

To conclude, I would simply add that his epistemology leads him to deny agency to historical actors, as the above quotation suggests. Actors are seen as caught up in larger and more important sociopolitical systems. Turner speaks in terms of “value systems” (14), “sexual systems” (14), or “systems of labeling” (29). In his reading of the first chapter, he argues that the pre-1660 church developed “a system of labeling that was deliberately inflexible and limited in scope, making no conceptual or linguistic distinction between different types of offence, or between casual sexual encounters and longer-term affairs” (28). Turner comes to this conclusion because he has arbitrarily limited his interpretation. He could have benefited from reading and engaging with literary and cultural criticism of the 1990s which discussed in depth issues of agency. Similarly, he could have benefited from engaging more directly with historians like Christopher Hill, David Underdown, and David Cressy, to name just three. Having limited himself to the consideration of (written) language and having conceived of language as abstract, dehumanizing “systems,” Turner need not consider the way that immorality could be defined by individuals within local communities. Through gossip, general opprobrium, and social rituals like charivari, the community could define for itself what it considered immoral and what behavior it might find excusable.

Dorothy Habel. *The Urban Development of Rome in the Age of Alexander VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xxi + 223 illus. + 400 pp. \$95.00. Review by PHILIP GAVITT, SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

This carefully crafted and meticulously-written book assembles a wealth of visual and documentary evidence in support of its thesis that the Chigi Pope Alexander VII between 1655 and 1667 “opting to refashion Rome according to the architectural formulae of Eastern capital cities in antiquity . . . hoped through his building program to reclaim the heritage of the Church as an institution and of Rome as an idea” (5). Habel’s visual evidence for the coordinated nature of Alexander’s building program comes from the putative resemblance of three major sites—the Quirinale, the Corso, and S. Pietro—to the palace, hippodrome, and temple of urban planning and development in the eastern Roman empire during late antiquity. Despite the documentary wealth, much of it from the Vatican Library and the Archivio di Stato of

Rome, the historian looking for conclusive written evidence to support Habel's major hypothesis looks mostly (but not entirely) in vain. The case, as the author is careful to point out, is mainly circumstantial, and hinges on the interests of two Vatican librarians: Lucas Holstenius (1596-1661), who became Vatican librarian two years before Alexander VII began his pontificate, and Leone Allacci (1586-1669). Both appear to have worked closely with Alexander VII on building plans; both had intellectual interests in the geography of Greece and of the Near East. Holstenius, in particular wrote descriptions of journeys across Greece and the Middle East, and had hoped to compile an anthology of writings about the city and empire of Constantinople. The connection between Constantinople and Allacci is less clear, apart from his conversion from Greek Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism, but Alexander VII at least had access to other sources concerning Constantinople, including Pierre Gilles *The Antiquities of Constantinople*. Thus the case for Habel's thesis is compelling, even though the evidence offers few direct statements by Alexander VII concerning his antiquarian interests, and even though the author evaluates the pope's own vision as "fugitive" (324).

The value of this book is in any case not in the concrete documentary proof of its major thesis but consists rather in the wealth of information and lavish illustrations Habel provides about the realities of planning building programs so complex as to seem inchoate. Habel brings genuine order to Alexander's "fugitive" vision by organizing the book by site (in the case of the Corso, the author devotes a chapter to each end of it), and within each site, exploring as much as is known about its pre-Alexandrine topographical and building history. The author explores as well how the Chigi became interested in a particular location, what alternative visions their architects and builders imagined, and how and why final decisions about design and execution reflected the balance of aesthetic, familial, financial, and ideological considerations that governed the Chigi pope's planning of the New Rome. In the case of the Quirinale, Habel leaves little doubt that Alexander's interest in using this Palazzo as his personal residence had to do with its commanding view of Rome, a statement, therefore, of papal supremacy in the secular city. Certainly the Quirinal Hill abounds in antiquities placed there by Constantine himself, but the latent symbolism seems to have escaped the Venetian ambassador Correr, who wrote that Alexander "has in mind to embellish [the Quirinal Palace] in the manner of which the Roman emperors Augustus, Domitian,

and the other were so fond” (11). It also seemed to have escaped the notice of the anonymous commentator on Alexander’s intention to smooth out the irregularities in the *Via del Corso*: this commentator, too, read the emperor Augustus as the classical precedent, despite the happy coincidence of two Byzantine institutions along the *Corso*, the church of SS. Apostoli and the monastic foundation of S. Silvestro in Capite (67).

At the southern end of the *Via del Corso*, where Piazza Venezia now stands, was the Piazza S. Marco. Here, Alexander VII’s intention appears to have been both to advertise the generosity of private patronage and to cement the alliance between city and church. As in other phases of the overall building strategy, Alexander VII personally issued directives to the urban planning commission, or *maestri delle strade*, to facilitate the removal of blocks of palaces that extruded into the *Corso*, even undertaking an expensive buyout to accomplish the task.

Private concerns also drove the Chigi search for suitable accommodations, since the Chigi family, having sold the Villa Farnesina to the Farnese family in 1579, had only re-established a residence in the city four years before Alexander VII’s election to the papacy. Although committed to a policy of discouraging nepotism, and conveniently installed in the Quirinale himself, the new Pope soon found himself at the mercy of his kinsmen, whose burgeoning presence in Rome drove the search for a new family palace, a search that involved numerous obstacles, extensive plans, and that was not ultimately resolved until after Alexander VII’s death. Thus, Habel argues, Alexander VII’s legacy to the *Via del Corso* was not suitably spacious accommodations for the Chigi family but rather the elegant new palace facades that took shape according to his vision by ultimately being undertaken by other families.

By far the strongest evidence that Alexander deliberately refashioned the city of Rome in the Eastern tradition is the inscription placed in 1665 at the corner of the *Corso* with the *via delle Vite*, an inscription that makes specific reference to the *Corso*, or *Via Lata*, as Alexander’s restoration of the hippodrome. Here the point of Alexander’s obsession with straightening the *Corso* becomes clear—that it was for “racing, public convenience, and beauty.” In particular, when Alexander VII employed Pietro da Cortona to design the façade of S. Maria in *via Lata*, the pope oversaw the plans for a *fastigium* to adorn the upper story of the church. The *fastigium*, Habel argues, carried multiple meanings involving not only the fusion of papal and imperial power,

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, buttressed 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.

Roger B. Manning, *Swordsmen: The Martial Ethos in the Three Kingdoms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. xv + 272 pp. \$110.00. Review by SIMON 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