

379
NB1
NO. 5106

MACHIAVELLI AND MYTH

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Melanie Hunt, B. A.

Denton, Texas

December, 1975 -

200

Hunt, Melanie Grove, *Machiavelli and Myth*. Master of Arts (History), December, 1975, 109 pp., bibliography, 87 titles.

This work presented the question: to what extent did each period and its events have on the development of the various schools of thought concerning Niccolo Machiavelli. The age of Reformation in its quest for theological purity gave birth to the myth of the evil Machiavelli. The Enlightenment, a period which sought reason and science, founded the myth of the scientific Machiavelli. The eruption of nationalism in the nineteenth century created Machiavelli, the patriot, and this was quickly followed in the twentieth century, an age of unrest, by the rebirth of all previous interpretations. These schools of thought developed as much from the changing tide of events as from the scholarly research of the writers. One of the reasons for the diversity of the Machiavellian literature was that each writer sought his antecedents on the basis of myth rather than where it might realistically be found. Machiavelli and Machiavellianism were abused and misused because modern man did not know himself. He viewed his origin incorrectly and thus could rest on no one explanation for himself or Machiavelli. Machiavellianism developed from a collection of myths, each started in an attempt to explain the unexplainable, man. Not Machiavelli's politics, but what man appeared to be in them, was the drawing power of Machiavelli's work. What Machiavelli meant to say or did not mean to say was unimportant when compared to what scholars believed him to have said.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Chapter | |
| I. THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE AND THE REFORMATION..... | 4 |
| II. THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND THE MACHIAVELLIAN LEGEND..... | 24 |
| III. CONTEMPORARY VIEWS AND MACHIAVELLI..... | 48 |
| IV. AN ANALYSIS | 74 |
| CONCLUSION | 94 |
| APPENDIX I..... | 101 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 103 |

INTRODUCTION

In researching the historiography of Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), one remarkable fact stands out: the works of the Florentine have become unimportant, almost forgotten, when compared to the legends that have developed around them. The connection between the works of Machiavelli and the growth of the Machiavellian myth remains only vaguely discernible, if one exists at all. The historiography of Machiavellianism was so confused that an attempt to discover the beliefs of the sixteenth century philosopher became virtually impossible. One purpose of this thesis will be to explain why this developed and how writers have used and abused Machiavelli's works by creating Machiavellian myths to support their own conclusions. Also in these pages the significance of the Machiavellian myth in the development of modern historiography will be explored.

At the dawning of the modern era, the historian was challenged with an overwhelming problem: man had to face the growth of a new leviathan, the absolute state. From where had it come? Some historians have argued that the modern state and its absolutism had been seen first during the late Middle Ages.¹ If true, it was only in an embryonic stage, waiting to

¹Edward McNall Burns, *Western Civilization* (New York, 1973), p. 494.

be nurtured to maturity by the absolutism of modernity. Historians, seeing a need to discern the political theory which gave life to this absolutism, looked to the past. In the period between the medieval and the modern, they discovered two major events, the Renaissance and the Reformation. The secular spirit embodied in such concepts as humanism, rationalism, science, and industrialism has practically eliminated the Reformation from consideration as a theological movement unrelated to politics for modern scholarship. Looking to the Renaissance, they discovered not only their cultural roots, but also Machiavelli and *The Prince*. Each historian since then has developed his view of Machiavellianism and used it to define both Machiavelli and his beliefs. Thus, today a historiography, based on myth, half truths, misrepresentation and filled with contradictions, has developed. We have accumulated hundreds of volumes on Machiavelli and Machiavellianism, without even a consistent definition of the word. Even *Webster's Dictionary* is unable to give a clear definition, only this: "Machiavellianism — the political doctrine of Machiavelli." Instead of helping to bring the concept of Machiavellianism into focus, this definition distorts it even more. On close examination it became obvious that each historian offers a different description of Machiavelli's political doctrine. Even when similar historical theories are linked together, there appears a staggering number of differing interpretations of the Florentine's political ideas. This problem is

illustrated by the number of interpretations attached to Machiavelli which view him variously as a cynic, as a product and spokesman of Renaissance Italy, as a patriot, as a "devil's tool," as a religious humanist, as an anti-religious liberal and as a satirist. If historians can not agree on what Machiavelli's political doctrine was, how could they agree on the definition of Machiavellianism? Thus the following questions are posed. When a historian wrote of Machiavelli and Machiavellianism, was he actually presenting "historical fact", or was he reflecting his own historical period with its problems and prejudices, along with his own personal views and bias? When the historian analyzed the works of Machiavelli, was he seeking to discover the true Machiavelli of the 16th century or some image of himself and his own period? Did Machiavelli, the cold political scientist presented in the early twentieth century, become Machiavelli, the devil, in the 1940's, because historical fact changed or because a historian changed his idea of what Machiavellianism was? Did Machiavelli, the sixteenth century tool of the devil, become Machiavelli, the nineteenth century nationalist, because the religious wars were followed by waves of nationalism or was it the result of new historical investigations? These questions, if not answered, will at least be introduced and explored in the following pages.

CHAPTER I

THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE AND THE REFORMATION

The Italian Renaissance, the period between 1200 and 1600 A.D., developed in a unique way. It was a period in which men were presenting changing ideas in all fields. Consequently, the period has drawn the attention of many scholars, and to each of these scholars it has appeared different. Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897) wrote in the nineteenth century:

To each eye, perhaps, the outline of a given civilization presents a different picture, . . . it is unavoidable the individual judgement and feeling should tell every moment both on the writer and on the reader. In the wide ocean upon which we venture, the possible ways and directions are many; and the same studies which have served for this work (*Civilization of the Renaissance Italy, 1860*) might easily, in other hands, not only receive a wholly different treatment and application, but lead also to essentially different conclusions.¹

Burckhardt predicted correctly. The historiography of the Renaissance became nearly as confused as that of Machiavelli himself. However, present in the general historiography of the Renaissance has been a general acceptance of Burckhardt's view of the era. One of the few exceptions to the Burckhardtian school was Douglas Bush (1896-), in his *The Renaissance*

¹Jacob Bruckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, translated by S.G.C. Middlemore (New York, 1944), p. 1.

and English Humanism. He considered the Renaissance to be an extension of the Middle Ages and, in sharp contrast to Burckhardt, he showed the Italian humanism to be strongly Christian, not secular pagan.

To return to the specific problem of chronology, modern critics may be roughly divided into two camps. One view extends the Renaissance backward to include the Middle Ages, the other extends the Middle Ages forward to include the Renaissance. . . . I incline to the latter . . . on a historical continuity which makes the Middle Ages and the Renaissance much more alike than they used to be thought. The great watershed of the Renaissance has been, if not levelled down, at any rate made a less conspicuous eminence . . .²

on the Christianity of the Renaissance humanist, Bush wrote:

I wish in these discussions to emphasize the more neglected and, I think more truly representative elements of orthodox conservatism. . . . To put the matter briefly and somewhat too bluntly, in the Renaissance the ancient pagan tradition with all its added power, did not overthrow the medieval Christian tradition, . . . it was rather, in the same way if not quite to the same degree as in the Middle Ages absorbed by the Christian tradition.³

Bush was joined in dissent by Charles Homer Haskins (1870-1937); however, he moved the Renaissance back into the twelfth century rather than extending the Middle Ages to the

²Douglas Bush, *The Renaissance and English Humanism*, (Toronto, 1939), pp. 29-30.

³*Ibid.*, p. 89.

fifteenth as Bush did. Haskins wrote in his *The Renaissance of the Twelfth-Century*:

There was an Italian Renaissance, whatever we choose to call it, and nothing is gained by the process which ascribes the Homeric poem to another poet of the same name. But—thus much we must grant—the great Renaissance was not so unique or so decisive as has been supposed. The contrast of culture was not nearly so sharp as it seemed to the humanists and their modern followers, while within the Middle Ages there were intellectual revivals whose influence was not lost to succeeding times, and which partook of the same character as the better known movement of the fifteenth century.⁴

Lynn Thorndike (1882-1965) went a step further than either Bush or Haskins by suggesting the non-existence of the "so called Renaissance."⁵ He wrote:

So out of touch and tune with the Christian centuries before them, did intellectuals become in early modern times, that the notion finally came to prevail that these previous centuries had been dark ages without civilization worthy of the name, that civilization had revived only with the "Italian Renaissance" of the humanists. But the revival of Civilization dates rather . . . from the tenth century.⁶

But even dissenters such as Bush agree that the most accepted view of the Renaissance was that of Jacob Burckhardt. Bush is

⁴Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth-Century* (New York, 1957), pp. 5-6.

⁵Lynn Thorndike, *A Short History of Civilization* (New York, 1948), p. 206.

⁶*ibid.*, p. 354.

a case in point. "As I have remarked already, Burckhardt's conception of the Renaissance is still the popular one, and there are still scholars who celebrate the secularizing of the human mind, its emancipation from the shackles of superstition."⁷ The modifiers of Burckhardt's original thesis also gave the master credit for the lasting scholarship of his work. Hans Baron (1900-), who has written a classic work on Florence, stated:

In September 1960, a hundred years will have passed since the appearance of Jacob Burckhardt's *Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*. No other work has had a comparable influence on the formation of the concept of the Renaissance and during the last one or two generations it has become an historical classic read in all western countries.⁸

After all this time few historians have written works that would completely disagree with the work of the Swiss historian or his followers. But how did Burckhardt view the Renaissance? He maintained that the Italian Renaissance was born in the midst of political chaos.

The struggle between the Popes and the Hohenstaufen left Italy in a political condition which differed essentially from that of other countries of the West, . . .the unity of the empire, Italy had shaken it off almost entirely. The Emperors . . .were no longer received and respected as

⁷Bush, p. 89.

⁸Hans Baron, "Burckhardt's *Civilization of the Renaissance* a century after its Publication," *Renaissance News*, XIII (Autumn, 1960), 200-207.

fuedal lords... while the Papacy, with its creatures and allies, was strong enough to hinder national unity in the future, but not strong enough itself to bring about unity.⁹

This, he suggested, resulted in never ending battles, both military and economic, between the city-states for the maintenance of power. "In them for the first time we detect the modern political spirit of Europe, surrendered freely to its own instincts, often displaying the worst features of an unbridled egotism, outraging every right and killing every germ of a healthier culture."¹⁰

Burckhardt saw as one of the two general political tendencies that developed in this period, the replacement of republican government with despotic ones; few city-states escaped the onslaught of these despots. Florence, although it was not ruled by princes, was controlled by a group of wealthy families, including the Medici. The second tendency was the expansion of the greater states at the expense of the less powerful ones. By the time of the signing of the Peace of Lodi (1454), only five great states and three or four lesser states remained of the numerous ones which had existed prior to the Venice-Milan war. The four powerful states that remained were the Duchy of Milan, the Republics of Venice and Florence, and the States of the Church. Florence, the home of Machiavelli, was situated on

⁹Burckhardt, p. 2.

¹⁰ibid., p. 3.

the western coast of Italy. During this period of expansion, Florence conquered all of Tuscany except Siena. To the east and south of Florence were situated the States of the Catholic Church, which during these years held great power, even though its influence weakened toward the end of the period. The absolute authority of the Popes was shaken by the Great Schism (1378-1417) and the Conciliar Movement in the fourteenth century. These events caused the Popes of the fifteenth century to face the problems of forcibly bringing the independent lords and city-states under their authority. The Popes grew more and more politically active until it was difficult to distinguish them from other princes of the age. They formed diplomatic alliances and hired armies of *condottieri* for both wars of aggression and defense. Burckhardt gave a vivid description of the role of the Church which has become classic:

Sixtus IV, was the first Pope who had Rome and the neighbourhood thoroughly under his control, especially after his successful attack on the House of Colonna, and, consequently, both in his Italian policy and in the internal affairs of the Church, he could venture to act with a defiant audacity. . . . He supplied himself with the necessary funds by simony, . . . Cardinal Pietro Riario enjoyed . . . almost exclusive favor of Sixtus. He soon drew upon him the eyes of all Italy, partly by the fabulous luxury of his life, partly through the reports which were current of his irreligion and his political plans. He bargained with Duke Galeazzo Maria of Milan (1473) that the latter should become King of Lombardy, and then aid him with money and troops to return to Rome and ascend the papal throne; Sixtus, it appears, would have voluntarily

yielded to him. This plan . . . would have ended in the secularization of the papal state. It failed through the sudden death of Pietro.¹¹

The Church of this period was one of the most avid collectors and patrons of art and literature. In the Renaissance, all the arts flourished with the aid of the princes. One of the earliest developments of the Renaissance was the beginning of an Italian literature, which would later serve also as a bond of unity. The men who renewed the study of the classics and brought new secularism to man and his activities were called humanists. Burckhardt wrote, "This humanism was in fact pagan, and became more and more so as its sphere widened in the fifteenth century."¹² To the Renaissance man, the study of the humanities meant a philosophy of life, and one in strong contrast to the preoccupation with the things of the spirit that had been stressed in the Middle Ages. The humanist investigated man and this world, not God or morality. "To the two chief accusations against them (humanists) that of malicious self-conceit, and that of abominable profligacy a third charge of irreligion was now loudly added . . ."¹³

¹¹Ibid., pp. 66-67.

¹²Ibid., p. 67.

¹³Ibid., p. 309.

Where did Niccolo Machiavelli fit into this age? Burckhardt wrote very little on the Florentine but the authorities to follow interpreted Machiavelli in keeping with Burckhardt's Renaissance man. Biographies from the Burckhardtian school described the life of Machiavelli in these terms. During the fifteenth century, Florence dominated the intellectual and artistic life of Italy. The Medici built palaces, monasteries, churches, and devoted great wealth to sculpture and painting. This family patronized artists in all fields, and, under their rule, Florence steadily grew in all areas. These men of the Renaissance felt that the key to their problems was rooted in the lives of men on earth, not in the unexplainable mysteries of God. Thus, there was an astonishing freshness in the works of these men of letters and "as with painters and sculptors, the greatest by far were the Florentines, and the greatest of the Florentines was Niccolo Machiavelli."¹⁴ As Roberto Ridolfi (1895-) romantically described Machiavelli, "Machiavelli was born just in time to know the ancient way of life of Florence, both from what he saw himself and from the memory of it preserved by others."¹⁵ Niccolo Machiavelli's classical education began early. By the age of twelve, he was

¹⁴J.H. Plumb, *The Italian Renaissance* (New York, 1961), p. 51.

¹⁵Roberto Ridolfi, *The Life of Niccolo Machiavelli*, translated by Cecil Grayson (Chicago, 1947), p. 14.

already accomplished in Latin composition. His life was spent in the reading of ancient events and the study of modern affairs.¹⁶

Four weeks after the execution of the Dominican monk Girolamo Savonarola, on June 19, 1498, Machiavelli was elected Secretary to the Second Chancellry of the Republic of Florence. "His duties consisted in dictating dispatches, compiling minutes, digesting reports, making transcripts and annotating official files."¹⁷ For the next thirteen years he was influential in shaping Florentine policy. He was sent on twenty-four missions, which included trips to the King of France, to Rome, and to Emperor Maximilian. However, in 1512, the French returned to Florence and recalled the Medici to rule the city. Machiavelli was removed from office, and soon he was forced by lack of employment to retire to his paternal estate, "at Sant' Andrea in Percussina, seven miles south of the city and two north of S. Casciano in the country."¹⁸ From there Machiavelli actively sought employment from the Medici in Florence and Rome, but, for some reason, whether it was fear of his republican leanings (his name had been tied to a group of republicans who had

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ralph Roeder, *The Man of The Renaissance* (New York, 1966), p. 134.

¹⁸J.R. Hale, *Machiavelli and Renaissance Italy* (New York, 1960), p. 140.

plotted against the Medici family)¹⁹ or an oversight, no job was forthcoming until 1520. At that time, he was commissioned by Cardinal Giulio de Medici, the future Clement VII (1523-34), to write a history of Florence. During the preceding years the author had spent much time writing and from this period came his greatest works. A list of Machiavelli's works, with their dates and Italian and English titles may be found in the appendix.

