603'. *Criminal Justice History: An International Annual* 9: 1–29.
- . 'Trials of Werewolves in the Franche-Comté in the Early Modern Period'. PhD Dissertation, London, 1993.
- Otten, Charlotte F., ed. 1986. *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Otten, Johan. 2015. *Duivelskwartier: 1595; heksen, heren en de dood in het vuur* [Devil's quarter: 1595; witches, lords and death by fire]. Nijmegen: Vantilt.
- Pearl, Jonathan L. 1999. *The Crime of Crimes: Demonology and Politics in France, 1560-1620*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Prieur, Claude. 1596. *Dialogue de la lycanthropie ou transformation d'hommes en loups, vulgairement dits Loups-garous* [Dialogue on lycanthropy or the transformation of men into wolves, commonly called werewolves]. Leuven: Jehan Maes.
- Roper, Lyndal. 1994. *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Sexuality and Religion in Early Modern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- . 2000. "'Evil Imaginings and Fantasies": Child-Witches and the End of the Witch Craze'. *Past & Present*, no. 167: 107–39. doi: 10.1093/past/167.1.107.
- Sauter, Marianne. 2010. *Hexenprozess und Folter: Die strafrechtliche Spruchpraxis der Juristenfakultät Tübingen im 17. und beginnenden 18. Jahrhundert* [Witchcraft-trials and torture: The criminal jurisprudence of the law faculty of Tübingen during the seventeenth and early eighteenth century]. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte.
- Schulte, Rolf. 2009. *Man as Witch: Male Witches in Central Europe*. Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 'Men as Accused Witches in the Holy Roman Empire'. In *Witchcraft and Masculinities in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Alison Rowlands, 52–73. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Soman, Alfred. 1978. 'The Parlement of Paris and the Great Witch Hunt (1565-1640)'. *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (2): 31–44. doi: 10.2307/2539661.
- Steiger, Brad. 2011. *The Werewolf Book: The Encyclopedia of Shape-Shifting Beings*. Canton, MI: Visible Ink Press.

- Walker, Anita M., and Edmund H. Dickerman. 1996. 'Magdeleine Des Aymards: Demonism or Child Abuse in Early Modern France?' *The Psychohistory Review* 24 (3): 239–64.
- Zagolla, Robert. 2007. *Folter und Hexenprozess: die strafrechtliche Spruchpraxis der Juristenfakultät Rostock im 17. Jahrhundert* [Torture and witchcraft-trials: The jurisprudence of the law faculty of Rostock during the seventeenth century]. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte.

Biographical Note

Jan Machielsen is Lecturer in Early Modern History at Cardiff University. He is currently working on a monograph study of the witch-hunt of the Pays de Labourd (1600–1620). He is the author of Martin Delrio: Demonology and Scholarship in the Counter-Reformation (2015).