

Brian Frederick Nicholas Richardson

MACHIAVELLI AND LIVY

Thesis submitted for the degree of M. Phil.
under the supervision of Professor Carlo Dionisotti

June 1970

ProQuest Number: 10097311

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10097311

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

A B S T R A C T

After a brief examination of interest in Livy up to the Trecento, the first chapter considers the use of Livy in the Quattrocento and by contemporaries of Machiavelli: firstly, the attention probably given to the Decades in education, and then their use in works dealing wholly or partly with Roman institutions and in works of ethical, historiographical and political reference.

The second chapter discusses the use of Livy in works written by Machiavelli before the Discorsi sulla prima deca di Tito Livio and then considers questions arising out of the Discorsi themselves: the extent of the importance of the meetings in the Orti Oricellari in the development of Machiavelli's use of Livy; the structure of the Discorsi; Machiavelli's choice of Livy; the use of Livy in various topics of the Discorsi and the development of Machiavelli's thought on the state; errors in his reading of Livy; the texts of the Decades probably used by him.

The final chapter deals first of all with the position of Livy among the sources of the Arte della guerra, and after examining the attitude of Machiavelli towards antiquity in the Vita di Castruccio Castracani and other works of 1520 goes on to consider the extent of the influence of Livy on Machiavelli's technique in the Istorie fiorentine and references to antiquity in the introductory chapters to each book. It is suggested in conclusion that Machiavelli's admiration for ancient Rome has now been put in perspective, but still leads to a feeling of strong contrast between the ancient and the contemporary world.

Abstract	2
I The importance of Livy's <u>Decades</u> before and in the time of Machiavelli	4
Interest in Livy before the Quattrocento	4
Livy in education	7
The study of Roman institutions	17
The study of Roman law	21
Rucellai's <u>De urbe Roma</u>	24
Raffaele Maffei's <u>Commentarii urbani</u>	25
Pontano's <u>De prudentia</u>	27
Historiography	37
Political works	53
II Machiavelli's use of Livy up to and including the <u>Discorsi</u>	69
Works up to the <u>Discorsi</u>	69
The Orti Oricellari	85
The structure of the <u>Discorsi</u>	103
Machiavelli's use of Livy in the <u>Discorsi</u> :	
(1) His choice of Livy; their differing views	113
(2) Change and continuity in the state	117
(3) Religion	129
(4) The state and the individual	131
(5) External affairs. Techniques of expansion	134
(6) Techniques of warfare	137
(7) The commander	145
(8) The continuity of history	152
(9) Topics which Machiavelli does not discuss. His uncritical approach to Livy	153
(10) Quotations from Livy; his texts of Livy and the development of his reading of the <u>Decades</u>	154
III The use of Livy in works after the <u>Discorsi</u>	158
The <u>Arte della guerra</u>	158
Works of 1520 and after	174
Bibliography	197

(1) De hominibus viris et rebus insignibus del medio aeg.
2 vols. Torino 1802.

(2) De Livio nel Rinascimento, Paris 1889.

(3) Historia, 1842.

I

THE IMPORTANCE OF LIVY'S "DECADES" BEFORE AND
IN THE TIME OF MACHIAVELLI

The enthusiasm aroused by Livy's history of Rome in the period of the Renaissance in Italy was, at least in some of his readers, considerable - inspiring, for instance, the search for the missing books and the excitement over what were considered, with a credibility born of devotion, to be his bones. Some of the most brilliant scholars of the age worked at the improvement of what they had of the text, which was prized both as a model of Latin style and as a vast potential source for knowledge of republican Rome. But Livy was not, of course, the only classical writer who dealt with this period, and interest in ancient Rome was by no means restricted to the republican days. As well as considering in what ways interest in Livy was manifested, then, we may ask how relatively important was the study of the Decades to the writers of the period.

Interest in Livy before the Quattrocento

The question of the study of Livy in the Middle Ages probably needs more attention than it gets from, for instance, Arturo Graf⁽¹⁾ or Alberto Baroni;⁽²⁾ but however that may be, we can point to what is probably an increase (rather than a revival) of interest in his work in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Already Lovato Lovati and others from Padua were working on the restoration of the text; Mussato at least tried to imitate Livy, whom he calls historiarum archigraphus; and Dante frequently uses examples from "Livio... che non erra"⁽³⁾ in the De Monarchia

-
- (1) In Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo,
2 vols. Torino 1882.
(2) In Livio nel rinascimento, Pavia 1889
(3) Inferno, 28.12

and Convivium.⁽¹⁾ A contemporary of Dante, the English Dominican Nicholas Trevet, wrote for Pope John XXII the only surviving commentary on Livy before Machiavelli's time;⁽²⁾ between 1318-24 the reaction to the discovery of what was thought to be Livy's tombstone testified, as Professor Weiss put it,⁽³⁾ to "a warm if indiscriminate enthusiasm" for him; and in 1323 Filippo da S. Croce translated the first of the Decades.

The culmination of this interest came with Petrarch's work on the text of Livy⁽⁴⁾ and his use of Livy (to whom he expresses his devotion in Lett. fam. XXIV 8) as a source in the Africa and elsewhere. Professor Billanovich has written that

"la fase acuta di ricupero e di rinnovamento delle storie di Livio sviluppò press' a poco tra il 1325 e il 1350:

-
- (1) On Dante's knowledge of Livy, and whether it was direct or indirect, see M. Scherillo, Dante e Tito Livio, in "Rendiconti dell'Istituto lombardo", s.II, XXX (1897), 330 seqq.

Louis Dyer, in Machiavelli and the modern state, Boston 1905, goes so far as to say that the Discorsi: "constantly reproduce the substance of what Dante says in the second book of the De monarchia about the Roman people before the day of Caesar"⁽⁵⁰⁾. He would like to account "in part at least... for his (Machiavelli's) taking his instances chiefly from Roman history by the influence upon him in particular, and on his contemporaries in general, of Dante's De monarchia," though he admits Machiavelli has "a fresh and original point of view" and sees the Swiss as having an even greater influence on him than Dante's Romans.

- (2) For this, see Ruth J. Dean, The earliest known commentary on Livy is by Nicholas Trevet, in "Medievalia et humanistica", 1945.
- (3) R. Weiss, The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity, Oxford 1969, 21. Nearly a century later - in 1413 - came the discovery, it was thought, of Livy's bones. This is described by B.L. Ullman, The post-mortem adventures of Livy, in Studies in the Italian Renaissance, Roma 1955.
- (4) For a detailed study of this see G. Billanovich, Petrarch and the textual tradition of Livy, in the "Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes", XIV (1951).

quando il dittatore della cultura letteraria del secolo, il Petrarca, restaurò e divulgò il corpo intero della Prima, della Terza e della Quarta Decade. Contemporaneamente ciascuna di quelle Decadi si diffuse in una traduzione italiana; e così la storia di Livio fu offerta anche ai lettori inferiori, inesperti di latino". (1)

Billanovich makes Boccaccio scudiero to the dictator Petrarch, working at a translation of the third and fourth Decades based on the new text formed by the young Petrarch - though eventually Boccaccio may have realised that this was a compromise between the earlier style of scholarship and his friend's new approach and let his labours pass into anonymity. Petrarch's influence in respect of Livy also extended to Donato Albanzani da Pratovecchio (a friend first of Boccaccio and later, when he moved from Verona to Venice, of Petrarch) who worked on preparing a text of the Decades; and to Pierre Bersuire of Poitiers (to whom Petrarch addressed his Letterae familiares 22.13 and 14), who around 1355 translated the three Decades then known into French. (2)

-
- (1) Il Boccaccio, il Petrarca e le più antiche traduzioni in italiano delle decadi di Tito Livio, in the "Giornale storico della letteratura italiana", vol. 130 (1953), 311. On the question of Boccaccio's probable authorship of the translation of the third and fourth Decades, see F. Maggini, Le prime traduzioni di Tito Livio, in "La Rassegna", XXIV (1916), pts. 5-6; A. Schiaffini, Tradizione e poesia, Genova 1934, 218-241; M.T. Casella, Nuovi appunti attorno al Boccaccio traduttore di Livio, in "Italia medioevale e umanistica", IV(1961) 77-129; and C. Dionisotti, Tradizione classica e volgarizzamenti, published in Geografia e storia della letteratura italiana, Torino 1967, 113-117.
- (2) On French translations of Livy and their popularity - though he also deals with translations of all classical works made in Italy, Spain and France - see Jacques Monfrin's two articles in the "Journal des Savants": Humanisme et traductions au Moyen-Age, 1963, 161-190, and Les traducteurs et leur public en France au Moyen-Age, 1964, 5-20.

Livy in education

After Petrarch, Livy became the object of widely differing types of scholarly interest - philological, legal, historiographical and so on - and these we shall consider in their turn. But at the basis of these studies lay the regard in which Livy was held in education, an important factor in determining how widely he was read. Evidence is provided by treatises on education and lectures on Livy, though in the last thirty years of the Quattrocento the best indication of the use of him in schools is probably given by the printed editions of the Decades.

In his dedicatory letter to Paul II which accompanies the editio princeps (and other, later ones) of Livy, Giovanni Andrea Bussi, bishop of Aleria, praises Petrarch's work on the Decades and goes on to extol the contribution to Livian studies of Vittorino da Feltre (whose lessons he attended in 1440). He mentions the public reading of Livy by this "aevi nostri Socrates", given "ingenti hominum admiratione et fama", and implies that Vittorino was a pioneer in this respect: "Livium primus ut intactum pelagus atque inexpertum noster Tiphys aperuit". He expresses a debt to Vittorino's work on the text: "si quid in recognitione profeci, auctori acceptum Vittorino referatur".

Vittorino was one of a small number of men born within a few years of Petrarch's death whose innovations in education had such a profound effect - the most notable of the others being Pier Paulo Vergerio and Guarino Veronese. Vergerio, in De ingenuis moribus, advocates the study of history, though no specific authors are mentioned. But Livy is used as a source (about Scipio saving his father) and is also drawn upon in his Epistolario. It is probable that the Decades played a part in Guarino's curriculum.

Batista Guarinus' De ordine docendi ac studendi, an exposition of Guarino's methods, says that students, after Valerius and Justinus,

"reliquos deinde historiographos ordine perlegent; hinc variarum gentium mores instituta leges, hinc varias hominum fortunas, ingeniorum et vitia et virtutes excerpant; quae res maxime in quotidiano sermone facundiam et in variis rebus prudentiae opinionem creabit".

(This, incidentally, adds another reason for the reading of history to Vergerio's; he saw it as useful in publicis rebus, while Guarino apparently saw it as also useful in teaching eloquence.) Livy would almost inevitably have figured among "the rest of the historians", but for evidence of Guarino's devotion to him we may turn to his Epistolario. In a letter to Baptista Zandrata ⁽¹⁾ we find him complaining about a Florentine copyist, Bartolommeo Casciotto; but he mentions one point in his favour: "Quod unam mihi scripsit decadem (Livii) cum rure essem et eam perfecit priusquam in urbem remearem infra menses septem." Writing to Feltrino Boiardo, ⁽²⁾ he says he has heard from his letters to Leonello d'Este of his passionate interest in Livy, commends him for this and pities himself:

"Quid enim malim, quam viros genere primarios et ingenio excellentes operam studiis exhibere, unde litterarum dignitas ac splendor augeatur et virtus clarioribus in locis amplificetur? ... Quid igitur faciam? te imitabor, me inter libros recondam et si quid inter legendum occurret tuo generoso spiritu dignum, continuo Feltrinum in voluptatis partem vocabo..."

Then, in the long letter ⁽³⁾ defending Caesar against Poggio's attack on him as "non.. magis patriae quam latinae linguae et bonarum artium ..

(1) Epistolario di G.V., ed. R.Sabbadini, in "Miscellanea di storia veneta", ser. III, tomi 8, 11 and 14, Venezia 1915-1919, no.552.

(2) No.635

(3) No. 670.

parricida", he talks of the historians who wrote in imperial times - Sallust, Trogus Pompeius, Tacitus and so on, "et ut in uno cunctorum laudes amplectar T. Livius ille gravis et lacteus." Finally in a letter ⁽¹⁾ to Giovanni da Prato on the morality of classical literature he mentions Gregory the Great's burning of Livy's Decades "quod ab aliquo qui vigilans somniaret manasse credo."

The reading of Livy for stylistic purposes was later recommended by Alberti as well:

"Ed arei caro, che i miei si ausassero co'buoni autori: imparassino grammatica da Prisciano e Servio, e molto si facessero familiari non a cartule e grecismi ma sopra tutto a Tullio, Livio, Sallustio, ne'quali singularissimi ed emendatissimi scriptori, dal primo ricevano principio e'attingano quello perfettissimo aere d'eloquenza".

But he also looked on Livy as a source for moral examples, as we see from Della famiglia, ⁽²⁾ for instance.

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini put the study of history under the heading of prose composition - part of the grammar course he advocates in De liberorum educatione, written in 1450. But he goes further than Alberti in pointing to the practical wisdom to be learnt from history. For him, Livy and Sallust are the best historians, though for boys he recommends Justinus, Valerius Maximus, Quintus Curtius and Arrian in translation.

We also have some direct evidence for the teaching of Livy in the introductory lectures to the study of the Decades. In Venice in 1452 Francesco Bertini of Lucca gave a speech Ad laudem Titi Livii Patavini et eius hystoriae, in which incidentally he mentions how in

(1) No. 823.
(2) The proemio, for instance, praises republican days; in book I there is the mention of Hannibal attacking the Romans in Italy, to illustrate how one should be on the alert for the faults of youth rather than let them grow; in book II there is the story to illustrate the ill-effects of excessive sentiment - of the mother dying with joy when she finds out that her son, contrary to what she had heard, had survived Trasimene.

the previous year il Panormita had collected an arm-bone from the "bones of Livy" to take back to King Alfonso (and with il Panormita was Pontano, then twenty-five).⁽¹⁾ In Machiavelli's time scholars such as Sabellico gave similar praefationes; but before we move on to discuss them we should consider the production of printed editions of Livy, which, as we mentioned, may cast further light on the use of the Decades in education. Needless to say, the numbers and nature of such volumes would inevitably have been largely dictated by the demands of teaching. Looking first at the number of editions of the Decades - from the editio princeps (most probably the first of the two produced in Rome by Sweynheym and Pannartz and generally dated in the year of Machiavelli's birth, 1469) up to the Aldine edition of 1518-21 - we find that eighteen were produced in Italy; which is a smaller number than those of either Justinus, Valerius Maximus, Suetonius' Lives of the twelve Caesars or Sallust's Catiline and Iugurtha. To some extent, this may be explained in terms of the Decades' much greater bulk, which must have had a deterrent effect on printers and teachers alike. And in his dedicatory letter to his edition of Livy - published in Venice in 1491, 1494 and 1498 - Sabellico gives another reason for people's reluctance to read Livy. He talks about the carelessness which has led to lacunae in texts, and goes on :

"Id ego vitium quum in aliis aegre tum in Livio quod toties imprimi contigisset aegerrime ferebam in quo pene plura mercenaria opera quam ulla temporum iniuria inverterat. Nec interea solus ego eam molestiam sentire. Erant et alii quamplurimi qui ob id ipsum eam lectionem cunctantius adirent, quum nulla alioquin vel utilior vel suavior adiri posset."