Of all these writings, one stood far above all the others in its popularity, or perhaps, infamy. *The Prince*, a short treatise on politics, written in 1513, has occupied the minds of almost all students of Machiavelli. The question, what did Machiavelli mean *The Prince* to say and be, caused the major controversies that have arisen around the Florentine's writings. This little book, became the material of which legends are made. When *The Prince* was written, it caused very little stir. It was not published until five years after Machiavelli's death. Before then it was passed among Machiavelli's republican friends in manuscript form. Biagio Buonaccorsi, a friend of Machiavelli from his years of service to the Republic, aided in the movement of the manuscript in this way; "he presented one of the first copies of *The Prince* to a mutual friend, Pandolfo Bellacci, in 1514."²⁰

¹⁹Ibid., p. 142.

²⁰Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Machiavelli*, translated by Gioconda Savini (New York, 1967), p. 173.

Francesco Vettori, a close friend and correspondent of Machiavelli, was another republican who, according to Giuseppe Prezzolini, showed little shock or disapproval of *The Prince*. "Among Machiavelli's correspondents, Vettori was the most authoritative witness to the fact that Machiavelli's ideas were not shocking—indeed they seemed completely acceptable and were re-echoed according to the degree of articulate ability of those who listened to him."²¹ Garrett Mattingly (1958) wrote that the ardent republicans among Machiavelli's friends, like Zamobi Buondelmonti and Vettori, were not alienated by *The Prince*, because they understood why it was written and agreed with it.²² In the letters of Machiavelli gathered together in Allan Gilbert's (1965) three-volume work entitled *Machiavelli*, there appeared no condemnation of the Florentine's ideas or writing. What then aroused such indignation against *The Prince* in 1532? What happened between 1513 and 1532 that caused the critics to attack Machiavelli so violently? The works of Machiavelli had not changed, but the outlook of many historians, or if you will, their frame of reference, had!

²¹Ibid., p. 176.

²²Garrett Mattingly, "Political Science or Political Satire," *The American Scholar*, XXVII (Fall, 1958), 480-491.

While the humanists were writing in Italy, in Germany a different revolution was under way which would end the movement the Renaissance had made toward a modern secular world. In the early sixteenth century Martin Luther began the Reformation. Martin Luther had begun life as a German Catholic but ended it as the leader of the Protestant movement. He led his followers to a complete break with the Roman Catholic Church. This conflict, because of its religious nature, touched off such deep hatred and destructive violence that all Europe was swallowed up in the madness. But Luther did something else of much more importance to history and modern society. Ernst Troeltsch (1865-1923) expressed the view, in *Protestantism and Progress*, that Luther extended the medieval period for at least another two hundred years after the Renaissance.²³ Luther extended the dogmas of the Middle Ages by revitalizing and spiritualizing the medieval institutions of one state, one church, and one social order, leaving little room for human influence. Luther's thinking developed a system of dual standards which were disastrous when applied to social, political and economic realms. He presented the idea of two worlds which exist as parallel non-intersecting lines, one spiritual and one secular, as Saint Augustine had, but, in actuality, Luther created only one

²³Ernst Troeltsch, *Protestantism and Progress*, translated by W. Montgomery (Boston, 1960), p. 49.

world. He took the medieval institutions and ideals and made them divine, allowing religion to encompass the total of man's activity. Erich Kahler wrote:

But more important than this creation of a social type is the fact that through Luther the middle class morality of the craft-guild cities took on the force of a secularized religion. The humble acceptance of one's station in life and the predominance of collective morality over individual conscience . . . Luther retained these ideas, but by destroying the authority of the church in the world he destroyed their specifically religious aspect, secularizing them and transforming them into the essence of middle class morality in the modern era . . . At one stroke Luther created the ideology that gave rise to the unlimited authority of the modern German ruler and the unlimited obedience of the modern German citizen.²⁴

In the same vein the Catholic historian Abbo (1911-) wrote that the modern world received, "the moral justification for absolutism."²⁵ Luther revived the idea that truth was singular and at the same time spiritualized the secular world. This belief was what the Dominican priest Heindrich Seuse Denifle (1844-1905) called, "Luther's special gift."²⁶ Denifle called this dogmatic legacy of Luther's the ". . . Protestant attitude . . . (which)

²⁴Erich Kahler, *The Germans*, translated by the author (New Jersey, 1974), pp. 213-214.

²⁵John Abbo, *Political Thought: Men and Ideas* (Maryland, 1960), p. 150.

²⁶Heindrich Seuse Denifle as cited in Erik Erikson, *Young Man Luther* (New York, 1958), p. 31.

introduced into history a dangerous kind of revolutionary spirit."²⁷ What is the link between the Reformation and Machiavelli? Both Catholic and Protestant began viewing Machiavelli as a supernatural evil and thus instituted the Machiavellian legend. For if as Luther wrote, everyone and everything was either good or evil, then one had to discover the true meaning of the Florentine's work in order to treat it properly. The men of the Reformation who read or heard of Machiavelli were shocked. They saw government as a tool of God, not as a secular functionary organization as had the men of the Renaissance. Thus from these men of religious zeal came the first legend of Machiavelli. As Erik Erikson (1902-) said, "... a man's historical image often depends on which legend temporarily overcomes all others."²⁸ For the next two hundred years, the legend of Machiavelli, the "devil's tool," was to reign with rare exception.

Machiavelli's works truly came alive after his death. Prezzolini was correct when he stated that "a work does not consist so much in what the author said or what he wanted to accomplish or express within as much as in what humanity has to add to it with comments, derivations, substitutions,

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Erik Erikson, *Young Man Luther* (New York, 1958), p. 37.

modifications, interpretations."²⁹ The growth of the various Machiavellian legends illustrated this problem well, for each developed as a result of comments, derivations or interpretations. The first myth about Machiavelli was developed from Catholic and Protestant interpretations. Each of these groups presented Machiavelli as the "devil's tool" because they were products of a spiritual reformation, in which the devil was a very real force. Machiavelli's humanist approach to the secular world and government threatened the dogmatism of both groups and so they condemned him as the devil. By giving Satan a name and dwelling place it became easier to defend themselves and their doctrine. Each of these groups proceeded to attack their enemies by calling them Machiavellian and from there they proceeded to describe what a "Machiavellian" was.

The first assailers of Machiavelli were the Roman Catholics. Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500-1588), in his *Apologia ad Carolum Quintum*, attacked Machiavelli's *The Prince* as an agent of the devil.

Reading it, I found all the stratagems by means of which religion, justice, and good will were invalidated and through which all human and divine virtues would become a prey of egoism, dissimulation, and falsehood. It was written by a certain Machiavelli, native of Florence, entitled *The Prince* and it is such a work that if Satan himself had had a

²⁹Prezzolini, p. 193.

son for a successor, I don't know what other maxims he could pass on to him.³⁰

Pole's pronouncement on Machiavelli was not unexplainable. He saw England being torn apart by Henry VIII, who to Pole played the role of the devil's advocate. Pole was horrified at Henry's secularism, which he found again in Machiavelli's *The Prince*. As Felix Raab wrote, "It is still less surprising that Pole should associate Machiavelli with Satan and Thomas Cromwell with both."³¹ Pole was joined in his attitudes by "other zealous clerics like Ambrosius Politi, Bishop of Cosenza, and especially by the Portugues Bishop Jeronimo Osorio.³² The Dominican, Abrogio Caterino Politi, 1487-1553, in his book *De Libris a Christiano detestandis et a Christianismo penitus eliminandis*, published in Rome in 1552; and Bishop Jeronimo Osorio (1510-1580), in book three of his *De Christiana Nobilitate*, 1552,³³ joined with Pole, forming a powerful enough following

³⁰Reginald Pole, *Apologia ad Carolum Quintum*, p. 137, cited in Guiseppe Prezzolini, *Machiavelli* (New York, 1967), p. 197.

³¹Felix Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli* (London, 1965), p. 31.

³²De Lamar Jensen, ed. *Machiavelli Cynic Patriot or Political Scientist?* (Boston, 1960), p. ix.

³³Prezzolini, p. 199.

that in 1559 all of Machiavelli's works were placed on the *Index of Prohibited Books* by the Roman Catholic Church. Books that when written had not caused a murmur were now so shocking that they must be prohibited. Was it the books or the readers that had changed?

The Catholics were not alone in their assault on Machiavelli. Many Protestant scholars were equally harsh in their attack. The most vocal Protestant attack came from the French Huguenots. "Machiavellianism, which is both parent and off-spring of antimachiavellianism, was born, grew up and was baptized in France"³⁴ The French attempt at forming a nation-state around the Ile de France erupted into full-scale religious wars which included the Saint Bartholomew night massacre, 1592. Innocent Gentillet (1550-1595), an active Huguenot lawyer and writer, believed that the blame for the massacre lay at the door of the Florentine. He wrote in *A Discovrse Vpon the Meanes of Vvel Governing* that Machiavelli and his theory gave Catherine de Medici, then Queen of France, the idea for the massacre. He believed that the ruler had become Machiavellian and Catherine had been his entry into the country.

Moreover Sathan ufeth frangers of France as his fitteft infruments, to inject us ftill with this deadly poyfon fent out of Italie, who has fo highly promoted their Machiavellian bookes, that he is of no reputation in the

³⁴Ridolfi, p. 251.

court of France, which hath not Machiavels writings at the fingers ends, and that both in the Italian and French tongues, and can apply his precepts to all purpofes . . . ³⁵

Across the channel in England Roger Ascham, also a Protestant, was equally shocked by the Florentine. "Ye see, what manners and doctrine our Englishe men fetch out of Italie."³⁶ To Ascham, Machiavelli represented the two worst evils of his day: popery and secular government. All of these writers used Machiavelli and his myth to qualify and attack the beliefs of their opponents, and thus they helped to develop the myth of Machiavelli's debasement of religion and aggrandizement of the state. They felt he was "more concerned with the salvation of his fatherland than his soul."³⁷ For a society still haunted by the shadows of Luther and Calvin, this was a very real fear. Not only did they fear Machiavelli's supposed placement in priority of the state over the church, but also what they conceived of as his amoral attitudes. They accepted statements aimed at corrupt church members and interpreted them as attacks on religion itself. In this, a period of great religious conflict, this Machiavellian legend was a very real method of

³⁵Innocent Gentillet, *A Discourse Vpon The Means of Vvel Governing* (New York, 1969), p. 2.

³⁶Roger Ascham *English Works*, ed. James Bennet (London, 1761), p. 5.

³⁷Ridolfi, p. 251.

assault on one's enemies. Roberto Ridolfi (1895-) wrote hundreds of years later a fiery description of the growth of this myth.

Death, which in the end usually brings men peace and the reputation they deserve, at first brought Machiavelli only violent attacks and ill fame. Misfortune, after having ravaged so great a part of his life now burst into flames over his ashes like a funeral pyre. . . . the Florentine secretary was made a symbol of wickedness . . . the immortal pages, printed with the grace and privilege of one pope, were condemned and forbidden by another.³⁸

Raab gave as proof of the popularity of this myth the evidence of Elizabethan and early Jacobean drama. He stated that there are over 385 allusions to Machiavelli in sixteenth and seventeenth century drama. "The Machiavellian villain strutted the stage in innumerable guises, committing every conceivable crime, revelling in villainous stratagems to the horrified enjoyment of audiences and the profit of theatrical entrepreneurs."³⁹ Edward Meyer, 1897, offered as examples of the Machiavellian villain the roles in such plays as Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* and *King Edward II*; Shakespeare's *Henry VI* (it was in this play that the word Machiavellianism was coined)⁴⁰ and *Richard III*; and

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Raab, p. 6.

⁴⁰Edward Meyer, *Machiavelli and The Elizabethan Drama* (New York, 1969), p. xi.

Greene's play *Alphonsus*.⁴¹ The myth of Machiavelli as the Devil's Tool did not end with the Elizabethan political villain but continued into the twentieth century. With the forthcoming of the Enlightenment, new interpretations were forthcoming, but the evil Machiavelli awaited only the changing tide of events to reappear in the mid-twentieth century.

⁴¹Ibid., Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND THE MACHIAVELLIAN LEGEND

Between the end of the Reformation and the beginning of the Enlightenment, Europe erupted politically and socially. Medieval concepts, both feudal and manorial, were replaced by a new, more inflammable idea, that of the absolute monarch. Historians have disagreed on the origins of this modern phenomenon. Some traced its birth to the Renaissance; some to the Reformation. One group suggested that the "absolute monarch" developed as a combination of both the secular and the spiritual. John B. Wolf in his work *The Emergence of The Great Powers*, 1951, wrote:

The seventeenth century was an age of princes patterned on Machiavelli's prototype and anointed with the Christian oil of divine right. From one extreme of Europe to another, philosophers, statesmen, and prelates, at times naively, at times with great show of scholarship, joined in extolling the wisdom of God as expressed in the divine structure of the status quo.¹

This interpretation was readily accepted by the citizens of the burgeoning nation-states; Lloyd Moote suggested that because of the devastating religious wars, "Subjects, were thrown into their

¹John B. Wolf, *The Emergence of The Great Powers 1685-1715* (New York, 1951), p. 297.

outstretched arms by the anarchy and terror of the religious wars were drawn toward absolutism by the feeling that the king knew his responsibilities toward them."² Moote also viewed the Reformation as the founding stone of this new absolute state.

Although the proponents of divine right may have been shaky in their use of history and mythology, and their confusion of kings with kingship, they were anything but inept in driving home their conclusions. . . . They put to good use the religious fervor which had been intensified by the Reformation, turning it against religiously inspired rebellion. If the king was quasi-divine, criticism of him was blasphemy, a sin which many Europeans hesitated to commit. . . . Writers were equally astute in playing on popular fears of social and political anarchy with their argument that kings were necessary to maintain an orderly, hierarchical system. And they could always pull out the plea that if a king was bad, that was God's punishment for men's sins.³

From this new absolute state developed the absolute monarch. By the seventeenth century, Europe witnessed the birth of this demi-god in almost every emerging state. In 1603, James Stuart of Scotland became James I of England. James showed both his learning and absolutism by writing: "*A deo rex, a rege lex,*" a Latin phrase meaning "The king comes from God, law comes from the king." Even the commonwealth which interrupted the Stuart line briefly, 1649-1660, was absolute in its

²A. Lloyd Moote, *The Seventeenth Century: Europe in Ferment* (Lexington, 1970), p. 43.

³*Ibid.*, p. 41.

control. Similar events were happening on the continent. France, under the absolute monarchy of the Bourbons, began a rise to power, following the Thirty Years War, that continued unchecked until after the death of Louis XIV, the Sun King. Louis was reported to have remarked, "*L'état c'est moi.*" "I am the state." Spain's power was declining under her ailing monarch Charles II. Russia's Romanov dynasty came to power in 1613 and would last for the next three hundred years as the world's most autocratic monarchy. It was on this stage, that of the divine and absolute state, that the Enlightenment was to be played. The mood of absolutism and spiritualism begun in the Reformation had set the scene for the intellectual dogmatism of the Enlightenment. All that was lacking were the Bacons, Rousseaus, and Fredericks. Peter Gay (1923-) argued;

A perceptive observer, looking about him in 1680, would probably have predicted that if there was to be an enlightenment, it would begin in the then fertile intellectual climate of England, would move from there to the ready soil of France and would then spread throughout Europe and even to the European colonies in America.⁴

What was this new philosophy that awakened the minds and scientific genius of Europe and the Americas? A good example of the Enlightenment ideal is carved in stone atop the administration building at the University of Texas, Austin. It

⁴Peter Gay, *Age of Enlightenment* (New York, 1966), p. 14.

reads: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The Enlightenment man was a man in search of the truth, and when he found it, he became as ardent a believer as any martyr to the faith. The Reformation had broken the power of the ecclesiastical authorities and the organized church; thus truth was no longer contained within theological principle. The intellectual of the Enlightenment searched for the truth; however, he looked for it not in the spiritual world but in the secular. He created a new religion, the religion of reason, with a new dogma, the scientific method. Observation, generalization, and experimentation replaced grace, sanctification, and justification as the cornerstones of intellectual debate. More importantly, these new dogmas came complete with what Denifle called that gift of the Reformation, the new revolutionary spirit. Consequently, the truth was not only sought but also defended as absolute. In the Age of Reason, a Rousseau was as out of place among the Encyclopedists as, during the Reformation, Luther was among the Catholics. The great thinkers of the Enlightenment were as dogmatic about their rational and scientific laws as Luther and Calvin had been about their theological truths. Men replaced their lists of theological truths with lists of rational or natural truths. Frank Manuel maintains that

The typical eighteenth century literate citizen of the world believed that Newton's law of motion and his world system were a perfect model of science—even if he could not even remotely follow the mathematical proofs of the *Principia*—and that the model was directly applicable to the "Science of man" as well as to physical science. . . . he

revered Francis Bacon's inductive experimental methods as the only true path to knowledge. He also accepted Descartes' conception of reason. . . . Above all, this average intellectual . . . was enchanted by John Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. . . .⁵

Enlightenment "truths" were taken on faith much like earlier theological truths. Peter Gay's description of the Enlightenment gentlemen, who discussed scientific theory while looking through the wrong end of a telescope, revealed this. "Their (Enlightenment Men) quest . . . whether viewed politically in Locke's fashion . . . or morally in Rousseau's fashion, . . . was predicated on devising a secular ethic to substitute for the traditional one judged no longer viable under the impact of science."⁶

What was to be the fate of Niccolo Machiavelli in the Age of Reason? With the seventeenth century came the birth of a new Machiavellian myth, that of the scientific Machiavelli. The scientific school was destined to continue as one of the strongest interpretations of the Florentine's work. This interpretation presented Machiavelli as a scientific observer, the realist simply explaining the political world as it really was. This view fit very well with the self image of the scholars of this period, for they pictured themselves doing actually this. However,

⁵Frank E. Manuel, editor, *The Enlightenment* (New Jersey, 1965), pp. 3,4.

