Representing Manhood: The Pre- and Post-War English Gentleman in 17th Century Courtesy Books

Stefania Biscetti

Abstract
This paper offers a preliminary diachronic investigation of 17th century conceptualisations of the ideal English gentleman. A corpus of 121 male metaphors extracted from two advice books for gentlemen published on either side of the Civil War has been analysed to uncover how and to what extent cognitive representations of gentlemanly manhood were affected by the experience of the Revolution. Continuity across a time span of about 70 years is given by the endurance of certain motives and themes, such as the exaltation of reason over passions and the emphasis on social conquest and self-mastery in the public rather than in the private sphere. Change is instead given by the types of metaphors used to conceptualise social success, by a shift in emphasis from the inner to the outer self, by a different notion of male honour, and by a great post-war concern for tolerance and social harmony.

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, male metaphors, 17th century England, diachronic change.

1. Introduction

This paper is intended as a cognitive-linguistic contribution to the debate on masculinity and male honour – almost a prerogative of social and cultural-historical studies (cf. Scott (2001)[1], Connell (1987; 1995; 2002), Foyster (1999), Fletcher (1995), Shepard (2003), Carter (2001), Amussen (1995)) – and as a diachronic contribution to cognitive metaphor analysis, marked by a prevailing, if not exclusive, synchronic approach. For reasons of space, this contribution is

[1] Scott's paper "Gender: a useful category of historical analysis" is considered a pioneering study in this field.

introductory in nature and representative of the most macroscopic aspects of this cultural-cognitive issue.

In her brief review of the historiography on masculinity for the period 1500-1700, Shepard (2005: 287) points out a gap in early modern gender history "relating to the impact of Civil War and the abolition of monarchy to concepts and experiences of manhood" in subsequent decades. She also highlights the need to reconcile the social and the cultural approach to the study of masculinity and gender, which have led to opposite conclusions regarding continuity vs. change in the meanings of manhood before 1640 and after 1660[2].

In the perspective of cognitive metaphor theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Charteris-Black 2004; Kövecses 2005), metaphors have an experiential grounding and therefore reveal how people understand experience, such as the cultural attributes and normative notions associated with maleness (Shepard 2005: 288). This means that if experience and its cognitive representation (i.e., the social and the cultural dimension) are merged in metaphors, metaphor analysis can help understand whether and to what extent concepts of manhood changed after the revolutionary decades.

Until the Civil War, sin and hell were key concepts used by preachers to secure obedience and moral conduct. Damnation awaited those who indulged in the pleasures of the flesh or yielded to any form of excess. The ingredients of a virtuous life were frugality, simplicity, chastity and moderation. The years of the Civil War witnessed a dramatic change in religious belief and scientific knowledge. The radicals' denial of the existence of hell helped to reduce or remove the anxiety of eternal punishment, while the scientific revolution resulted in scepticism and in a critical approach to the Holy Scriptures. After 1660, the emphasis shifts away from sin and life after death. Most Restoration writers are more concerned with bad form (which they criticise) rather than sin. Restoration decorum, consisting in moderation and balance (Alvarez 1961), forms

[2] Continuity is usually advocated by social historians (e.g. Foyster 1999), who focus on patriarchal manhood practiced in relation to womanhood within the household in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; change is instead emphasised by cultural historians (e.g. Carter 2001), who are more interested in the refined manhood achieved between men outside the domestic sphere later in the seventeenth century.

the basis for that "polite culture" emerging in the later seventeenth century, one that extolls self-discipline and social order (cf. Carter 2001: 24; Withington 2011).

Through the analysis of a corpus of 121 metaphors used to conceptualise the ideal gentleman (henceforth "male metaphors") in two advice books written by and intended for gentlemen and published on either side of the Civil War, this paper will show how and to what extent 17th century notions of gentlemanly manhood were affected by the experience of the Revolution.