(1) The speech is to be found in cod. Ambros. C.145 inf.. R.Sabbadini quotes the passages relating to il Panormita's collection of the relic in Ottanta lettere inedite del Panormita, Catania 1910, 157-8.

But ultimately we must conclude that demand would have created an equal supply if Livy had been as much read as these other authors - though it is clear that Livy was still quite widely read compared, for instance, to Tacitus. As for schools in particular, however, another aspect of the editions may help to indicate whether here Livy was a basic text or whether, despite the enthusiasm of Guarino and others, he was not. This aspect is the absence of any commentary on the text.⁽¹⁾ Again, it is not sufficient excuse to say that the length of the work was prohibitive; rather, this absence is a reflection on the level at which Livy was taught. There were, for instance, two published commentaries on Valerius Maximus' Factorum dictorumque memorabilium libri XII, first Ognibene Leonicensi's and, from 1487, that of Oliverius Arzignanensis, and both of these are on the level of elementary exegesis which one would expect for a work of this sort. With Sallust's Catiline there were published (until the Aldine edition of 1509⁽²⁾) firstly Valla's elementary commentary and then, in addition, Ognibene's;⁽³⁾ while with the Iugurtha could be found a commentary of Frater Ioannis Chrysostomus Soldus of Brescia. Suetonius found distinguished commentators in Sabellico and the elder Beroaldo, both of whom indulge themselves in reflections on the ethics of the characters of the Lives; but eventually return to exegesis of the text with some such formula as "nunc ne longius evagemur enarrationis ratio admonet". Again, the explanations of the

(1) So far as I know, there is no commentary on Livy after Trevet's and before Machiavelli's death. In 1540 Heinrich Loritus' commentary was published in Basle. Ida Maier (in her Ange Politien, Genève 1966, 121n.) attributes a commentary on Livy to Calderini, but this seems to be an exaggeration of Scipione Maffei's description (in Verona illustrata, Verona 1731, II, 225) of "una raccolta d'Osservazioni in tre libri divise" of which the third contained "una scelta d'annotazioni sopra Cicerone, Livio, Quintiliano, ed altri".

(2) In general, commentaries began to be published with texts in the penultimate decade of the fifteenth century but were dropped in the first decade of the sixteenth.

(3) In the edition of Venice, 1502.

text are clearly addressed to relative beginners (even though the character judgements are addressed to the ruler to whom the edition is dedicated).

Clearly the commentary was considered (for some years at least) as an integral part in the publication of certain works, and it was due to more than chance if a classical work lacked one. With editions of Justinus' epitome of Trogus Pompeius and L. Florus' Gestorum romanorum epitoma the reason for a lack of commentary (though these were without doubt texts read at an early stage in one's education) is that they are not works of any great literary value and are anyway clear enough. With Tacitus, the reason is that he was not read enough; with Livy, the probable reason is that he was read at a stage in one's education when a commentary was superfluous. We have seen that Piccolomini recommended only Justinus, Quintus Curtius, Valerius Maximus and Arrian for younger readers, while Vittorino's choice for them was Sallust and Quintus Curtius, and Guarino's was Valerius Maximus and Justinus. But for those to whom Livy was taught, what aspects of the subject were held to be important?

There is an introductory lecture on Livy by one of the figures we mentioned above - Marcantonio Sabellico. From the introduction we may assume that the Oratio de laudibus historiae in Titum Livium ⁽¹⁾ was given at the accademia which met at his house:

"Plurium annorum consuetudo fecit, patres et viri ornatissimi ingenuique adolescentes, ut haec dicendi ratio qua post autumnii ferias soleo meorum auditorum coetum ad litterariam ineuntis anni exercitationem velut classico quodam revocare non mei amplius muneris voluntariique officii esse videatur.... "

(1) To be found in the collection of letters, speeches and poems published in Venice in 1502.

After praising Livy's style and the moral qualities of his characters, and saying that the story of Rome's foundations and growth is too well-known to expound upon, he sums up his reasons for recommending the Decades:

"Quum talis igitur sit Livii historia ut et ad dicendum multum et ad bene beateque vivendum prodesse possit, hoc exemplorum auctoritas praestare potest, illud stili ornatus et elegantia."

It is notable that he largely limits the benefits of Livy's examples to the sphere of ethics,⁽¹⁾ and he obviously does not mean the same as Machiavelli later meant when he extols, for instance, Romulus' solertia, Numa's religio, Tullus Hostilius' pugnacissima indoles and Brutus' calliditas.

We find further evidence of Sabellico's esteem for Livy as a model of eloquence in a letter⁽²⁾ to Antonio Bonfini about the education of his son Mario, whom he had entrusted to Bonfini at Ferrara. He asks him to teach him Greek, and goes on :

"Nec diutius quod ad caeteram eruditionem attinet, velim eum in grammaticae quaestiunculis immorari; iam tempus est ut maioribus assuescat; quare Livium velim illi vel Lactantius proponi. Unde pleniore haustu hauriat eloquentiam."

Mario left Bonfini for Padua in 1494, when he was only about sixteen; but reading extracts from Livy (probably the speeches above all) is not the same as studying the subject matter of his history. And the adolescentes whom Sabellico included in his audience would not necessarily have been immature students; the term was regularly used for anybody from fifteen to thirty years of age, or even older.

Another important figure in the production of editions of Livy was Alessandro Minuziano, who worked on Scinzenzeler's edition of 1495

(1) He does, however, suggest benefits to public life: "neque, ut arbitror, futura est historia, quae melius vitam possit in omnes civiles disciplinas instruere quam haec quam Livius scripsit."

(2) Ed.cit., f.13.r.

and brought out his own ten years later. Two colleagues of his - Parrasio and Stefano Negri - gave praefationes on Livy. When Parrasio had left Minuziano to teach in the scuole palatine founded by Lodovico il Moro, he certainly lectured on the Decades, as we know from the dedicatory letter (of Teofilo Calcondila) to the edition of Valerius Maximus published in Milan in 1506. This contains an attack on Minuziano,

"qui quom bonam partem Livianarum castigationum quas triennio iam Parrhasius (ut scis) ex bello macedonico frequenti promulgavit auditorio, pro suis edidisset".⁽¹⁾

Negri's praefatio was published in Milan in 1521 in a collection of his works which contains two other praefationes - on Homer and Pindar - given in publico gymnasio Mediolani (where he held the chair of Greek), and it is possible that the one on Livy was given during a temporary occupation of Minuziano's chair of Latin in 1520-1.⁽²⁾ Although he goes on to praise Livy's eloquence, Negri emphasises the political utility of the study of history, by gaining experience in this way (as well as visiting other states) one will avoid being in the position of a man ignorant of seamanship at the helm of the ship of state. In Milan, of course, he says (and one might contrast Machiavelli's attitude towards his native city), the laws and

(1) Minuziano is accused of using Parrasio's corrections in his 1505 edition of Livy. The triennium makes the date of the lectures 1503, when Parrasio had taken up his post again after the plague of the previous year. Parrasio's praefatio is to be found in F.Lo Parco's monograph, Parrasio, Vasto 1899, 155-7. It is interesting to note his "grading" of Livy:

"Ego quom viderem, ut ceteris in rebus, sic in liberalibus disciplinis certos esse gradus, per quos itur ad summum, anno superiore aditum struens ad Livium, L. Florum praelegi... " (155).

As often, Sallust and Livy are grouped together; on the question "Sallustiusne doctior fuerit an Livius", he judges them to be "utrique summi" (157).

(2) This is suggested by C. Dionisotti in Notizie di Alessandro Minuziano, in the "Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati", Città del Vaticano 1946, IV, 327-372.

institutions are so fine that it seems that all that is left is

"ut adulescentes ingenui perpetuae gloriae cupidi eos demum studeant emulari qui in rebus agendis adeo se praeclare ac prudenter gesserunt ut et maximam sibi posterisque suis laudem comparaverint et suae ipsorum Reipublicae salutem ac felicitatem praestiterint. Quod ut facilius vobis tutiusque facere liceret Livianum opus nobis proposuimus interpretaendum."

He goes on to say how an assiduous reading of Livy will benefit both individuals and the state - adding an ethical point of view to the political one; but Negri is writing in a principality, and his praise of the subject-matter of the Decades is, to say the least, back-handed;

"pulchrum est praeterea ex aliorum erratis in melius instituere vitam nostram ... Nam T. Livius eam scribendae historiae materiam delegit quae et maxime inter caeteras excellat et legentibus utriusque fortunae exemplis mirum in modum conferat."

In Florence the educational picture must have been largely similar. The choice of which authors were to be taught was of course a matter for the individual teacher, and this would have been especially true at the more advanced level at which one imagines Livy to have been taught. We know from a letter of Bartolommeo Fonzio⁽¹⁾ that one of his teachers, Bernardo Nuzzi, thought that Livy was "maxime imitandus.. in historicis" and Fonzio himself, in his Oratio in historiae

(1) Epistolario, ed. L. Juhasz, Budapest, 1931, III 11. The letter is to Bernardo Rucellai, and dated 1st March 1512. Fonzio was at Nuzzi's school at least until he left for Ferrara in 1467, when he was aged twenty-two. Cf. Concetto Marchesi, Bartolommeo della Fonte, Catania 1900.

laudationem⁽¹⁾ (an introduction, given at the Florentine Studio in 1482, to the reading of Caesar and Lucan), gives an account of previous historians, "quos omnis ut aetate posterior ita eloquentia prior est T. Livius subsequutus omnium historicorum et copia rerum abundantissimus et artificio et structura verborum eruditissimus." After this, the part Livy played in Florentine education is a matter for speculation, just as is Machiavelli's own education after he had begun in 1481 to go to a "maestro di grammatica" with whom, his father records,⁽²⁾ he did Latin compositions. The family's poverty (which emerges from Bernardo's Ricordi) must have been an almost insuperable bar to further education. On the other hand, Machiavelli was appointed in 1498 to a post which traditionally was given to lawyers, notaries or literary men. He was not a sere nor had he, so far as we know, produced any works by then;⁽³⁾ the only other area in which he could have distinguished himself within these categories was as a student - perhaps of Marcello Virgilio Adriani - even though he may well, but not definitely, have known no Greek. All we can say is that it was not necessarily before 1498 that he studied Livy in depth, that the stimulus to do this may well have come later, and that in either case the study of Livy, while not an esoteric pursuit, was associated with a level of scholarship closer to that of the accademie than of everyday learning. In other words, a statement like this one, of Gennaro Sasso,

(1) Published in a contemporary collection of his speeches in the Studio, without date or place. He is addressing "praestantissimi viri hominesque docti" and later "humanissimi cives vosque huius litterarii gymnasii praefecti." He heavily emphasises the utility of history - even more so than Negri. Historians "maximam utilitatem vitae mortalium afferentes quid sequi, quid vitari oporteat docuere". And so on; "considerans quam utilis et necessaria sit historia"; "eius utilitate..perspecta". But there is no specific reference to its contemporary political utility. The speech also contains an unimpressed appraisal of Tacitus as having imitated Livy both in his narrative and, to a greater extent, in his style.

(2) Bernardo Machiavelli, Libro di ricordi, Firenze 1954, 138.

(3) Cf. R. Ridolfi, Vita di N.M. Roma 1954, 24. But the second Chancellery, less involved in foreign affairs, demanded less of a knowledge of humanist rhetoric than the first.

calls for some qualification:

"Dopo tutto, la sua conoscenza di Tito Livio era troppo profonda e minuta fin dai primi anni della sua formazione politica e culturale perché l'ipotesi che il suo commento possa aver avuto inizio subito dopo le note vicende della caduta della Repubblica e dell'esilio, non abbia peso".⁽¹⁾

The study of Roman institutions

Even if Livy was not quite as widely read as other historians, the study of him at a higher, literary level took many forms, and in most cases these could be seen to have had some influence on the fruits of Machiavelli's own study of the Decades. One branch of scholarship with which Machiavelli was not of course connected was the study of the text, although the particular interest shown in this in Florence, both earlier in the Quattrocento and, in his own time, by Fonzio and Barnardo Rucellai, may well have helped to concentrate his own interest on Livy, especially when he became involved in the Rucellai circle.⁽²⁾ But in the Discorsi, at least, we can see

(1) Intorno alla composizione dei "Discorsi" di N.M., in the "Giornale storico dell'lett. italiana", vol.CXXXIV fasc.4 (1957), 487-8.

(2) For the earlier group of students of the text, which flourished in the years 1434-6, see Valla's In Barptolomaeum Facium recriminationes lib. IV, in his Opera, Basle 1540,602: "Testimonio est manus Caroli (Marsuppini), Cintio (Cencio Rustici), Pogii, Flavii aliorumque multorum, qui Florentiae, ut audio, rogatu cardinalis Columnae una cum Leonardo (Bruni) Livium quatenus potuerunt emendarunt". Valla himself of course contributed much to the study of the text.

Most of Fonzio's Observationes in primum librum Livii de secundo bello punico can be found in Marchesi, op.cit., 150-164. Evidence for Rucellai's work on the text can be found in the dedicatory letter of Antonius Francinus de Montevarchi to Palla Rucellai which precedes a collection of Latin historical works published apud Philippum Iunctam in 1517; he says how well he was received when "praeteritis diebus ad amplissimas, ac sane regias aedes tuas... Livii Decas a Bernardo patre tuo castigatas petitum veni". It is, incidentally, wrong to imply from this that he had written some formal castigationes - an error found in the life of Rucellai preceding the Florence 1770 edition of his De urbe Roma; and Felix Gilbert, in his article on Rucellai in the "Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes", XII (1949), 113 n.4, makes even more out of it, saying Rucellai wrote a "commentary on Livy".

something of the influence of another branch of scholarship concerned (at least in part) with Livy: that is, the study of ancient Roman institutions, both civil and military. The fundamental work in this field is, of course, Biondo's Roma triumphans, which deals with a whole range of subjects concerning ancient Rome - her religion, government, soldiery, private life, buildings and triumphs. The proemium talks of Rome's expansion and the beneficial effects of her rule on her subjects. Biondo says she "propter virtutem omnibus nationibus imperavit", but obviously means something different from what Machiavelli does in Discorsi 2.1 by virtù; nor are the Discorsi concerned with the efforts of Roman magistrates "ut hi qui in eorum imperio erant quam beatissime essent".

But Biondo at least foreshadows Machiavelli's opinion of the importance of Rome's foreign policy as well as her internal organisation. In Book III he starts to deal in detail with the administration of the republic, and having, with the use of sources like Livy, briefly discussed the foundation of Rome (like Machiavelli at the start of the Discorsi) he goes on:

"Sed ad gubernationem: ea bipartite a nobis tractanda erit, ut urbis ipsius et illi continentium primo intrinsecum, post Italiae et provinciarum imperio subditarum externum regimen ostendamus";

similar to the division Machiavelli makes between the first two books of the Discorsi, though again the Florentine is not concerned with the details of Roman rule in the provinces. Biondo describes the institutions in the time of the kings, and then those of the republic, using Livy and Cicero as his chief sources, before moving on to Italy outside Rome. He goes into this in some detail - and one can only contrast Machiavelli in this respect, as in the Discorsi and elsewhere he is quite happy to talk in general terms about colonies and leave it at that. But Biondo makes the distinction between the cities of

Latium, the coloniae, the municipia, the civitates liberae and stipendiariae, and examines them in turn at some length, using again Cicero and Livy. He is prepared to look more closely at the Decades than Machiavelli:

"Sed ad modos nobis redeundum est quibus populi in civitatem Romanam accepti sunt, qui multiplices variique fuerunt, a Livioque initium est sumendum: a quo non solum qui populi et quando, sed quo etiam iure accepti sunt, facile est intelligere."

