Heywood in his *Ages* plays uses drama to bring classical knowledge to the populace, firmly grounding the world of his mythological stories in the physical reality of the playhouse. In the last chapter, Valls-Russell interrogates a pamphlet on Charles I's ship *Sovereign of the Seas* to demonstrate Heywood's use of mythological, biblical, and historical sources to describe the vessel's decorations and how they assert the king's—and thus Britain's—superiority. To Demetriou and Valls-Russell's credit, *Heywood and the Classical Tradition* benefits from the way the chapters are often in conversation, with various authors referring to their fellow contributors' arguments, further unifying the issues discussed even beyond the subject matter alone. The result is a collection of analyses interwoven as thoughtfully as are the classical sources in Heywood's work.

Ultimately, *Thomas Heywood and the Classical Tradition* follows the strategy of its subject, bringing together a multitude of creative works and their sources to present the reader with a wide-ranging examination that conveys not only how prolific and creative Heywood was, but also the far-reaching and varied presence of the classical tradition in early modern England. Because of the scope of the texts covered, from various authors of antiquity to medieval and other Renaissance versions of the classics,, Heywood and other early modern creators, Demetriou and Valls-Russell's collection, with its many detailed, nuanced considerations of how these texts blend, contrast, and inform each other will be useful even beyond readers interested in Heywood's use of classical sources.

Katja Pilhuj
Coventry University and The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina
ad8868@coventry.ac.uk

Jamie A. Gianoutsos. *The Rule of Manhood: Tyranny, Gender, and Classical Republicanism in England, 1603–1660*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. 426. $99.99 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.16

Jamie A. Gianoutsos's *The Rule of Manhood* is a welcome and timely contribution to our understanding of the intellectual and cultural origins of English republicanism. Gianoutsos convincingly argues that the classical education provided by the early modern grammar schools promoted views of masculinity—primarily Roman views of masculinity—that were often antithetical to Stuart absolutism. Common school texts such as Cicero's *De Officiis* taught that fully realized manhood required the exercise of "autonomy, authority, and moral excellence" in both public and private life (36). They also depicted tyrants as failed men whose licentiousness, instability, and abuse of power emasculated their male subjects by preventing them from exercising their own manhood, supplying seventeenth-century Englishmen with historical lenses through which to understand and critique their own political moment.

By devoting four chapters to examining how specific historical exempla were mobilized in early Stuart England, Gianoutsos demonstrates that this shared educational background created a common political vocabulary. For example, in chapter 1, she maintains that reworkings of Livy's account of the rape of Lucretia and the founding of the Roman Republic celebrated the ideal masculinity of Junius Brutus by contrasting it with the degeneracy of the Tarquins. She concludes with a reading of Thomas Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608) that finds that the depiction of Lucius Tarquin as an emasculated and lawless tyrant governing a corrupt court was tailored to evoke parallels with James I's court and "effeminate" foreign policy (65). In chapter 2 Gianoutsos looks at the how the story of Virginia—a chaste maiden killed by her virtuous father to protect her from being imprisoned and raped by

Appius Claudius—was used to foreground concerns about judicial abuse and corruption. This chapter exemplifies the strength of this section as a whole: nuanced readings of a broad range of cultural documents, especially neglected plays such as Webster and Heywood's *Appius and Virginia*, that illuminate early seventeenth-century political anxieties as well as continuities with the later republicanism of the interregnum. Gianoutsos is an agile reader of these texts and excels at highlighting the crucial differences between various retellings of the same basic story. Chapters 3 and 4 focus on the ways that the history of Nero's tyrannical reign was mobilized to criticize the failings of James I and Charles I. For James, Neronian comparisons emphasized the effeminacy of his pacifist foreign policy and the extravagance and sexual debauchery of his court. For Charles, they stressed his uxoriousness and inability to govern his own household. Both chapters reveal how vulnerable the patriarchal and absolutist doctrines of the Stuart monarchy really were to gender-based criticism from those who embraced classical masculinity and how readily James and Charles could be recast as effeminate tyrants.