2. Sources

The sources considered here belong to the Puritan tradition of conduct literature, which chiefly focused on moral issues such as honour and virtue. They are *Heropaideia, or The Institution of a Young Noble Man* (1607) by James Cleland[3], and *The Gentleman's Companion* (1672) by William Ramesey[4]. James Cleland's work is dedicated to Prince Charles, King James I's second son, and is aimed at the nobility and gentry. It is 271 pages in length and is organised into six books dealing with the duties of parents and tutors towards children, of the young nobleman towards God, the King, his Country, his parents and tutors; and with a young nobleman's duty in civil conversation and in travelling.

Ramesey's treatise is dedicated to the Earl of Dalhousie, and is also aimed at British nobility and gentry. Its 252 pages deal with gentility, education, learning, religion, travel, expenses, vanity and ostentation, discourse and carriage, health, recreations, and passions or perturbations of the mind.

3. Male metaphors in Cleland's *Heropaideia* (1607)

The conceptual metaphors[5] extracted manually from Cleland's

[3] Cleland was tutor to Sir John Harington of Exton (1592-1614), one of the gentle companions to King James I's eldest son Henry (Pollnitz 2015: 325).

[4] William Ramesey was physician and astrologer, and a Royalist.

[5] A conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains, in which one domain [i.e. the target domain] is understood in terms of another [i.e. the source domain] (Kövecses 2010: 4). Conceptual metaphors are made manifest by metaphorical linguistic expressions. In this study, we selected metaphorical

Heropaideia form a sub-corpus of 39 metaphors, the most frequent being:

MAN IS A CONQUEROR (8); MAN IS A WARRIOR (5); MAN IS A WINNER (4); MAN IS A SENTRY/WARDEN (4); MAN IS A BEAST (3); MAN IS A SLAVE (3); MAN IS AN ACCOMMODATOR (2); MAN IS A TAMER (1); MAN IS PREY (1).

These metaphors may be labelled deontic metaphors, as they are used to prescribe what the ideal gentleman should or should not be. Type and token frequency shows that man is conceptualised both as strong and powerful (MAN IS A WARRIOR, A CONQUEROR, A MASTER, A WINNER, A TAMER) and as weak (MAN IS PREY, A SLAVE, A BEAST), and that metaphors of powerfulness outnumber those of powerlessness. "Your young Nobles … are borne to command" says Cleland (1607: 51), that is, to exercise power. Among metaphors of power, the most frequent ones are war metaphors (i.e. MAN IS A WARRIOR, A CONQUEROR, A SENTRY/WARDEN). According to Fletcher (1995: 126), in the Tudor and Stuart periods manhood coincided with honour, understood as lineage and virtue. Gentlemanly virtues included the four cardinal virtues (i.e. prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude (or courage)) and their cognates as mild disposition, humility (or modesty), compassion and liberality. Vices were passions (pride, ambition and lust) and servitude. Since in 17th century Western culture (and in Cleland) VIRTUE IS POWER/STRENGTH[6] (and VICE IS WEAKNESS)[7], the high frequency of war metaphors tells us that the ideal man proves his manhood by fighting, conquering, mastering

expressions used to talk about (gentle)men (our "target domain"), as well as their qualities, vices and (in)appropriate behaviour. Linguistic metaphors can be distinguished from non-metaphorical (i.e., literal) linguistic expressions because usually their lexical items have a contextual meaning that contrasts with their non-contextual or basic meaning (see Pragglejaz Group (2007) for metaphor identification procedure). For example, in the sentence "Contend then al yee young Nobles to have this Queen [i.e. prudence] for your wife" (Cleland, p. 168), the lexical items "queen" and "wife" have contextual meanings (i.e. "the noblest of virtues" and "the virtue to choose/embrace" respectively) that differ from their basic, non-contextual meanings (i.e. "ruler of a country" and "married woman"). This sentence is thus a linguistic metaphor expressing the conceptual metaphor THE PRUDENT GENTLEMAN IS A KING.