He then makes the distinction between cities with and without suffragium; again, something which is omitted by Machiavelli. It is not, then, for his scholarly reading of Livy that Machiavelli can be compared with Biondo, but rather for his enthusiasm for certain broad aspects of Roman policy; as, for instance, in his approval of the granting of citizenship. Machiavelli praises this method of expansion in Discorsi 2.4, and Biondo, concluding his examination of this subject in the third book of the Roma triumphans, praises it too, though perhaps seeing it all more idealistically:

"ut nunc accomode liceat repetere, quod supra ex Tito Livio sumptum scripsimus, dum nullum fastiditur genus, in quo virtus elucesceret, Romanum crevisse imperium."

Book III ends with a detailed account of the election of magistrates (with Livy among the sources). Book IV deals with the senate in and after the time of Caesar, the magistracies (such as the triumviri and decemviri) with which he had not previously dealt, and then with Roman laws; again, Cicero and Livy are his main sources. He has a similar view to Machiavelli's of the Agrarian law:

"Legem agrariam ultimo servavimus loco, quia.. incendium magis urbi Romae quam lex fuisse videtur."

The book ends with a discussion of the cultured elements in Roman society, from tragedians to barristers, and gives, incidentally, a judgement on historiography which contrasts with the practice of such imitators

gestorum quae secunda et alii decem Livii ipsius supra quartam decades continebant summas strictissima brevitae complecti."

But he is not uncritical of Livy; on the subject of the three ranks used by the Romans in battle he points out Livy's vagueness - "ordo.. nisi ab attento et cupientissimo facile intelligi nequit"; while Machiavelli, both in the Discorsi (2.16) and the Arte della guerra (Book 3) goes further and silently alters Livy's account, as we shall see later. In general, as far as its sources are concerned, one might compare the attitude of the sixth book of the Roma triumphans to that of the Discorsi, though of course Machiavelli has nothing like Biondo's range (which includes Varro, Josephus, Aulus Gellius, Festus' abbreviation of Verrius Flaccus, Pliny and Cicero); but one might contrast the Arte della guerra, where Vegetius is given preference to Livy. One also notes the same characteristics in the books on military matters as in the three de administratione rei publicae: Biondo's use of Livy but his unwillingness to restrict himself to him, his critical evaluation of the sources; his concern with full documentation, his encyclopaedic knowledge. Machiavelli's scholarship is of a different order, even if they are both working in the same field. But there is agreement between them in the emphasis they give to certain aspects of ancient Rome - her expansion by colonisation, for instance, or her military prowess - so that the possibility remains that Biondo's enthusiasms rubbed off on Machiavelli. And if the Florentine's use of the classics bears only a superficial resemblance to Biondo's, we must remember that Machiavelli was not engaged in research but was making use of humanist methods to present proposals for changes in the contemporary state.

The study of Roman Law

Among the works influenced by the Roma triumphans were those which dealt with Roman law. In the first half of the Quattrocento, Andrea Fiocchi had written a work De magistratibus sacerdotisque romanorum (though until the 1561 edition it was ascribed to Fenestella).

of Livy as Bruni and Bracciolini:

"Historia quoquo modo scripta delectat. Sunt enim homines natura curiosi, et quamlibet nuda rerum cognitione capiuntur."

Book V, the last to deal with the administration of the state, goes into minor economic details,

"ex quibus pecunia rei publicae nervus, et omnis vitae adminicula publice et privatim conficiuntur."

Livy is among his sources. Again, we may contrast Machiavelli's lack of concern for such details and his opinion that economics are of secondary importance. But, like Machiavelli, Biondo extols the virtues of integritas, modestia and frugalitas, also citing the examples of Cincinnatus and others from Livy. He says that in Rome virtus was considered more important than class. But in Discorsi 1.60 ("Come il Consolato e qualunque altro magistrato in Roma si dava senza rispetto di età") Machiavelli implies disagreement with this opinion of Biondo:

"Nec magis apud Romanos valuit nobilitas quam aetatis superioritas ... Maioresque natu a minoribus colebantur...: equidem in omni loco inque omni specie honoris primores potioresque habiti."

In the sixth book, which deals with military matters, Livy is especially singled out by Biondo as his source. He starts by dismissing Vegetius, or at least qualifying his usefulness:

"Vegetius autem et si aetatis suae disciplinam militarem potius quam vetustam docuit multa habet a maioribus, praesertim a Sallustio, sumpta."

Livy then becomes his fundamental source, as he implies retrospectively at the beginning of the next book :

"Multa superius variaque diximus ad utriusque belli terra marique gerendi militiam facientia. Unde cum ea ut plurimum a Tito Livio patavino sumpserimus operumque eius pars maxima temporum malignitate perierit, non indecens hoc loco iudicamus bellorum et aliorum terra marique a Romanis

Later, on the same lines, though at less length, came Pomponio Leto's De romanis magistratibus; and the genre was continued in a different way with a work by a member of Pomponio's accademia - Sabellico, with his De venetis magistratibus. It is not certain that the De magistratibus romanorum veterum commentarius is Rucellai's, but the reasons for the attribution⁽¹⁾ are reasonably convincing. The work has two books - De officiis magistratum, on the qualities they should possess, and De magistratibus romanorum, which, as the title suggests, covers the same ground as Fiacchi's and Pomponio's works. The first book is concerned with the natural virtues - prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance - which magistrates should possess. But the first chapter is devoted to recommending the magistrate (and indeed everybody) to concern himself with religion;

"Inde enim gignitur quaedam virtutis opinio, et modestiae singularis, quae plurimum pollet ad mentes hominum illiciendas, flectendas, concitandas, leniendas, exasperandas.. Tanta pii et religiosi hominis est veneratio, ut quidquid velit persuaderi, dici non possit, quam facilis sit omnium adsensus."

This is, of course, identical with the views of Machiavelli in the Discorsi, though it is combined in Rucellai's case with the assumption that the leader using religion in this way would therefore be an honest man. Later (in 1.3) he praises the prudence of the Romans in setting up the censorship (mentioned in Livy, 4.8.7), "qua dignitate et officio, nihil unquam sanctius Roma vidit. Floruisse enim rem publicam scimus, quam diu bonorum consilia valuerunt...". This is the sort of Livian view of Rome's former goodness with which Machiavelli was not at all concerned. Livy tended to see the nobles as the guardian of morals, and Rucellai, as might be expected, echoes this, urging the optimorum consultatio - in other words, that magistrates should be guided by the nobles' opinions.

(1) For which see Johann Walchius' preface to his edition, Lipsiae 1752.

The second book, as we have said, describes the individual magistracies, though without any comment on their value; and we may contrast Machiavelli's account of the dictatorship, the plebeian tribunate, or the decemvirate. Of the sources, Walchius writes that, among the many writers whom Rucellai uses, the most important are Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus; even the language of the work, he says, is reminiscent of Cicero and Livy. Like Biondo, in fact, Rucellai uses a wealth of evidence, but Livy is perhaps the most important provider of it. Again, we may contrast Machiavelli, who, by largely limiting himself to Livy as his source in the Discorsi, clearly intended his work to be nearer the genre of the commentary than anything else. Nevertheless, the Discorsi have affinities with this work of Rucellai's, and also with the last work in this quasi-legal genre which concerns us - Alessandro d'Alessandro's Geniales dies. Published in Rome in 1522, a year before the author's death, the work is interesting not, obviously, because it could have influenced Machiavelli but as an illustration of the work being done in the same period. In reply to a query of Raffaele Maffei as to the purpose of the work, d'Alessandro replies that he is writing

"quod leges quae ad communem utilitatem editae, studio et labore maximo quaesitae et meditatae forent, neque ab his qui iura darent coli, neque perinde ut oportet, praecipi viderem....". (1)

But the subject-matter is much wider than this implies, covering, like the Discorsi, many constitutional and military topics. A great many classical sources are used, however, and the structure is quite loose - based on that of Aulus Gellius' Noctes Atticae; both these points differentiate the work from the Discorsi, although the structure

(1) Ed.cit., VI 7, f.250

of the Discorsi is, as we shall see later, far from straightforward. At any rate, on a more detailed level, we find Livy being used - as by Machiavelli - as a source for chapters on, for instance, "Quae potestas quantumque ius adversus reliquos magistratus tribunis plebis Romae fuerit",⁽¹⁾ the army (its discipline, structure and methods),⁽²⁾ the dictator,⁽³⁾ auspices,⁽⁴⁾ foretelling the future,⁽⁵⁾ and colonies.⁽⁶⁾ D'Alessandro, a Neapolitan, was a pupil of Pontano, who influenced him in, for instance, his aversion to Valla, but he was also strongly influenced by his period of study in Rome (from 1472 or 73 onwards) where he had as masters Calderini, Perotti and Francesco Filelfo, and his interests are very close to some of those of scholars who worked in Rome - Biondo, Leto or Maffei, notably; and we shall see how Machiavelli's study of Livy has affinities with other aspects of studies conducted in Rome and Naples as well as Florence.

Rucellai's "De urbe Roma"

One link between Rome and Florence is in the work done on ancient Roman topography. Biondo's Roma instaurata draws frequently on Livy; so does a work with the same aim produced in Florence. Again, the author is Bernardo Rucellai, and the work is his De urbe Roma.⁽⁷⁾ It has two parts, a brief history of the city of Rome and then a commentary on Publius Victor and Sextus Rufus. Livy is cited during the commentary, and also during the first part; for instance, on the origin of Rome :

"Sed unum ex omnibus Livium gravem profecto scriptorem, et cui,

-
- (1) I 3 .
 (2) For instance, I 12, I 20, IV 7, VI 13.
 (3) I 6, IV 23. Other political offices are dealt with in e.g. II 2, 15 and 27 and III 3
 (4) I 29.
 (5) III 15. Like Machiavelli in Discorsi 1.56, he uses the Via Nova incident from Livy 5.32.
 (6) IV 10.
 (7) Published Florence 1770. Crinito mentions the work in De honesta disciplina 8.5, 21.4 and 22.12. According to Domenico Becucci in his introduction, ed. cit., the text of Publius Victor was corrected by Francesco Vettori, Rucellai's nephew and close friend of Machiavelli.

Augusto principe, veterum monumenta repetere licuerit,
mihi libet proponere ad imitandum, quum indulgendum
dicat antiquitati, ut miscendo humana divinis origines
urbium augustiores fiant."

These works, of course, have only a general affinity with the Discorsi as far as their subject matter is concerned; what is of particular interest is the form of Rucellai's work as compared to that of the Discorsi. It is interesting that, like Machiavelli, he chose to write at least partly in the form of a commentary, and that nevertheless he did not feel it necessary to restrict himself in the work as a whole to the limitations which the commentary traditionally imposed. On the other hand, we find a completely different kind of scholarship in the De urbe Roma, in that Rucellai is not content with using the information provided by his two chosen texts alone. He uses several other authors - apart from Livy, we find for instance Strabo, Plutarch, Pliny, Frontinus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Julius Obsequens and even modern writers. Machiavelli is not a scholar in this mould, and when he chose to venture some way into the scholarly world with the Discorsi (and we will discuss this further when examining the structure of the work), he did not try to masquerade as something he was not and had no wish to be.

Raffaele Maffei's "Commentarii urbani"

A humanist who, like Biondo, worked at the Papal court - Raffaele Maffei - uses Livy in a work which partly resembles the Roma triumphans in its encyclopaedic account of ancient Rome, although it takes in much more than this; that is, his Commentariorum urbanorum libri XXXVIII (first published in Rome in 1506). The Decades provide information in the early historico-geographical books (for instance on the Gauls in Book 3). Livy is again used in the next section, an "antropologia hominum clarorum omnium temporum", which consists of

an alphabetically arranged biographical dictionary of famous ancients and an account of famous modern men divided by their categories. Apart from being a source for some of the ancients, Livy figures among them himself. Maffei cites, inevitably, the judgements of Asinius Pollio (on his patavinitas) and Quintilian (on his lactea ubertas), and also says: "Solet nasci inter eruditos An Cicero si historiam fuisset aggressus eum superasset, multosque habet uterque adfertores". Hardly one of Machiavelli's interests, but it emphasises the popularity of Livy as a stylistic model. Further on, in Bk.29, Livy is a source for Roman magistratures. In Bk.30, Xenophon is used for the section de re militari, but Livian examples are among the dicta ducum and the parallela stratagemata where (as elsewhere) modern and ancient examples are found alongside, just as in Machiavelli. Thus, together with Hannibal and Fabius Maximus, Maffei mentions, for instance, Niccolò Piccinino and Federico, Duke of Urbino. Further uses of Livy are to be found in the sections on the mos antiquae militiae, de disciplina ac poenis et premiis militaribus and de divinatione. The Decades, in fact, are constantly used in the sections to which they can contribute, even if Livy is not always mentioned by name; for instance, the phrase "res ad triarios redacta", in the section de ordinibus et militum exercitatione is obviously taken from him. On the other hand, as we find in all these works, Livy is by no means exclusively used; Suetonius and Xenophon, for instance, are equally important.

Maffei, until 1502 at least, worked in the Papal curia in Rome, ⁽¹⁾ but he had close contacts with Florence. At first they were of course with the generation before Machiavelli (than whom he was eighteen years older) - notably Poliziano, who wrote to Maffei the only letter in Greek published in his epistolario and whom Maffei mentions in Bk. 21 of the Commentarii urbani. During the years after the fall of the Medici, and Poliziano's death, he was however in touch with Francesco Soderini (bishop of Maffei's native Volterra). In a letter ⁽²⁾ of 1st October 1502, written together with his brother Mario, he says he does not know Francesco's brother Piero, the gonfaloniere of Florence; but from Volterra on the 7th June 1509 he sent to Piero his version of Procopius which had been published in Rome three months previously. This is not, needless to say, a suggestion of any direct influence on Machiavelli through these tortuous channels by a man of such strict Christian views, in many ways the antithesis of Machiavelli; merely an illustration that what went on outside Florence was not necessarily excluded from influencing the intellectual climate inside Florence, and that this could well have been the case with Maffei.

Pontano's "De prudentia"

While the works of Gioviano Pontano were anyway available in print (and the De prudentia, perhaps the most important of his works from the point of view of Machiavelli, was published by Giunta), there

(1) For this and other details of his life, see mons. Pio Paschini's article Una famiglia di curiali: i Maffei di Volterra, in "Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia", VII (1953), 337-76.