In the second part, Gianoutsos contends that English republican thought emerged as a response "to the perceived problem of emasculating tyranny experienced under the Stuart regime" (223) and that its "fundamental purpose . . . was to realise manhood—to allow men (of a certain status) to develop fully as rational, free, and virtuous individuals" (224). Moving to the interregnum, Gianoutsos shifts from case studies of historical exempla to chapters devoted to major Commonwealth figures: John Milton, Marchamont Nedham, and Oliver Cromwell. In chapter 5, she argues that Milton epitomizes her overall claims, and although some will quibble over precise dates and terminology, few scholars familiar with Milton's political writings would dispute that his "classical republicanism" stresses "the restoration and realisation of manhood for its citizens" (232). But Gianoutsos reads too much of Milton's work through a stark republican gender binary that is characteristic of his political prose from 1649 to 1660 but that obscures the gender fluidity and nuance evident elsewhere in his thinking. For instance, Gianoutsos observes that young Milton ("the Lady of Christ's College") dissents from the prevailing view of masculine identity based on violence and sexual adventure and that he seeks to redefine virility in terms of virtue and intellectual prowess. But Gianoutsos overlooks the degree to which he subsumes traditionally feminine virtues such as chastity into his definition of perfect manhood, as he does in *An Apology*. Likewise, Gianoutsos overemphasizes the difference between Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*. Milton famously declares that Eve was formed "[f]or softness . . . and sweet attractive Grace" (*Paradise Lost*, bk. 4, line 298); Gianoutsos oversimplifies these characteristics by reducing them to "physical frailty and untamed sexual passion" (233), and emphasizes "the portrayal of Adam as virile, free, and upright" (234) but neglects that Eve shares most of these traits ("Two of far nobler shape erect and tall, / Godlike erect" [*Paradise Lost*, bk. 4, lines 298–89]). None of these localized missteps threaten the core of the overall argument. Indeed, the complexity of Milton's views elsewhere in his writings underscores the distinctly masculine posture of his republican prose. Gianoutsos focuses chapter 6 on Nedham's republican writings in the 1650s. Establishing that he shares Milton's desire to create "a free-state in which males could become fully realized as men" (275), Gianoutsos demonstrates that Nedham differs by placing martial prowess and imperial expansion at the center of his republicanism. Gianoutsos concludes with a final chapter on representations of Cromwell that validates both sides of her thesis: his supporters portrayed him as meeting (or exceeding) the classical ideal of masculinity and thus as the perfect counterpoint to Stuart effeminacy, whereas his critics depicted him as grotesquely hypermasculine and used historical example to cast him as a classical usurper and tyrant.

Revisionist historians have long maintained that we cannot talk about English republicanism before the execution of Charles I. *The Rule of Manhood* is exciting because it is a judicious, forceful, and eloquent case for why we can and should. It reveals undeniable continuities between the classically informed views of masculinity evident before the English Revolution and those that define English republicanism, and in doing so, it reiterates why gender is a crucial framework for understanding the political culture of seventeenth-century England. The schoolboys who learned what it meant to be a man by studying the tyrannical regimes and republican revolutions of Roman history were prepared to confront political crises that may not have been inevitable but that were certainly conceivable.

Gregory Chaplin
Bridgewater State University
gchaplin@bridgew.edu

William Gibson. *Samuel Wesley and the Crisis of Tory Piety, 1685–1720*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. 235. $100.00 (cloth)
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.44

William Gibson's decision to treat the ecclesiastical and theological career of Samuel Wesley in isolation from that of his vastly more famous sons is something of a gambit. On the one hand, there is a strong case to be made that the elder Wesley's life is best understood within the ecclesiastical politics of his own revolutionary era, rather than within the genealogy of Methodism. On the other hand, the ecclesiastical career of Samuel Wesley, absent any connection to those of his sons John and Charles, is often that of a bog-standard Anglican country parson—albeit a particularly luckless and improvident one. Over the course of Gibson's *Samuel Wesley and the Crisis of Tory Piety, 1685–1720*, Wesley's cows are stabbed; his dog is maimed; he is jailed for debt; his rectory burns down; he is bitten by a rabid dog; he squabbles constantly with his indomitable wife, Susannah; and his home is haunted by a particularly obnoxious ghost. Wesley's wife sympathetically described him as "one of those who Our Saviour saith are not so wise in their generation as the children of men" (211). (A very different religious tradition might be inclined to label Samuel Wesley something of a *schlemiel*.) But Gibson does not mine Wesley's serial misfortunes for either laughs or pathos. He relays them all carefully and vividly in the course of a clerical career that Gibson considers illustrative of the fate of the Church of England in the wake of the Revolution of 1688–1689.

Gibson's subtitle, "the crisis of Tory piety," conscientiously echoes Gareth Bennett's enduring 1976 biography of Francis Atterbury, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State*. But Samuel Wesley was no Atterbury. His ecclesiastical career never takes him beyond the rectory of the remote Lincolnshire village of Epworth. Nor was he ever really a fire-eater like Henry Sacheverell (although Gibson posits a working relationship between the two men). Wesley's sermonizing and pamphleteering was not a driver of politics during the so-called rage of party. Apart from a consequential stint as proctor in the 1710 Convocation, Wesley's ecclesiastical politics remain overwhelmingly local. He mostly follows the major trends in post-Revolutionary Anglicanism rather than inaugurating any of them. But Gibson assiduously documents the ways national tensions play out in Epworth: the dynastic politics of Jacobite and Williamite (and later, Hanoverian), the legalization of Protestant nonconformity, the reformation of manners movement, the vogue for religious societies, the so-called lay baptism controversy, and the polarization of high and low churchmanship. They are all brought to bear to elucidate the challenges of Wesley's personal life and ministry: his often-fruitless pastoral efforts; his incarceration for debt at the hands of his local Whig enemies; the strain his wife's ardent Jacobitism places on their marriage. Even what Samuel's daughter Sukey Wesley described as the "groans, squeaks, tinglings, and knockings" (201) of the Epworth poltergeist Old Jeffrey were reported as loudest and most aggressive during the family prayers for King George.