but also the deliberate reminiscence of such Eastern classical examples as
Hadrian's temple at Ephesus, the Marble Court from Sardis, Diocletian's
palace in Spalato, and several other important examples, most tellingly the
missorium of Theodosius I. Similarly direct references, mostly to Constantine,
abound also in Bernini's design for the colonnade in Piazza San Pietro, but-
tressed by the Vatican Library Prefect Holstenius's citation of Greek sources
for porticoed buildings.

Both the conception of the Corso as Hippodrome and Bernini's design
of the Piazza San Pietro make the strongest possible circumstantial case for
Habel's thesis. The resulting intricacy of the argument makes for very dense
reading indeed, and this reviewer exhorts the book's readers to savor every
detail. For Habel makes the book's argument architectonically, and the reader
who takes the trouble to understand the book's structure, and how each
chapter makes part of the larger whole, will be amply repaid by the rhetorical
effectiveness of the author's argument. This was no mean feat, for in addition
to attempting to capture Alexander VII's elusive vision, the author had to
juggle parallel narratives involving Alexander's relationship with the patrons
and with the municipality of Rome itself, the occupational demands and
kinship networks involved in transplanting an entire papal family, and last but
not least, Richard Krautheimer's monumental work on seventeenth-century
Roman architecture. Merely to engage Krautheimer's work would be a
formidable task for any art historian, but to do so in the carefully crafted
fashion that Habel has done bespeaks great ambition and an enormous labor
of love.

HEALY, HISTORY OF PARLIAMENT TRUST, LONDON.

What relevance does a martial ethos have for modern civil society? Public
officials in America swear to uphold a civil constitution which leads few
charges, yet military experience has been a significant electoral factor since the
days of George Washington. Indeed, one can hardly imagine Grant or
Eisenhower being taken seriously as politicians in the absence of their military
record. A martial pedigree, however, is not a one-way ticket to political
office: MacArthur’s vaunting political ambitions hobbled his military career; the presidential contests of 1996 and 2004 saw decorated war veterans bested by men who had never heard a shot fired in anger; and in the most bizarre twist of all, Governor Schwarzenegger’s political career has been founded on an impressive but entirely fictitious military career.

If modern America values martial prowess as an indicator of leadership ability, the same was true of early modern Britain, where the nobility was not only born to command but inculcated with basic combat skills from an early age and motivated by chivalric assumptions which pervaded many aspects of elite culture. Roger Manning chronicles a number of the disparate ramifications of this martial ethos in a wide-ranging survey of both contemporary memoirs and literature and also of modern historiography. First, he establishes that the titled nobility of England, Scotland, and Ireland were by no means completely demilitarised during the 16th century, and that the level of combat experience increased dramatically, not only during the Civil Wars of the 1640s and 1690s (as one might expect) but in the 1590s, the 1620s and the Restoration period as well. Some may argue that his definition of combat experience (see p.19) is too broad, covering everything from formal war to cattle-rustling, but in a study of the impact of martial values on wider civil society, this is perhaps a justifiable elision of boundaries. In fact, David Trim’s painstaking work on English mercenaries during 1562-1610 suggests that Manning’s narrow statistical focus on the peerage underestimates the extent of English involvement in foreign wars during the Elizabethan peace of 1562-85.

Why did the martial ethos remain so alluring? Manning touches upon several themes: a classical education which stressed the importance of personal courage; a culture of chivalry which remained potent (although the relative importance of lineage and personal courage remained open to question); the large number of noblemen and gentlemen who rounded off their education by “trailing a pike” on the continent; and the continuance of clan culture in upland areas of Britain (here he omits to mention Wales, which shared many economic and cultural characteristics with the gaeldom of Scotland and Ireland). He also suggests that the rise of the rapier and the continental fashion of duelling was a key factor in the re-militarization of elite society. Duelling was (naturally) most common among military officers, where an accusation of cowardice, if unchecked, could have lethal consequences on
the battlefield, but it quickly spread throughout gentry society in the later 16th century. Any study of the practice is necessarily impressionistic, as duellists took pains to avoid prosecution for murder or affray, but scholars will shortly benefit from a comprehensive calendar of the records of the Earl Marshal’s court (housed at the College of Arms in London and are being calendared by Richard Cust and Andrew Hopper), established in 1623 specifically to check the spiralling problem of duelling in London and at Court.

The most interesting idea Manning touches upon is the thesis that the revival of a martial culture based upon edged weapons at a time when guns came to dominate the battlefield was a way in which elites validated their continuing claims to pre-eminence in civil society. In a nice piece of product placement, he suggests that this will receive more systematic coverage in his next book, but some of the strands of his argument can be discerned in this work: personal courage in the face of mortal danger, either on the battlefield or in a duel, served as an indicator of leadership ability (as true for Oliver Cromwell as it was for Theodore Roosevelt); and an honour code underpinned by a martial ethos was, to some extent, an aristocratic reaction against the centralizing tendencies of the early modern state (this is probably more true of France than England, although the 2nd Earl of Essex was a natural-born *frondeur*). On the basis of these assumptions, he speculates that the martial ethos, when combined with classical republicanism and antiquarian scholarship, inspired resistance to Stuart absolutism. Well, perhaps. John Adamson makes a persuasive case for the political impact of such influences on several of the ancient nobility who sought to dominate the parliamentarian cause in the mid-1640s (see “The Baronial Context of the English Civil War,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th series XL [London, 1990], 93-120). However, most of the Court gallants and continental veterans who flocked to Charles’s colours in the north of England in 1639-40 ended up among the Cavaliers at Oxford during the Civil War, while Cromwell’s Ironsides were motivated not by classical republicanism but by Biblical providentialism.