(2) Cod. Barber.lat. 2517. fol.36.

was also a link between him and Florence through Bernardo Rucellai and then through a pupil of Bernardo, Giovanni Corsi. Another link is provided by Francesco Pucci who left Florence for Naples after studying under Poliziano from 1480-3 and teaching at the Studio in the year 1483-4. He taught in Naples (where one of his pupils, incidentally, was Parrasio), until the fall of the dynasty in 1494, visiting Florence in 1491, and thereafter worked in Rome as the Secretary of Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona until his death in 1512. He took part in the accademia pontaniana, and is recorded in the De sermone as "vir in studiis nostris eminens"; he also appears in the dialogue Aegidius.⁽¹⁾ But though Pucci was involved both in the Florentine humanism of Poliziano and in that evolved in Naples, he did not return to Florence to relate what he had learnt from Pontano. Rucellai, on the other hand, met Pontano on an embassy to Naples in 1486 and again, probably in 1495, on a similar mission, and appears to have come back impressed.⁽²⁾ In a letter to Roberto Acciaiuoli, Rucellai records a discussion he had on this second visit, "authore me, quisnam e veteribus praecipue deligendus foret, quem in Historiam sequeremur". He quotes Pontano's views as follows :-

"Caesar ac Salustius ambo procul dubio inter insignes excellunt ... Caesar tanquam seminarium, Crispus lex et exemplar Historiae est... At Livius ut magna vis aquarum profluens insignem speciem praefert, modo altissimo alveo, modo tenui, interdum rapido, ac freto magis, quam torrenti similis, nam et copiosus, et acutus, et gravis, par Graecis, quos ille aemulatus est, supraque posteros, quibus ille singulari magnitudine praeripuit imitandi facultatem;

-
- (1) For more details, see Mario Santoro, Uno scolaro del Poliziano a Napoli: Francesco Pucci, Napoli 1948.
- (2) To be found in Sylloges epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum, ed.P. Burmannus, Leyden 1727, t.II, 200-2.

quippe cui si datum foret, ut Romae ortus patrium sermonem nactus esset, cunctis proculdubio praeponeremus".

Pontano ends by advising an eclectic approach to the problem of style. We shall see that Sallust was undoubtedly Rucellai's favourite model but that he did allow other historians to influence him. One suspects, in fact, that Rucellai has adapted Pontano's views slightly to fit his own, for in the dialogue Actius Pontano shows no such preference for Sallust and is far from criticising Livy for any patavinitas. We shall come back to this later when dealing with the use of Livy as a historiographical model.

We have seen how Livy was recommended by teachers as a source of both ethical and political examples. In the De principe of Pontano, Livy is irrelevant, but in some of his works on moral qualities Pontano certainly does not exclude public actions. Indeed, it is here that his use of Livy comes closest to Machiavelli's.

In the De fortitudine, Livy is a source for some of the examples of fortitudo domestica, but earlier in the work Pontano uses him for examples of political and military bravery. In the section de timidis, for instance, he writes: "Et Iunius Brutus Romanae libertatis assertor in provocantem Tarquinium ipse belli Dux equum statim adegit quia haec laus esset temporum illorum". The examples in the section de militibus are entirely taken from Livy. Also important is the point that he brings ancient and contemporary characters together - though not, as so often with Machiavelli, to the latter's detriment. Piccinino and Hannibal are found together (as in Maffei) in the section Quosque debeat vir fortis confidere, and further on, in praising the cautious,

Pontano writes :

"Quo in genere laudis maiores nostri Quintum Maximum primum esse voluerunt. Non mediocre etiam hinc laudem tulit Franciscus Sfortiae filius qui post Mediolanensibus imperavit; aut nunc fert Federicus Urbinas".

The edition of the De prudentia which appeared in Florence in 1508 has a dedicatory letter of Corsi to the archbishop of Florence, Cosimo Pazzi. Corsi was of Machiavelli's generation (he was born in 1472) but, like Rucellai, came from a different background (that of a noble family) and held totally different political views. He held no political office until 1512 - indeed, he was linked with a group of opponents of Soderini - but after the fall of the republic he served the Medici, and was Florentine ambassador to Spain from 1513-16. He left Florence during the next republican period and returned with the Medici in 1530. In short, politically and socially, Corsi was the antithesis of Machiavelli and the same is true of course of Rucellai, whose pupil he had been. To some extent this must inevitably have affected Machiavelli's relation with the Florentine scholarship which they also represented, even under the Soderini government; one must in other words expect some polemical reaction to their type of learning - and we have already noted some of the differences between the scholarship of Machiavelli and that of other humanists. But of course there are similarities as well; so that, if this edition of 1508, for instance, bore the mark of what he rejected politically, we must not assume that if he read this edition, Machiavelli therefore completely rejected the work itself.

The dedicatory letter of Corsi (who met Pontano when in Naples from 1501-3) illustrates, apart from the continuing association of Florentine humanism with the Medici, the link between Pontano and

Florentine humanism, above all in the person of Rucellai. Corsi writes that he was on a trip to Naples and met the great scholar,

"a quo cum ex ea quae illi cum Bernardo Oricellario tuo, cuius me alumnus fateor, intercedebat amicitia, essem perbenigne acceptus, haud facile dixerim, quot quantisque mihi sim visus discedere praeceptis auctior et documentis ornatio".

Pontano showed him his new work, of which Corsi writes :

"in his (libris) cum Laurentii Medici avunculi tui viri amplissimi nonnulla praeclarissima facinora agnoscerentur, possentque ea nostris civibus optimo esse documento, ut quantum in re publica moderanda prudentia stultitiae, solertia ignaviae, et avaritiae praestat magnificentia, tantum ab illo et patriae bene fuisse provisum, et suae immortalitati consultum, visi profecto sunt, cum nuper sint in lucem prodituri, nostra cura formis excusi, tuis ut prodeant auspiciis atque autoritate".

It is important to note that Corsi sees the book as having a public, not merely private application. Writing about prudentia in the second and third chapters of the first book of his De magistratibus romanorum veterum, Rucellai expresses the same idea :

"si enim prudens esse cupis, quod idem sapienter monet, in futura curam intende, et, quae possunt contingere, animo tuo propone; nihil tibi subitum sit; sed totum ante conspicias... Prudentes sunt, qui publicis privatisque rebus administrandis sunt apti; sapientia vero proprias commoditates spernit" (cap.II).

In the third chapter, he says that prudentia leads to civitatis salus and that therefore magistrates should heed the advice of those "quorum sit integritas spectata" (who are, of course, the optimates). The example he gives is a Roman one (taken from Livy, 4.8.7):

"Itaque olim a Romanis censores optimo consilio

instituti sunt, quibus esset morum cura...; qua
dignitate et officio, nihil unquam sanctius Roma vidit.
Floruisse enim rem publicam scimus, quam diu bonorum
consilia valuerunt";

which is, incidentally, a thoroughly Livian sentiment. Pontano's idea of what prudencia means in the state is even more interesting from the point of view of Machiavelli. In Book I he gives a straightforward definition ("cum recta agendi sit ac vera ratio ... actiones quidem omnes sic moderatur ac regit, ut virtutum omnium quae a moribus nomen habent, dux sit ac magistra"⁽¹⁾), but this is what he says at the end of Book 4 in the section "Quae sunt prudentis viri partes atque officia":

"... diu multumque et simul omnia considerare, et discretim etiam singula, prudenterque prospicere, et quae necessaria visa sunt apparare, ac nunc cunctare, nunc festinare; introsus res ipsas perspicere, ad singula intentum esse, observare tempora, locum, personas, res, negocia, inter seque discernere, vertere etiam sese, perinde ut casus, fortuna, rerum eventa, inopinatique exitus tulerint, ac nunc simulare, nunc dissimulare, dum ne id fiat dolo malo, sollicitari animo, cavere ad passus singulos ne concidat, diligentiam ubique summam retinere, cum primisque adhibere delectum, nec a se ipso discedere, atque haec quidem cum dignitate et penso omnia".⁽²⁾

There is no need to enlarge upon the similarity with what Machiavelli says about dealing with fortuna, in Discorsi 3.9, for instance - "Come conviene variare co'tempi, volendo sempre avere buona fortuna". One must not overlook Pontano's caveat, of course - "dum ne id fiat dolo malo" - and the limitations he imposes on prudence in the third book, where

(1) Florence, 1508, f. Vv.

(2) F.LXXXIIIr. and v. He says that all this is to be done "publice privatimque".

we find two sections entitled "Neque solertiam, neque sagacitatem, neque astutiam, esse prudentiam" and "Prudentiam cum bonitate coniunctam esse", (1) which are considerations with which Machiavelli would have been prepared to dispense. Nevertheless, that Pontano was in fact prepared to condone solertia and so on is shown later in the fifth book; and one might also compare what he says in his De oboedientia:

"Cum publica utilitas plus nimio gravata est, honestatis autem ac famae labes aut minima aut certo perlevis futura, permissum forsitan fuerit, declinata paulum honestate, consulere in communem civium ac patriae usum". (2)

Prudenza in Machiavelli is a concept which deserves more attention, being an indispensable ally of virtù, as for instance in Discorsi 2.1 when, talking of the wars waged by Rome, he says that anyone who considers them "vi vedrà dentro mescolate con la fortuna una virtù e prudenza grandissima". And just as he uses the Decades to illustrate Roman virtù, so he draws from them to show their prudenza in a very similar way to Pontano. (3)

Pontano defends Romulus over the rape of the Sabine women (Livy, 1.9) like this:

"Cum haec fuerint Romani imperii principia, maximi omnium quae unquam fuere, eiusmodi consilium quis accuset? cum praesertim Romulus de re uxoria prius cum finitimis amicissime egerit, et urbi suae ut consuleret, necessario sequeretur,

(1) Ff. LXXIIII seqq.

(2) Opera, Florence 1520, I 175

(3) M. Santoro, in his article Il Pontano e l'ideale rinascimentale del "prudente", in the "Giornale italiano di filologia", anno XVII (1964), 29-54, points out briefly the similarity between Pontano's concept of prudence and that found in Il principe, but he goes no further than this.

A discussion of Pontano's concept of the utile may be found in Rodolfo de Mattei, "Giusto e utile nell'età umanistica", in Dal premachiavellismo all'antimachiavellismo (Firenze 1969).

aliqua via aut ratio nulla esset reliqua" (f.CIII)

This is identical with Machiavelli's views on actions dictated by the necessities of the state, which are reflected in the chapter in the Discorsi (1.9) on Romulus. He is in fact talking not about the Sabine affair but the murders of Remus and Titus Tatius and the necessity of being alone "a volere ordinare una repubblica di nuovo", but he makes the same point about Romulus' prudence in putting public considerations first. "Uno prudente ordinatore d'una repubblica", and one who wants to help "la comune patria" must get sole authority, he says; "ne mai uno ingegno savio riprenderà alcuno di alcuna azione straordinaria, che per ordinare un regno o costituire una repubblica usasse. Conviene bene che, accusandolo il fatto, lo effetto lo scusi.." Furthermore, like Romulus, he must be "prudente e virtuoso" enough not to leave this authority to others on a hereditary basis.⁽¹⁾

The next Livian example used by Pontano is that of Tullus Hostilius' ploy to overcome the Fidenates when Mettius had deserted him. Machiavelli does not use this in the Discorsi, but we may compare it with the kind of examples used in 3.14 or the statement which heads another of his chapters (3.40): "Come usare la fraude nel maneggiare la guerra è cosa gloriosa". Nor does Machiavelli use the next example which Pontano takes - Cnaeus Fabius Ambustus' success at Anxur when he gave the order "nequis ex hostibus praeter armatos violaretur" (from Livy, 4.59). But in Discorsi 3.12 Machiavelli quotes the incident (from Livy, 5.12. 13-14) where "Cammillo prudentissimo di tutti i capitani romani" employed the same idea at Veii. Here the chapter-heading too calls for the use of prudence: "Come uno capitano prudente debbe imporre ogni necessità di combattere a'suoi soldati, e a quegli degli inimici tòrta".

(1) And cf. Discorsi 1.19: ".. chi somiglierà Romolo, e fia come esso armato di prudenza e d'armi..."

Pontano next gives the example of Spurius Postumius (Livy, 9. 8-12) and his actions after the humiliation of the Roman army at the Caudine Forks; an example also used by Machiavelli, though in a rather different way, in Discorsi 3.42, on not keeping promises made by force. Much closer to Machiavelli is the use made of the next examples, which are drawn from the events leading up to the battle of Aquilonia. The first two - the oath sworn by the Samnites (Livy, 10.38) and the episode of L. Papirius Cursor and the pullarius (10.40-1) - are also used by Machiavelli (in Discorsi 1.15 and 14 respectively), and the third (the order to raise dust with the baggage train) is again similar to the kind of examples used in Discorsi 3.14. And as before the heading of one of the chapters (1.14) underlines the importance of prudence in the two Livian examples with which it deals: "I Romani .. con la prudenza mostravano di osservare la religione..."

With the next example from Livy, Pontano goes further back into the first Decade - just as Machiavelli at some points in the Discorsi goes out of chronological order. The example is one which is fundamental for Machiavelli, being used both in the treatise on the rebels of the Val di Chiana and in the Discorsi (2.23); that is, the way the Romans dealt with the rebels of Latium (Livy, 8.13 seqq). In the Discorsi, Machiavelli adds two further examples of how one should avoid la via del mezzo, the first of which shows, he claims, "Quanto il parlare il vero giovi, quando egli è detto nel conspetto di uomini prudenti" - the senators, in this case.

Pontano goes back into the seventh book of Livy for a later example, that of the revolt of the legions left in Capua (Livy, 7.38.5 seqq). Machiavelli mentions this in the second book of the Discorsi (chs. 20 and 26) but looks at it from the same point of view as Pontano in the chapter on conspiracies (3.6). They both praise the means used

to prevent the conspiracy from getting any further - Machiavelli pointing out how, like the Romans, one should "con ogni industria dissimulare" a conspiracy, and Pontano saying that the consul "iudicavit arte ... occurrendum esse". This consul, according to Pontano, is Q. Servilius; but it is Machiavelli who remembers his Livy ⁽¹⁾ better when he says it was "Rutilo nuovo Consolo". Pontano, however, gives a fuller account of what was done to destroy the conspiracy.

A further point, though a peripheral one, on which one could compare the use of Livy made by Pontano and Machiavelli is in the quotations they give from him. If the mistake about Rutilus suggests Pontano was relying on memory, so do his versions of Livy's words. We cannot, of course, be sure of which text he used, but it is clear that the differences between what he says and what most texts read show that in the process of time he has unconsciously made some slight paraphrastic alterations. This, as we shall see, is often the case with Machiavelli in the Discorsi as well. In an age before the wide diffusion of copies of texts the feats of memory encouraged at school were not so prodigious as they seem to us; but at any rate this would inevitably have led to an intimate command of Livy among admirers like Pontano and Machiavelli. There are other Livian examples in the fifth book of the De prudentia which are not used by Machiavelli (the garrison at Nola, for instance, from Livy, 23.15.7 seqq) or are used in a different way (the house of Publius Valerius, for instance, from Livy, 2. 7-8); and there are points at which Pontano, though talking about characters who also appear in the Decades, like Numa or Hannibal, uses a source other than Livy (Plutarch's life of Fabius Maximus, for instance, in the case of Hannibal), while Machiavelli in such cases

(1) "Haec agitata occultis coniurationibus necdum volgata in omnes consilia invenit novus consul C. Marcius Rutulus, cui Campania sorte provincia evenerat, Q. Servilio collega ad urbem relicto"
(7.38.8)

generally remains faithful to Livy. Again, one can say that the De prudentia and the Discorsi differ not only in their form but in the whole approach of their authors - one starting from a philosophical standpoint, the other from a political one. This argument, up to a point, is true, but it ignores on the one hand the practical (both ethical and political) application which Pontano wanted his writing to have; and, on the other, the fact that, in choosing to write a work in the form of the Discorsi, Machiavelli was deliberately working to some extent in the territory which belonged to scholars like Pontano. To sum up, then, one may see Pontano's De prudentia as a probable influence on the Discorsi of Machiavelli, and as a stimulus at the same time both positive and negative - positive, as regards the use of Roman, and particularly Livian, examples to illustrate the use of prudence, and negative in that Machiavelli would have read with a critical eye a work associated with his political opponents. But the parallels between these two men, both writing for the benefit of others after their political careers had been terminated, are as important as their differences; and there is an especially close parallel in their use of Livy.