⁶Leonard M. Marsak, editor, *The Enlightenment* (New York, 1924), p. 5.

a problem appeared with this theory. How were they to reconcile the difference between *The Prince* and Machiavelli's other works? The ardent republicans solved this by praising *The Discourses* and naming *The Prince* a satire. Some writers such as Voltaire called Machiavelli confusing; others simply relied on the old myth of the evil Machiavelli. Each saw his own prejudices confirmed.

In the earliest period of the Enlightenment in England, the idea of Machiavelli the realist came to life. Francis Bacon (1561-1626), genius of the scientific revolution that preceded the Enlightenment, gave one of the first scientific tributes to the Florentine. "We must be grateful to Machiavelli and to authors like him, who write about what men do and not about what they should do."⁷ Bacon was one of the first great scientific minds of the age. In his comment on Machiavelli, the new truth was beautifully reflected. Catholic, Protestant, good, or evil, that was not the question. The important thing was to be rational and scientific in one's method. For Bacon, Machiavelli had met the three important criteria: observation (the courts in which he lived), generalization (conclusions about the nature of politics), and experimentation (the examples he experienced and offered). This was also an example of a post-Reformation

⁷Francis Bacon, *The Works of Francis Bacon*, eds. James Spedding, Robert Ellis and Douglas Heath (Boston), p. 45.

development in the historiography of Machiavelli, that of amorality. There would continue to be a school that simply accepted Machiavellianism for what it was, neither moral nor immoral, just factual, without the need for religious or moral reflections. This school, was rigorously condemned following the world wars of the twentieth century, but not in the Enlightenment and not by Bacon. To Bacon, the truth was absolute and important, but it was the truth of science, not the Reformation. "He was mainly concerned with guiding men in the right scientific procedures,"⁸ not to the right god. Thus Machiavelli was reflected by Bacon as scientific, not immoral; "Bacon was living in the age of science."⁹

In France, the most important political philosopher of the period, other than Rousseau, called Machiavelli "that great man."¹⁰ Charles de Montesquieu born in 1689, at La Brède, near Bordeaux was to become the father of sociology. Montesquieu planned for a study of government in relation to both the physical and social milieu surrounding it.¹¹ In this plan,

⁸Gay, p. 17.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Charles de Montesquieu, *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris, 1838), p. 229.

¹¹George Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, ed. Thomas Landon Thorson (Hinsdale, Ill., 1973), pp. 507-514.

the scientific school believed Montesquieu was deeply influenced by Machiavelli's work.¹² In his *Montesquieu*, Robert Shackleton wrote that Montesquieu saw Machiavelli's relevance to present problems and was appreciative of Machiavelli's scientific method.¹³ In 1682, Amelot de la Houssaye, a French diplomat and translator of *The Prince*, wrote that Machiavelli was teaching one "how one must govern today."¹⁴ Jean de Muller, a historian and diplomat, 1752-1809, spoke of the realist Machiavelli in glowing terms.

I have just re-read Machiavelli's *Titus Livius* and his *Prince*, something I had not done for twenty-four years. This *Prince* is a classical book, one can even say an antique—nothing but pure gold. Experience enlightened by the most vigorous intelligence, nothing chimerical, nothing exclusive or partial, nothing sterile. All genuine political wisdom but one must know how to grasp it.¹⁵

This myth of the scientific Machiavelli appeared even in the works of the literary greats of the period. The English gentleman and poet Edward Young, 1683-1765, wrote of the Florentine in his *Night Thoughts on Life, Death and Immortality*,

¹²Robert Shackleton, *Montesquieu* (Oxford University, 1961), p. 126.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 127.

¹⁴Amelot de la Houssaye, translator, *The Prince* (Venice, 1683), as cited in Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Machiavelli* (New York, 1967), p. 242.

¹⁵Jean de Muller, *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 344, as cited in Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Machiavelli* (New York, 1967), p. 244.

Apology," that Machiavelli only presented to us the facts.

Poor Machiavell who labored hard his plan,
 Forgot that genius need not go to school;
 Forgot that man, without a tutor wise,
 His plan had practiced, long before twas writ.¹⁶

The Enlightenment was a movement that sought reason, science and truth, and the intellectuals created the new scientific Machiavellian myth on the way to finding their roots. But these rationalists were not alone. A second myth was created in this age. Although it never had the following of the former, it was as enduring. The new republican theorists of the Enlightenment echoed the kindness shown Machiavelli by the scientists in a different way. They thought of Machiavelli as a fellow republican and presented him as such. Two of the earliest republicans to view Machiavelli as a fellow republican were the English writers James Harrington and John Milton. Both of these scholars were Enlightenment philosophers following the traditional schools of scientific thought, but with a more utopian slant.

John Milton . . . defended republicanism on the abstract ground that it was implied by natural law and the sovereign power of the people. James Harrington, though the creator of a utopia (*Oceana*), laid aside more completely than any other writer the familiar legalist argumentation and defended republicanism as a consequence of social and economic evolution.¹⁷

¹⁶Edward Young, *Edward Young, The Complete Works; Poetry and Prose*, edited by James Nichols (Hildesheim, 1968), p. 160.

¹⁷Sabine, p. 459.

John Milton (1608-1674) made numerous references to the republican Machiavelli in his work. "That one can place more trust in an alliance or a league made with a republic than in one made with a prince, is shown by Machiavelli."¹⁸ He quoted from *The Discourses*, "Popular uprising have often been the occasion for the recovery of liberty and therefore should not be condemned for they generally arise out of just causes and complaints."¹⁹ He said of them, "Machiavelli much prefers a republic to a monarchy, showing weighty reasons throughout the whole 58th chapter of *Book I* of his *Discourses*, and again in Chapter 34 of *Book III*, where he states that a republic is less likely than a prince to err in choosing magistrates and officials."²⁰ James Harrington (1611-1677) illustrated a two-part interpretation of Machiavelli. He was more scientific and viewed the Florentine as a scientist, but he remarked many times on Machiavelli's republicanism.

Machiavel has a difcourfe, where he puts the queftion; Whether the guard of liberty may with more fecurity be committed to the nobility, or to the people? Which doubt of his arifes thro the want of explaining terms; for the

¹⁸John Milton, *The Works of John Milton*, editor, Don M. Wolfe (New Haven, 1953), p. 215.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 216-217.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 199.

guard of liberty can signify nothing else but the result of the commonwealth.²¹

And,

Machiavel gives a handsome caution, Let no man say he, be circumvented with the glory of Caesar, from the false reflection of their pens, who thro the longer continuance of his empire in the name than in the family, chang'd their freedom for flattery. But if a man would know truly what the Romans thought of Caesar, let them observe what they said of Catilin.²²

At one point in Harrington's work, *Of Popular Government*, he included one entire chapter from Machiavelli's *Discourses*. As an introduction to the chapter, Harrington wrote, "I have hertofore in vain persuaded them upon this occasion, to take notice of a chapter in Machiavel, so worthy of regard, that I have now inserted it at length . . ."²³ These Englishmen, although original in their interpretation of Machiavelli, had one very early source, Alberico Gentili, an Italian-English jurist. Gentili presented a solution to the major problem that he and later republicans were to have in presenting Machiavelli as a republican. These writers had little difficulty fitting the bulk of Machiavelli's writing into their republican philosophy, with the exception of *The*

²¹James Harrington, *The Oceana and Other Works of James Harrington*, ed. John Toland (Ann Arbor, 1956), p. 146.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 199.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 295.

Prince. Gentili, a contemporary of the Florentine, in his *De legationibus libri tres*, London, 1585, III,²⁴ suggested "that *The Prince* was actually intended to be a burlesque of despotism and tyranny rather than a guide for its promotion."²⁵ But Gentili was early; Machiavelli's republicanism and Machiavelli's satire did not reappear as a theory until a century later in Milton, Harrington, Spinoza, and Rousseau. The myth was revived along with the rebirth of republicanism during the Enlightenment and eventually became a recognizable part in Machiavellian legend.

Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677) wrote of government, "It makes for slavery, not for peace, to confer unlimited power on one man."²⁶ With this view of politics in mind, in his *Political Treatise*, he called Machiavelli "both a satirist and a shrewd observer."²⁷ As both Isaiah Berlin and Sir Frederick Pollock stated, Spinoza was particularly clear on Machiavelli's intent in writing *The Prince*. Spinoza wrote:

²⁴Alberico Gentili, *De legationibus libri tres* (London, 1585), as cited in Felix Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli*, (London, 1965), p. 68.

²⁵Alberico Gentili, *De legationibus libri tres*, (London, 1585), as cited in De Lamar Jensen, *Machiavelli*, (Boston, 1960), p. xi.

²⁶Frederick Pollock, *Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy*, (London, 1899), p. 309.

²⁷Benedict de Spinoza, *The Political Works*, V, editor and translator, A.G. Wernham (Oxford, 1958), p. 313.

Perhaps Machiavelli wanted to show how chary a free people should be of entrusting its welfare entirely to one man, who, if he is not a vain fool who thinks he can please everyone, must go daily in fear of plots; and thus is forced in self-defense to plot against his subject rather than to further their interests. This interpretation of that wise statesman seems to me particularly attractive in view of the well-known fact that he was an advocate of freedom and also gave some very sound advice for preserving it.²⁸

Spinoza pointed out that Machiavelli warned against one-man rule. "Machiavelli advises that the legislator should not transmit his absolute authority to a successor (*Discourses* I, 9), a point frequently overlooked by interpreters of *The Prince*."²⁹ Spinoza's desire for republican government influenced his interpretation of the works of Machiavelli, leading Pollock to end his analysis of Machiavelli and Spinoza with a statement that showed the frustration involved in working with Machiavelli's historiography: "The true intention of Machiavelli's treatise has been a standing puzzle to modern critics, and Spinoza's guess is perhaps as good as any other."³⁰

After the works of Spinoza came the writings of the dedicated republican, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1797). Between Rousseau and the most characteristic writers of the

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid., p. 163.

³⁰Pollock, p. 309.

Enlightenment "is fixed a great gulf."³¹ Rousseau was probably the least scientific of the Enlightenment authors, but he had a dogma which he defended as ardently as Bacon did his. Rousseau passionately believed that men were naturally good. This was his truth and he presented it in all his works. His natural man and state of nature were far removed from those of Hobbs and Locke. Sabine said of Rousseau that he led a revolt against reason. "Essentially he was interested in homely things, was terrified of science and art, distrusted polished manner, sentimentalized commonplace virtues and enthroned sense above intelligence."³² Thus when a scholar with the belief in the good man corrupted only by society looked at *The Prince*, he saw only a reflection of his beliefs. In Machiavelli, he saw an authority which could support his beliefs. He called *The Prince*, "the handbook for republicans."³³ In *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*, he wrote of Machiavelli:

Machiavelli was an honest man and a good citizen, but attached as he was to the court of the Medici, he was forced, in the midst of the Oppression of his country, to disguise his love of liberty. The choice of his execrable

³¹Sabine, p. 529.

³²Ibid., p. 530.

³³Ibid.

hero (Caesar Borgia) alone is enough to show his secret intention and the opposition of the maxims contained in *The Prince* to those in his *Discourse on Livy*, and his *History of Florence*, shows that this profound thinker has only had superficial or corrupt readers up to now.³⁴

In this passage, Rousseau followed the familiar pattern of dogmatically declaring his view as true and all others superficial or corrupt. The fact that Rousseau cited Machiavelli as a profound thinker gives some indication of the importance he would have attached to Machiavelli.

As irony would have it, the one Frenchman of the day who agreed with Rousseau's interpretation of Machiavelli was his bitterest enemy Diderot. Denis Diderot (1713-1784) wrote of the difference between himself and Rousseau as "the vast chasm between heaven and hell"³⁵ and said that the very idea of Rousseau disturbed his work "as if I had a damned soul at my side."³⁶ Diderot, the principal compiler of the *Encyclopedia*, met and disagreed with Rousseau in Paris in 1744. But Diderot's liberalism was reflected in his view of *The Prince*, not his dislike of Rousseau. He wrote of *The Prince*, "as a matter of fact, it was the fault of his contemporaries if they

³⁴Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, translated by Charles Frankel, (New York, 1947), p. 64.

³⁵Sabine, citing Denis Diderot, p. 529.

³⁶*Ibid.*

misconstrued his aim; they mistook a satire for a eulogy."³⁷

Concerning Machiavelli's politics, he wrote:

He didn't follow in the footsteps of writers of his time, nor did he fill his works with all those details that make their books so tasteless—but because of his superior genius, he grasped the meaning of the real principles of the constitution of states, clarified the mechanisms with skill and explained the causes of revolutions—in a word, he blazed a new trail and probed the depths of politics.³⁸

Following Diderot and Rousseau, in this line of thought were Vittorio Alberico, 1749–1803, Signor Ricci, 1801, and Ugo Foscolo, 1778–1827. These authors saw reflected in Machiavelli much more than just republicanism; they saw nationalism. Alberico called Machiavelli a "divine genius and Italy's only real philosopher," in his work *Del principe e delle lettere*, 1796.³⁹

The addition of nationalism to the beliefs of these men may easily be explained by a glance at the historical milieu in which they wrote. All three were writing at the turn of the nineteenth century and, with the advance of time, there had come many changes in the political climate of Europe. In the two decades prior to their writing, the American Revolution had ended and the French Revolution was being overtaken by the

³⁷Denis Diderot, *Oeuvres Completes*, edited by J. Assez (Paris, 1836), translation by M.R. Grove, 1975, p. 38.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 344.

³⁹Vittorio Alberico, *Del principe e delle lettere*, as cited in De Lamar Jensen, *Machiavelli*, (Boston, 1960), p. x.

Napoleonic Era. The religion of science was giving way to the truth of nationalism. But to the republicans of the Enlightenment, both at its beginning and end, Machiavelli had been the republican, political scientist, and political satirist. After the works of these men, no ardent supporter of this view presented himself again until the present-day works of Garrett Mattingly.

In the era of the Enlightenment, one major school remained to be investigated, that of the evil Machiavelli. The "devil's tool" theory was not the most active school of thought in this period, but it had at least one extremely powerful advocate, Frederick II of Prussia. Frederick, a student of Voltaire prior to assuming the throne, wrote poetry, played the flute, and read philosophy, and, in general, admired French culture. After he became ruler of Prussia, he wrote several books including *Histoire de Brandebourg* and a book on the duties of rulers, but his work of greatest importance here was his *Antimachiavel*. Frederick wrote this treatise shortly before he became King of Prussia in 1740. Frederick had written Voltaire in 1739, saying that he was thinking of writing a book on *The Prince*. Voltaire edited the work, and he aided in the anonymous publishing of it at The Hague in September, 1740, soon after Frederick had become King of Prussia and shortly before he marched into

Silesia.⁴⁰ This attack on the morality of Machiavelli was one of the strongest ever produced by any writers in support of the "devil's tool" theory. Frederick first called Machiavelli a poison.