[6] "Temperance […] is the pillar of force." (Cleland 1607: 206-207)

[7] "Selfe-Love is the greatest disease of the minde." (Cleland 1607: 241)

and resisting vice. In Cleland, the pair virtue-power is enriched with a third element, learning: "*Inherent Nobility* […] is attained by one's own proper Vertue; as when by valor, learning, wisdom, or the like vertuous meanes, a man is worthilie promoted by his *Maiesty*" (Cleland 1607: 7). Learning is founded on virtue, which is not an inborn quality, but is acquired in "frequenting the world" and goes hand in hand with civility in behaviour and conversation. Civility consists of wisdom, affability, temperance, and discretion in words and actions:

> your swaggering, your swearing, and your refined oathes, horrible protestations, your odde humors, and your drinking of Tobacco with a whiffe, make not a *Noble* or *a Gentleman*: but that is to be wise, affable, temperate, and discreete in all your actions and conversation. (p. 5)

Civility is best exercised in conversation and speech. Conversation is in fact the backbone of civility in Cleland[8], and the chiefest means of self-advancement and achievement for the noble élite. The association learning-virtue-power is metaphorically expressed through the metaphor MAN IS A WINNER, which points explicitly to the notion of gain and success. A success that the learned nobleman achieves in the social, interpersonal sphere and which consists in obtaining other people's favour through learning, meekness, gentility and civility; facil accesse and sweetness (1-2); benevolence through modesty (3); and consent or opinion through eloquence (4):

> 1) A learned Courtier is capable of his Maiesties profound discourses at al times, he can court the ladies with discretion and intertaine them in wise and honest conference, and is able to *winne al mens favour* by his meeke, gentle, and civill behaviour, as to be imploied by his Maiestie in some serious and important affaiers. (pp. 137-138)
> 2) A facil accesse and a gracious countenance[9] engendreth a great favour in everie mans minde towardes you: and there is nothing that *winneth so much* with so little cost, […]. (pp. 171-172)

---

[8] Cleland dedicates a whole book of his treatise to "civil conversation".

[9] This seems to contradict Larkin's (2014: 38) claim – based on two other 17th century pre-war courtesy manuals – whereby "the theme of grace in the Castiglionian sense of elegancy of speech and behaviour […] with emphasis on personal 'souplesse' and flexibility" is not developed in British manuals circulating at this time because the adherence of their authors "to plain style prohibited it" (p.40).

3) I desire you to behave your selves so modestlie, that nether your advancement maie be envied, nor your debasing laught at. *Winn to your selves the love of al men*, while your favours are prosperous; (p. 175)
4) For the armour that glister for brightnes, besides that they hurt as wel as the rustie, they dazell the sight also: so an eloquent speech is understood as wel as the common talke of the village, and *pearceth and perswadeth the heart* of the hearer besides. (pp. 185-186)

Anna Bryson (1998: 174) observes that eloquence had been identified as "the original agent of civilisation" at least as far back as the 16th century[10], and "was thus linked historically and in political practice with the power of an élite." She also observes that later on in the 16th century the image of the eloquent gentleman inspired by classical orators had become a model of social prestige and authority alongside the established image of the gentleman soldier, and that the combination of these two images emerged in language as martial metaphors of conquest and force to conceptualise the persuasive power of eloquence (as in 4). However, the type of eloquence recommended in Cleland's manual is neither Demostenes's nor Cicero's, as Bryson (1998: 174) argues, but that of Caesar. To be an effective weapon of persuasion, eloquence must be "souldier-like"[11]:

5) Your qualitie being above the common, I wish that your speech were also not popular, (…) not ful of trivial words, but plaine and perspicuous", […] "not Pedantike or ful of inkehorne tearmes: but souldier-like as Sveton saith Caesar was. (Cleland 1607: 185)

Moreover, the metaphor of the gentleman soldier is not unique to eloquence but, at least in our sources, is a metaphorical *topos* used in connection with virtues (cf. 1-3) and vices. In Cleland, the MAN IS A CONQUEROR metaphor is the most frequently used (8 tokens) to represent a gentleman's appropriate and effective behaviour towards vice, conceptualised as enemy (11-12) and identified with

[10] Evidence is found in Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553).
[11] The ethos of plain speech emerged, according to Larkin (2014: 12), because of the Reformation (with its association between English national identity and simplicity), and in this later phase of history received new vigour from "a Tacitean revival and a hostile reaction to perceived excesses […] at court and in the city."

