

Fuller, we need to read his works as they did: as works of literature as well as history. If we do, Patterson's book will be an essential companion in the process.

Brooke Conti
 Cleveland State University
b.conti@csuohio.edu

MATTHIAS RANGE. *British Royal and State Funerals: Music and Ceremonial since Elizabeth I*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016. Pp. 408. \$90.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.137

This book complements the work of previous scholars of royal and state funerals by focusing on the hitherto relatively neglected theme of the music and liturgy used on these occasions. It exhibits an impressive depth of research over a wide-ranging period extending from the early seventeenth to the early twenty-first century. Matthias Range's perspective from the history of music leads him to suggest some significant modifications to previous accounts of such events. For example, the elaborate anthems composed by Handel and Boyce respectively for the funerals of Queen Caroline (1737) and George II (1760) revise previous perceptions of the eighteenth century as a period of relatively perfunctory funeral ceremonial. Range also shows how Queen Victoria's musical tastes, notably her dislike of Handel, had a significant impact on the content of royal funerals in the later nineteenth century (257).

The book betrays, however, a propensity to careless, if minor, factual errors: for example, King George V of Hanover did not succeed his father, Ernest Augustus, until 1851 (256); George III died in 1820, not 1827 (321). More seriously, Range's judgments often lack an awareness of wider historical context, and, in particular, his preoccupation with music limits his appreciation of other aspects of funeral commemorations. For example, his statement that Queen Victoria's funeral did not take place in London (268) is technically correct insofar as the actual funeral service was indeed at St. George's Chapel Windsor. A rounded appreciation of Victoria's funeral and its public impact does, however, require one also to take into account the semipublic lying-in-state at Osborne House on the Isle of Wight, the impressive naval review as the coffin crossed the Solent, and the military procession through the capital between Victoria and Paddington stations in front of enormous crowds. This last was an especially significant and intentional innovation at a royal funeral, bearing in mind that it would have been entirely possible to have used the railway network to bring the coffin directly from Portsmouth to Windsor without crossing London. Range deals with all these developments in a single sentence (269). While his focus on the music and liturgy of the Windsor and Frogmore services themselves are a valuable complement to existing accounts of Victoria's funeral, his treatment, when read in isolation, gives a distorted impression of the event as a whole.

There is a similar difficulty with Range's suggestion (265) that the choice of German music in the later nineteenth century "clearly contradicts" my own conclusion (*Great Deaths: Grieving, Religion and Nationhood in Victorian and Edwardian Britain* [2000], 214) that royal funerals in this period assumed a more national character. It is, however, unlikely that before the First World War the choice of German music would have been perceived as unpatriotic. Moreover, my argument on this point rests not on the content of the services themselves but on developments such as the use of the Union Flag (rather than a heraldic pall) to cover the coffin and the increasing prominence of the military in funeral processions. Range's focus on the actual funerals at St. Paul's, Westminster, and Windsor also causes him to give limited attention to the simultaneous memorial services held across the country, which in

years before radio and television were the principal means by which people could feel a sense of participation in events physically remote from them. Hence, he misunderstands (265) my summary of the proceedings at such parallel events (*Great Deaths*, 57) as relating to the actual funeral services themselves.

These examples suggest a wider caution that Range's interpretations, especially when he modifies the conclusions of other scholars, often need to be checked against his references. Nevertheless, despite such limitations, his research on the musical aspects of the central London and Windsor services means that his work is a valuable addition to the literature. The comprehensive and somewhat mechanical nature of his treatment renders the book rather tedious as narrative and analysis but very useful as a work of reference. Those seeking a rounded contextualized understanding of its subject will, however, need to read it alongside the work of other scholars, including Olivia Bland's *The Royal Way of the Death* (1986), which Range complements rather than supersedes; Jennifer Woodward's *The Theatre of Death* (1997) for the early part of the period; the studies of Paul Fritz and Esther Schor for the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; and David Cannadine and John Wolfe for the Victorian era and the twentieth century.

John Wolfe
The Open University
john.wolffe@open.ac.uk

JACQUELINE ROSE, ed. *The Politics of Counsel in England and Scotland, 1286–1707*. Proceedings of the British Academy 204. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 303. \$110 (cloth). doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.138

While all late medieval and early modern English and Scottish kings promoted the sacred, even absolutist, nature of their monarchical power, they also used the discourse of counsel to legitimate their authority, inform their decisions and manage discordance. The influence of the counselor was the chink, the gap through which others could seek to shape policy. Thus, the counselor's role implicitly acknowledged the negotiated nature of even so-called absolute monarchy. In *The Politics of Counsel in England and Scotland*, the various authors' clear explanations of the theories of seeking, giving, and occasionally heeding counsel, and the more institutionalized counsel offered through formal councils demonstrates that using and following counsel was all part and parcel of being an early modern monarch.

Individually, each of the jewel-like chapters unpicks, elucidates, and clarifies the rationale, discourse, functions, implications, processes and effects of seeking and taking counsel, and the dangers in failing to be seen to take counsel. Not including those who considered themselves by right part of the consultative process in decision-making, Alan MacDonald argues, led to Charles I's undoing, though this was the culmination of a decline in communication that had already begun in James VI and I's reign after 1603. The "perils of offering unwelcome counsel" are noted too, in this case Richard Rex on Thomas More and Henry VIII (145). Jacqueline Rose draws the distinction between consultation and counsel, and Susan Doran usefully separates two distinct activities, in firstly seeking counsel, and sourcing information on which to make a decision, and secondly in heeding and acting upon counsel. Elizabeth I did the first but not necessarily the second, especially where the royal prerogative was involved (156–57). Some of the authors chart the rise of institutionalized counsel in privy councils, councils of estates, and parliaments.

Above all, Rose's lengthy, measured and comprehensive introduction should be required reading for anyone looking at monarchical power in England and Scotland. She brings out