

antiquities dealer Jacobiglio Ebreo, and several essays devoted to the social aspirations of women (see Elena Brizio, Maurizio Arfaioli, and Brendan Dooley).

Two chapters in particular partake in the growing momentum behind the recuperation (and re-vindication) of women's place in the history of the Medici grand duchy. In the case of Sheila Barker's chapter, women of the house of Medici are demonstrated to have been frequent protagonists in the fields of medicine and pharmacy, not merely as patrons and purveyors, but also as practitioners of both so-called domestic medicine as well as the more prestigious scientific medicine. In another notable chapter, Brian Sandberg compares the "regencies" of Maria de' Medici and Christine de Lorraine. His conclusions resoundingly refute the labeling of their rulership as a "Monstrous Regiment of Women," misogynistic propaganda that was first codified and disseminated in 1558 with John Knox's acrimonious diatribe. The book also contains essays that propel the reader across the Atlantic to survey the Medici court's interest in the New Indies (Lia Markey), or that direct the reader eastward to consider the Medici court's challenges in negotiating the intrigues and dangers surrounding the volatile succession of Ottoman rulership (Mark Rosen).

In conclusion, this volume is a kaleidoscope that, in each of its sixteen essays, deconstructs and recomposes our views on this society, offering multiple perspectives thanks to the variety and quantity of documentation that has been tracked down and pieced together according to a valid interdisciplinary methodology. Much of this documentation, naturally, is kept at the Archivio di Stato in Florence, which has collaborated since the outset with MAP's enterprise. One can only conclude from this volume that the recent international resurgence of Medici and anti-Medici studies owes a great deal to the initiatives of MAP.

Paolo Simoncelli, *Sapienza Università di Roma*

Machiavelli on Liberty and Conflict. David Johnston, Nadia Urbinati, and Camila Vergara, eds.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017. vi + 424 pp. \$50.

This collection comprises sixteen studies. Harvey Mansfield seems to undervalue the negative quality of necessity for Machiavelli: a prince should not, if possible, depart from good unless necessity makes him embrace evil (*Prince* 18.15). Giovanni Giorgini writes that Machiavelli "put the well-being of the state above the well-being of the individual," but for Machiavelli and his contemporaries *stato* meant "regime" or "dominion," not "the state" in modern terms, and in *The Prince* he never uses the term *politico*, which describes a good and unselfish political order in the sense of the common good (*vivere politico*); the purpose of politics was glory, as shown by the episode of Agathocles (*Prince* 8.10), not the common good. Gabriele Pedullà persuasively demonstrates that the sub-

sequently momentous antithesis between a tumultuous but imperialist Rome and a stable but impotent Venice was down to Machiavelli (*Discourses* 1.4/6), who, however, was not entirely unprecedented in this regard, given rare but similar, if probably influential, contrasts drawn by George of Trebizond and Poggio Bracciolini.

Miguel Vatter offers no textual evidence to link Machiavelli to the ancient theology as revived by the Byzantine and Florentine Platonists. Quentin Skinner convincingly argues that Machiavelli's treatment of *virtù* involves the classical rhetorical technique of redescription whereby what is held to be a vice is actually a virtue (and vice versa), but the upshot is that Machiavelli still recommends a series of qualities (such as deception or cruelty) that are contrary to ordinary morality (as he himself admits in *Discourses* 1.26): redescription does not mean that Machiavelli was not separating politics from morality. In attempting to sanitize Machiavelli's outrageous message, Erica Benner flaunts numerous philologically untenable readings: for example "uno essercito iusto" can mean only "a reasonably sized army," not a "just" army in the moral sense, given the context of an "abbondanza di uomini o di danari" (*Prince* 10.2). Stephen Holmes similarly distorts the context of Machiavelli's remarks: thus "ostinata fede" is not the "nonstrategic devotion" of subjects empowering established rulers to resist adverse fortune, but the enthusiasm that redeemers such as Giuliano or Lorenzo de' Medici, newly arrived on the international scene between 1513 and 1516, would rouse in Italians beleaguered by foreign armies (*Prince* 26.27). Paul A. Rahe disregards the irony and sarcasm unmissable in Machiavelli's discussion of ecclesiastical principalities (*Prince* 11). Benedetto Fontana proposes a revisionist reading of Machiavelli's treatment of the Gracchi, praising their intentions if not their prudence—an attitude more apparently sympathetic than "that of the ancient writers." Jérémie Barthas persuasively links military and fiscal reforms under the revived Florentine republic from 1494 to 1512: an indigenously conscripted militia would loosen the stranglehold wielded by the aristocratic elite over emergency finances required to fund mercenaries upon whom Florence had hitherto depended; besides enhancing Florence's effectiveness on the battlefield, Machiavelli saw these military reforms (which he himself originated) as a means of arresting the impoverishment of the people through taxation in order to prevent an imagined popular uprising (*Discourses* 2.30.11).