affections (6) or passions such as self-love (7-8), ambition (7, 9, 10) and lust (11):

6) […] Which we maie easilie effect in *subduing our own affections, whereby wee shal obtaine a more glorious victorie, (…) our triumph* maie bee more renowned, then if we overthrew the *Medes* and *Persians*. (p. 241)
7) For he that can *conquer selfe Love, overcome Ambition*, bridle his furie, and *subdue the unrulie passions* of his owne minde: […] (p. 241)
8) How yee may *overcome selfe-Loue*. (p. 241)
9) How yee maie *overcome Ambition*. (p. 242)
10) To *subdue this affection* [ambition] you must not mount higher then your wings wil permit. (p. 243)
11) Our third mortal enemie, *which we haue to fight against, and ouercome*, is *Carnall Loue*; a most furious & dangerous passion: (p. 244)
12) Let us then *arme ourselves against* our common enemies and consider how we *shal get the victorie*. (p. 241)
13) This last foe, [i.e. the flesh] […] is a strong and puissant enemie; yee had neede to come *furnished with complete armour to overthrow him*." (p. 244)

This metaphor, expressed linguistically by the verbs "conquer", "overcome", "subdue", "overthrow", and by the phrases "get the victorie", "obtaine a more glorious victorie", entails the notions of successful combat (i.e. defeat) and of power/control over. These notions are not part, instead, of the MAN IS A WARRIOR metaphor, expressed linguistically by "fight against" (11), "arme ourselves against" (12), "furnished with complete armour" (13), and featuring the ideal gentleman engaged in a difficult and uncertain struggle against the passions. It may not be chance, therefore, that this metaphor is used four times (out of five) in reference to lust[12], although self-love is "the capital enemie of wisdom" (p. 241) and ambition "contends against *Selfe-Love* for the first place among the passions" (p. 242). The reason why lust is in fact the most dangerous and powerful of passions for the ideal gentleman (13) is to be found in its association with sin, hell and spiritual death:

14) these are the three infernal furies: the three capital enemies of our salvation; the Devill, the world, and the flesh; […]. (Cleland 1607: 244)

[12] Besides (11) and (13), we have: "You must *arme your selvs against* the shot thus." (p. 245); "my best advise in this *Combate* shalbe the *Apostles* precept […]" (p. 246).

Effective weapons against lust are avoiding the company of impudent women (17) and mortifying the flesh[13], that is, abstinence and chastity. The degree of danger attributed to lust and women (lust instigators), can be measured by the use of yet another metaphor pertaining to the overarching cognitive domain of war, MAN IS A SENTRY/WARDEN, to recommend prudence and vigilance with beautiful women:

15) I wish […] that *you bee ever upon your guarde*, cheiflie amongst those who are faire, of a comlie, gracious, and alluring behaviour. (p. 245)

The type and token frequency of war metaphors (i.e. MAN IS A CONQUEROR/MASTER, WARRIOR, SENTRY) used in connection with lust form a metaphorical cluster that construes this passion as the most dangerous for a man's honour. This is clearly an ideologically motivated discourse strategy serving strongly dissuasive purposes.

This metaphorical cluster is further articulated into masculine metaphors of powerlessness (after the rhetorical principle of antithesis) associating men, lust and women, and reinforcing the idea of danger. The metaphors in questions are MAN IS A VICTIM (16) (i.e. of female beauty, construed as a deceitful and deadly weapon of seduction), MAN IS PREY (17) and MAN IS A BEAST (18):

16) Consider that the beauty of a woman is like a floure that withereth, and that *manie have perished* therby (p. 245)
17) Abstaine from the company of these impudent Laïs, who with their painted faces, smooth tongues, & glancing eies study *to entrapp young Gentlemen in their snares*; (p. 245)
18) This last foe, which the Courtiers cal simply *Love*, is common unto man & beast, & *turneth men into beasts*, It was *Circes* cup, & that Potion, which metamorphised *Ulysses* his followers. (p. 244)

Lust is not the only vice that carries man away from an honourable, godly state and makes him a brute, however. In this manual, MAN

[13] "that you mortifie the wantonnes of your flesh" (Cleland 1607:246). Chastity here coincides with abstinence from lust oustide marriage, given Cleland's focus on the young nobleman as a future man of state rather than as a master of a family. Continence, however, is also expected of married gentlemen: "I exhort you […] Gentlemen to beware of incontinencie, […]. Gods wrath hath never suffered this sinne to escape unpunished, as *Davids* adulterie was the death of threscore thousand *Isräelits*." (p. 208).