I venture now to take up the defense of humanity against this monster who wants to destroy it; with reason and justice I dare to oppose sophistry and crime; and I put forth these reflections of *The Prince* of Machiavelli, chapter by chapter, so that the antidote may be found immediately following the poison.⁴¹

Frederick further suggested that *The Prince* would "seduce the innocent young men," as well as, "the princes who must govern the people; administer justice, and set an example for their subjects, and to be by their bounty, magnanimity, and mercy, the living images of the Divine."⁴² These views reflected more the Reformation legacy of spiritualism and absolutism than the traditional Renaissance legacy of reason. Frederick wrote with moral and religious indignation rather than in rational terms. He was defending the honor of princes against the attack of Machiavellianism. For him absolute monarchs were the "living images of the Divine,"⁴³ and the people must be defended

⁴⁰G.P. Gooch, *Frederick the Great*, (New York, 1947), p. 286.

⁴¹Frederick the Great, "Should a Prince Keep Faith?," as cited by De Lamar Jensen, *Machiavelli*, (Boston, 1960), p. 5.

⁴²*Ibid.*

⁴³*Ibid.*

against this monster who dared to suggest differently. He admitted there had been bad kings, but stated that there had been many, many more good ones. He called Machiavelli's model Cesare Borgia, "the most abominable monster ever vomited out of hell."⁴⁴ Before closing his attack on Machiavelli, Frederick dismissed all the supporters of the other Machiavellian myths in a sweeping denunciation. He especially hit hard at Rousseau's idea of *The Prince* as a satire. (Frederick had once said of Rousseau. "We must succor this poor unfortunate . . . His only offense is to have strange opinions which he thinks are good ones."⁴³)

I cannot finish this preface without saying a word to the people who believe that Machiavelli wrote about the things that princes actually do rather than what they ought to do, a belief which has pleased many in the world because it has a flavor of satire. Those who have pronounced this decisive judgment against the rulers have, undoubtedly, been seduced by the examples of some corrupt princes.⁴⁶

Frederick, a highly educated man, spoke only of the one work *The Prince*. He of all people would have had access to Machiavelli's works (His tutor Voltaire was a translator of

⁴⁴G.P. Gooch, *Frederick the Great*, citing Frederick, (New York, 1947), p. 288.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 144.

⁴⁶Frederick the Great, p. 6.

Machiavelli's works into French.). Yet he preferred to base his entire attack on one short work. This suggested that he looked for the work that would reflect his view of Machiavelli as the "devil's tool," and not to the works that could reflect other Machiavellian theories. Frederick had a personal bias when looking at *The Prince*. He was a prince, and he was therefore defending himself and his reign from this threat. But what of Frederick's tutor Voltaire?

Voltaire (1699-1778) once numbered Machiavelli among the great men of Renaissance Italy, a move of which Frederick disapproved, having written on March 30, 1738, "I find your history of the century of Louis XIV charming, I only wish you had not placed Machiavelli, who was a dishonest man, among the other great men of his century."⁴⁷ To the Prince's letter, Voltaire replied:

The first thing I have to speak to you about, Monseigneur, is your manner of thinking in regard to Machiavelli. How could you fail to be moved by that virtuous anger you almost feel with me because I praised a wicked man's style? His infernal policy was to be studied by the Borgias, father and son, and all those petty princes who could only rise through crime; a prince like you must detest it. (Voltaire, May 20, 1738)⁴⁸

⁴⁷Voltaire a Rupin, *Voltaire's Correspondence*, ed. Theodore Besterman (Institut et Musée Voltaire, Genève, 1963), p. 446.

⁴⁸Richard Aldington, ed. and trans. *Letters of Voltaire and Frederick the Great*, (London, 1927), p. 114.

Voltaire's thoughts on Machiavelli were much more varied than they appeared above. To Voltaire, Machiavelli seemed a man of many facets:

A strange man this Machiavelli! He amused himself with making verses, writing plays, showing his cabinet the art of killing with regularity [*The Art of War* which Voltaire translated along with the *Golden Ass*; *Mandragola* and *The Prince*] and teaching princes the art of perjuring themselves, assassinating, and poisoning as occasion required — a great art which Pope Alexander VI, and his bastard Cesare Borgia, practised in wonderful perfection without the aid of his lessons.⁴⁹

Voltaire wrote extensively about Machiavelli's military works:

Let us observe that arrangements, the marching and the evolutions of battalions, nearly as they are now practised, were revived in Europe by one who was not a Military man — by Machiavelli, a secretary of Florence, . . . He taught Europe the art of war; it had long been practised without being known.⁵⁰

He once wrote in a letter to Count Grancasso Algarotti, August 15, 1760, "I believe as you do that Machiavelli would have been a good army general. But I would never advise the enemy general to dine with him in times of truce."⁵¹ Here he referred to the Borgia story which showed some identification with the evil Machiavellian myth, but he also gave him credit in many

⁴⁹Voltaire, Vol. VI., p. 216.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 215.

⁵¹Ibid., Vol XLII, p. 51.

other areas. Voltaire praised Machiavelli's anti-clericalism, reason, and learning, but his work with Frederick on the *Antimachiavel* appeared to condemn the Florentine.

Theodore Besterman, 1969, a Voltaire scholar, suggested that Voltaire's adulation of Frederick "reflects that he was doing everything in his power to keep the new king to his princely resolutions."⁵² He was agreeing with him in an effort to keep Frederick on the road to becoming an enlightened despot. Besterman suggested that Voltaire realized quickly that Frederick would not live up to his high expectations. "The king almost immediately let fall the mask and his conduct showed how long and how well he had prepared a course of action far removed from the views he had proclaimed and continued to proclaim."⁵³ After Voltaire came to realize that his model prince was no model at all, he wrote his most famous remark on Frederick and Machiavelli. In a letter to Nicolas Claude Trieriot, September 10, 1756, the Frenchman sarcastically wrote, "You must know . . . that the Solomon of the North (Frederick) is seizing power in Leipsic! I do not know if this is a chapter of Machiavelli or Anti-Machiavell, . . ."⁵⁴ Voltaire's view of

⁵²Theodore Besterman, *Voltaire* (New York, 1969), p. 255.

⁵³*Ibid.*

⁵⁴Voltaire, Vol XLII, p. 137.

Machiavelli seemed to flow from one myth to the next without any real support for any.

Voltaire's fellow encyclopedist and anti-cleric, Bayle (1674-1706), seemed to have much the same problem with Machiavelli. He praised him on the one hand: "Machiavelli, native of Florence, was a man of great wit who "possessed a beautiful pen."⁵⁵ and condemned him on the other: "This book (*The Prince*) of which Catherine of Medici made a special study and which she placed in the hands of children."⁵⁶ Boyle, being a Huguenot, was truly condemning *The Prince* here. He also wrote of *The Prince*, "The maxims of the author are very wicked. People are so convinced of this that Machiavellianism and the art of ruling tyrannically have become synonymous terms."⁵⁷ Although these Enlightenment philosophers were confused about Machiavelli's work, the myth of the evil Machiavelli remained a strong influence on them and that, even in this age of reason, morality and government were being equated.

⁵⁵Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, (Amsterdam, 1724), vol. M-O, p. 9.

⁵⁷Ibid.

In the Enlightenment, as in the Reformation, the writer of each tract on the Florentine pointed to the works that reflected his views. The intellectual of the Enlightenment reached out for the truth and finding it in reason saw nothing but reason in the world. A few saw the world as scientific, and they created the myth of the scientific Machiavelli. Some saw the world as republican and they established the myth of the republican satirist. The writings of the Enlightenment, as did the writings of the Reformation, reflected the truths of that age.

CHAPTER III

CONTEMPORARY VIEWS AND MACHIAVELLI

The nationalism viewed in the works of Alberico and to some degree in Rousseau became the rule in the nineteenth century rather than the exception. As Stuart Hughes pointed out, both the nation-state and nationalism were an accomplished fact by the beginning of the twentieth century.

The nation-state was a European invention. Although in this century it has been initiated all over the world; often with bizarre results—its origin lay in Western Europe in the period between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries. First, England, France, and Spain organized themselves around a common core. In the nineteenth century, Germany and Italy overcame their more stubborn disunity and emerged as nation-states. By the twentieth century, the nation-state had become the norm throughout Western Europe. In the central and eastern parts of the continent, the multinational Austrian and Russian empires remained as relics of the past. But these empires too were sovereign and allowed their subjects no higher allegiance.¹

Hughes further suggested that this growth of nationalism "was the great political novelty of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth."² The nationalism of the nineteenth and early

¹Stuart Hughes, *Contemporary Europe* (New Jersey, 1961), p. 4.

²*Ibid.*

twentieth century had become the new truth replacing the goals of the Enlightenment. The rationalism of Voltaire was replaced by such romantic and nationalistic works as that of Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872). Mazzini wrote in his work that God had established and sanctioned nationalism. He presented God as saying to Man:

March on among the brothers whom I (God) have given you, with head held high, freely and easily, as befits one who carries my words in his bosom. Take your rank among the nations in obedience to the sign which I placed upon your brow and the words which I whispered in your ear when you were a babe in the cradle.³

Here Mazzini reflected a new belief, one very different from the Enlightenment's science of reason. For Mazzini and his fellow nationalists, the truth had become nationalism and national unity. This new theme was reflected in page after page of their works. Hughes discussed the difference between nationalism and pre-nationalism in his *Contemporary Europe*:

This undivided loyalty was the great political novelty of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth: formerly, there had always been narrower allegiances, to municipality, guild, feudal lord, or the like to compete with and divide the national loyalty of the individual. At the other end of the scale, there had been wider allegiance . . . to the Holy Roman Empire, to a universal church, to the solidarity of an international aristocracy — to split a man's political devotion. By the third quarter of the nineteenth century, these older political loyalties were either dead or in decay. In the whole of European history, only in the years from

³Giuseppe Mazzini, "Nationalism and Liberalism," *From Absolutism to Revolution 1648-1848*, edited by Herbert H. Power (London, 1968), p. 279.

1866 (the dissolution of the German Confederation) to 1919 (the establishment of the League of Nations) did there exist not even a vestige of an international political organization. As the twentieth century opened the Nation-state claimed exclusive and total allegiance.⁴

The treatment accorded the works of Machiavelli by the school of historians was also very different from that of the Enlightenment. While a few historians continued to see only the objective scientific Machiavelli, others also saw the subjective spirit of nationalism reflected in his work, especially *The Prince*. The controversial last chapter of *The Prince*, "Exhortation to Liberate Italy From the Barbarians", now became the focal point for the discussion of the Florentine's writings. This last chapter of *The Prince* was filled with emotional and nationalistic thought. In *The Prince* Machiavelli wrote:

... that he was ordained by God for her redemption, nevertheless, it has afterwards been seen in the further course of his actions that Fortune has disowned him; so that our country, left almost without life, still waits to know who it is that is to heal her bruises, to put an end to the devastation and plunder of Lombardy, . . . to staunch those wounds of hers which long neglect has changed into running sores . . . we see how she prays God to send some one to rescue her from these barbarous cruelties and oppressions . . . what gates would be closed against him? What people would refuse him obedience? What jealousy would stand in his way? What Italian but would yield him homage?⁵

⁴Hughes, p. 4.

⁵Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. Charles W. Eliot, translated by N.H. Thomson (New York, 1910), pp. 86-90.

After having read this chapter, many historians in the period were convinced that Machiavelli was a nationalist. While many of the nineteenth and twentieth century writers continued to accept the myths of the scientific or realistic Machiavelli, they blended these myths with that of Machiavelli the patriot.

The list of nineteenth century scholars who supported the myth of Machiavelli's nationalism included such men as Georg Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1802), and the Italians, Pasquale Villari (1827-1917) and Francesco De Sanctis (1818-1883). All of these literary giants lived in a period of fanatic nationalistic movements which were encouraged in Germany by Napoleon's pressure on Prussia, and in Italy by the continuing civil wars of unification that were raging in that nation.

Herder and Hegel wrote only briefly of the Florentine. However, each referred to what each viewed as his strong nationalism. Herder wrote in his *Briefe zur Beforderung der Humanitat*, 1797, that *The Prince* was, "a pure political masterpiece composed for princes of that period, in accordance with their tastes and their principles, written to free Italy of barabrians"⁶

⁶John Gottfried Herder, *Briefe Zur Beforderung der Humanitat*, as cited in Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Machiavelli*, (New York, 1967), p. 274-75.

Hegel continued both the idea of Machiavelli's nationalism and that of his works being reflective of his environment. Hegel, who worked under the influence of the Napoleonic era, saw society as impersonal, not individual, as had Rousseau. Hegel developed a new system he called dialectic. Hegel's new system was discussed by George Sabine as

What Hegel's philosophy professed to offer, therefore was an enlarged conception of reason that should overlap and include what had been separated by the analysis of Hume and Kant, and the center of his system was a new logic purporting to systematize a new intellectual method . . . Its virtue, he held, lay in its capacity to demonstrate a necessary logical relationship between the realm of fact and the realm of value.⁷

Based on such beliefs as these, it was understandable that Hegel would write of Machiavelli:

. . . with cold circumspection, (Machiavelli) grasped the necessary idea of the salvation of Italy through its unification into one state . . . Gangrenous limbs cannot be cured with lavender water. A situation in which poison and assassination are common weapons demands remedies of no gentle kind . . .⁸

Shlomo Avineri, in his *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*, 1972, wrote that since Hegel had been condemned for this praise of Machiavelli:

⁷Sabine, p. 570.

⁸Georg Frederick Hegel, *Political Writings*, as cited by Shlomo Avineri, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*, (Cambridge, 1972), p. 53-54.

It is therefore of some interest to try and specify what it is that Hegel saw in Machiavelli as worth of admiration. Moreover, since Hegel tries to place Machiavelli in a methodological perspective as well, the full measure of Hegel's assessment of Machiavelli is of utmost importance.

Avineri quoted Ernest Cassirer as disavowing Hegel's theory. "Ernest Cassirer, even saddled Hegel with the charge that he dreamed of becoming a second Machiavelli; whatever this may mean."¹⁰ However, Avineri showed that Hegel hit hard at men who believed as Cassirer implied here, that there was an inherent evil in Machiavelli's works. Avineri quoted:

Machiavelli's fundamental aim of erecting Italy into a state was misunderstood from the start by the blind who took his work as nothing but a foundation of tyranny of a golder mirror for an ambitious oppressor. . . . It is utterly senseless to treat the execution of an idea directly created out of an insight into the Italian situation as a compendium of moral and political principles applicable indifferently to any and every situation, i.e. to none.¹¹

Avineri suggested that Hegel based his interpretation of *The Prince* on the last chapter. In view of Hegel's sense of nationalism, this appeared likely. Avineri said Hegel compared Machiavelli with Cato and saw his ideas not as a general political theory but as a theory for his time.¹² Hegel wrote:

⁹Avineri, p. 53.

¹⁰ibid.

¹¹ibid., p. 54.

¹²ibid., p. 53.

You must come to the reading of *The Prince* immediately after being impressed by the history of the centuries before Machiavelli and history of his own times. Then indeed it will appear as not merely justified but as an extremely great and true conception produced by a genuinely political head with intellect of the highest and noblest kind.¹³

Both Herder and Hegel reflected the themes that were to be developed during this period: Machiavelli's patriotism, and Machiavelli as a mirror of sixteenth century Italy. These writers also illustrated the idea that morality was unimportant as an issue for debate. They looked at Machiavelli as neither moral or immoral. This changed abruptly in the twentieth century after the world wars. Both Herder and Hegel saw social tradition as a general system of social evolution, and the rational form of the evolution might be made into a method generally applicable to philosophy and social studies.¹⁴ Thus when Hegel looked at Machiavelli's works he saw the Florentine using methodology to solve the problem of his time. Machiavelli systematically found the cause and prescribed a cure for that time in history. Morality had no bearing on the subject at all.

