

by inviting audiences to reimagine their assumptions about other's beliefs through the lens of drama. Once more, Gurnis challenges monolithic conceptions as she carefully articulates how Shakespeare's play provides multiple perspectives on predestinarian positions. Her movement through literal, metaphorical, and anagogical levels of the play's interrogations serves as a model for articulating affective piety in early modern scholarship.

Mixed Faith and Shared Feeling deftly challenges oversimplified confessional assumptions about people of the period by demonstrating through a wide array of lenses and perspectives the nuances of post-Reformation political, social, and religious practices. Through meticulous, sophisticated study, the author details how the power of theater shapes and is shaped by audiences of the time to reveal "a way of moving around, inside and out of, between, or aslant of rigid confessional binaries" (154). This volume requires careful reading for students and scholars of drama. It is a remarkable resource for our time.

Arran Johnston. *Essential Agony. The Battle of Dunbar 1650*. Warwick, England. Helion and Company, 2019. xxx + 220 pp. + 59 illus. + 12 maps. \$37.95. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, MONTGOMERY COLLEGE.

Johnston presents a masterful analysis of how the terrain dictated and impacted the armies' maneuvers and positions in a campaign that decided the fate of Great Britain and Ireland for a decade. Although based only on printed primary sources (and secondary ones) this work adds to our understating of what the author rightly calls a battle whose "outcome changed the course of British history" (198). The battle is hardly understudied, being analyzed in numerous accounts since W.S. Douglas' *Cromwell Scotch Campaigns* (1898). Johnston manages to contribute to the subject in a work of eight chapters, plus an epilogue, and appendices.

While the English events of the period from December 1648 through June 1650 are readily accessible, the Scottish developments are less well known. In first two chapters Johnston remedies that lacuna. He sets the scene of growing political divisions in Scotland, and the

policies of the ruling kirk party. Although like most he ignores discussing the other possibilities the kirk party could have selected after the execution of Charles I—declaring a republic or selecting Elizabeth of Bohemia or one of her sons as monarch. He rightly stresses the kirk party's pacific inclinations toward the English Commonwealth in the months after Charles' death. While it had declared the Prince of Wales and Duke of Rothesay heir to his father's thrones on 5 February 1649, its levying of military forces over the next seventeen months was enough only to quell Scots Royalists. Only on 3 July 1650 did the Scottish estates declare a national levy. Just nineteen days later Oliver Cromwell invaded with an English Commonwealth army, giving the kirk party an incredibly brief period in which to levy and train its forces.

The five chapters on the 1650 summer campaign and the battle of Dunbar dominates the book. Johnston is equitable in his account, although the English perspective seems to pre-dominate. Missing from his sources are James Balfour's *Historical Works*, as well as J. Lamont of Newton's and John Nicoll's diaries, which would have enhanced the Scots' viewpoints. By relying on fortifications and interior lines Lieutenant General David Leslie was able to outmatch Cromwell for over a month. The success, dealt with in chapters 4 and 5, before 3 September of Leslie's campaign against Cromwell is graphically recounted. Perhaps more attention could have been made to the rationale of the kirk party members in favor of the purging their army of politically and morally questionable personnel? In addition to scriptural references (such as Gideon's Israelite army), they could reference the recent victories at Balvenie (1649) and Carbisdale (1650) when godly forces handily defeated larger opponents. Or a deeper examination of Leslie's force structure would have revealed that the offensive actions of his cavalry units arose from their greater cohesion. Fourteen of his seventeen cavalry regiments had at least partly existed before the English invasion. While for the infantry regiments nine of the twenty-one units were only raised after 3 July. Further analysis of the opposing cavalry regiments would have been beneficial. Johnston properly gives the English units (71) a superior rating to the covenanters'. That was based not on the quantity of the horsemen's armor, which was similar, but on the quality of English horses. Since 1639 the covenanters had

contrived to compensate for that disadvantage by arming at least part of a cavalry regiment with lances, which had otherwise disappeared from western Europe. The author rightly describes Cromwell's army on 2 September as one in desperate straits, although supply problems undermined the capabilities of both armies.