IS A BEAST is a metaphor of ineptitude and powerlessness used in connection with ignorance/lack of reason (p. 135) and lying (p. 187). This can be explained with the importance attributed to a gentleman's loyalty and skill in serving the King and the Country.

4. Male metaphors in Ramesey's *The Gentleman's Companion* (1672)

Ramesey's manual provides us with a sub-corpus of 82 male metaphors. In order of frequency we have:

MAN IS A BEAST (10), MAN IS A MASTER/CONQUEROR (8), MAN IS COMMANDER/GOVERNOR/RULER (5), MAN IS A BRIGHT ENTITY (5), MAN IS A SENTRY/WARDEN (5), MAN IS A WARRIOR (4), MAN IS A KILLER (4), MAN IS PREY (4), MAN IS A FORTRESS (3), MAN IS A SUBJECT (3), MAN IS A SLAVE (2), MAN IS AN ACCOMMODATOR (2), MAN IS A TAMER (1).

Type and token frequency reveals similarities and differences with Cleland's work. War metaphors are again the most frequent ones, and man is still represented more as powerful than powerless. The experience of the Revolution left a deep impression on Ramesey that can hardly be evinced from the crude data listed above, but can perhaps be glimpsed from the higher frequency of the "MAN IS A BEAST" metaphor and the types of behaviour and vices to which it is applied. This metaphor, the most frequently occurring metaphor in this manual[14], is used to stigmatise anger (19) ("the effect of Pride" and "the worst of Vices"), jealousy (20) and revengefulness (21-22), passions potentially disruptive of the social order:

19) *Anger becomes* rather a *Savage Beast*, than a Gentleman; (p.196)
20) 'tis [jealousy] the most absurd, ridiculous, and *most brutish passion,* and sottish, that can be […]. (p. 95)
21) Much more is it [ignoring offences] becoming a Gentleman, than *that beastial way of Revenge*. (p. 106)
22) And so, to Revenge is beastial, […]. (p. 212)

[14] It may be objected that the prevalence of "beast" metaphors may be due to the author's personal preference rather than to the effect of the Revolution. But as well as frequency, what is especially remarkable here are the types of vice and behaviour deplored: these are revealing of the writer's negative experience of the revolutionary years in terms of moral and social disorder.

This metaphor is also used in connection with drunkenness (three tokens), as in Cleland, and with ingratitude. Excessive drinking, rage and revenge were among the main occasions of duelling, an "idle, wicked, and damnable custome" (p. 81) conceptualised as bestial and foolish just like war (i.e. a "beastial folly" (p. 232)).

A longing for peace, order, and social harmony clearly emerges from Ramesey's work, where religion and its moral values become the means to prevent divisions and guarantee uniformity. The true Gentleman is the good Christian whose chief aim should be immortality (p. 224). His virtues are a good Soul, good Education, honesty, ingenuity and learning (p. 6).

Although learning promotes virtue and good manners, it is now associated with religious belief rather than power, and is no longer a weapon of social conquest or personal advancement. In Ramesey, pertinence and agreeableness in discourse are said to be more persuasive than eloquence, because wit tends to ostentation and contention (p. 15), and therefore "a solid Iudgment in discerning Truth" (p. 73) is much preferable to wit. Indeed, within the post-war ideology exalting obedience and reconciliation (Sharpe 2013: 195), and shunning social conflict, learning is not as cogent as before. For the same reason, ambition or pride is now more dangerous than lust for its association with rebellion, opposition to the King, and resistance, connoted as sinful ("whosoever resisteth, shall receive to himself Damnation." (p. 67) "Rebellion is as the sin of Witchcraft" (p. 67)).