The Italians had much more to say about their fellow countrymen. Pasquale Villari, who wrote the classic life of Machiavelli, *Life and Times of Niccolo Machiavelli*, continued both

¹³Ibid., p. 54.

¹⁴Sabine, p. 568.

the theme of the Florentine as a man of his times, as well as that of Machiavelli's nationalism. Villari wrote:

Machiavelli, as we have seen, was very closely connected with his times. Therefore, our estimate of him must greatly depend upon our estimate of the age in which he lived. He came into the world at a moment when political corruption was general throughout Europe, but more predominant in Italy than elsewhere . . .¹⁵

From this background Villari believed the reason for the writing of *The Prince* became clear. For Villari:

Our Italian motherland, he said in conclusion, can never be prosperous nor great until it is united, and its unity can only be the work of a Prince — reformer . . . In this strain *The Prince* was conceived and written. It lays before us the constitution and organization of a State by the work of the man who is this living personification, but in whom the individual and private conscience is, as it were eradicated.¹⁶

Villari also saw in Machiavelli the scientist for whom the Enlightenment had looked so diligently. As Villari pointed out:

It was the scientific character of the work that led the author to examine with equal indifference both the virtuous and wicked prince and offer to either the counsels suited to the achievement of his end . . . The case of conscience, so unavoidably present to our own minds, never seems to occur to that of Machiavelli, who is solely concerned in inquiring which is the road to power and how the state is to be established.¹⁷

¹⁵Pasquale Villari, *The Life and Times of Niccolò Machiavelli*, translated by Linda Villari (London, 1929), p. 509.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 514.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 515-16.

Although Villari discussed Machiavelli in relationship to his environment and his scientific method, it was Machiavelli's nationalism that he praised the highest. "At the present day, when Italy's political redemption has begun, and the nation is constituted according to the prophecies of Machiavelli, the moment has at last come for justice to be done to him."¹⁸ This modern justification of Machiavelli reflected as much Villari's beliefs as it did Machiavelli's, Villari in his youth had been an agitator for national unity and a leader of the May, 1848, revolt in Naples.¹⁹ Thus, in justifying Machiavelli, Villari justified himself and his age.

Villari was the student of Francesco De Sanctis, who has been called the greatest nineteenth century student of Italian literature and was recognized as the founder of modern literary criticism in Italy. De Sanctis, in *The History of Italian Literature*, reserved an entire chapter for the Florentine. De Sanctis saw Machiavelli as a great republican and nationalist. "So deeply attached did he (Machiavelli) grow to the republic that he thought it a small thing to suffer even torture for its sake when the Medici were restored. Working and struggling like this

¹⁸Ibid., p. 517.

¹⁹Jensen, p. 17.

for his country, his mettle was proved and his spirit was formed."²⁰ Of Machiavelli's nationalism De Sanctis wrote, "He saw with great distinctness that if Italy was to keep her independence, she needed to be wholly or at any rate, partially, united under a single prince,"²¹ and,

This is the real Machiavellianism, alive indeed young, even today. Developed, corrected, simplified and in part realized, Machiavellianism is the program of the modern world, and great nations are the nations that come nearest to realizing it. Let us be proud of our Machiavelli. Whenever a part of the ancient building crumbles, let there be glory to Machiavelli, and whenever a part of the new is built let there be glory to Machiavelli! Even as I am writing these words the bells are ringing far and wide, unceasingly, telling that the Italians are in Rome: the temporal power is falling, the people are shouting, "Long live the unity of Italy!" Let there be glory to Machiavelli.²²

De Sanctis suggested of the myth of Machiavellianism this: "Machiavellianism is a by-product, secondary or relative to Machiavelli's teaching and the absolute and permanent part has been forgotten."²³ As he wrote on the myths of Machiavellianism, he helped to create one of the most accepted myths, that of Machiavelli the patriot.

²⁰Francesco De Sanctis, *History of Italian Literature*, translated by Joan Redfern, (New York, 1931), p. 535.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 537.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 585.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 583.

The patriot Machiavelli can be seen in the works of a multitude of historians from Villari and De Sanctis to the present day. Machiavelli the patriot grew into one of the important schools of thought concerning the Florentine. In 1893, John Owen wrote in his *The Sceptics of the Italian Renaissance*, "Machiavelli longed for the advent of some deliverer, a man with indomitable will and iron hand, who might reconstruct and unify the whole country. The means by which he accomplished this purpose were of no importance."²⁴ *Italian Democracy In The Making*, by William Salomone, 1845, said of Machiavelli and his nationalism, "The polemical literature on Machiavelli is vast and while differing about the sources, it is mostly agreed about the objective, of his patriotic fervor. In the much quoted chapter XXVI of *The Prince* entitled "Exhortation to Liberate Italy From The Barbarians,"²⁵ Hans Kohn, 1955, whose work on the realism of nationalism has become a classic, suggested that

²⁴John Owen, *The Sceptics of the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1908), pp. 174-175.

²⁵William Salomone, *Italian Democracy* (Philadelphia, 1945), p. 3.

Machiavelli should be thanked for preparing the stage for nationalism. "A lonely voice for nationalism was raised in Italy of the Renaissance by Niccolo Machiavelli . . . was important in the preparation of nationalism."²⁶ Carlton Hayes, in 1960, called nationalism a religion and Machiavelli an eloquent sixteenth century applier for Italian nationalism.²⁷

In his introduction to *The Prince* for Harvard Classics, in 1910, Charles W. Eliot made the sweeping statement that "Machiavelli's aim in *The Prince* has been very variously interpreted. His motive was probably mainly patriotic . . ."²⁸ In his work *Lust and Liberty: the Poems of Machiavelli*, (1963) Joseph Tusiane reflected the nationalism of his age when he wrote of the Florentine, "And it is from his verse that we derive the impression of a Machiavelli who, even in a state of delirious intoxication says the things that he loves most and repeats the one thought that to him is poetry — the freedom of his country."²⁹

²⁶Hans Kohn, *Nationalism* (New York, 1955), pp. 13-14.

²⁷Carlton Hayes, *Nationalism: a Religion* (New York, 1960), p. 32.

²⁸Machiavelli, ed. Eliot, p. 3.

²⁹Niccolo Machiavelli, *Lust and Liberty*, translated by Joseph Tusiane (New York, 1963), p. xxiv.

One of the leading exponents of this line of thought was Allen Gilbert, the editor and translator of the Duke University Press edition of Machiavelli's works. Gilbert, in 1938, presented nationalism as a prime factor in the writing of *The Prince*. In *Machiavelli's Prince and Its Forerunners*, he suggested that

1. Machiavelli's first interest was the good of the people of Italy.³⁰
2. Machiavelli advised a prince because he believed Italy could be delivered only by a single person, not by a republic.³¹
3. The work is addressed not to a tyrant but to a good ruler.³²
4. Though Machiavelli's prince will be moral when possible he is under no detailed moral restraint whatever. He has, however, the ultimate obligation to rule well. (This is one element of Machiavellinism that would be attacked in the later post-war era.)³³
5. *The Prince* is designed for the deliverer of Italy and is a unit.³⁴
6. Though manifesting independence of mind *The Prince* is not a unique work but a representative — the greatest — of a type familiar to Machiavelli.³⁵

This was one of the more definitive statements of the general

³⁰Allen Gilbert, *Machiavelli's Prince and Its Forerunners* (New York, 1968), p. 3.

³¹ibid.

³²ibid.

³³ibid.

³⁴ibid.

³⁵ibid.

thought of the nationalist school. Gilbert, as did all the aforementioned scholars, wrote in the age of nationalism and their works reflected this philosophy.

With the end of World War I came a different world, a world in which the purity of nationalism came to be doubted. The late twentieth century grew into an age much different from what the earlier had been. In the 1920's and 1930's came the horrors of the national socialism of Hitler and Mussolini, followed by the sweep of anti-colonial nationalism, in Asia and Africa. Added to this chaos was the devastating effect of the Cold War, in which the communist and non-communist peoples the world over were locked. These elements, combined with the revolutionary character of the scientific and technological achievements of the nuclear age, greatly altered the world. For the first time in history man could at will destroy all of mankind. The turbulent result of these developments naturally was reflected in the writing of the age and thus in the historiography concerning Machiavelli.

The unrest in the literature of the period illustrated the unrest in the scholarly world. In the Reformation, the intellectual had the spiritual truth; in the Enlightenment, knowledge of reason; and in the nineteenth century, the religion of nationalism; but in the post-war years his "truths" were open to doubt. He looked to nationalism and found atrocity; to reason

and found immorality in the name of science; to faith and found Darwin and atheism. W. B. Yeats characterized the twentieth century when he wrote,

Things fall apart, the centre cannot hold
 Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
 The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
 The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
 The good lack all conviction, while the worst
 Are full of passionate intensity.³⁶

Many historians saw this situation as a result of political leaders following the tenets of *The Prince*. They placed the blame for immorality on Machiavelli. To men like the educator Frederick Mayer, 1960, Machiavelli had made a nationalistic appeal but of a very different kind. According to Mayer, "To Machiavelli as to modern fascist educators, the goal of instruction was the creation of blind patriotism. The people are to be taught obedience to . . . and be willing to die for the state."³⁷ Mayer joined the sixteenth-century thinkers as he attacked Machiavelli's morality, calling him "a caustic critic," and "atheistic".³⁸ He stated, "While religious leaders pointed to love and compassion, Machiavelli regarded these traits as

³⁶Kenneth Clark, *Civilization* (New York, 1969), p. 347.

³⁷Frederick Mayer, *A History of Educational Thought* (Columbus, Ohio, 1966), p. 188.

³⁸*ibid.*, p. 186.

enfeebling."³⁹ Mayer was a member of that school that grew to great importance after World War II, the school which had met the new National Socialists and once again condemned Machiavelli's morals. In 1967, Giuseppe Pressolini assailed Machiavelli as anti-religious when he wrote,

Machiavelli's message, as we shall see, is profoundly pessimistic. He repudiates the relevance of Christian morality, the basis upon which the Western world is founded. And he even denies the values of life except for pride and presents a vast universal panorama that offers no reward to valor, no justice to innocent victims . . .⁴⁰

Of Machiavelli's role in national socialism, Prezzoline implied, "These books (anti-Machiavelli tracts), did not flourish in Italy because Italians thought of Machiavelli as a national figure, or in Germany because there he was considered too serious a person, whose tragic utterances were well understood."⁴¹

Gerhard Ritter's *The Corrupting Influence of Power* called Machiavelli the pathfinder of continental power politics, but said,

Fortunately for Europe, the fate of that continent and the growth of political theory in the modern world was not determined exclusively by Machiavelli . . . No words are necessary to point to the dangerous one-sidedness of this teaching . . . What Machiavelli rediscovered was the demonic character of power . . .⁴²

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Prezzolini, p. 3.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 282.

⁴²Gerhard Ritter, *The Corrupting Influence of Power*, translated by F.W. Pick (Essex, 1952), pp. 44-45.

The famous British philosopher Bertrand Russell, at the end of the second World War, called *The Prince* "a handbook for dictators."⁴³ The twentieth century writers Leo Strauss and Jacques Maritain, 1961, presented Machiavelli in this light also. Maritain wrote in 1942, while exiled from his native country France:

Machiavelliansim succeeds in bringing about the misfortune of man, which is the exact opposite of any genuinely political end . . . Absolute Machiavellianism succeeds against moderate or weak Machiavellianism; this also is normal. But if absolute Machiavellianism were to succeed absolutely and definitely in the world, this would simply mean that political life would have disappeared from the face of the earth . . .⁴⁴

Maritain continued, "Machiavellianism is a philosophy of politics and by essence must make use of evil . . . There will be no end to the occurrence of misdeeds and mistakes as long as humanity endures. To Machiavellianism there can and must be an end."⁴⁵

One of the most interesting developments of the new anti-Machiavellian movement was the Machiavellian personality created by the twentieth-century psychologists. Several works were done

⁴³Bertrand Russell, as cited in Isaiah Berlin, "Question of Machiavelli," *The New York Review of Books*, XVII (Nov. 4, 1971), 17-24.

⁴⁴Jacques Maritain, "The End of Machiavellianism," *Machiavelli*, ed. De Lamar Jensen (Boston, 1960), p. 94.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 96.

on this subject in the early 1970's. Among the better known of these works, *The Machiavillians, A Social Psychological Study of Moral Character and Organizational Milieu*, by Stanley S. Guterman, illustrated simply the theme of this paper. It showed clearly how a myth was found to fit the need of the writer. Guterman, quoting not one of Machiavelli's works nor any Machiavellian scholar, wrote an entire book on the Machiavellian personality, which he saw as injurious to humanistic values and democratic society. Guterman stated:

More subtle types of unethical behavior cannot be defined so easily. Yet they are just as injurious, if not more so, to the values of humanistic and democratic society. We have in mind:

The physician who lies to his patient for the latter's "own good," thereby violating his autonomy;

The political leader who distorts the issues and makes irrational appeals to the electorate, thereby making a travesty of reasoned discussion, which is supposed to be an essential of the democratic process;¹

The university professor who, in his frenzy to build up his prestige and reputation, exploits his students, thereby stifling their independence and creativity;

The businessman who earns a large portion of his income from the tenements of a slum, thereby contributing to the degradation and misery of slum living;

The social scientist who proffers advice on how to manipulate the public, thereby betraying his calling.

Since these individuals have not committed a clear-cut violation of any law, they are more difficult to identify than, say, delinquents and are therefore not as accessible to study. If, however, there is a quality of character which underlies, and is common to, most of these diverse behaviors, we have no need separately to identify and study those who engage in each type of behavior. We

can instead center our attention on the underlying character variable. There, indeed, does seem to be such a variable — Machiavellianism.⁴⁶

Guterman saw Machiavellianism as evil and therefore used the term to describe the evil personality, without a firsthand knowledge of the Florentine's work. He, however, was doing what many writers with a claimed knowledge of Machiavelli's work had already done. He drew from Machiavelli only the myth which fit his need.

A second school that developed from this chaos was that of Machiavelli as a mirror of Renaissance Italy. This school saw the only defense of Machiavelli's methods as placing them in the sixteenth century. This school, led, by L. A. Burd, author of the introduction to *The Prince* in the *Oxford Classics*, wrote along the lines of Hegel. They presented Machiavelli as writing for and about Renaissance Italy, developing a methodical view of the history of one age and of one place. Burd, 1897, suggested that "To understand *The Prince* aright, it is not only necessary to go back to Machiavelli's age, the book must also be restored to Machiavelli's country."⁴⁷ He attacked the idea of universal maxims in the *The Prince*. "The tendency to regard as universal

⁴⁶Stanley S. Guterman, *The Machiavellians* (Lincoln, 1970), pp. xiii-xiv.

⁴⁷Laurence Arthur Burd, "A Product and Spokesman of Renaissance Italy," *Machiavelli*, ed. by DeLamar Jensen (Boston, 1960), p. 42.

maxims of political science what were only suggested as methods unfortunately rendered imperative in a given case, increased the difficulties of criticism ten-fold."⁴⁸ For Burd, Machiavelli was simply talking to his generation, not to posterity. Therefore there was no connection between his methods and the horrors of the 1940's. A major student of the Renaissance, Federico Chabod, accepted the premise of Machiavelli, the mirror, but violently attacked the ideal of Machiavelli's nationalism. In 1957, he quoted Machiavelli as saying "... you make me laugh — first because no union will ever do any good..."⁴⁹ He portrayed the Florentine as a depressed, sad man who "often as he contemplates the Italy of his day... is filled with a profound sense of grief."⁵⁰ Of Machiavelli Chabod wrote, "Florence is an object of pity."⁵¹ Chabod's work presented a series of points by which he showed the cause-and-effect relationship between Machiavelli's Italy and Machiavelli's writings. Machiavelli, far from being a nationalist, was instead a mirror of his times. Herbert Butterfield, author of *The Statecraft of Machiavelli*, (1956), saw Machiavelli much as Chabod did.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 43.

⁴⁹Federico Chabod, *Machiavelli and The Renaissance*, translated by David Moore, (London, 1958), p. 20.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 82.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 89.