Historiography

Earlier in the De prudentia - in the first book, in the section "Quae sit vita ac virtus perfecta" - Pontano is talking about men who have excelled in their fields of activity. Cicero, he says, is the perfect orator; and

"in describendis vero rebus gestis Livius ac Sallustius.
Itaque ille (Cicero) suo in genere summus Orator; hi
diversis tamen artibus suo in genere summi Historici"
(ed. cit., f. XXVII).

We find these two historians - so often paired as the best - again in

Pontano's dialogue Actius, which was first published in 1507 in Naples. We have already seen, in the praefationes for instance, the respect for Livy as a historiographical model; and Actius, among other things, examines more closely what points in Livy (and Sallust) one should imitate. First of all, the question of style is examined. Altilius, one of the characters in the dialogue, says:

"Reliquum est, quoniam historiam poeticam pene solutam esse quandam de maiorum auctoritate dixi, ut... talem esse eam exemplis quoque ipsis edoceam. Licet autem in Livio Sallustioque, historiae Romanae principibus, diversa splendent claritate quae historia digna sunt lumina dicendique in altero maiestas heroica pene quaedam emineat atque uterque fuerit poeticae admodum studiosus..., tamen Livius in plurimis oratori similior est, Sallustius vero historicis tantum legibus ubique videtur addictus".⁽¹⁾

He goes on to a stylistic examination of these two, comparing them to Virgil, and concludes that they are right "qui historiam censeant poeticam quasi quandam esse solutam". Another character (Pudericus) wonders whether Altilius is right in neglecting Cicero as a model and thinking that Livy is sufficient; to which he replies :

"Et Livii testimonio contenti esse unius possumus et Cicero minime est adiciendus, vir ad omne genus eloquentiae genitus naturae ipsius munere atque ipsius Livii magister et doctor...

... Nesciam tamen quoniam modo minus haec extant in Sallustio nec tam apparent atque exposita sunt quam in Livio, ut alter quodammodo prae se ferre velit artem poeticaeque imitationem, alter celare eam, ut tanquam in nubecula delitescat".⁽²⁾

(1) Pontano, Dialoghi, ed. C. Previtiera, Firenze 1943, 194-5

(2) Ibid., 200, 202.

He goes on to discuss how history should be written, and again Livy and Sallust provide the examples. He is mainly concerned with the description of wars, "nam res gestae plerunque sunt bellicae".⁽¹⁾ Clearly most of the things he is concerned with - speeches, descriptions of battles and sieges, giving reflections on events - are only relevant in Machiavelli's case to the Istorie Fiorentine, which we will be discussing later. Irrelevant for Machiavelli is the discussion de verbis when the discussion de rebus is over. But some of the things to which Altilius says a historian should give attention are interesting not merely from the historiographical point of view but also in relation to the Discorsi, in so far as, in saying that the description of something is important, Pontano (through Altilius) is implying that the thing itself is important. Among these things is the description of military commanders, and Hannibal is mentioned. In the Discorsi (3.21) Machiavelli considers Hannibal's character and its effect, comparing him to Scipio. Pontano also considers the description of the terrain over which the war is fought to be important. He quotes Livy, 22.28.3 on Minucius and the hill; with which we might compare (apart from ch.14 of Il principe) Discorsi 3.39 and its account of the episode of P. Decius Mus and another hill (from Livy, 7.34). The title of the chapter is "Che uno capitano debbe essere conoscitore de'siti". The third point which relates to something in the Discorsi is summed up thus by Altilius:

"Necubi vero plura quam bellicis in rebus accidunt
improvisa, insperata, non ante cogitata praeterque
opinionem atque consilium eaque ipsa plena nunc terroris
nunc spei, modo gaudii modo tristitiae. Itaque casuum
fortuitorumque in his eventuum magna scriptori ratio
habenda est".⁽²⁾

(1) Ibid., 218. Pontano's own historical work is of course about a war - the De bello neapolitano.

(2) Ibid., 220.

He quotes as an example Livy, 39.48.6. Three Livian examples (all from the first Decade) of the effects of improvisa are given in Discorsi 3.14: "Le invenzioni nuove che appariscono nel mezzo della zuffa e le voci nuove che si odino, quali effetti facciano".

Actius, then, is relevant in a sense to the Discorsi; but it is of course more directly relevant to Machiavelli the historian. When he has discussed what topics history should deal with, Pontano goes on, "reliquum est de verbis ut dicamus". Here again his two models remain the same:

"Nam quamquam et Tacitus et Curtius abunde sunt laudibus ac virtutibus ornati suis, laus tamen omnis Latinae historiae penes duos putatur existere diversoque in dicendi genere, Livium ac Sallustium".⁽¹⁾

The question of Latin style was obviously of no importance to somebody writing in the volgare, although of course the very fact that Machiavelli rejected Latin as his medium is of great significance. Nevertheless, as well as following classical precedents in giving special attention to certain topics, it is possible for a writer in the vernacular to follow general aspects of the style of a Latin model - in, for instance, the speeches put into the mouths of the characters. Since then, Machiavelli wrote historical as well as political works, and since (as we have already seen from Actius) humanist historiography is another area influenced by Livy, we should consider further how important this influence was.

In Negri's praefatio in Livium, which we considered above, he makes these distinctions concerning histories:

"Duplex est praeterea genus historiae privatum ac publicum. Publicum est quod temporum continet varietatem: ut Livianum opus exemplo est. Privatum quod nulla temporum varietate titulo tantum gaudet: ut Iugurta et

(1) Ibid., 231

Catilina. Quidam duplicem etiam modum posuere,
 intersectitium quale est illud Suetonii, continuum
 quale est illud Plutarchi per singula virorum gesta;
 item Apiani....⁽¹⁾

To this one might add another category, that of a general account of recent times. This would include Tacitus, with Renaissance equivalents in the histories of Sigismondo de'Conti or Guicciardini. The kind of history typified by Suetonius and Plutarch found an imitator in Platina with his Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum, finished in 1474, which was a well-known and influential work. Plutarch was very popular in the first half of the Quattrocento, and Platina's contemporary Campanus published a collection of Latin translations of his Lives in Rome. Another collection of lives, unpublished until modern times but nevertheless evidence of interest in the biographical genre is Vespasiano da Bisticci's Vite. Machiavelli's own life of Castruccio has affinities with this kind of work, being in turn based upon the earlier life of Castruccio by Tegrini. But at this time the interest in writing contemporary history in this genre seems to have waned.⁽²⁾ In the humanist circles to which Machiavelli was closest, the most popular model was Sallust; examples of histories dealing with a particular topic (a war, like Iugurtha, or a conspiracy, like Catiline) are Bracciolini's Historia fiorentina, Poliziano's Pactianae coniurationis commentariolum, Rucellai's De bello italico and Pontano's De bello neapolitano. In the Livian genre - the history ab urbe condita - the main works were of course those of Bruni and Biondo; thereafter this type appears to have lost favour, except for Sabellico's Decades, until Machiavelli decided on second thoughts to start the Istorie Fiorentine before 1434. Both his excursions into

(1) Praefationes, Milano 1521, Xcr - v.

(2) However, Giovanni Corsi is the author of four translations of Plutarch dated between 1511 and 1513. Three of them are dedicated to Palla Rucellai (one of Bernardo's sons), Francesco Vettori, and his principal teacher, Francesco da Diacceto.

historiography, then, went against the current trends in the subject, as well as differing radically between each other; and there were also differences between him and his predecessors as regards their use of Livy, though these differences do not preclude the existence of similarities as well. Later (in the third chapter) we shall examine the extent of Livy's influence on the Istorie fiorentine; at this point all that need concern us is the influence of Livy on humanist historians up to Machiavelli's time, whether or not their works fall into the ab urbe condita category.

Even Bruni is not entirely Livian in his technique. He mentions in the prooemium to his Historiarum florentini populi libri XIII the utility of history ("ut quid sequere et quid vites facilliter sumas") which is a contrast to the desire expressed by Livy in his introduction to escape through his writing into happier days (and incidentally something of which Machiavelli would of course have approved). Poggio, in concentrating almost entirely on events foris rather than domi, is writing a different kind of work altogether. However, the presence of Livy is felt, if in a modified form, in his Historia florentina.⁽¹⁾

Bruni starts by justifying his work by putting it on a par with ancient history - something Machiavelli considers superfluous, or rather false, in view of the differences he points out (Ist.fior.3.1) between Florence and Rome. However, Bruni in his prooemium talks of Pisa,

"Quam ego urbem ... recte alteram Carthaginem, ut mihi videor, appellarim. Cuius extrema debellatio atque obsidio ... ita multo memoratu digna continent, ut antiquis illis maximis rebus quas legentes admirari solemus, nulla ex parte inferiores appareant".

(1) For a general consideration of the debts of Bruni and Poggio to Livy and Sallust respectively, see Donald J. Wilcox, The Development of Florentine Humanist Historiography in the Fifteenth Century, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1969.

In Bk. I he talks at length of the Roman foundation of Florence ("Florentiam urbem Romani condidere a Lucio Sylla Fesulas deducti") as does Poggio (also in his first book), who says that "prioris urbis (i.e. of Roman Florence) perpauca supersunt vestigia" but describes them all the same. Bruni then uses Livy extensively for the history of the Etruscans - their origins and their relationship with Rome - which Machiavelli, in spite of his belief in the enduring characteristics of nations, is content to pass over. And Bruni starts his seventh book (after having given his account of the duca d'Atene) with an echo of Livy, 2.1.1, on the people now free from oppression. Parallels between Florence and Rome are more numerous in Poggio, who even includes in his first sentence, clearly based on the opening of Iugurtha, the phrase "operae pretium fore putari" - an echo of Livy's opening, "facturusne operae pretium sim....". Poggio's main scholarly pursuit was, of course, Cicero's speeches, but we find evidence even outside the Historiarum florentini populi libri VIII of devotion to Livy: he urges Lionello d'Este to look for the lost Decades, for instance, and quotes Livian exempla to Cosimo de'Medici (unjustly exiled, he says, like Camillus and Scipio Africanus) and to Giovan Francesco Gonzaga (whose cruel treatment of his son was not justified even by the example of Manlius Torquatus). So too in Poggio's Historiae, in spite of their debt to Sallust, we find reminiscences of Livy. For instance, in 2.39.7 Livy writes "externus enim timor maximum concordiae vinculum"; this is possibly reflected in Poggio's remark after his description in Bk. I of a "turba agrestium", driven into the town by the army sacking the outskirts of Pistoia: "trepidatumque est magis interiori, nequa seditio ex repentino hostium adventu oriretur, quam externo metu".

This is a minor point but closer parallels emerge in a comparison of these two passages - the Romans' reply to the Campanian envoys in 7.31.2 and the Venetians' reply to the Florentine envoys in Poggio's Bk.5 (my italics):

"Auxilio vos, Campani, dignos censet senatus; sed ita vobiscum amicitiam institui par est, ne qua vetustior amicitia ac societas violetur. Samnites nobiscum foedere iuncti sunt; itaque arma, deos prius legatos, sicut fas iusque est, ad socios atque amicos precatum mittemus, ne qua vobis, vis fiat".

"Veneti etsi vera quae dicerentur videbantur... respondent: antiquam Philippi amicitiam, societatemque obstare, quo minus foedere iungantur; oratores tamen ad eum se missuros ex principibus civitatis, qui eum ad pacem hortentur, moneantque, ut ab armis desistere velit, ne quod iure nequit, vi'et iniuria assequi velle videatur".

Poggio also makes his orators refer to Roman examples in their speeches: for instance Donato Barbadoro, in his speech to Gregorio XI, in Bk. 2, says

"imitari enim conantur cives nostri Romanorum in ea re (i.e. dying for the state) virtutem, a quibus originem traxere, quos legimus pro communi libertate saepius summa cum gloria occubuisse".

Later he talks of the "prisci Romani" ejecting the Tarquins.

Apart from such reminiscences of Livy in these two works, we also find characteristically Livian features in their organisation, though this is obviously less true of Poggio's. In Bruni's, after the "pervagatior" first book (as he calls it) we find the division by years which is typical of Livy's Decades. We also find the alteration between foris and domi, with the connection of peace in one area causing strife in another.⁽¹⁾

(1) E.g. in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, tom. 19 pt. 3 (Citta di Castello 1914-26) Bk. IV, p. 85 l.23 and p.101 l.15).

This is found, to a lesser extent, in Poggio and Machiavelli as well - all three, for instance, give the same, typically Livian interpretation of events after the death of Gregorio XI :

"Externam pacem intestinae confestim discordiae subsecutae" (Bruni, at the start of Bk IX);

"Quieta ab externis bellis civitate, pax in dissensiones domesticas versa est" (Poggio, Bk II);

"Sendo adunque morto papa Gregorio, e rimasa la città senza guerra di fuora, si viveva dentro in grande confusione"

(Istorie fiorentine, 3.8)

Another Livian aspect is the special attention given to certain episodes in order to bring out their moral or political importance.

But other authors had less desire to make their histories a mirror of classical practice. One such was Biondo, whose Decades have nothing Livian except their title. We have mentioned his view that technique in historiography is unimportant; and this view was repeated much later (with a plagiarism of Biondo's exact words) by another scholar who worked in the curia, Sigismondo de'Conti, at the start of his history of the period 1475-1510. It is the utility of history that matters, he says (again in contrast with Livy); it teaches men what to flee and what to follow, and how God supports the Church. The whole work, in fact, revolves around the Papacy, and it is perhaps de'Conti's concern with contemporary politics that gives it an independence from classical models. There are several references to classical authors, however, including Livy; in 5.4, for instance, he relates how the Genoese raised the siege of Porto Pisano either because of storms, or lack of supplies,

"sive gentis natura, quae ut T. Livius refert, novandis, quam gerendis bellis est aptior".

There are only a few instances of possible echoes of Livy: in 13.9 and 15.8, for instance, when he contrasts the Roman character to the unstable Gallic race, or in 14.3, where he calls Capua "mollissima, ac delicatissima urbs Campaniae". In 7.38.5 Livy calls Capua "minime salubris militari disciplinae", accusing the town of distracting the soldiers "instrumento omnium voluptatum".