Marco Genua shows that, in treating the Roman institution of dictatorship, Machiavelli relies on Cicero and Livy but not on Dionysius of Halicarnassus, as has recently been suggested. Jean-Fabien Spitz seems to suggest a democratic reading of Machiavelli, contesting Quentin Skinner's allegedly more republican interpretation, without taking into account that the populism evident in *The Prince* and the *Discourses* was modified or even retracted in later works such as the *Discourse on Florentine Affairs* and especially the *Florentine Histories*. Neglecting overwhelming proof in Machiavelli's later political and literary works (*Sommario di Lucca*, *Discursus*, *Ricordo al cardinale Giulio*, *Minuta di provvisione*, *Clizia*) of his conservatism after 1519, John McCormick claims that favorably portrayed popular actions "trump" unambiguous evaluative state-

ments (e.g., *Florentine Histories* 3.1); vitiated by arbitrary selection and disregard of evidence, this approach distorts unmistakable condemnations of specific popular actions, for example, the reactions to the anonymous Ciompo's speech in 1378: "these incitements powerfully inflamed spirits already burning in their own right with evil [*male*]" (3.13.22). The upshot of Machiavelli's censure of both the people and the nobility in the *Florentine Histories* is a mixed constitution (a key aspiration of Florentine conservatives) whereby disparate social groups would in theory check one another's excesses, but which would in practice lead to aristocratic predominance following Venice's example: a structure rejected in *The Prince* and the *Discourses*, with their popular biases.

Luca Baccelli considers Machiavelli's realism and populism, together with his theories of conflict and law. Michele Battini speculates that the militia was the first step for Machiavelli toward political empowerment of Florentine country dwellers, although there is no evidence that he took on board the revolutionary political inclusiveness inaugurated by the rebellious Pisan regime in 1499. Finally, Marie Gaille has more to say about Louis Althusser than about Machiavelli. Overall this collection may have interest for students of theoretical politics but, with a few exceptions, has less to offer those readers for whom context—both historical and intellectual—is the key to understanding Machiavelli.

Robert Black, *University of Leeds*

Apologie pour Machiavelle. Louis Machon.

Ed. Jean-Pierre Cavaillé. With Cécile Soudan. Libre pensée et littérature clandestine 69. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2016. 738 pp. €70.

This is a critical edition of Louis Machon's *Apology for Machiavelli*, the only systematic defense of the Florentine's work to appear in French during the seventeenth century. It had its genesis in Cardinal Richelieu's desire to counter his excessively Machiavellian reputation by commissioning Machon to defend "the indispensable and reasonable maxims of this solid and true writer" (90, my translation). It exists in two manuscript versions, that of 1643, written for Richelieu, and the expanded version of 1688, used for this edition. It is structured as two books of Machiavellian maxims dealing, as one might expect, with the most controversial of the Florentine's topics: the use of force, fraud, and cruelty in the conquest of states and submission of subjects; the political role of religion, the utility of dissimulation and deception, especially in making vice appear virtuous; the requirement to imitate the lion and the fox; and the justifications for war. Book 1 contains thirteen maxims from the *Discorsi*; book 2, ten maxims from *Il Principe*—their juxtaposition indicating no meaningful difference between the two works. Each maxim serves as a chapter heading for the passages that follow in Machiavelli's Italian; then come their French translation followed by Machon's commentary.