However, he added a touch of the "evil Machiavelli" to his works: "... the anti-Machiavels and even the Elizabethan dramatists were not so willfully wide of the mark as some writers have assumed."⁵² Both the nationalist and the anti-nationalist writers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries reflected in their works the development of the religion of nationalism with all its dynamic forces. From the fear of nationalism came the rebirth of the formerly strong Machiavellian myth, that of the evil Machiavelli, as shown in the works of Pressolini, Guterman, and Mayer, and the development of a strong defense of Machiavelli in the myth of the man of his times. A second defense of Machiavelli was presented in the school who saw the Florentine as a realist. This defense reflected a rebirth of the Enlightenment scientist, who earlier had seen in Machiavelli a reflection of scientific realism and amorality.

Ernst Cassirer, an active author and theorist, 1944, wrote "Since the time of Herder and Hegel we have been told that it is a mistake to regard Machiavelli's *Prince* as a systematic book... I fear least we are suffering from a sort of political illusion..."⁵³ To Cassirer, the empiricist, *The Prince* was real and relevant.

⁵²Herbert Butterfield, *The Statecraft of Machiavelli* (New York, 1956), p. 11.

⁵³Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven, 1946), p. 124.

The Prince is neither a moral nor an immoral book. It is simply a technical book . . . Machiavelli studied political action in the same way as a chemist studies chemical reactions. Assuredly a chemist who prepares in his laboratory a strong poison is not responsible for its effects . . . Machiavelli's *Prince* contains many dangerous and poisonous things, but he looks at them with the coolness and indifference of a scientist. He gives his political prescriptions.⁵⁴

Cassirer defended the work as scientific and therefore not responsible for the results. In 1944, with the world in flames because of politics, Cassirer saw a need to defend the scientific method, a problem that the Enlightenment thinker had not faced.

Cassirer was joined in 1950 by Max Lerner in viewing Machiavelli as a cold scientist. He wrote of Machiavelli, "We live today in the shadow of a Florentine, the man who above all others taught the world to think in terms of cold political power."⁵⁵ Max Lerner, who wrote the introduction to Random House's *Prince and the Discourses*, 1950, thought of Machiavelli as very different from his fellow humanists in his goals.

But the intellectual spirit that pervades the book is quite another matter. Here we are in the presence of something little short of a revolution in political thinking. The humanists who had written books about princes had

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 153.

⁵⁵Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince and The Discourses*, introduction by Max Lerner (New York, 1950), p. 25: This quotation appears in the introduction by Max Lerner.

written in the idealistic and scholastic medieval tradition. They were ridden by theology and metaphysics. Machiavelli rejected metaphysics, theology, and idealism. The whole drift of his work is toward a political realism, unknown to the formal writing of his time.⁵⁶

Lerner also wrote, "He had the clear-eyed capacity to distinguish between man as he ought to be and man as he actually is — between the ideal form of institutions and the pragmatic conditions under which they operate."⁵⁷ Therefore, for Lerner, Machiavelli had not justified Cesare Borgia, he had not laid the foundations for Adolf Hitler. He had only described men as they were. Machiavelli was not the personification of evil. He simply was describing what men were.

In another defense of Machiavelli, developed from the realist school, J.H. Hexter, in 1964, presented a thesis concerning *The Prince* based on linguistics. Hexter analysed the words used by Machiavelli as a means of discovering the true meaning of the Florentine's work. He concluded of Machiavelli's state:

Lo stato is no body politic; it is not the people politically organized, the political expression of their nature and character and aspirations, their virtues and their defects. Rather it is an inert lump and whatever vicarious vitality it displays is infused into it not by the people but by the prince who gets it. Our investigation has lead us to a curious conclusion. In *Il Principe*, Machiavelli has not

⁵⁶ibid.

⁵⁷ibid.

stretched *stato*; he has shrunk it. He has drained away most of its medieval social meanings and has not given it its modern political amplitude.⁵⁸

Thus to Hexter, Machiavelli was not writing of modern politics at all, but realistically looking at the politics of his day. Machiavelli saw politics through an alienated eye. He wanted "not to reinforce, to mend the fabric of political society but to destroy it."⁵⁹ Hexter's work brought forth many new ideas showing that the historiography of Machiavelli was still very much alive in the 1960's and 1970's. Men still sought the true meaning of Machiavelli, as they had in the Enlightenment.

After the two world wars another Enlightenment interpretation reappeared as a defense. Garrett Mattingly, the author of *Catherine of Aragon*, 1941; *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 1955; and *The Armada*, 1959, prepared an article "Machiavelli's Prince; Political Science or Political Satire," 1958. In this presentation, Mattingly revived the views of Spinoza and Rousseau. He saw Machiavelli as the satirist and therefore an antagonist to men of Hitler's stamp. Mattingly suggested:

Although the method and most of the assumptions of the *Prince* are so much of a piece with Machiavelli's thought that the book could not have been written by anyone else, yet in certain important respects, including some of

⁵⁸J.H. Hexter, "The Loom of Language and the Fabric of Imperatives: The Case of *Il Principe* and *Utopia*," *American Historical Review* (July, 1964), p. 954.

⁵⁹*ibid.*

the most shocking of the epigrams, *The Prince* contradicts everything else Machiavelli ever wrote and everything we know about his life. And everyone who has studied the subject at all has always known this.⁶⁰

He further suggested, "the notion that this little book was meant as a serious, scientific treatise on government contradicts everything we know about Machiavelli's life, about his writings and about the history of his time."⁶¹ Mattingly believed Machiavelli to be a republican who deeply loved his country and therefore wrote *The Prince* as a satire. "To read *The Prince* as satire not only clears up puzzles and resolves contradictions, it gives a new dimension and meaning to passages unremarkable before."⁶²

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there reappeared three former Machiavellian myths: Machiavelli as a satirist, as a tool of the devil, and as a realist. These centuries also created two major new myths, Machiavelli as a mirror and Machiavelli as a patriot. With the birth of nationalism, it was to be expected that a new Machiavellian myth would be born. In the previous centuries, when political circumstance changed, so did

⁶⁰Garrett Mattingly, "Political Science or Political Satire," *The American Scholar*, XXVII (Fall, 1958), 480-491.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 483.

⁶²*Ibid.*, p. 489.

historical interpretation. Throughout the last two centuries, nationalism was the major element in the development of Machiavellian literature. As Henry Steel Commager, 1965, stated:

There is one bias, one prejudice, one obsession, so pervasive and so powerful that it deserves special consideration: nationalism. History, which should be the most cosmopolitan of studies, most catholic in its sympathies, most ecumenical in its interests, has, in the past century and a half, become an instrument of nationalism. Nationalism is, no doubt the most powerful force in modern history . . .⁶³

But what was not expected was the rebirth of previous myths and one new legend in the forms of defence. Following the world wars, historians fell into two schools. Either they attacked Machiavelli as a tutor of Hitler and Mussolini or they revived old myths in a defense of his works. It appeared that the immorality of the methods he suggested was universally accepted. The only question left was whether he was personally immoral or not. The men of the late twentieth century had seen genocide, a horror not easily forgotten. Thus the nationalism of Mazzini had become the nationalism of Mussolini, and the term nationalism developed a different hue.

⁶³Henry Steele Commager, *The Nature and The Study of History* (Columbus, 1965), p. 55.

CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS

Reflected within the historiography of Machiavelli was much more than the writings of one man. It was the shadow of changing history and man. Each element and person colored the image of the Florentine until a kaleidoscope of images developed. Each of the scholars attempted to answer the questions: what did Machiavelli write and what did he believe? In doing so they presented much more of their own views than they did his. One basis of this problem was the unanswered question: what was Machiavelli? Intellectuals have called him a satirist, a patriot, a political scientist, and some, a humanist. There was truth in each of these descriptions, but fundamentally he appeared to be more of a humanist, not a traditional humanist but a revisionist humanist. Most authorities have said he was a secular, moralistic, and anticlerical grammarian. Paul Kristeller and John Herman Randall, Jr. wrote in the traditional vein when they suggested that "the interests of the humanist ranged from rhetoric and poetry to history and moral philosophy. Work in each of these fields comprised both the study of the appropriate classical authors and the composition of original writings patterned on their model."¹

¹Ernst Cassirer, Paul Kristeller, John Ranall, Jr., editors and translators, *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* (London, 1948), p. 4.

However, there have developed some doubts about this definition. In reading the works of various humanists, including Giovanni Boccaccio, Pico Della Mirandola, Machiavelli, and Dante Alighieri, there were found to be some statements which, if taken literally, helped promote this traditional definition. However, the continuing theme and overall tone of their works presented a quite different view: that of religious, moral, intellectually curious men working to strengthen man's understanding of man.

Some traditionalists would say of Machiavelli and the humanist that they were secular, but were they in the terms of modern secularism? Would they have been comfortable living in modern secular society? Did they foresee a society in which democracy was a divinity much like Christianity and often confused with Christianity? The humanist frequently wrote of and referred to the state, *The Prince* being just one example, but the state about which he wrote was very different from the massive, authoritarian institution of today. Modern governmental systems, democratic and communist, can trace their roots, both spiritual and secular, as easily to the Reformation as to the state of Machiavelli. The difference between modern secularism and humanist secularism is almost insurmountable. The state of Machiavelli was functional, almost modern; the state of modernity, spiritual, depending on something larger than life whether it be natural law or a contract. Machiavelli's state was

there to pass and enforce laws, not supervise morals and dictate theology. Machiavelli suggested a true division of the secular and theological world in *The Prince*. He carefully explained in the chapter on ecclesiastical principalities that he was prepared to discuss the secular papacy, not the theological.

Only these principalities (ecclesiastical) therefore are secure and happy. But as they are upheld by higher causes, which the human mind cannot attain to, I will abstain from speaking of them, for being exalted and maintained by God, it would be the work of a presumptuous and foolish man to discuss them. However I might be asked how it has come about that the church has reached such great temporal power, when . . . ²

When Machiavelli criticized the papacy he was discussing the temporal papacy, not the spiritual throne of St. Peter. He did not discuss Catholic doctrine; he attacked the weakness and vice of men. For the Florentine, there was a division of church and state. The ruler had the power of man, not the power of God. For Machiavelli there were two worlds, one religious and theological, and one secular.³

In Machiavelli's state, as in the state of his fellow humanist Dante, the government existed to provide services to society, not salvation. In the humanist state there was true division of church and state. For Dante, the emperor could have

²Machiavelli, *The Prince*; ed. Lerner, p. 42.

³*Ibid.*, Chapter XI.

been a Turk and still have ruled well as the head of a functionary government because salvation of the people came from the Pope and the church, not the state.

Thus the reins of man are held by a double driver according to man's twofold end; one is the supreme pontiff, who guides mankind with revelations to life eternal, and the other is the emperor, who guides mankind with philosophical instruction to temporal happiness.⁴

In modern secular state this became impossible.

No non-democrat could rule a democracy, no non-Christian could rule a Christian people. The government, as well as the governor, had become the instrument of God. Salvation had become possible by ideology as well as theology. The Christian humanist believed quite differently. For him salvation came from the spiritual, not the secular. The universal monarch of Dante and the unifying prince of Machiavelli would of necessity have been a "lay state".⁵ Their government was secular in the truest sense of the word. The secularism of the humanist differed from modern secularism in that their secular government did not stem from the spiritual. Their temporal government could not have passed into law a resolution calling for a national day of Fasting, Humiliation, and Prayer, as did the United States

⁴Dante Alighieri, *On World Government*, translated by Herbert W. Schneider (New York, 1953), p. 79.

⁵Ibid., p. XII.

government in 1974.⁶ In the humanist state of Machiavelli and Dante, the secular was not spiritual and the spiritual was not secular. It took the Reformation and Martin Luther to reinforce the phenomenon of modern secularism. Luther was capable of writing, "the ruler's command and punishing sword were to serve the same purpose as chains and cages for wild animals."⁷ In the humanism of Dante and Machiavelli there appeared nothing equivalent to that. The modern state fit well into Luther's definition of the state, but very uneasily into Dante's world, where "mankind exists for itself and not for another, since then only is there a check on perverted forms of government such as democracies, oligarchies and tyrannies, which carry mankind into slavery."⁸ or Machiavelli's world, where mankind was more virtuous than authority.

If now we compare a prince who is controlled by laws and a people that is untrammelled by them, we shall find more virtue in the people than in the prince; and if we compare them when both are freed from such control, we shall see that the people are guilty of fewer excesses than the prince, and the errors of the people are of less importance and therefore easily remedied . . .⁹

⁶U.S. Congress, *House, Resolution Proclaiming a National Day of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer*, H.R. 1001, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1974, p. 1.

⁷Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther's World of Thought*, translated by Martin H. Bertram (St. Louis, 1958), p. 85.

⁸Dante, p. 13.

⁹Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, ed. Lerner, p. 265.

Here both Machiavelli and Dante illustrated a belief in the Christian doctrine of the imperfectability of man, as did Luther. However the humanist had more faith in mankind's ability to be virtuous than did Luther. As Luther wrote in his *Bondage of the Will*, "We have lost our freedom and are forced to serve sin — that is, we will sin and evil, we speak sin and evil, we do sin and evil."¹⁰ For the humanist, the government and its law did not need to be the controller of beasts. It need play only the secular role of law giver.

The second important charge placed against Machiavelli and the humanists was that of undermining Christianity. Burckhardt called them "irreligious"¹¹ The Burckhardtian traditionalists presented the humanist as seeking morals and ethics through the study of the classics, not from Christian theology. To these traditionalists, the humanists were reading the pagans as well as Christian writers and, worst of all, not understanding the differences. They followed magic, astrology, and the Cabala, while attacking the church and clergy. Boccaccio in his *Decameron*,

¹⁰Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*, eds. and trans. J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnston (London, 1957), p. 147.

¹¹Burckhardt, p. 272.

even placed Christianity, Islam, and Judaism on a par.¹² Thus the Italian humanists were lustful, sinful egotists leading Italy's intellectual and public life astray.¹³ Here the traditionalists seemed to have made the mistake of applying post-Reformation ideals and mores to pre-Reformation Italy. Even Paul Oskar Kristeller and John Herman Randall, two historians who presented many of the traditionalists' other theories, disagreed with the Burckhardians here. In their introduction to the *Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, Kristeller and Randall wrote:

The opposition to medieval logic and natural philosophy found in many of the humanists was far from being an opposition to the church or to the Christian religion . . . Petrarch, in posing as the defender of religion against the atheism of his Averroist opponents, or Valla, in appealing from philosophical reason to blind faith is obviously trying to detach theology from its dangerous link with Aristotelian natural philosophy and metaphysics and to join it instead with his own different type of learning, with eloquence, or with humanistic studies. This religious tendency was strong among many of the humanists and found its culmination in the Christian Humanism of Erasmus.¹⁴

Many humanists and Machiavelli were religious men, but men who saw the corruption of the institutionalized church and fought it by literary means. The attacks of the humanists in

¹²ibid., p. 372.

¹³ibid., p. 272.

¹⁴Cassirer, Kristeller and Randall, pp. 4-5.

every case were attacks on corrupt individuals and institutions, not on the doctrinal beliefs of Christianity. Never did the humanist write that there was no God or that the ideas of salvation or the trinity were ridiculous. They wrote instead of human beings, as seen in the institutions. Machiavelli joined actively with his fellow humanists in the assault on the corrupt church official and member. Machiavelli's *Mandragola* included many of the typical characters for those assaults, such as the wicked cleric Grate Timoteo, the silly old woman Sostrata, the prideful husband Nicia, the beautiful and virtuous wife Lucretia, and her soon-to-be lover Callimaco.¹⁵ In the satire he played on the sins of mankind, greed, lust, jealousy, envy, violence, and many, many more. In the end, all the sins had been made sport of, not praised. The people had been laughed at, not their roles. The priesthood was not attacked, but instead the priest as a man; the church's doctrines were not attacked, but the misuse of them. In Machiavelli's *Discourses*, as in *The Prince*, he chastized the church of Rome for having kept Italy divided. He continued by blaming the irreligious actions of the people on "the evil example of the court of Rome,"¹⁶ which brings in its train "infinite improprieties and disorders . . ."¹⁷ Machiavelli was

¹⁵Machiavelli, "Mandragola," editor, Gilbert.

