were neither immobile nor static. A large subset of early modern paper was, it seems, constantly on the move. Depending on the legal, familial, or historical question at hand, eager readers and copyists dusted off pages in search of documentation that might prove their case (or disprove someone else's). Distance, mobility's correlate, became a particular "feature of colonial epistomology" since it created emotional in addition to temporal distance (Sylvia Sellers-García). Institutional differences, it seems, produced further asymmetries of access and mobility: De Vivo, for instance, contrasts princely and republican forms of record keeping in Renaissance Italy, suggesting that personal obligations maintained the former, institutional arrangements the latter—an insight that his article, unfortunately, never fully develops.

Head's contribution outlines one particularly promising avenue for further conceptual research on proving as a technique, which, as he traces for German archives, existed in the intertwined fields of classical rhetoric, Roman and canon law, and in legal practice. Using archives (or not), copying or utilizing the original, translating (or not) all meant taking sides in long-lasting and complex debates in the history of authentication. Since material properties became part and parcel of proving, many authors would have benefited from integrating the insights about materiality raised by Peter Stallybrass, Heather Wolfe, and Sundar Henny more systematically into their own contributions. But these small quibbles only pay tribute to the field's changing nature. They do not take away from the many merits of this fine volume. Together with its twin, published in 2016, it should be on the reading list of every student interested in the history of archives.

Taken together with similar developments in the history of paper, diplomatic letter-writing, the news, and court history, these contributions promise to turn a history of text-as-discourse into a social history of texts as intellectual, social, and material artifacts.

Tom Tölle, *Universität Hamburg*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.537

Engineering the Eternal City: Infrastructure, Topography, and the Culture of Knowledge in Late Sixteenth-Century Rome. Pamela O. Long.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018. xii + 370 pp. $45.

Any recent visitor to Rome would agree: a shared understanding of environmental hazards, deep insights into how to sustain a large urban population, and the availability of relevant technologies are insufficient prerequisites for keeping the city clean. And what is tragically true in 2019 was no less evident to Rome's denizens in earlier eras. Pamela O. Long demonstrates for the later sixteenth century that consensus was simple enough to reach concerning the importance of clean air and water, wide and paved streets,

proud Christian(ized) monuments, and a pious, disciplined population. Yet serious obstacles stood in the way of realizing any of it: the humongous costs involved in creating, restoring, and policing infrastructures; conflicting political agendas among the religious and secular elites governing Rome; and the limited technical and logistical competence required to carry out grand urban projects, often exacerbated by corruption and professional rivalries. There were also some externally inflicted setbacks, not least among them the city's sack in 1527 and especially the Tiber's massive flooding in 1557, which claimed a thousand lives and signaled to Rome's dense and mostly low-lying population how vulnerable the Eternal City really was.

For a period and a city all too often celebrated for their intellectual, political, and material achievements, Long's injection of contingency is a breath of fresh air. It is easy to forget at what exorbitant cost (and popular outrage) some of the city's present-day monuments were erected, at what shocking inefficiency, and with what limited benefits to the population as a whole. As seen through Long's lens, the new Christian urbanism of the post-Tridentine era was a story of (at best) intermittent success, undermined by popes' resolve to undo or outdo their predecessors' legacies in a material sense and the lack of regular budgets and stable bureaucratic structures to run the city proactively. It is unclear, however, to what extent Long thinks that the latter situation was unique to Rome, perennially true, or an outcome of recent political and demographic events. After all, salaried infrastructure specialists such as roads officials (*viarii*) had been active in Rome and in numerous cities across the peninsula (whence many of the city's architects and engineers hailed) since at least the thirteenth century. And there is abundant evidence for their preventative and reactive efforts to keep cities decorous and clean during centuries in which urban populations and networks were rapidly growing.

Long's challenges to a popular view of late Renaissance Rome concentrate in chapters 1–4 and 7, which deal with programs to improve drainage, streets and aqueducts, and human and animal behaviors in these sites. Based on detailed archival records, narrative accounts, maps, prints, and archaeological data, she ably reconstructs the trials and errors of urban magistrates' attempts to protect the urban environment and update its infrastructure using abandoned devices and sometimes by creating new ones. Although the humoral-Galenic paradigm informing preventative health programs had scarcely changed since late antiquity, the author convincingly shows how a new kind of curiosity about past structures, from a mathematical as well as aesthetic perspective, intensified and diversified their (re)integration into the city's fabric.

This new intellectual vigor, along with the tensions it summoned, is even more present in chapters 5, 6, and 8, which concern efforts to map and beautify Rome using its ancient material heritage as well as techniques said to derive from (and even improve on) Greek and Roman science. The tenor in these pages tends to be somewhat more celebratory than in other chapters and is richly illustrated by designs, themselves a product of new and sophisticated etching and printing techniques, for which Rome has become justly famous. Long rightly warns against seeing the ambitious men recruited by the

papal court and communal government as modern-day professional engineers, architects, or urban planners. Indeed, it was precisely their lack of specialization (or what we may call interdisciplinarity) that led them to attempt (and sometimes fail) to rebuild Rome.

In sum, *Engineering the Eternal City* is a very readable account of three dynamic decades in Rome's material and intellectual history, which resists a teleological narrative of the city's urbanistic success, on the one hand, while illustrating the benefits of a multidisciplinary approach on the other.

G. Geltner, *Universiteit van Amsterdam*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.538

Reading Machiavelli: Scandalous Books, Suspect Engagements, and the Virtue of Populist Politics. John P. McCormick.
Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018. xiv + 274 pp. $29.95.

In this book, John McCormick plays Machiavelli's defense advocate. The charge: Machiavelli changed his mind. The case for the defense: critics have misunderstood or misrepresented what he wrote. The case for the prosecution: Machiavelli's writings.

In *The Prince* (first mentioned in December 1513, completed in 1514, and revised in 1515 or early 1516), Machiavelli said that a new prince should base his rule on the people, not on the nobility (chapter 9); a new prince should not try and impose rule over an established republic because the memory of former liberty will be too deep-seated (chapter 5). Such pro-popular and pro-republican views were spelled out in the *Discourses on Livy* (begun no earlier than 1515 and completed by 1519). Rule by the people is superior to rule by a monarch (book 1, chapter 58). Lands accustomed to inequality and dominance by a feudal nobility, such as Lombardy, Naples, the Romagna, or the Papal States, are suitable only for monarchical rule; in areas such as Tuscany, lacking feudal traditions and accustomed to equality, only republican rule is sustainable (book 1, chapter 55). In both *The Prince* and the *Discourses*, Machiavelli is critical of Venice, governed by a closed aristocracy and militarily weak. In both works, he praises the German and Swiss towns, governed as republics and militarily strong. In the *Discourses*, he singles out ancient republican Rome as the preeminent political and military model.

In the 1520s, Machiavelli shifted his position. In the *Summary of Affairs in Lucca* (1520), he put Venice forward as a model government comparable to ancient republican Rome, a view reflected also in the *Art of War* (1519–20). In the *Discourse on Florentine Affairs after the Death of the Younger Lorenzo de' Medici* (1520–21), he suggested a model constitution for Florence dominated by the aristocracy and the upper-