The virtues which hold the key to the post-war gentleman's honour (23-26) and social success (27) are meekness and forgiveness:

23) 'Tis the Honour and Glory of a Man to pass by Offences: Anger resteth in the bosom of a Fool. (pp. 83-84)
24) 'tis the Honour of a Man to pass by Offences; (p. 106)
25) To get meekness, a calmness of Spirit, (…) advances a Mans Honour. (p. 196)
26) […] to Pardon is King-like. (p. 212)
27) So moderation, the Spirit of clemency, and mildness, adds a grace and lustre to him that bears them, and also *pleasure, acceptation, and love of all the Spectators*. (p. 190)

Ramesey's emphasis on these moral values corresponds to a strong aversion towards the duel of honour, a cultural institution aimed at

restoring one's honour upon affronts or injuries. It was a custom violating Christian principles and the king's legitimate authority, sanctified by God's will. It was therefore both unlawful and sinful: "From the 1590s onwards the preachers included duelling in their overgrowing list of social vices which should be eradicated" (Peltonen 2003: 86). In fact, in Ramesey, duelling is not only abominable, it is utterly irreligious, and the (gentle)MAN who opposes the Almighty IS A PURCHASER OF DAMNATION:

28) can any thing be more irrational and sensless, than (…) *to purchase eternal Damnation*, for a momentary revenge? (p. 79)

Ramesey, like Bacon, held that the best and easiest remedy for duels was generosity (cf. Peltonen 2003: 126), which consisted in ignoring trifling insults and extenuating or excusing faults in others. The cognate virtue of clemency is a most Christian and kingly virtue recommended by Ramesey. It consists in returning good to evil, thereby inducing "remorse and sorrow" (p. 106) in the other. These are the weapons that the ideal Gentleman should use against offenders. The MAN IS A CONQUEROR metaphor occurs four times to construe the magnanimous and forgiving Gentleman as a brave, powerful, successful and superior being:

29) Nay, if need were, to Relieve him [his enemy] with thy Estate to thy Power, And in all other cases that lie in thy way to do him good; which is *the greatest Conquest* imaginable *thou canst have over him*; (p. 106)
30) A couragious *insensibility* (…) *and* a constant *magnanimity, makes a most glorious Conquest*, and returns all on his Enemies pare. (p. 212)
31) *make thine enemy stoop* by benefits and doing good unto him. (p. 212)
32) *vanquish it* by carrying thyself a bove it and him that offer'd it. (p. 212)

Ramesey's insistence on the folly of duels and his attempt to construct the duellist as a coward and the forgiver as honourable and brave reflects the fresh wave of anti-duelling campaigning occasioned by the bill introduced in the House of Lords by the Duke of York in April 1668. The bill was presented in the aftermath of the duel between the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Shrewsbury, which threw new light on the worrying increase in the frequency of duels after the Restoration (Peltonen 2003: 202). Ramesey's dissuasive discourse strategy against duels is reinforced by the use of the MAN IS A MASTER/

CONQUEROR metaphor and the MAN IS A COMMANDER/GOVERNOR/RULER metaphors, which emphasise the need for self-mastery and control over emotions and the will to prevent social disorder and conflict.

5. Conclusions

This preliminary investigation of the ways of conceptualising the English Gentleman before and after the Civil War reveals that the motives and themes remain more or less the same across a time span of about 70 years. A remarkable element of continuity lies in the fact that the ideal gentleman featured in both manuals is the future man of state rather than the master of a family. This seems to suggest that the articulation of manhood in the public sphere is hardly a prerogative of the later seventeenth century (cf. Carter 2001).