One historian, though - this time a Florentine - who was interested in classical style was Bartolomeo Scala.⁽¹⁾ This concern emerges in his correspondence with Poliziano, who defends himself against Scala's criticisms of his style. He asks if Cicero is the only model, and whether Livy, Sallust and others are not worthy

(1) In the Archivio di Stato of Siena is a manuscript of a dialogue De legibus et judiciis dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici and written by Bartolomeo Scala in 1483. It is published by Lamberto Borghi in "La Bibliofilia", XLII (1940), 256-282. The other speaker is one Bernardo Machiavelli. For the reasons why this is probably Niccolò's father, and the implications as regards his career, see Felix Gilbert, Machiavelli and Guicciardini, Princeton 1965, 318-321. One should not overlook the significance of the friendship from the point of view of possible literary influences on Niccolò. The work also illustrates - if it can be taken to be a fair picture of Bernardo's knowledge - the knowledge of Livy which one would expect from a man who had made a geographical index of the Decades and who possessed a copy of them. On f.88v. he refers to the lex Oppia passed during Hannibal's invasion of Italy, and on f.94v., using Livy's own phrase, he gives Appius Claudius as an example of the tendency of power and self-love to corrupt - "Et Appius Claudius decemvir apud Romanos, dum dat vindicias libertatis pre amore in servitutem decoris omnis honestique obliviscitur". Earlier (f.66r.) Scala had referred to the period during which Rome lived without laws after the expulsion of the Tarquins as twenty years; here he mentions that this is the figure given in Justinian's Pandectae, but gives an alternative one - "sive, ut Livio placere magis videtur, octo et triginta a pulsus Urbe Tarquiniis". He goes on to relate the expedition to Athens to bring back Solon's laws, mentioned by Livy in 3.

of imitation? In reply Scala says :

"An ego Salustium, an Livium despexerim, quorum altero nihil in scribendo ingeniosius, aut exactius crediderim, alterius gravitatem orationis, atque maiestatem, admirari satis pro meritis nemo potest". (1)

But he excludes Quintilian, Seneca and the two Plinii from the rank of possible models. It is interesting to see the reason Poliziano gives for this in his reply:

"Nam quod Livium modo, et Salustium probas, Quintilianum, Senecam, Plinius ambos reiicis, causa est opinor, quod ocium tibi nondum fuit historiam scriptitanti, etiam horum virtutes inspicere". (2)

In other words, Scala was too obsessed with imitating Livy and Sallust to have time for anybody else. And in the procemium to his De historia florentinorum, Scala has this to say about the style of Bruni and Poggio:

"Da Leonardo Aretino....., da Poggio, qui et ipse in comune pro virili laboravit, Antiatem aliquem aut Pictorem, aut alios innumerabiles clarosque auctores, quos sequantur minus, mihi crede, Livianam tu in iis diligentiam facundiamque desiderabis".

The implication is that, since of course they were not imitating Valerius Antias and Fabius Pictor, they should have done a better job of imitating Livy. Nevertheless, Scala is un-Livian enough to emphasise the utility of history in showing what it is best to do both in public and in private matters.

Two Florentines who were also very conscious of stylistic imitation in their histories are Poliziano and Bernardo Rucellai. The account of the Pazzi conspiracy which appeared in 1478 was the first work of Poliziano destined for publication, and, like Machiavelli's

(1) Angeli Politiani et aliorum virorum illustrium Epistolarum libri XII, Argentorati 1513, LVII r.

(2) ibid., LIX r. It is unlikely, of course, that Poliziano is being sarcastic here as he too chose to imitate Sallust in his historical work.

history over forty years later, was commissioned by the Medici - in his case, Lorenzo il Magnifico. The obvious model for such a work was Sallust's Catiline, and Livy is of course almost irrelevant.

A. Perosa, in his critical edition ⁽¹⁾ gives only one reference to the Decades, when he compares

"una omnis factio in facinus coniurant" ⁽²⁾

with

"coniuratio in omne facinus ac libidinem". ⁽³⁾

Rucellai's De bello italico - an account of the French invasion of 1494 - is another work written deliberately in the manner of Sallust. Sir Ronald Syme has called it "a perfect Sallustian monograph, rapid, intense and dramatic", as regards its vocabulary and style and use of devices like the character sketch. ⁽⁴⁾ Like Sallust, he points out, Rucellai pounces upon the ethical pretexts that mask discreditable motives or obscure the real political forces, and employs the Sallustian "honesta nomina" at least five times, ending his account of the war, for instance, with suitable reflections on that universal "dominandi cupiditas" which is veiled by "honesta nomina". However, one might expect Rucellai, whom we have already seen to be a student of the Decades, to have borrowed something from Livy as well, if only in a minor way; and this in fact, as with Poggio, seems to be so.

(1) Della congiura dei Pazzi, Padova 1958

(2) Ed. cit., p.13, l.5.

(3) Livy 39. 18.3

(4) In his History writing in Latin: introductory remarks at the conference, in "Society and History in the Renaissance", the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington 1960. Erasmus had already made this comparison: "Novi Venetiae Bernardum Oricularium, civem Florentinum, cuius Historias si legisses, dixisses alterum Sallustium, aut certe Sallustii temporibus scriptas" (in Apophtegmata, Opera omnia, Leyden 1703, IV, 363 E) Cf. also Guglielmo Pellegrini, L'umanista Bernardo Rucellai e le sue opere storiche, Livorno 1920, 37-56.

In his introduction to the De bello italico, Rucellai seems to be doing the opposite of Livy at the beginning of the first Decade - Livy was seeking refuge from present evils in the past, while Rucellai is recording the evils of his own lifetime. However, Rucellai expresses the wish that he was writing about the past; he is also, he says, a laudator temporis acti. One suspects that he had Livy in mind when writing the first pages of his history of the French invasion, aware of the contrast between them in respect of the appeal of their subjects, but trying at the same time to show that he shares Livy's point of view.

In the text, we find adaptations of phrases and observations from Livy. For example, one can compare his "ruitur in tela et vulnera" and Livy's "in vulnera ac tela ruunt";⁽¹⁾ or "sed fato datum, sive consilio Deorum immortalium, ut e manibus hostis eriperetur"⁽²⁾ and "ex hostium manibus eripuimus". There is evidence that Rucellai intended to draw a parallel between Rome and Florence in 1494 (while contemporary Rome was relegated to the place of ancient Capua: compare his "at Romae luxuriantis diuturnae felicitate, atque indulgentia fortunae..." and Livy's "Capuam... luxuriantem longa felicitate atque indulgentia fortunae"⁽³⁾). Instead of being governed by a consiglio and numbering among its inhabitants nuns with a monotheistic creed, Rucellai's Florence has a senate and vestal virgins worshipping the Deos immortales.

(1) De bello italico, London 1733, 79; Livy 26. 44.9.

(2) De b.i., 93; Livy, 5.51.3., where Camillus is talking about the saving of Rome from the Gauls, which he attributes to the work of the gods as well as of the Romans.

(3) De b.i., 61, and Livy, 23.2.1.

Rucellai also treats Charles VIII's French in the way that Livy treated the Gauls. They are a people who "superstitione ducatur";⁽¹⁾ he talks of their savagery ("furor Gallorum militum", "Gallus natura ferox, vehemens"⁽²⁾) and points out their superficial, impulsive nature - "Gallorum fortiter excipere primam audaciaum, ardoremque animi, magna pars victoriae est",⁽³⁾ and "ut sunt Gallorum subita, ac repentina consilia"⁽⁴⁾ - with which may be compared Livy's remark about their being in battle more than men at first and less than women after,⁽⁵⁾ and his account of their swift defeat of the Romans followed by their hesitant entry into Rome. Finally, with Rucellai's account of the destruction and terror caused by the French entry into Florence may be compared Livy's description of the Gaul's entry into Rome in 390 B.C.⁽⁶⁾

Rucellai also hints at a parallel between the French commander and Hannibal:

"Druentia initium capit, per Taurinos, ubi primum Hannibalem illum cum omnibus copiis constitisse tradunt".⁽⁷⁾

There is another reference to Livy in Rucellai's version of his own reply to Charles when he points out Rome's mercy to their foes, citing Massinissa as an example.⁽⁸⁾

(1) De b.i. 14; cf. Livy, 5.34.7

(2) *ibid.*, 64

(3) *ibid.*, 28

(4) *ibid.*, 33

(5) Livy, 10.28. 3-4.

(6) *ibid.*, 5.42

(7) De b.i., 34; cf. Livy, 21.31.9 and 38.5

(8) *ibid.*, 49

These reminiscences of Livy have an appearance of superficiality, of mere homage to an admired model, compared to the more serious view of history displayed by others we have mentioned (with Poliziano as an exception). The parallels Rucellai draws between Florence and Livy's Rome are only embellishments rather than, as with Machiavelli, clues to a course of politic action. The parallels are there in Machiavelli - at least in the Discorsi; but we shall see later the differences that also exist between his attitude and that typified by the De bello italico.

Like Negri in the praefatio we have mentioned, and in contrast to Rucellai and others, Sabellico, in the prooemium to his Decades, praises the present day at the expense of Rome.

What Rome did, he writes,

"fuerunt...res...magnificae et amplae... Verum sanctitate legum, iuris equatione, innocentia, caeterisque sanctoribus institutis res Venetae cum Romanis collatae, non modo non deteriores illis, sed longe etiam ... meliores reperientur".

Venice, he says, was built by noble men; and he goes on - with Rome clearly in mind -

"neque mirum creduntur caeterorum primordia (nisi Poetarum fabulis fidem habendam putamus) omnino humilia ac pene sordida Et dubitet quisquam, quales earum gentium fuerint mores, quae Regum libidinibus prius assueverint, quam legibus, quae ante servili plausu delectatae sint quam libero suffragio? Ego vero non miror Imperia ille quae huiusmodi habuissent principia, prorsus olim interiisse..."

However, he still seems to think it worthwhile to draw parallels between Venice and Rome, even if not just for Venice's benefit (as was the case with Machiavelli and Florence). The second Decade starts like this :

"Multa nobis res Venetas scribentibus occurrunt, quae tam Romanis similia sunt, ut consilio, laboribus, fortunae varietate, eventu ipso, nihil videri possit similius".

Especially, he says, as regards the war between Rome and Carthage and that between Venice and Genoa. He illustrates the points of comparison, concluding :

"eventus si non idem, non tamen omnino diversus".

Similarly, he starts the fourth Decade with another comparison between Venetian and Roman wars. Both started by fighting local peoples, then the Gauls, and so on; and the Venetians, like the Romans, had finally proved invincible in all Italy. But as in the prooemium the comparison glorifies Venice by comparing her to Rome and then showing how Venice is even greater - in this case, by saying that Venice, unlike Rome, had not been ruined by a war.

Sabellico's model was Biondo's Decades, and so it is understandable that Livy's influence on his style and organisation is negligible. The same is true of his later historical work, the Enneades ab orbe condito ad inclinationem Romani imperii. The first edition⁽¹⁾ contained seven enneads, but he continued the work up to 1503 and the second book of the eleventh ennead; this second part was published in 1504. In the period covered by Livy he uses him extensively as a source. In the preface to the fifth ennead, in which he announces his intention to describe the war in Italy between Hannibal and Rome (the greatest of all Rome's wars, he says), he writes that before giving his account of the war he wants to mention some Greek affairs which Polybius put before the war in his history -

"quia ab illius autoritate discedere nec historiae
in hac parte utile sit, nec mihi commodum".

However, Livy is, in spite of this, of great importance; Sabellico

(1) Venice 1498

plagiarises him, for instance, in the fifth book of this fifth ennead when he gives a speech to a Locrian envoy which is a summary (unacknowledged) of Livy, 29.17-18. The close similarity is illustrated by these sentences - Sabellico's

"Q. Pleminius legatus qui ad Locros a Poenis recipiendos missus est, quique nobis recaeptis ut praesidio esset a Scipione fuit relictus ... "

and Livy's

"Q. Pleminius legatus missus est cum praesidio ad recipiendos a Carthaginiensibus Locros et cum eodem ibi relictus est praesidio" (29.17.10).

Political Works

Already we have begun to see a contrast between Machiavelli's approach to Livy (that of someone eager to learn from the Roman example) and the less humble approach of others. This contrast is also found between the Discorsi and the few earlier political works which dealt (as the Discorsi chiefly do) with republican government. It is certainly rare (before Machiavelli) to find Livy being used in order to extol republicanism. One Florentine example (though not in a work of general political theory) is Bruni's Laudatio florentinae urbis, where he contrasts Livy's heroes with the Roman emperors, a contrast which is meant to reflect on Florence's political wisdom, a quality which Machiavelli usually found lacking. There are only two general works on republics which it is possible to compare to some extent with the Discorsi as regards their use of Livy - the De republica of Tito Livio de Frulovisiis and the De institutione reipublicae of Francesco Patrizi.

The De republica was, according to C.W. Previté-Orton, "seemingly written early in 1434"⁽¹⁾ and was unpublished until this

(1) Opera haectenus inedita T. Livii de Frulovisiis de Ferrara, ed. C.W. Previté-Orton, Cambridge 1932, xvi.

century; it is, therefore, almost definitely not a work which could have influenced Machiavelli, and is only illustrative of the trend of thought on its subject in the first half of the Quattrocento. As in the Discorsi, the first book starts with a division of governments into the three categories of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, with the further division of monarchy into regalis and tyrannicus. The reasons for change from one form to another are discussed in the second book. It is discussed into what category Rome falls. One view is that Rome appeared to be a democracy at certain times (when religious posts and magistracies were thrown open to the plebs) but that the dominant group were the faeneratores or money-lenders, so that in effect Rome had an oligarchy. Tito Livio explains to his two companions

"non ego nunc aliter dico populum principari nisi nomine."

On the other hand, Florence is lavishly praised for her type of government. In the second book the position of the plebs is examined further. Before the final fall of the Tarquins, the senators "omni indulgentia in plebem utebantur" - by lifting the salt tax during the war against Porsenna, for instance. But afterwards came the money-lenders - never made illegal - who kept the plebs down. The conclusion is that the plebs were better off under a king acting for his own ambition than under the senate - very different from Machiavelli's view of the class situation in Rome. The third and last book discusses a variety of topics - the

law, religion, social questions like marriage, and war⁽¹⁾ - and Livy is used to illustrate some of his namesake's points. On pietas for instance, Tito Livio mentions T. Manlius, Marcus Curtius' suicide, Camillus returning from Ardea, Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaevola. On the keeping of faith in war, he mentions M. Regulus coming back from Carthage to exchange prisoners, and on magnanimity he mentions Scipio and Q. Fabius Maximus.

Patrizi, a friend of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, was banished from his town of Siena in 1457, for political reasons. In 1461 he became bishop of Gaeta. His two political works - one on the prince, the other on the republic - had a great influence, being published in several editions (both Latin and Italian), though after Machiavelli's time their popularity waned. The work on the republic was written - like the Discorsi - in exile, during the 1460's, and though Patrizi was Sienese we learn from a letter of 1457 to Nicodemo Tranchedini⁽²⁾ that he did not write the work until he had met many Florentine citizens.

