

Galis (who believed that he had been bewitched because no one wanted to be friends with him any more) may have been a much more obvious – and easier – target for Scot than the earl (targeted *via* the son of a long-deceased possible servant). As indicated by phrases such as ‘it is fair to conclude that’, ‘it seems highly probable that’ and (especially frequent) ‘there is little doubt that’, many of the connections proposed can only be highly suggestive, rather than definitive. (Given that witchcraft is the subject matter, it can hardly be otherwise.)

Perhaps a more substantial criticism of Elmer’s thesis is its very loose definition of politics, extended to encompass all of religion, science and medicine, as well as neighbourly interactions. Elmer effectively makes everything subservient to high politics by making everything political. Joseph Glanvill’s *Saducismus triumphatus* may well have been part of a ‘moderate’ Anglican project to use witchcraft to reach out to Dissenters, but it was certainly also an attempt to set witchcraft on a new empirical footing, compatible with the new science. Only the historian’s adoption of a political prism makes the former inevitably more important than the latter.

These criticisms do not obviate the fact that Elmer’s analysis is in many cases illuminating. His insightful comments doubtless contain much truth. We learn a great deal when thinking with Elmer, but we also learn to stick with ‘many reasons why’. Reading *Witchcraft, witch-hunting, and politics* is a fascinating roller-coaster ride that throws you around and makes you see the history of witchcraft in new ways, if not quite upside-down. It is an experience that is highly recommended for everyone with even the remotest interest in early modern witchcraft.

CARDIFF UNIVERSITY

JAN MACHIELSEN

The literature of the Arminian controversy. Religion, politics, and the stage in the Dutch Republic. By Freya Sierhuis. Pp. xi + 294 incl. 14 ills. New York–Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. £60. 978 0 19 874973 8
JEH (68) 2017; doi:10.1017/S0022046917000550

Freya Sierhuis analyses the interactive dynamic between politics and literature in the Dutch Republic. Sierhuis is a lecturer in the department of English literature at the University of York, but the book originated in her PhD research at the European University Institute in Florence. It is based on painstaking and detailed research and yet is bold in its claim: the political culture of the Dutch Republic was marked by controversy. She thus takes issue with the dominant paradigm in Dutch historiography which emphasises consensus. The focus of the book is on the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609–21) between the Dutch Republic and Spain. Between 1610 and 1618 a conflict developed that started off as a theological dispute on predestination, but morphed into a constitutional conflict and almost ended in civil war until the leader of the Arminian Party, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, was executed and the Synod of Dordt restored Calvinist orthodoxy. The political ramifications have been well researched, but Sierhuis focuses on the religious dimension. The thrust of her argument is that theology did matter, and that it generated a vast literature that reflected upon the nature of religious as well as political issues. Indeed, literature itself shaped and reshaped the political landscape of the Dutch Republic. In six

more or less chronological chapters Sierhuis shows how this was the case. Her claim that literature, politics and theology are intimately intertwined and are continually being reshaped through mutual interaction is stimulating and appropriate. Some minor comments are in place. The text is sometimes rather dense and contains typos. Also, Sierhuis's attempt to integrate political, religious and literary history is laudable, but to suggest that the 'religious controversy alone' (p. 1) brought the country to the brink of war is not warranted and overstates the case – exciting though the claim must sound to scholars working on ecclesiastical history. This does not alter the fact that this is a very good book that offers stimulus to any scholar interested in literature, theology or politics, whether in the early modern or modern age.

UNIVERSITEIT UTRECHT

DAVID ONNEKINK

British royal and state funerals. Music and ceremonial since Elizabeth I. By Matthias Range. Pp. xvi+408 incl. 18 ills, 5 music examples and 2 tables. Woodbridge–Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2016. £50. 978 78327 092 7
JEH (68) 2017; doi:10.1017/S0022046917000422

In this companion to his *Music and ceremonial at British coronations: from James I to Elizabeth II* (Cambridge 2012), Matthias Range has again presented deeply researched and painstaking studies of music and musical performances at a major religious ritual of the British monarchy during its long Anglican history. He now interestingly extends his coverage to the very similar ritual, in the same places of worship, that was accorded to other leading public figures. Here the duke of Albemarle, the duke of Marlborough, Pitt the Elder, Nelson, Wellington, Churchill, Mountbatten and Thatcher take their places alongside sovereigns and other prominent members of the royal family, notably Queen Caroline, Princess Charlotte-Augusta and Diana, Princess of Wales. The result is another authoritative contribution to musical history, deploying many archival discoveries, notably from the records of the College of Arms, to establish as never before the musical details and the ceremonial contexts of these great funeral and memorial services. A wider readership will find careful definitions of the distinctions between royal, state and ceremonial funerals, between 'public' and 'private' (though actually still public) funerals, and between funerals strictly understood and the twentieth-century practice of 'pre-internment memorial' (with burial elsewhere). There are also accounts of changing styles: night-time funerals, lyings-in-state, places of royal burial and the remarkable eighteenth-century 'concert' funerals, with performances of music by Handel. In its central features, the ritual was deeply conservative (even more so than coronations), not least because it was determined by the Book of Common Prayer. As Range's remit does not include public reactions nor memorial services in other places of worship and among other religious communities, which for the period since 1800 are included in John Wolffe's *Great deaths* (Oxford 2000), his section on 'some wider issues' is necessarily rather circumscribed. It nevertheless contains interesting observations on the effectiveness of silences and on how these occasions were usually more funerals of a 'public *persona*' than of a corpse. This will be particularly useful as a reference work, providing musical