

glish poem “At A Vacation Exercise,” belongs. The Renaissance version of freshman hazing (a term that is American and late nineteenth-century), a salting is never an assaulting, as hazing was—sometimes a fatal one—in the nineteenth century, and on occasion even today. No, the underclassmen at Cambridge were required to do no more than display the salt of wit in their Latin performances before the upperclassmen. Wit being absent, salt would be supplied by way of noxious additive to the beer already being consumed in no small dosage.

These are difficult texts and one can only applaud the annotating vigor with which Professor Hale carries water for the team. One example: Milton “calls the freshmen ‘Saltaturientes,’ ‘those who desire to leap up [to higher status].’ He lets fly with this imposing new Latin word to glance simultaneously at increase of status, at possible hubris (‘jumped-up’), at the ‘dancing’ or antics by which they acquire tribal seniority; and then, down at the bottom of the pile of puns, ‘sal-’ (and ‘salt-’ for the monolinguals present) give to the central salting idea a sudden and surprising new embodiment” (219).

Hale’s expertly established, indispensably annotated, accessibly Englished text of Milton’s collegiate salting marks the highlight of the tour and will be an essential guide for scholars. Masson long ago found the Sixth Prolusion “nauseous and obscene”; today bits of it actually sound like excerpts from Joyce’s *Ulysses*. A judicious guide, Hale knows when not to bother explaining the jokes, as when Milton urges, “fellow-students of mine” (“Academici”), “Let the soft breeze of your goodwill erect me [*erigat me*], faint as I am, for I know it can; let it warm me back to life” (250-51). Neo-Latin can be fun too.

David Farr. *Henry Ireton and the English Revolution*. Rochester, New York: Boydell Press, 2006. ix+277 pp. \$90.00. Reviewed by ROBERT MCJIMSEY, COLORADO COLLEGE.

This work is not a biography of Henry Ireton. Rather, its author’s aim is to relate Ireton to the various events of the English Civil Wars that shaped both his own position and that of the New Model Army concerning the goals of the rebellion. To accomplish this task the author gives the reader a background on Ireton’s family, their puritan views and Ireton’s education at Oxford and the Middle Temple. These three elements, he claims, provided

the formative influences upon Ireton, in particular his strong and enduring religious convictions. Thereafter the author provides successive chapters, detailing Ireton's and the army's movement toward the necessity of a settlement based upon regicide. The author's general argument is that Ireton's position moved in step with this movement and that his writings gave the army's case an influential voice. His final year as Lord Deputy of Ireland (1651), ending in his death, left open any assessment of his leadership of the revolutionary movement.

Although he favored a moderate settlement between Charles I and Parliament, Ireton was able to maintain reasonably good working relations with some of the more radical members of the army. These included Thomas Harrison, John Lambert, John Wildman and, if briefly, Thomas Rainsborough and John Lilburne. Here his success owed something to the influence of his father-in-law, Oliver Cromwell, and to the fact that one of his brothers embraced millenarian views. In 1647 he emerged as a spokesman for the army's grievances against Parliament, his efforts culminating in *The Heads of the Proposals*, itself a moderate attempt by the army's leadership to reform both the monarchy and Parliament. This document led to open opposition within the army against Ireton and Cromwell. Wildman, Rainsborough and Lilburne charged Ireton with Machiavellianism and demanded a more radical settlement based on ideas of popular sovereignty. From this point onwards Ireton and Cromwell were enmeshed in efforts to reconcile differences within the army—the Putney Debates—and confront the dawning realization that Charles I could no longer be trusted. This conclusion led Ireton to accept that the road to regicide entailed the purging of Parliament of its moderate members.

Throughout this confrontation with events, religious convictions guided Ireton's thinking. On this subject, however, the author's footing is less assured. He establishes, at the outset, Ireton's "puritan" background, without giving much indication as to the content of his beliefs. In subsequent chapters he brings up Ireton's religious views in particular circumstances, such as his appeal that the army pray to discern God's purpose in support of its cause (Putney), and his reliance on God's Providence as a support to his *Remonstrance*, demanding the abolition of the monarchy. The term Providence, however, is a slippery one. At times it means finding God's blessing in victory in battle. At other times it means using the Bible to find an appropriate sanction for actions

against the king. And it also means simply appealing to God for guidance. It is possible to bring these elements together with an overview of certain puritan beliefs. For example puritan Biblicism stressed use of the Old Testament as a guide to temporal affairs. Hence Ireton's use of the Book of Numbers to attack Charles I as a man of blood. In the same way Puritanism placed heavy emphasis on moral conduct, a way of making Providence depend upon deeds done with a righteous understanding. And the concept of natural law, found according to reason, was part of the puritan canon. This observation should encourage the author to rethink his identification of "the generall law of reason or Nations" with an appeal to Providence (149). In the end the reader is unsure whether Ireton's religious views, however sincerely held, were more than a justification for conclusions he had reached by other means.

This lack of a general perspective on particular topics and problems places unfortunate demands upon the reader. The author more or less stipulates the general narrative of Ireton's career and then concerns himself with a close reading of documents illustrating Ireton's involvement in particular activities. This approach makes the balance among evidence, analysis and argument highly uneven. Often evidence means the presentation of long indented textual quotes, giving the reader a chance to sort out analysis and argument for himself. In the same way analysis often means lining up the opinions of a select group of historians and either taking their views at face value, or offering some form of modification or dissent. While the comparison of authorities can provide a useful introduction to particular topics, substituting their opinions for those of the author causes the reader to wonder to what extent the author has taken possession of his subject. This concern receives reinforcement from the author's use of qualifiers. Words such as "probable," "possible," "may be," "suggests," and "could simply be seen" (52) flow throughout the text and remind the reader that without a clear interpretative structure, the facts themselves yield stunted fruit. The limitations of this approach become even more apparent in the book's Conclusion. Rather than relating the three influences the author established at the outset to Ireton's career, the author speculates on the role of the individual in history and cites the opinions of Ireton's contemporaries about his significance.

This is a work of serious scholarship but needs to move further beyond the orbit of the graduate seminar to become both absorbing and convincing.