In the fourth chapter of the first book Patrizi enumerates the types of government - monarchy, tyranny, democracy, aristocracy and oligarchy. In 1.1 he explains why princes are worse than republics, quoting the same verses from Juvenal as does Machiavelli in Discorsi 3.6. Both democracy and rule by the nobles have their dangers, he says, but if he had to choose between them, he

(1) Incidentally, this passage, from f. CXXXa, has close parallels in Machiavelli;

Livius: Licet arcem in urbe principi fabricare?

Comes Pulcini: Licet. Arx autem benevolentia sit et amor suorum civium.

Li.: Manufactam dico.

Co.: Ita, sed ad dubios rerum exitus, non contra cives nec in illorum odium.

(2) Cited by H. Baron in The Crisis of the early Italian Renaissance, Princeton 1966, 437.

would choose the nobles as safer; and he praises the Spartan type of government. The contrast with Machiavelli is clear, as is the contrast with the level he is working on. Patrizi looks (in 1.2) to Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle and Cicero for guidance on the different type of society; Machiavelli prefers Polybius, Livy and his own judgment. Patrizi decides to advocate a new republic, even though Sparta has its good points, as he writes at the end of 1.4:

"Nec Lycurgi instituta improbanda sunt ... Tempora tamen et diversi hominum mores diversaeque regiones alia, atque alia instituta praescribunt. Idcirco longiore ordine quam Rempublicam magis probandam censeam, deinceps tractabo".

Though Machiavelli would agree that one must change according to circumstances, he still preferred to recommend the Roman constitution as illustrated by Livy. Nevertheless, if Patrizi is not devoted to Rome to this extent, he is still willing to incorporate into his republic some aspects of Roman government. In the third book, for instance (which is on magistracies, on the model of Fenestella, whom he quotes in the ninth chapter) he is discussing the division of the city for the purpose of the election of magistrates and says:

"exemplo igitur Romanorum optime utemur" (3.2)

On the question of the magistrates' nomenclature he mentions the various possibilities and then says:

"nos autem Romanorum nomina sequemur, tum propter auctoritatem, universo enim orbi terrarum imperarunt: tum propter dignitatem ac gravitatem, qua omnibus gentibus ac nationibus praestant: tum etiam quia Latini sumus, et a verbis nostris minime discedere debemus" (3.4).

Livy is, of course, among his sources.

One of the subjects discussed in the first chapter of the ninth book is "Fallacem esse belli fortunam". Patrizi draws on Livy to support this:

"Consilium, virtus et scientia rei militaris in bello adiuvant, sed fortuna plurimum praestat: quocirca vera esse cernitur sententia illa Hannibalis ad Scipionem, cum ait: Nunquam minus eventus rerum respondere, quam in bello: ideoque meliorem tutioremque esse certam pacem, quam speratam victoriam".

One might compare what Machiavelli has to say in Discorsi, 2.27:

"Ai principi e repubbliche prudenti debbe bastare vincere; perche il più delle volte quando e' non basta si perde".

Here too it is Hannibal who is praised for his prudence in this respect.

Patrizi goes on in this chapter to praise at length the virtues of Scipio: the friendliness which won over Syphax and Hasdrubal, and the virtue and glory which led through the jealousy of others to his exile. But, unlike Machiavelli, he sees war as something to be avoided if possible, and this time draws a lesson from Livy which is in contrast to that of the Discorsi. "Magna est gloria militaris", admits Patrizi;

"nos tamen pacis artes magis sequimur ... et eam scribimus Rempubicam quae viam foelicitatis affectat. Igitur contenti finibus nostris bellum non nisi necessarium agimus: vel si eos uspiam egredimur, finem quamprimum imperandi cupiditate praescribimus, quod quidem comprobasse videtur etiam armatus Hannibal cum ad Scipionem ait : 'Optimum enim fuerat eam patribus nostris mentem datam a diis esse, ut vos Italiae, nos Aphricae imperio contenti essemus' " (9.1).

Another chapter in which Livy is drawn upon is the second of the ninth book, which is on consuls and military commanders and on soldiers. The latter, Patrizi says, should be punished for their errors, even if a great number are guilty, and he cites Sempronius Gracchus' decision, after the battle against Hanno near Beneventum, that all those who fled should have to eat and drink standing up as long as they were in the service.⁽¹⁾ On the subject of leaders, he mentions the Horatii and Curiatii among those who "vel soli vel pauci stipati magnas victorias assecuti sunt", while Machiavelli mentions them in Discorsi 1.22 and 24, advising against such encounters. Further on, Patrizi talks about one of Machiavelli's favourite subjects - fraud. "Placuit antiquis Romanis ab initio Reipublicae nihil per dolum geri", he says; "at vero Romulus urbis conditor, nonnunquam etiam fraude vincebat". He mentions how he won Fidenae (Livy, 1.14), and later talks of how C. Marius (in the war with Jugurtha) won authority,

"exemplo (ut arbitror) Numae Pompilii, qui Egeriae nymphae simulata autoritate novas feroci populo leges persuadebat" (cf. Livy, 1.21; and Discorsi 1.11)

The third chapter of this book also draws on Livy on the subject of the second consul and the problem of avoiding too many commanders (something with which Machiavelli is also concerned in Discorsi 3.15). If more than one man is in charge, Patrizi says,

"ille praeferendus est, qui virtute et scientia rei militaris praestat, ut fecit Minutius Fabii Maximi collega contra Hannibalem..."

(1) Cf. Machiavelli in Discorsi 3.49 on how Rome was not afraid to punish "una legione intera per volta, ed una città". He mentions the punishment of the soldiers who fought badly at Cannae, two years before Beneventum.

He also criticises C. Terentius Varro, whose inexperience led to the disaster of Cannae.

Patrizi's De institutione reipublicae can, then, be compared to the Discorsi in respect of the use of Livy, though the two works do not always come to the same conclusion; nor is Livy so important for Patrizi. There is no model for the Discorsi of course, but one can see parallels between them and the De institutione reipublicae; and these parallels can hardly be said to be generic, as Patrizi's work is an exception to the majority of political works of the time which recommend a principate as the ideal state.

It should not, however, be assumed that Livy was only used in the few works which deal with republics. He is also used in works on principates, and we shall see in the next chapter the use made of him in Machiavelli's Principe. But clearly he is of relatively minor importance in this kind of work, and - also because the number of treatises on princes is so great ⁽¹⁾ - a few examples may suffice. The first is a Trattato del modo di ben governare of the Dominican Fra Tommaso da Ferrara, unpublished until this century. ⁽²⁾ It is dedicated to Borso d'Este and can therefore be dated during his principate, 1450-71. Naturally, the best government is seen as a monarchy, rather than a democracy ("come ne la preclara citade de Firença") or aristocracy (as in Venice), though Fra Tommaso disclaims "adulatione alchuna" in this choice. In illustrating the ways in which one becomes prince (rather like Machiavelli in the Principe) he gives as an example of "per ellectione humana"

"Cincinato quale, essendo al arte de la coltura,

(1) Cf. A.H. Gilbert, Machiavelli's Prince and its Forerunners, Durham, N.C., 1938.

(2) A cura di Alfredo Acito, Milano (no date). The work is preserved in Milan in the Codice Trivulziano No.86.

ellecto fu per ditatore, quale era officio piu
prestante e più digno del consulato"; (1)

but he gives his source as "Augustino nel quinto libro de Civitate Dei". He also uses St. Augustine as a source for Numa, (2) and the sons of Brutus. (3) To emphasise the difference between him and more renowned humanists (with whom we may thus compare Machiavelli) his other main source for republican Rome is Valerius Maximus; while Livy is used only once, when Fra Tommaso is giving examples of justice being upheld even when it meant that fathers (like Brutus) had to kill their sons:

"similiter dice Tito Livio nel octavo libro Ab Urbe, fece Torquato de uno suo figliolo, perché contra el precepto paterno pugnavit contra hostes et habuit victoriam". (4)

In 1492 a member of Pontano's accademia, Giuniano Maio, wrote a work De maiestate which is closely connected with the genre of treatises on the prince. Like Fra Tommaso's Trattato it is in the volgare and was unpublished until recent times. (5) But its standard of learning is much higher than that of the Trattato, even though Aristotle's Ethica is the only Greek work used, and in spite of Maio's opening remarks (which can be contrasted with Machiavelli's emphasis on both experience and reading in the dedication to the Principe):

"Bella et onorata cosa è, sapientissimo Signore,
sapere le cose de la umana vita per arte e per scienza,

(1) Ed. cit., 51

(2) Ibid., 53-4

(3) Ibid., 57.

(4) Ibid., 58

(5) By the Commissione per i testi di lingua, Bologna 1956,
a cura di Franco Gaeta.

la quale con grande studio, con frequente legere
 e le cose lette conferendo retinere se acquista...
 Più utile e più certa cosa è la esperienza...
 Imperò che la scienza sape ben dire, la pratica
 sape multo meglio fare." (1)

It is insufficient, he continues, to have read so many times

"tanti libri de istorie et instituti greci e latini
 de vite de incliti principi e de antiqui costumi,"(2)
 even though these do teach one a great deal. But this, one suspects,
 is more to give an opportunity to praise Ferrante (a living example
 of all virtues) than anything else. It is certainly not to cover
 up a knowledge of Roman republican history based on Valerius Maximus,
 for Maio has clearly considered Livy for possible examples of
maiestas (and again we notice the liking of Pontano's circle for
 the Decades). One type of maiestate, he says, is that of the
 whole people, the patria, personified in one man, as was the case
 in Rome:

"questo dice Tullio specialmente ne le orazioni e Livio
 ne le Istorie sue. Notase questo ne la severitate de
 Torquato el quale disse al suo figlio: 'O Tito Manlio,
 figlio, perché non hai portato onore e reverenza al mio
 consulare imperio, né manco a la maiestate de la patria,
 ante, contra lo commandamento nostro e fore de l'ordine,
 predesti battaglia con li inimici, voglio a la tua
 dissobediente audacia sia dato condecete supplizio'.
 E cosi li fe' mozzare la testa, parendo ad esso essere
 violata la maiestate de la patria. Questo dice Livio
 ne lo ottavo libro". (3)

Maio's quotation up to inimici is a close enough translation of Livy,
 8.7. 14-15; thereafter a summary of Livy's account. Unlike Maio,
 Machiavelli never gives references to a particular book of Livy -

(1) *ibid.*, 1

(2) *ibid.*, 3

(3) *ibid.*, 14-15. Livy in fact uses the phrase "maiestatem patriae",
 whence Maio's observations are clearly derived. The incident
 is also related in Discorsi 3.22

though Maio's next example has a wrong reference, Marcus Porcius Cato's observation ⁽¹⁾ being not "nel XXXIII^o libro" but in 34.2.1. Machiavelli, as we have seen and will see again, has a tendency to paraphrase Livy (even when quoting him in Latin, which Maio never does), but nothing like as freely as Maio, who is even less concerned with accuracy and makes the Florentine look scholarly by contrast. Later in the De maiestate Maio gives much amplified versions of Livy, 28. 35.5-7 on the effect of Scipio's reputation on Massinissa, king of Numidia ⁽²⁾ and of 26.19.14, again on Scipio's maiestate. ⁽³⁾ Finally, in the fourth chapter, "De la franchezza de core", Maio writes that this quality is to be found most of all in war, and

"Per questo poneremo uno esempio de bello spettacolo de franchezza de animo, de constanza e de invincibile fortezza de dui magnanimi capitanei, Scipione et Anibale, de li quali scrive Livio....";

at which point he gives a translation of 30.32.4-7. ⁽⁴⁾

We can see, then, that it was possible to take individual examples from Livy in a work concerned directly or indirectly with monarchy. But our final example - Filippo Beroaldo's Libellus de optimo statu et principe - shows us that it was quite another matter to approve of republican Rome's government. This work, in fact, gives a view of Roman history (from the period covered by Livy onwards) which must have been widely held, perhaps even in Medici Florence, and which is in direct opposition to that expressed by Machiavelli in the Discorsi.

Beroaldo starts like Machiavelli in the Discorsi (1.2),

(1) *ibid.*, 16.

(2) *ibid.*, 21-22

(3) *ibid.*, 23. On this occasion Livy uses the word maiestas

(4) *ibid.*, 56-8

and like de Frulovisiis, Patrizi and Fra Tommaso, by enumerating the forms of government:

"Administrandarum civitatum tres sunt species. Est principatus unius quam monarchiam vocant. Est paucorum optimatumque quae oligarchia atque aristocratia⁽¹⁾ nuncupatur. Tertia est popularis gubernatio ... Item Aristoteles in secundo politicorum quosdam fuisse tradit qui optimam gubernationem esse crederent ex omnibus hiis commixtam et propterea laudari lacedaemoniorum veluti ex monarchia aristocratia democratia consistentem".⁽²⁾

He dismisses all of these forms except monarchy. After summing up what the prince represents, he begins to give him advice, both practical and moral, including this:

"Dicere solebat Aurelianus imperator Nihil populo saturo laetius esse; ideoque decet principem Annonae urbanae curam suscipere ut populus sit satur ... Romani cum primis annonariae rei rationem habendam censentes praefectum annonae creaverunt. Primus autem ut docet Livius in quarto⁽³⁾ praefectus annonae Lucius Minutius creatus...."⁽⁴⁾

Later,⁽⁵⁾ he quotes "Scipio Africanus apud Livium" on Alexander the Great's temperantia and continentia.

So far, there is nothing which Machiavelli might not have used in the Principe. Beroaldo's division of the forms of government does not go as far as that of the Discorsi, nor of course does he choose the same ideal form as Machiavelli. But it is in his final paragraph - which it seems worthwhile to quote at some length - that Beroaldo analyses Roman government, drawing, one must assume, chiefly from Livy

(1) Oligarchia is also found without pejorative overtones in de Frulovisiis' list of forms of government.

(2) Philippi Beroaldi Opusculum eruditum, Bologna 1497, f.B.iii v.

(3) Livy, 4.12

(4) Ed.cit., f. Cr.

(5) *ibid.*, f. Er.

and Suetonius,⁽¹⁾ but coming to a conclusion so different from Machiavelli's:

"....A Platone philosophiaque didicimus naturales esse conversiones quasdam rerum publicarum ut eae tum a principibus tenerentur, tum a populis, aliquando ab optimatibus. Quod potissimum accidit romanae rei publicae quae ut sublimibus incrementis auferetur virtus et fortuna plerumque alioqui dissidentes mutuo concordiae nexu convenerunt et ita factum est ut populus Romanus virtute ac fortuna simul suffragantibus (Virtus enim sine fortuna manca est et mutila) ad summum fastigium pervenerit. Cuius prima aetas et quasi incunabula sub septem regibus annos prope CCL fuerunt. Dein aetatem ingressus adultam modo sub Aristocratico modo sub Democratico statu vires exercuit et lacertos movit per annos circiter CCCC. Tandem post gentium nationum regum cervices oppressas, post subactam diutinis bellis maximam orbis terrarum partem, Urbs venerabilis Caesaribus tanquam liberis suis regenda patrimonii - hoc est imperii romani - iura promisit.....".⁽²⁾

The main points in contrast with the tenets of the Discorsi are Rome's debt to fortune (it could be that this was among the works Machiavelli had in mind in Discorsi, 2.1) her alternation between aristocratic and democratic rule, and her debt to the Caesars. The difference between Machiavelli's views and these does not stem just from his agreement with Polybius' analysis of Rome's organisation in his sixth book; there is a detailed reading of Livy involved as well, and one that is clearly different from Beroaldo's.