¹⁶Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, editor, Lerner, p. 151.

¹⁷Ibid.

typical of the humanists of his day in the rejection of corruption in the name of God while accepting the tenets of Christian faith as unassailable. Machiavelli and his fellow humanists shared this general tendency.

In Book Three of *De Monarchia*, entitled "That Temporal World-Rule came Direct From God and not From The Papacy," Dante wrote:

"There are three kinds of men who most violently oppose the truth we are seeking. First there is the supreme pontiff . . . , to whom we owe what is due Peter but not what is due Christ . . . Secondly, there are those whose light of reason has been extinguished by stubborn greed. Pretending to be the sons of the church they are children of the devil . . . Then there is a third group called Decretalists, who, being ignorant and unskilled in any theology or philosophy whatever and resting their whole case on their decretals . . ."¹⁸

In every case these were attacks on individuals and on institutions, not attacks on Christianity. Pico Della Mirandola (1463-1494) for his *On the Dignity of Man* was criticized highly by those who said that the humanists were irreligious. On page nine of this work, he discussed the climbing of Jacob's ladder from the depth to heaven and God. The Burkhardtians presented this as showing man's perfectability, and thus disbelief in the faith. But through the work he repeatedly wrote that nothing can be attained by man alone, without the grace of God:

¹⁸Dante, p. 55.

unless by abusing the very indulgent liberality of the Father, we make the free choice which he gave to us harmful to ourselves instead of helpful toward salvation. Let a certain holy ambition (grace) invade the mind, so that we may not be content with mean things but may aspire to the highest things. . . .¹⁹

In *The Decameron*, Boccaccio seemed to greatly enjoy describing the unholy friars, sinful monks and abbots, and perverse hypocrisy of the religious orders. He was a master of characterization. He made these, as all his hundreds of characters, come alive.²⁰ However, he, as Machiavelli and the other humanists, did not attack the ideal of the Holy Orders, or the church; they were simply discussing the humanity of the people in the institutions.

Boccaccio was considered especially devastating to Christianity for the point he made in *The Third Story of the First Day*, the story of the three rings. Boccaccio told the story of a father and three sons. The father gave to each of the three a golden ring, thus giving each son the impression that he had become the father's favorite, when in fact they were all equal in the father's eyes.²¹ The traditionalist attacked this as placing Judaism,

¹⁹Pico Della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man*, translated by Paul J.W. Miller (New York, 1965), p. 9.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Giovanni Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, translated by John Payne (New York, 1957), pp. 48-52.

Islam, and Christianity on an equal plane, thus illustrating Boccaccio's humanistic egoism and atheism.²² However, it reflected that Boccaccio, like his fellow humanists, had a deep faith in God's will and schemes in the world. Thus he simply would not dogmatically declare one of God's creations better than the other. What the traditionalist construed as attacks on Christianity were really attacks on the corrupt and hypocritical persons in the Church, not its doctrines.

The third major challenge to the humanists presented by some historians was that of tools. The Burckhardtians thought that the humanist was simply a grammarian more concerned with style and form, with nothing new or creative in his works. Gilbert, Cassirer, and Kristeller, as well as other scholars, saw the humanistic movement as an extension of the scholastic school of the Middle Ages. Kristeller wrote, "the humanists were not a rebuttal of anything but a continuation of scholastic learning."²³

The traditionalists, that is, Burkhardt and Spitz, saw the humanist as writing philosophy but following literary and grammatical rules in which form, rather than content, was the important element. Kristeller listed the three influences that

²²Burckhardt, p. 372.

²³Kristeller, Randall, pp. 1-6.

created the humanist as French poetry, Italian rhetoric, and Greek scholarship.²⁴ This school presented the humanist as in a straight line of descent falling from Augustine to Pico.²⁵ But did the humanist fall within this classification? The humanists were using the tools of the scholastics, but with great insight. They were men disillusioned with the systems of the Middle Ages; the institutional state, church and social class system which allowed man to use his fellow man so unkindly. This disillusion and anguish filled Machiavelli's *Prince*. He saw what the Florentine people had allowed to happen and the agony that followed. He saw that they were as much at fault as the battling princes, and he wrote of their faults in his *Prince*. Of power he wrote, "It cannot be called virtue to kill one's fellow citizens, betray one's friends, be without faith, without pity and without religion, by these methods one may indeed gain power but not glory."²⁶ Then, of corrupt people he wrote: "And it must be assumed a well demonstrated truth, that a corrupt people that lives under the government of a prince can never become free, even though the prince and his whole line should be extinguished."²⁷

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Machiavelli, *The Prince*, editor, Gauss, p. 32.

²⁷Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, p. 165.

The writers of the humanist movement had made one great change in content. They had stopped writing of God and began talking of man. The humanist did not argue theology but wrote of man's everyday life. The writings of Dante, Pico, Boccaccio, and Machiavelli showed man's humanity and made man's faults laughable. This was a very meaningful change from the scholastic literature of the Middle Ages. The humanists saw the Medieval dream dying and tried to jar men's minds with their writings. They merely presented both good and bad in an attempt to revitalize the dream, not destroy it. However, their attempt failed. It fell to Luther to revitalize the system but destroy the dream.

One difference in content appeared between Machiavelli and his fellow humanists, his love of military and political history. Thus, although he wrote a classic of Renaissance comedy, *Mandragola*, he devoted much more time to his first love, military tactics. Sabine called Machiavelli a diplomatic historian.²⁸ The Florentine's writings showed a strong political and military tone, reflecting his almost two decades at the center of political and military decision-making in Florence. Many scholars have searched Machiavelli's works seeking to discern his political beliefs. George Sabine divided Machiavelli's political theory into

²⁸Sabine, p. 320.

three main subdivisions; Max Lerner, into eight. Sabine listed them as (1) universal egoism, (2) omnipotent legislator, and, (3) republicanism and nationalism.²⁹ Max Lerner listed them as (1) superiority of the democratic republic, (2) ultimate reliance on mass consent, (3) primary political imperative of cohesiveness, (4) role of leadership, (5) imperative of military power, (6) use of national religion for state purposes, (7) need in the conduct, even of a democratic state, for the will to survive, and (8) idea of cyclical rise and fall of civilization.³⁰

A more workable discussion could be based on a four-part division: (1) nature of man, (2) lawgivers, (3) republicanism, and, (4) military organization. Nature of man would be a degree or two different from universal egoism. Sabine suggested that Machiavelli's view of

" . . . human nature is essentially selfish . . . Government is really founded upon the weakness and insufficiency of the individual, who is unable to protect himself against the aggression of other individuals unless supported by the power of the state . . . men are always in a condition of strife and competition which threatens open anarchy unless restrained by force.³¹

²⁹Ibid., pp. 320-331.

³⁰Machiavelli, *The Prince and The Discourses* ed. Lerner, p. xxxvii.

³¹Sabine, pp. 320-321.

This statement appeared a little too modern for a sixteenth-century Italian. Machiavelli wrote of people:

For a people that governs and is well regulated by laws will be stable, prudent, and grateful, as much as, and even more, according to my opinion, than a prince, he may be esteemed wise; and, on the other hand, a prince, freed from the restraints of the law, will be more ungrateful, inconstant, and imprudent than a people similarly situated . . . if there be any difference for good, it is on the side of the people.³²

Machiavelli seemed to have enough belief in his fellow man to warrant giving the republic a vote as the superior form of government. "We furthermore see the cities where people are masters make the greatest progress in the least possible time, . . . this can be attributed to no other cause than that governments of the people are better than those of princes."³³ Sabine's statement was a reflection of the corruption Machiavelli saw in the Italian people in his own time. He viewed the only hope for their unity as a strong prince. However, this illustrated only his belief about the nature of his times, not his view of the eternal nature of man.

In the *Discourses*, the theory of mixed state was discussed, and, because of the turbulent spirit of sixteenth century Italy, Machiavelli presented a mixed state as the best possible state. Of mixed states Machiavelli wrote:

³²Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, ed. Lerner, p. 263.

³³Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. Lerner, p. 30.

The sagacious legislators, knowing the vices of each of these systems of government by themselves, have chosen of that should partake of all of them . . . In fact, when there is combined under the same constitution a prince, a nobility, and the power of the people, then these three powers will watch and keep each other reciprocally in check.³⁴

He also based his theory of constitutional cycles on this corrupted spirit. His theory was much like Aristotle's classifications: kingship-tyranny, aristocracy-oligarchy, polity-democracy.³⁵ But in the *Dicourses* he offered democracy as the highest ideal from which would come oligarchy, then tyranny, and then a return to democracy.

For as all religious republics and monarchies must have within themselves some goodness, by means of which they abstain their just growth and reputation and as in the process of time this goodness becomes corrupted, it will of necessity destroy the body unless something intervenes to bring it back to its normal condition.³⁶

The second division, lawgivers, encompassed both the law makers or maker, and the laws made. Machiavelli viewed the law, as did the Roman stoic, as the basis of government. His theory of laws was rather circular. The government and laws reflect the nature of national character and conversely the attribute of moral and civic virtue was derived straight from the

³⁴Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, ed. Lerner, p. 115.

³⁵Aristotle, *The Politics*, ed. and trans. Ernest Barker (London, 1969), Chapter IV.

³⁶Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, ed. Lerner, pp. 397-398.

laws. Thus, Machiavelli believed if the people were virtuous it was because they were governed by virtuous laws, and virtuous law steamed from virtuous states. Some of his most heated attacks on the Florentines were in this area. He saw a powerful prince as the only hope for the Italians, because they had lost all virtue and thus had no virtuous rulers. He looked for one virtuous lawgiver to bring about the needed reform. However, he reiterated the need for the people to have a part in the government and laws. As Sabine remarked, this reformer would be "little more than an idealized picture of the Italian tyrant of the sixteenth century."³⁷ Machiavelli's primary problem when writing of laws was the conflict between his stoic roots, his belief in free republics, and his admiration of resourceful despots. He stated that in Italy to form or reform a state there must be a single lawgiver, but to maintain a state the people must be involved in the governing.³⁸ In this conflict can be seen the roots of his theory of constitutional cycles.

The division republicanism, is closely related to the former. Machiavelli's republicanism reflects his desire to have citizens involved in the state once it had been founded. His concept of citizenship rested between egalitarian and aristocratic.

³⁷Sabine, p. 324.

³⁸Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, ed. Lerner, Chapter LVIII.

His citizenship was limited to male property owners and did not include the nobility, which he saw as a threat to stable government.³⁹ The citizen had the liberty of free discussion and even election of magistrates. "The people show more wisdom in their selection (of magistrates) than princes."⁴⁰ Since the ordinary citizen could not cope with the problems of politics, internal or external, such problems remained with the prince. In no way could this republic be considered a modern democratic nation-state, for two strong reasons. The first reason for the difference was that Machiavelli's republic was not modern in the sense of our modern secular state, and the second reason rested on the fact that Machiavelli was not a nationalist. He did not foresee the rise of the nation-state, democratic or otherwise. His requirements for governing, considered by some as nationalistic, were more a dream of the stability, unity, and virtue of the Roman Republic, not the nation-state of today.

The fourth and last division, military organization, came also as a part of the Italian's dream of stability. He wrote of armies and arms after years of personal experience. He saw the armies of the Italian city-states in defeat and in victory. Out of his experiences he developed a hatred for mercenary soldiers. He saw them as evil, cowardly, and traitorous. He feared they could

³⁹Ibid., p. 122.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 509.

undermine the stability of any state, and, even worse, would follow orders of the highest bidder. Machiavelli became convinced that Florence needed an army of citizen-soldiers. One of his most treasured achievements was the organization of such an army in Florence. From this dream, came one of his greatest failures, when he watched his citizen army break and run before Spanish troops and mercenaries. His belief in the citizen-soldier was a predominant theme continuing throughout all his political works.

The mercenaries and auxiliaries are useless and dangerous, and if any one supports his state by the arms of mercenaries, he will never stand firm on such as they are disunited, ambitious without discipline, faithless, bold amongst friends, cowardly amongst enemies, they have no fear of God and keep no faith with men.⁴¹

Machiavelli and his ideas remained controversial through five hundred years of change. This in itself said something for the importance of his work. That scholars have thought him worthy of consideration for that long is proof of the viability of his theories. To see Machiavelli as the father of political science attributes an insight to the Italian that was not there. Machiavelli's theories were more of an observation than a pure scientific logic. He wrote of events as they were happening in the first half of the sixteenth century. He felt free to make

⁴¹Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. Lerner, p. 44.

comment based on personal opinion, in his writings. He had a valuable insight into the workings of the state and the men who ruled them, but not, as some have suggested, a psychological understanding of statecraft based on empirical observation. His writings reflect too much personal involvement to support this suggestion. The Florentine's personal feelings allowed him to make many statements supported only by assumptions and personal experiences.

To have been the father of political science, he would have needed to perceive the role which moral and religious changes were going to play in the development of the nation-state. He did not even perceive the modern nation-state. His nationalism was a simple ardent desire for a stable Florence and a stable Italy, in which the ideals of humanity might be reborn. However, because Machiavelli's work's reflected his time, this by no means makes them devoid of value or relevance today. Machiavelli presented in his works years of personal experience and opinion, and was a capable inventive public servant without a public to serve. His exile and its accompanying loneliness and bitterness appeared in his works but did not detract from them. Machiavelli's insight into both man and politics was well worth the trouble scholars have gone through to examine him. He, as did his fellow humanists, presented a clarity of thought that became difficult to find after the Reformation.

CONCLUSION

This work, although the briefest of summaries, has attempted to present the question, to what extent did each period have an effect on the development of the various schools of thought concerning Machiavelli. The Reformation, in its quest for theological purity, gave birth to the myth of the evil Machiavelli. The writers of both the Catholic and Protestant churches were shocked by Machiavelli's *Prince* and attacked it violently. The Enlightenment, a period which sought reason and science, founded the myth of the scientific Machiavelli. Many philosophers from Bacon to Montesquieu looked for the grand man of logic and science and discovered him in the Florentine. The eruption of nationalism in the nineteenth century created Machiavelli the patriot, and this was quickly followed in the twentieth century, an age of unrest, by the rebirth of all previous interpretations. These schools of thought developed as much from the changing tide of events as from the scholarly research of the writers.

The historiography of Niccolò Machiavelli reflects thus a major problem in history. Many historians have argued the question, are the thoughts in a historical work presented from an empirical basis or from the philosopher's frame of reference? Some scholars have moved one step further by asking if objectivity should even be attempted. These scholars believed that

historians were obligated to make value judgments, not merely to regurgitate fact after fact. This debate has produced major divisions among historians. Isaiah Berlin wrote in *The Hedgehog and the Fox*, 1953:

There is a line among the fragments of the Greek poet Archilochus which says: "The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing: Scholars have differed about the correct interpretation of these dark words, which may mean no more than that the fox, for all his cunning, is defeated by the hedgehog's one defence. But taken figuratively, the words can be made to yield a sense in which they mark one of the deepest differences which divide writers and thinkers, and it may be, human beings in general. For there exists a great chasm between those, on one side, who relate systems less or more coherent or articulate . . . and, on the other side, those who pursue many ends, often unrelated and even contradictory . . ."¹

Henry Steele Commager, in *The Nature and The Study of History*, 1965, spoke for the subjective view when he suggested:

Let us admit at once that history is neither scientific nor mechanical, that the historian is human and therefore fallible, and that the ideal history, completely objective and dispassionate, is an illusion. There is bias in the choice of a subject, bias in the selection of material, bias in its organization and presentation, and, inevitably, bias in its interpretation. Consciously, or unconsciously, all historians are biased: they are creatures of their time, their race, their faith, their class, their country — creatures, and even prisoners.²

¹Isaiah Berlin, *The Hedgehog and The Fox* (New York, 1953), p. 1.

²Henry Steele Commager, *The Nature and The Study of History*, (Columbus, 1965), p. 53.