The difference between the two sources lies in their emphases and in the degree to which they consciously chose when to entrust (or not entrust) the same concepts to metaphorical expression or to a different type of metaphor. For example, while in Cleland learning is a weapon of social conquest (martial metaphor), in Ramesey the idea of social success or esteem is conveyed by a stage metaphor (26) in which the Gentleman is an actor or model of moderation, clemency and mildness, and love is the natural consequence of those virtues. The metaphor MAN IS A CONQUEROR, used in Cleland only to represent a man's inward battle against passions, is used in Ramesey also to conceptualise a man's outward victory over other men by means of generosity and insensibility to minor offences, which implies a great concern for interpersonal conflict. Ramesey's ideal Gentleman is (unlike Cleland's) a beast neither out of lust nor out of ignorance, but because of vices potentially disruptive of the social order. While in Cleland abstinence, continence and chastity are the key features of a Gentleman's honour (and lust its greatest threat), in Ramesey male honour coincides with forgiveness and meekness, and damnation awaits the ambitious and the revengeful, duellists for example, rather than the lustful. Ramesey's concern for peace, tolerance and social harmony as a reaction to the turmoil of the Revolution seems indeed to guide thematic choice and metaphoric expression.

Both in Cleland and in Ramesey the light of reason is opposed to the darkness of passions. However, only in Ramesey do we find the

idea that religious faith should be rationally grounded, not accepted by tradition but embraced after critical examination of its doctrine (pp. 43-47), and that superstition is foolish and ungentlemanly (pp. 26, 43). This can be explained with "the rise of scepticism and the new Royal Society's experimental philosophy" during the reign of Charles II, which "eroded the certainties of faith and the authority of the Church" (Sharpe 2013).

Metaphor analysis may thus prove a useful tool for investigating the relation between ideology, history and culture, such as the influence of the Civil War on concepts relating to manhood and gentlemanly conduct. This will be the object of a larger study drawing on a greater diversity of source material from before and after the Civil War.

References

ALVAREZ, ALFRED, 1961, *The School of Donne*, Chatto & Windus, London.

AMUSSEN, SUSAN D., 1995, "The part of a Christian man': the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England", in S. Amussen and M. Kishlansky (eds), *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe: Essays presented to David Underdown,* Manchester U. P., Manchester, pp. 213-233.

BRYSON, ANNA, 1998, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

CARTER, PHILIP, 2001, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society: Britain 1660-1800,* Longman, Harlow.

CHARTERIS-BLACK, JONATHAN, 2004, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke-New York.

CLELAND, JAMES, 1607, *Heropaideia, or The Institution of a Young Noble Man,* Joseph Barnes, Oxford.

CONNELL, RAEWYN W., 1987, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

CONNELL, RAEWYN W., 1995, *Masculinities*, Polity Press, Sydney.

CONNELL, RAEWYN W., 2002, *Gender*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

FLETCHER, ANTHONY, 1995, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800,* Yale U. P., New Haven-London.

FOYSTER, ELIZABETH A., 1999, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage*, Longman, London-New York.

KÖVECSES, ZOLTÁN, 2005, *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*, C.U.P., Cambridge-New York.

KÖVECSES, ZOLTÁN, 2010, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, O.U.P, Oxford.
LAKOFF, GEORGE and JOHNSON, MARK, 1980, *Metaphors We Live By*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London.
LARKIN, HILARY M., 2014, *The Making of Englishmen: Debates on National Identity 1550-1650*, Brill, Leiden.
PELTONEN, MARKKU, 2003, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, C.U.P., Cambridge.
POLLNITZ, AYSHA, 2015, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, C.U.P., Cambridge-New York.
Pragglejaz Group, 2007, "MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse", *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), 1-39.
RAMESEY, WILLIAM, 1672, *The Gentleman's Companion: or, a Character of True Nobility and Gentility: in the way of Essay,* printed by E. Okss for Rowland Reynolds, at the Sun and Bible in the Poultrey, London.
SCOTT, JOAN W., 2001, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", *American Historical Review* 91, pp. 1053-1075.
SHARPE, KEVIN, 2013, *Reading Authority and representing Rule in Early Modern England,* Bloomsbury, London-New York.
SHEPARD, ALEXANDRA, 2005, "From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700", *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2), pp. 281-295.
SHEPARD, ALEXANDRA, 2003, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England,* O.U.P., Oxford.
WILSON, THOMAS, 1553, *The Arte of Rhetorique*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
WITHINGTON, PHIL, 2011, "Tumbled into the Dirt': Wit and Incivility in Early Modern England", *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12 (1-2), pp. 156-177.