of later events. Parker also questions editorial practices surrounding a key character in *Othello*: Brabantio, called in some editions "Brabanzio." The name, Parker demonstrates, is a signal of the play's preoccupations with Brabant, erased in the alternate spelling, and the attendant issues of religious affiliations, warfare in the Low Countries, ideologies of cash and credit, and immigration patterns, to name only a few of the many contexts identified in this chapter. The inclusivity of Parker's analysis is valuable here, though it is a somewhat sprawling chapter that is at times overabundant and repetitive in its references to both the text and contextual material. This trait is indicative of the challenges inherent in a methodology that seeks to illustrate the depth and breadth of resonance in Shakespeare's language (and at times characteristic of other chapters as well); some larger issues, such as the theoretical connection to queer theory attested to in the introduction, are subordinated here. Parker's final chapter, by contrast, provides a pointed analysis of a romance, *Cymbeline*, and how its "intimations" (273), rather than explicit invocation, of the mythical figure of Ganymede may be seen as a critique of James's court and his favoring of young courtiers who served as stewards of his bedchamber, returning to the book's ongoing theoretical concerns.

Though at times the analyses of the plays offered in *Shakespearean Intersections* privilege referential inclusivity over streamlined argumentation, Parker's innovative readings of Shakespeare's texts provide a vital demonstration of the viability of close reading and attention to linguistic detail in the larger critical projects of gender studies, historicism, queer studies, and race studies. Parker effectively conjoins meticulous textual analysis with larger historical claims that deepen conceptualizations of how Shakespeare's works responded to and shaped their contemporary culture. By addressing critical and editorial lacunae with such rigorous attention to both formal and historical matters, Parker models a methodological approach that enables dynamic intersections for the practice of Shakespeare criticism. Future studies will benefit from a similarly deep engagement with the complexities of the Shakespearean lexicon and its intimate relationship with early modern culture.

Kimberly Huth
California State University, Dominguez Hills
khuth@csudh.edu

W. B. Patterson. *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. 368. $85.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.136

Even the most celebrated early modern historians are now more frequently read in excerpt than perused at length, and those who came later are especially prone to neglect. Less familiar today than William Camden or Raphael Holinshed, Thomas Fuller is most often remembered as the author of "Fuller's Worthies" (*History of the Worthies of England*, 1662), which was both England's first biographical dictionary and a county-by-county study of notable local features. As recently as the nineteenth century, however, *History of the Holy Warre* (1639) and *Church-History of Britain* (1655) were read with admiration and enthusiasm, and not just for their historical content. Coleridge ranked Fuller second only to Shakespeare in exciting "the sense and emotion of the marvelous," and his friend Robert Southey listed Fuller's *Church-History* among the twelve books he could not live without—a library that included works by Chaucer, Spenser, and Milton in addition to Shakespeare (337–38). It is the project of W. B. Patterson's new book to recapture some of this esteem.

In part a biography of Fuller, Patterson's work does an admirable job filling in the details of Fuller's life and the way it reflected or responded to the momentous years he lived

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through. An exact contemporary of Milton, Fuller took a different path than the poet, staying on at Cambridge for his master's degree and ordination and voicing dissent from the Laudian church in mostly muted ways. A moderate when moderation was out of fashion, Fuller saw himself as neither a puritan nor a high royalist, but as belonging to what he presented, in *Church-History*, as the large middle group of Calvinist supporters of episcopacy (254). This meant, of course, that Fuller lost his living during the civil wars, but he had enough friends and supporters—and enough of a reputation as a godly and talented preacher—that he continued his work as a minister through the Interregnum. It was also in these years that Fuller turned most seriously to his writing, and particularly the work that Patterson sees as his masterpiece, the *Church-History*, which traces the British church from its origins to the moment that might well have been its extinction, the execution of King Charles.

As a biography, it is difficult to imagine Patterson's work being superseded any time soon. For most readers, however, the chief interest of the book will be Fuller's considerable and varied literary output. In one sense, Patterson's treatment of these works is extremely thorough. In addition to two and a half chapters on *Church-History*, there are separate chapters on *The Holy Warre* (the first English account of the Crusades), *The Holy State* (1642) (a collection of essays and character sketches), and the *Worthies*; Patterson also discusses Fuller's three collections of meditations and a number of published sermons or works of religious controversy. Each work is set firmly within its historical and biographical context and summarized, usually at length. This is an excellent resource for anyone hoping to get up to speed on a particular work or on Fuller's corpus as a whole.

As an analysis or interpretation of Fuller's works, the book is more intermittent in its successes. Patterson's short introduction gives a sense of the issues at stake in memorializing England's past, while chapter 5 effectively situates Fuller within early modern historiographic trends, tracing the influence of classical history, humanism, and the demands of religious controversy on both the rise of historical writing and the forms that it took in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But in Patterson's lengthy treatments of individual works the reader can easily lose the forest for the trees. Although Patterson amply credits the previous historians upon whom Fuller depends, there is rarely much discussion of how his analysis differs from theirs; moreover, his detailed summaries of Fuller's works often give the mistaken impression that there is something unique in, for example, his mild skepticism about the legend of Joseph of Arimathea or his lack of deference toward Thomas à Becket (162, 197). Patterson's remarks about Fuller's successes and failures as historian can also seem a mismatch for his likely audience: the fact that his works downplay popular support for the Crusades or get things wrong about early Celtic religion will surely not materially affect the value of his works for twenty-first-century readers, who are not coming to them for the same reasons they read the latest historiography (59–60, 219). The importance of the *Church-History* is less what Fuller gets right or wrong about the distant past than how it reflects the concerns of his contemporary moment. The story of the early British church had been told many times in the century before Fuller. But as he and his audience grappled with the seeming loss—or at least the transformation—of the church of their parents and grandparents, what Fuller chooses to borrow or alter from Matthew Parker or Holinshed can tell us something important.

Fuller's other enduring strength is the power and peculiarity of his voice. In his introduction, Patterson says that Fuller "wrote in an unpretentious, pungent, and frequently amusing way that made his work accessible and appealing to the general reader" (8), and this is an understatement. Fuller's voice stands out in every one of his works and is sometimes (as in an otherwise unremarkable tract on pedo-baptism) their chief delight. Patterson quotes Fuller, if not as often as this reader would have liked—but as with all early modern prose, it is hard to truly get the flavor from a short excerpt. To share Coleridge and Southey's esteem for

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.136 Published online by Cambridge University Press