Commager quoted American historian Charles A. Beard as having said, "it was only honorable for the historian frankly to acknowledge his frame of reference."³

C. V. Wedgwood opposed this kind of thinking in his work *Truth and Opinion*. For him the problem of historical interpretation was "largely a problem of finding out and establishing the correct relationship between facts; of restoring sequences of cause and effect . . ."⁴ In the historiography of Machiavelli, the conflict between these two philosophies was readily demonstrated. Bacon, Montesquieu, and Cassirer, men who believed in the scientific method, saw Machiavelli as scientific. They wrote of his objective observations, factual descriptions, and his unemotional advice. They shunned the emotional character of the works of the republicans and, later, the nationalists. Those writers, such as Ridolfi, whose works were filled with emotional republicanism and nationalism, saw just that, republican and national ideals, in the works of Machiavelli. They presented, therefore, in their works a Machiavelli filled with love for republican Florence, and a desire for a unified Italy.

³ibid.

⁴C.V. Wedgwood, *Truth and Opinion* (New York, 1960), p. 95.

The bias of history, which to critics appeared easily recognized, was not always so visible to the writer. What these writers of the past blended into their works gave more life to the past than a truly neutral historian could have given. However, to say that subjectivity made an addition to the works of these writers, is not to say that good scholarship and research did not serve to build the greatness of their works. One of the most exciting challenges of historical thought, determining what was important or true amid a mass of often conflicting information and regulating one's own opinions and biases as well as those of the sources, was a problem for the writers of the past as well as those of the present. Thus, there appeared in the historiography of Machiavelli, not only the reflection of the historian's beliefs and his age, but also the reflection of his view of history. When the historian wrote of Machiavelli, he contributed to the Machiavellian myth or legend because of the culture and views of his own time. Machiavellianism thus reflected the growth of these myths, not the doctrines of the sixteenth-century philosopher. Each of these historians read the Florentine's works and saw reflected there his own values, whether religious, non-religious, scientific, non-scientific, nationalistic, or satirical. But these reflections did not detract from their works: they helped create a history.

The historiography of Machiavelli, like perhaps that of any historical figure, reflects this kind of subjective treatment. What

each man believed himself and his society to be, colored his view of Machiavelli's works. Each writer knew a truth and supported it as absolute.

Machiavelli became a major source for our political thought because society in general believes the modern political system to be secular. The modern political theorists tend to look to the Renaissance, an age known for its secularism, when tracing the roots of modern politics. However, George Sabine has conceded that Machiavelli could not have been the father of political science, because he had no sense of political evolution. At the same time, Sabine was discussing his relationship to modern political activity.⁵ If modern politics did not come from Machiavelli, the traditional source, from where did it come? If Machiavelli was not a modern political theorist, why the volumes of works which discuss his political ideas? These questions are left unanswered in the works considered during the preparation of this work.

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli talks of dishonesty, corruption, theft, and murder. If Machiavelli's politics are not related to modern politics, what in *The Prince* is? The suggestion offered here is that *The Prince* remained current because of its portrayal of man's personality. Man was shown weak, corrupt,

⁵Sabine, pp. 311-332.

and sinful. This was the view of man that has prevailed in the main stream of western thought for centuries. This view did not change with the secularism of modernity. Man was still seen as evil and not to be trusted. Modern thought has not actually made a shift from the spiritual to the secular. The Reformation revitalized the medieval concept of man's sinfulness and injected it into the modern concept of state. From the Reformation, modern man inherited a state which was as restrictive and demanding as the Church in the Middle Ages. It was from this concept of state that the Hobbesian state of nature and Locke's state of war came. Of man's nature Thomas Hobbes wrote:

I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death and the cause of this, is not always that man hopes for a more intensive delight . . . but because he cannot assure the power and means to live well, which he hath present, without the acquisition of more.⁶

Hobbes believed that the human condition in a state of nature was one of war between all men in a drive to get and keep the necessities of life. John Locke's theory of the nature of war was much the same. Locke saw man without government as living in violence and confusion.

To this strange doctrine — viz., that in the state of nature every one has the executive power of the law of nature I doubt not but it will be objected that it is

⁶Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (Baltimore, 1975), p. 161.

unreasonable for men to be judges in their own cases, that self love will make men partial to themselves and their friends, and on the other side, that ill nature, passion and revenge will carry them too far in punishing others, and hence nothing but confusion and disorder will follow; and that therefore God has certainly appointed government to restrain the partiality and violence of men.⁷

These basic works of modern politics reflected not the secularism of the Renaissance but the spiritualism of Martin Luther.

One of the reasons for the diversity of the Machiavellian literature was that each writer sought his antecedents on the basis of the myth rather than where it could realistically be found. Machiavelli and Machiavellism were abused and misused because modern man did not know himself. He viewed his origin incorrectly and thus could rest on no one explanation for himself or Machiavelli. Machiavellianism developed from a collection of myths, each started in an attempt to explain the unexplainable, man. Not Machiavelli's politics but what man appeared to be in them was the drawing power of *The Prince*. What Machiavelli meant to say or did not mean to say was unimportant when compared to what scholars believed him to have said.

⁷John Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government*, ed. Thomas P. Pearson (New York, 1952), p. 5.

APPENDIX I

THE WORKS OF MACHIAVELLI

| ITALIAN TITLE | ENGLISH TITLE | DATE* |
|--|--|--|
| Discorso della guerra di Pisa | Report on the Pisan War | 1499 |
| Descrizione del modo tenuto dal Duca Valentino nell'ammazzare Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto da Fermo, il signor Pagolo e il Duca de Gravina Orsini. | Description of the Manner in which Duke Valentino put Vitellozzo Vitelli . . . etc. . . . to death | 1503 |
| Parole sopra la provvisione del danaio | Remarks on the raising of money | 1503 |
| Del modo di trattare; sudditi della Valdichiana ribellati | On the method of dealing with the Rebels of the Valdi Chiana | 1503 |
| Decennale Primo | The First Decade | 1504 |
| Discorso dell'ordinare lo stato di Firenze alle armi | Discourse on Florentine military preparation | 1506 |
| Rapporto delle cose dell'Alemagna | Report on Germany | 1508 |
| Discorso sopra le cose della Magna e sopra lo imperatore | Discourse of Germany and the Emperor | 1509 |
| Decennale Secondo | The Second Decade | (1509) |
| Ritratto delle cose della Magna | Description of German Affairs | (after April, 1512) |
| Ritratto delle cose di Francia | Description of French Affairs | (after April, 1512, before August, 1513) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Il Principe | The Prince | 1513 |
| Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio | Discourse on the First Decade of Livy | 1515-1617 |
| Discorso o dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua | Discourse or Dialogue on our Language | (conventionally 1514 but probably later) |
| L'asino d'oro | The Golden Ass | (1517 or 1518) |
| Mandragola | Mandragola | 1518 |
| Belfagor | Belfagor | (1515-1520) |
| Dell'Arte della Guerra | The Art of War | (1519-1520) |
| Sommario della cosi della citta' di Lucca | Summary of Lucchese Affairs | 1520 |
| La Vita di Castruccio | The Life of Castruccio | 1520 |
| Castracani da Lucca Discorso della cose fiorentine dopo la morte di Lorenzo | Castracani of Lucca Discourse on Florentine affairs after the death of Lorenzo | 1519-1520 |
| Istorie Fiorentine | The History of Florence | Begun 1520, finished 1525 |
| Memoriale a Raffaello Girolami | Advise to Raffaello Girolami | 1522 |
| Clizia | Clizia | (1524-1525) |
| Relazione di una visita fatta per fortificare Firenze | Report on the Fortifications of Florence | 1526 ¹ |

*Dates in parentheses are conjectural.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Abbo, John A., *Political Thought: Men and Ideas*, Westminster, Maryland, The Newman Press, 1960.
- Addington, Richard, editor and translator, *The Letters of Voltaire and Frederick the Great*. London, G.Routledge & Sons, 1927.
- Alighieri, Dante, *On World Government*. translated and edited by Herbert W. Schneider, New York, Bobbs Merrill Co., Inc., 1957.
- Aristotle, *Politics*. edited and translated by Ernest Baker, London, Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Ascham, Roger, *English Works*. edited by James Bennet, London, R. and J. Dodsley, 1761.
- Avineri, Shlomo, *Hegel's Theory of The Modern State*. London, Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Bacon, Francis, *Complete Works*. editors, James Spedding, Robert Ellis, and Douglas Heath, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, and Company.
- Barincou, Edmond, *Machiavelli*. translated by Helen R. Lane, New York, Grove Press, Inc., 1961.
- Bayle, Pierre, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*. edited by Des Maizeaux, Amsterdam, La Compagnie des libraires, 1734.
- Berlin, Isaiah, *The Hedgehog and The Fox*. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1953.
- Besterman, Theodore, *Voltaire*. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969.
- Black, J.B., *The Art of History*. New York, F.S. Crofts and Co., 1926.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni, *The Decameron*. translated by John Payne, Modern Library, New York, 1956.

- Bornkamm, Heinrich, *Luther's World of Thought*. translated by Martin H. Bertram, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1958.
- Bruun, Geoffery and Ferguson, Wallace, *A Survey of European Civilization*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilization of The Renaissance in Italy*. New York, Modern Library, 1954.
- Burns, Edward McNall, *Western Civilization*. New York, W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1973.
- Butterfield, Herbert, *The Statecraft of Machiavelli*. New York, Macmillan, 1956.
- Cassirer, Ernst, *The Myth of the State*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1946.
- Cassirer, Ernst, Kristeller, Paul, and Randall, John, editors, translators, *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*. London, Phoenix Books, 1948.
- Chabod, Federico, *Machiavelli and the Renaissance*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Clark, Kenneth, *Civilization*. New York, Harper and Row, 1969.
- Commager, Henry S., *The Nature and the Study of History*. Columbus, Ohio, C.E. Merrill Books, 1965.
- Dannenfeldt, Karl H., *The Renaissance Medieval or Modern*. Boston, D.C. Heath and Company, 1959.
- Della Mirandola, Pico, *On the Dignity of Man*. translated by Paul Miller, Bobbs Merrill, 1965.
- De Sanctis, Francesco, *History of Italian Literature*. translated by Joan Redfern, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931.
- Diderot, Denis, *Oeuvres Complètes*, edited by J. Assezat, Paris, Garnier Frères Libraires-Editeurs, XVI, 1836.
- Erikson, Erik, *Young Man Luther*. New York, W.W. Norton, 1958.

- Gay, Peter, *Age of Enlightenment*. New York, Time - Life Book, Inc., 1966.
- Gentillet, Innocent, *A Discovrse Vpon the Means of Vvel Governing*. New York, DaCapo Press, 1969 (London, 1602).
- Gilbert, Allan H., *Machiavelli's Prince and Its Forerunners*. New York, Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1968.
- Gooch, G.P., *Frederick the Great*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.
- Guterman, Stanley, *The Machiavellians*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1970.
- Hale, J.R., *Machiavelli and Renaissance Italy*. New York, The MacMillan Co., 1960.
- Harrington, James, *The Oceana and Other Works*. edited by John Toland, Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, Inc., 1956, (London, printed for T. Becket and T. Cadell, In the Strand, and T.E. Vans in King Street, Covent Garden, MDCCLXXI).
- Haskins, Charles H., *The Renaissance of the Twelfth-Century*. New York, Meridian Books, 1957.
- Hayes, Carlton, *Nationalism: a Religion*. New York, Macmillan, 1960.
- Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*. edited by C.B. Macpherson, Baltimore, Maryland, Penguin Books, 1975.
- Hughes, Stuart, *Contemporary Europe*. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Jensen, De Lamar, editor, *Machiavelli: Cynic, Patriot or Political Scientist?* Boston, D.C. Heath and Company, 1960.
- Kahler, Erich, *The Germans*. edited by Robert and Rita Kimber, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Kohn, Hans, *Nationalism*. Princeton, New Jersey, Van Nostrand, 1955.
- Locke, John, *The Second Treatise of Government*. New York, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1952.

- Luther, Martin, *The Bondage of the Will*. translated and edited by J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnston, London, James Clarke and Co., Ltd., 1957.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Chief Works and Others*, translated by Allan Gilbert, 3 vols., Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press, 1965.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*. edited by Charles Eliot, translated by N.H. Thomson, New York, P.F. Collier and Son, 1910.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*. Introduction by Christian Gauss, New York, Mentor Classic, 1952.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *Lust and Liberty: The Poems of Machiavelli*. translated into verse with notes and introduction by Joseph Tusiani, New York, Ivan Obolensky, Inc., 1963.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *Il Principe*. edited by L.A. Burd, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1891.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince and The Discourses*. Introduction by Max Lerner, New York, Modern Library, 1950.
- Manuel, Frank, editor, *The Enlightenment*. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Marsak, Leonard M., editor, *The Enlightenment*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1924.
- Mayer, Frederick, *A History of Educational Thought*. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Books, 1966.
- Meyer, Edward, *Machiavelli and The Elizabethan Drama*. New York, B. Franklin, 1964.
- Milton, John, *The Works of John Milton*. edited by Don M. Wolfe, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953.
- Moote, Lloyd A., *The Seventeenth Century: Europe in Ferment*. Levington, D.C. Heath and Co., 1970.
- Montesquieu, Charles De, *Oeuvres Complètes*. Paris, Dupin, Crevier, 1838.

- Owen, John, *The Skeptics of The Italian Renaissance*. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1908.
- Pansini, Anthony, *Niccolo Machiavelli and the United States of America*. Greenvale, New York, Greenvale Press, 1969.
- Pascal, Roy, *The Social Basis of The German Reformation: Martin Luther and His Times*. New York, Augustus M. Kelley, 1971.
- Plumb, J.H., *The Italian Renaissance*. New York, Harper Torch Books, 1961.
- Pollock, Frederick, *Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy*. London, Duckworth and Co., 1899.
- Prezzolini, Giuseppe, *Machiavelli*. translated by Gioconda Savini, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1967.
- Raab, Felix, *The English Face of Machiavelli*. London, Routledge & K. Paul, 1965.
- Ridolphi, Roberto, *Life of Niccolo Machiavelli*. translated by Cecil Grayson, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Ritter, Gerhard, *The Corrupting Influence of Power*. translated by F.W Pick, Hadleigh, Essex, Tower Bridge Publications, 1952.
- Roeder, Ralph, *Man of the Renaissance*. New York, Meridian Books, 1958.
- Rowen, Herbert H., *From Absolutism to Revolution*. London, Macmillan Company, 1969.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, *The Social Contract*. translated by Charles Frankel, New York, Hafner Library of Classics, 1947.
- Sabine, George and Thorson, Thomas, *History of Political Theory*. Hinsdale, Illinois, Dryden Press, 1973.
- Salomone, William, *Italian Democracy*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945.
- Shackleton, Robert, *Montesquieu*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1961.

- Spinoza, Benedict de, *The Political Works*. edited and translated by A.G. Wernham, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Strauss, Leo, *Thoughts on Machiavelli*. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1958.
- Thorndike, Lynn, *A Short History of Civilization*. New York, Appleton Century Crofts, 1948.
- Troeltsch, Ernst, *Protestantism and Progress*. translated by W. Montgomery, Boston, Beacon Press, 1960.
- Villari, Pasquale, *The Life and Times of Niccolo Machiavelli*. translated by Linda Vallari, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1878.
- Voltaire, *Voltaire's Correspondence*. edited by Theodore Besterman, Geneve, Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1963.
- Wolf, John B., *The Emergence of The Great Powers 1685-1715*. New York, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1951.
- Wedgwood, C.V., *Truth and Opinion*. New York, MacMillan Co., 1960.
- Young, Edward, *Complete Works*. edited by James Nichols, Hildesheim, G. Olms, 1968.

Articles

- Baron, Hans. "Burckhardt's *Civilization of The Renaissance*, A Century After Its Publication." *Renaissance News*, XIII (Autumn, 1960), 200-207.
- Berlin, Isaiah. "The Question of Machiavelli." *The New York Review of Books* XVII (November 4, 1971), 20-32.
- Hexter, J.H. "The Loom of Language and The Fabric of Imperatives: The Case of *Il Principe* and *Utopia*." *American Historical Review* XLI (July, 1964), 945-968.
- Mattingly, Garrett. "Political Science or Political Satire," *American Scholar* XXVII (Fall, 1958), 480-489.

Government Documents

U.S., Congress, *Resolution Proclaiming National Day of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer*, (H.R. 1001, 92th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1974) Washington, Government Printing Office.