Leslie's plans for 3 September 1650 still seem unclear to the reviewer. If Johnston is correct about the siting and elements of Major General Sir James Lumsden's infantry brigade on the right flank of the army, which would lead an assault on the 3rd, then Lumsden must have been severely dismayed. Six years earlier at Marston Moor he had watched one of his trained brigades rout at first contact; facing the prospect of launching the decisive infantry attack with a largely raw brigade would have sent him to the bottle or a night of agony. In any case the author rightly stresses covenanter failures in leadership and discipline in laying the foundations for their defeat on 3 September. In such close physical proximity to an enemy army just a few hundred yards away establishing a well-manned picket line regularly inspected by captains, if not senior regimental officers would have been at least prudent both for defensive security and obscuring the covenanters' plans. When that army was led by such an aggressive military commander as Cromwell the failure to create such a warning system verged on and was indeed catastrophic. Johnston's attention to detail on how the landscape effected plans, lines of sight, and potential movements is superb. Equally, his analysis and use of Fitz-Payne Fisher's contemporary illustration of the battle is impressive. Particularly, the recognition that image presents not a single moment in the battle, but a compendium of critical episodes allows greater appreciation of a work familiar to historians since 1900 when C.H. Firth used it for his article on the battle. Johnston's account of the battle (144–62) provides enough detail for even a military history neophyte to understand the challenges and responses encountered on 3 September 1650. While some may be unmoved by such a meticulous approach the consequences of Cromwell's victory deserve that degree of intense discourse.

The concluding sections—chapter 8 and the epilogue—continue the story of the Anglo-Scottish war to its denouement at Worcester on 3 September 1650. While one may argue that these pages allows

the reader to appreciate the end of the story, the material is too compressed. The scale of the mortality disaster (treated 165–9) experienced by the soldiers captured at Dunbar seems underplayed. Their death rate surpassed that of Soviet prisoner of war held by the Nazis. The description of the battle of Inverkeithing on 20 July 1651, as usual, omits the slaughter of the Presbyterian Highlanders of Buchanan's Foot, while the Episcopalian Highlanders of Clan Maclean who were also destroyed alone receive recognition. While the author rightly refers to the "unaccustomed brutality" the English storming of Dundee in September 1651 (195), there is no mention of the following two weeks of pillage and atrocity perpetrated by the Commonwealth soldiers in that burgh. The limited space also prevents deeper investigations into Worcester, such as did David Leslie experience acute stress disorder, preventing him from adding his thousands of cavalrymen to the desperate fight?

The publisher generously allowed for supporting materials. In addition to contemporary images the author's photographs inform the text. A useful collection of detailed maps enables the reader to follow the author without recourse to an atlas or other books. Prime among them are four maps for the battle of Dunbar. Modern renderings of the soldiers' clothing and equipment along with their flags add to the text. Oddly one finds the occasional grammatical error, which sadly detracts from an otherwise superior product. The only factual error spotted were references to Major General John Middleton as the earl of Middleton in 1648 (37, 177)—by the author's own statement (196) that elevation to the peerage only occurred in 1656. That flaw exceptionally stands out in an otherwise impressive publication. Although the statement that Charles I "was benign by instinct" (31), leads one to wonder how that could be squared with his desire to prosecute the 2nd Lord Balmerino to the verge of death for knowing about a petition, or the catalogue of grievances he amassed across religious and social groups in the Scottish political nation between 1625 and 1637. Fortunately, the notes appear at the foot of the page. Equally, useful there is a bibliography. In terms of Scottish sources, the omission of manuscript ones does not detract from the quality of the research, since few of them directly relate to the subject. The book is further enhanced by appendices, reprinting relevant primary sources, as well

as useful orders of battle for the two armies.

Both historians and students will find the book valuable. Johnston's attention to how geography impacted the campaign will provide insights to the former. The latter will benefit from a well-written, sometimes dramatically engaging work that will carry them through the often-neglected military operations of the 1648–51 period in Great Britain. While Helion may aim its publications at wargamers and historical re-enactors, this volume at least appeals to a larger audience. Regardless of the issues raised in the review the book still stands as one worthy of reading and will tempt the reader to arrange a battlefield tour with the author, who is the manager of the Scottish Battlefields Trust.

John Henderson, *Florence under Siege: Surviving Plague in an Early Modern City*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019. xviii + 363 pp. + 38 Illus, 4 maps, 9 figures, 4 tables, \$45.00. Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

This is a thorough and very detailed discussion of the plague epidemic in Florence Italy in 1630–33. The plague had spread into Lombardy by troops of the Thirty Years War in 1629. The city of Venice lost 33 per cent of its population of 140,000 and Milan 46 per cent of 130,000. In Venice the huge church of Santa Maria della Salute was built in thanksgiving for the plague's passing. In Milan this plague features in Alessandro Manzoni's great nineteenth century novel *I Promessi Sposi*. In Florence the victims were fewer, about 9,000, 12 per cent of the population of 75,000. There are several accounts of the plague in Florence: contemporary accounts, including Francesco Rondinelli's *Relazione del contagio stato in Firenze l'anno 1630 e 1633* (1634), and more recently studies by Carlo Cipolla (1973–76) Giulia Calvi (1984), earlier articles by Henderson (1988–2001) and briefly in a section of the present reviewer's book *Florence Ducal Capital, 1530–1630* (2008). Henderson utilizes all of these earlier works besides archival sources such as the archive of the Sanità (the Florentine health office that corresponded throughout the state and was founded at the time of the plague of 1527), the confraternity of the Misericordia (which