(1) At the end of the paragraph he mentions that he has done a commentary on Suetonius "hoc anno". It was first published in Bologna in 1493 and was published in several later editions.

(2) *ibid.*, f. E.iv.r-v

In the Discorsi Machiavelli is, with a few exceptions (3.47, for example), concerned with the state rather than the rôle of the citizen. A work which does, however, take the citizen as its subject is Platina's De optimo cive. It is a dialogue in two books between Platina, Cosimo de' Medici and his grandson Lorenzo, to whom the work is dedicated. Platina, before he went to Rome and became involved in Leto's accademia romana, spent five years in Florence (from 1457 onwards) studying Greek. In spite of this work's different viewpoint (and in spite, perhaps, of its connections with the Medici) there are one or two parallels with the Discorsi as far as the use of Livy is concerned. Cosimo starts by saying that religion is fundamental in establishing a state, and remarks on the power of religion and the happiness possessed by men "deos qualescunque colentes" which reminds us of Machiavelli's indifference to the Christian religion. Cosimo continues :

"Tantumque apud cives suos auctoritatem hac una re compararunt (i.e. rulers), ut populos quoque voluerint impulerint, ut de Numa Pompilio legitur, qui populum ferocem Romuli imperio religione iniecta ad meliorem cultum redegit, deposita scevitia illa et rusticitate". (1)

With which one may compare Machiavelli's

"(Numa) trovando un popolo ferocissimo, e volendolo ridurre nelle obediienze civili con le arti della pace, si volse alla religione come cosa al tutto necessaria a volere mantenere una civiltà". (2)

Cosimo mentions Lucius Brutus "ut optimus civis et bene de patria meritus"; in Discorsi 3.2 and 3, Machiavelli praises his prudence in getting back Rome's liberty and his severity in maintaining it. In

(1) De optimo cive, published together with the Historia de vitis pontificum, etc., Venice 1504, f.D V r

(2) Discorsi, 1 - 11. Patrizi, in the passage on Numa quoted above, also uses the phrase "populus ferox".

the second book, Cosimo mentions the episode from Livy, 5.27 of the schoolmaster who handed over his boys to Camillus during the siege of Falerii, and how Camillus "Phalerios quos vi non poterat iusticia et clementia in deditiōnem accepit". (1) Machiavelli heads Discorsi 3.20 with the same observation: "Uno esempio di umanità appresso i Falisci potette più che ogni forza romana". One cannot pretend, of course, that Machiavelli has necessarily taken his observations straight from Platina, though he may well have read this work. The important point is that certain humanist works have clearly stimulated Machiavelli to think at least partly along the same lines as them. The parallels with the De optimo cive, for instance, may be coincidental; but one cannot go on saying that about all the works we have considered.

In the next chapters we will examine the conclusions which Machiavelli drew in his various works from the reading of Livy and consider how far they are justified. We will also, I hope, be in a position of being able to judge what parts tradition and originality play in these conclusions. Meanwhile, it seems to me that the main points that have emerged are these. The Decades were not necessarily taught in schools, though they were quite widely read in the pursuit both of eloquence and of wisdom in public and private matters. But they were not an obvious first choice for a student of politics, since their length and lacunae made them more difficult than, say, Sallust or Suetonius, and since republics were anyway less popular than principates. There was, nevertheless, a tradition of the study of Roman institutions and so on (in which Biondo's Roma triumphans is the most important work), but nobody had relied primarily on Livy. Livy also had some limited

(1) De optimo cive, ed. cit., f.E iiii v.

influence among historians conscious either of style or the tendency of history to repeat itself. The study of the Decades was especially important in various centres - Rome, Naples and Milan, with Sabellico later moving from Rome to Venice; but nobody was willing to admit that the Rome of the Decades was better than their own city. It seems probable that Machiavelli was influenced by the Roman scholarship of Biondo and then of Leto's accademia. But he was obviously liable to be most strongly influenced by Florentine scholarship. Here, by the time of his exile, the predominance of the Hellenists like Ficino, Pico and Poliziano had ended; Poliziano's most promising pupil, Pietro Crinito, had died in 1507 and no remaining scholar (not even Francesco da Diacceto) was able to keep their great tradition alive. On a minor level, however, there were people like Bartolomeo della Fonte and Bernardo Rucellai who outlived their more brilliant fellow-citizens and who were more interested in Roman than Greek studies. Like the Neoplatonists, they were closely associated with the Medici regime (Bernardo married Lorenzo's sister, Nannina) and the antithesis of Soderini and everything associated with him.⁽¹⁾ We must, then, expect Machiavelli to react to what they represented in the world of literature as well as of politics; but it is surely more than coincidence if he shows an increasing interest in the kind of studies associated in Florence with them and in particular in an author they both studied and admired. On the other hand, after Bernardo's death in 1514 it became increasingly apparent that the young men who now met together with Machiavelli in the Orti Oricellari were reacting to what their parents had stood for. It is clear, then, that the part played in the relationship between Machiavelli and Livy by the

(1) Filippo de' Nerli, for instance, mentions the "gagliarda opposizione" to Soderini of Rucellai and others in his Commentarii de fatti civili, V, Augusta 1728, 98.

circle established by Bernardo and continued by his family will be a crucial point in the examination in the next chapter of Machiavelli's political works up to and including the Discorsi.

UP TO AND INCLUDING THE "DISCORSI"

Works up to the "Discorsi"

The first of Machiavelli's works to make use of Livy is his essay Del modo di trattare i popoli della Valdichiana ribellati. Although probably written at least ten years before the Discorsi were started,⁽¹⁾ this brief essay displays an approach to Livy which remained basically unchanged in the later work - the account of an incident from Roman history, given, as often, without scrupulous attention to detail, followed by the recommendation to imitate the example of Roman procedure in a modern context. There are only two differences from the approach of the Discorsi, that the quotation is given in translation (underscoring the practical rather than literary character of the work), and that Machiavelli is of course only writing about a specific incident, not generalising as he is in the later work. But the fact that he is using Livy to such an extent in a work intended for a particular situation makes an exception of this essay in the context of his works directly connected with the Florentine government; as we shall see, the presence of Livy is as rare here as it is frequent later on.

Machiavelli starts by giving a translation "quasi ad verbum" of Lucius Porcius Caelius' speech to the senate in Livy, 2.13.11-18,

(1) E. Anglo, in his Machiavelli, a dissection, London 1869, 217 n. 31, suggests that this work was written after the Principe "it clearly depends on an idea worked out in the Discorsi", he says, and points out that the only evidence for dating is the date of the subject matter. But why should Discorsi 2.23 not depend on an idea worked out here? And what reason would Machiavelli have had for giving advice for a specific situation over ten years later? Further reasons for dating the work in 1503 are given in Machiavelli, Arte della guerra e scritti politici minori, ed. Sergio Bartelli, Milano 1961, 67.

II

MACHIAVELLI'S USE OF LIVY
UP TO AND INCLUDING THE "DISCORSI"

Works up to the "Discorsi"

The first of Machiavelli's works to make use of Livy is his essay Del modo di trattare i popoli della Valdichiana ribellati. Although probably written at least ten years before the Discorsi were started,⁽¹⁾ this brief essay displays an approach to Livy which remained basically unchanged in the later work - the account of an incident from Roman history, given, as often, without scrupulous attention to detail, followed by the recommendation to imitate the example of Roman procedure in a modern context. There are only two differences from the approach of the Discorsi: that the quotation is given in translation (underlining the practical rather than literary character of the work), and that Machiavelli is of course only writing about a specific incident, not generalising as he is in the later work. But the fact that he is using Livy to such an extent in a work intended for a particular situation makes an exception of this essay in the context of his works directly connected with the Florentine government; as we shall see, the presence of Livy is as rare here as it is frequent later on.

Machiavelli starts by giving a translation "quasi ad verbum" of Lucius Furius Camillus' speech to the senate in Livy, 8.13.11-18,

(1) S. Anglo, in his Machiavelli, a dissection, London 1969, 277 n.37, suggests that this work was written after the Principe: "it clearly depends on an idea worked out in the Discorsi", he says, and points out that the only evidence for dating is the date of the subject matter. But why should Discorsi 2.23 not depend on an idea worked out here? And what reason would Machiavelli have had for giving advice for a specific situation over ten years later? Further reasons for dating the work in 1503 are given in Machiavelli, Arte della guerra e scritti politici minori, ed. Sergio Bertelli, Milano 1961, 67.

while in Discorsi 2.23 (where the same incident is discussed) he starts with a sentence from 8.13.2 and then gives the speech from 13. 14-17 only. The translation is accurate for the most part, with two kinds of changes. Firstly, there is the alteration of the order of Livy's phrases ("o con incrudelire... liberamente", for instance, appearing a sentence earlier than in Livy) or adaptations which leave the original sense unaffected; for instance, "per multa bella magnaue" becomes "ne'pericoli vostri"; "et vestram... absolvi" is omitted; "illorum animos dum expectatione stupent" becomes "trarre di questa ambiguità"; and "il che ho fatto" is inserted. Here, one could say, we see Machiavelli's typical attention to the meaning rather than the exact wording, which was to make his translation of the Andria so good but which differentiates him from the humanist scholars with their attention to detail. The second kind of alteration is the amplification of Livy's words to accommodate sentiments of Machiavelli's. Thus "quo oboedientes gaudent" becomes "che ha i sudditi fedeli e al suo principe affezionati", and "quod optimum vobis rei que publicae sit" becomes "quello che torni comodità e utile della republica".

The rest of Machiavelli's account follows Livy's, but
(1)
is not a translation. There is an inaccuracy: the Veliterni were not "mandati ad habitare a Roma" but their senate was confined across the Tiber (Livy, 8.14.5); that is, sentenced to live among

(1) Repeated in Discorsi 2.23, where Machiavelli shows an incomplete appreciation of Rome's methods of expansion. To an account, in effect the same as that given here, of Rome's punitive measures (the spegner of Principe ch.3), he adds the expedient of giving citizenship (vezzeggiare) but without giving the fundamental distinction between federation and annexation that is also a crucial omission in Discorsi 2.4

an alien population and forbidden to come "cis Tiberim". Nothing is said about the rest of the population, but colonists from Rome were sent there and restored the "speciem antiquae frequentiae". Machiavelli also seems to think that Velitrae was called Veliternum. These errors do not argue close attention to the text, or complete memory of it if, as seems possible, Machiavelli did not have the text in front of him. The same thing we shall see, is true of the Discorsi. But, while this work is clearly an important precedent for the Discorsi, it is important to remember that it stands in isolation among his minor works as far as the use of Livy is concerned; so that one can argue that it was not until much later than the stimulus came to develop the idea which was still only in a germinal stage in 1503.

It was events later in the year of the Valdichiana rebellion (1502) that inspired the Descrizione del modo tenuto dal duca Valentino nello ammazzare Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto da Fermo, il signor Pagolo e il duca di Gravina Orsini. It is clearly a literary exercise (by contrast with the work we have just been discussing) but it keeps strictly to the present, and Machiavelli does not try to dress the Borgian wolf in classical clothing - something he did later with Castruccio Castracani when he had been in close contact with humanist circles. It has, however, been obliquely suggested⁽¹⁾ that Machiavelli's insistence here on a detail which does not appear in his Legations constitutes a reminiscence of Livy. He pictures Cesare Borgia riding, on the 30th December, with his troops "in sul Metauro", - a point twice repeated. On the river Metaurus in 207 B.C. took place the battle in which Hasdrubal was defeated and killed, and which is related in Livy, 27.47-49. A possible reference

(1) Cf. Machiavelli, Opere, Milano - Napoli 1954, 461 n.3, where it is pointed out that "Metauro" is a "nome greve di romani ricordi!"

to Livy, then - but a very distant one.

Machiavelli's Capitolo dell'ingratitude, addressed to Giovanni Folchi, is generally considered to date from early 1510.⁽¹⁾ There are several points of comparison between it and the Discorsi. In the Capitolo Machiavelli writes that

"..... nel mondo Ingratitudin nacque.
Fu d'Avarizia figlia e di Sospetto" (24-5).

In Discorsi 1.29 he says that

"Questo vizio della ingratitude nasce o dall'avarizia
o da il sospetto."

In the previous chapter he says that the Romans were less ungrateful to their citizens than the Athenians; a point he had made in the Capitolo (130f.). He had said in the earlier work that few princes are grateful (166 f.; also 1.27) but went on to say that ingratitude

".....più si diletta
Nel cor del popol quand'egli è signore ...
E le sue genti, d'ogni invidia piene,
Tengon desto il sospetto sempre, et esso
Gli orecchi alle calunnie aperti tiene" (62 f.).

But in the Discorsi (1.29 and 30) he reverses this judgement:

"dico che usandosi questo vizio della ingratitude
o per avarizia o per sospetto, si vedrà come i popoli
non mai per avarizia la usarono, e per sospetto assai
manco che i principi, avendo meno cagione di sospettare,
come di sotto si dirà" (1.29).

Earlier in this chapter he says that the only example of ingratitude in Rome is that of the treatment of Scipio Africanus; and in the Capitolo, to illustrate the ingratitude of the people, he relates the story of Scipio's brilliant career and its undeserved curtailment.

(1) Cf. Tommasini, La vita e gli scritti di N.M. Roma 1883-1911, vol. I, 484-6. This capitolo could well, however, have been written nearer the date of the DecennalePrimo.

Although, then, Machiavelli radically alters his anti-popular point of view in the Discorsi, abandoning the traditional tendency to support the prince, one can see that what he says in the later work is closely based on the ideas he had expressed earlier. And it is interesting that many of the points he makes about Scipio are common to both works; his saving of his father (Capit., 79-81, Discorsi 3.34), his action after Cannae (Capit., 82-84, Discorsi 1.11 and 3.34) and his campaigns in Spain, Africa and, under his brother, in Asia. But if, around 1509, he regarded these as "felici tempi" (in spite of his relatively harsh judgement on the Roman populace), it does not follow that it was as yet to a close study of Livy that he owed this opinion. Of course, all the details Machiavelli gives are to be found in Livy, but they also appear in the more easily accessible Valerius Maximus: Scipio's divine nature (arising from his habit of passing time alone in the temple on the Capitol) in 1.2.2., the ingratitude of the Romans and Scipio's refusal to leave his bones to the city in the section De ingratis (5.3), his saving of his father in 5.4.2, his going to Asia with his brother in 5.5.1, and his action after Cannae in 5.6.7. But a closer comparison appears possible with Petrarch's life of Scipio which forms part of the De viris illustribus. Here we find all the events to which Machiavelli refers (Capit., 76-129) in the same sequence; this is natural for the events of Scipio's military career (though in both cases the point about his "divine" nature comes first, while Livy only mentions it in 26.19), but is perhaps more than coincidental when it comes to the more general reflections that accompany the account of events after Scipio's return from Asia.⁽¹⁾ Petrarch talks of his pietà and castità,⁽²⁾

(1) i.e. in the Capitolo, 97f., and in La vita di Scipione l'Africano, ed. Guido Martellotti, Milano 1954, XI - XII (144-162), and in the earlier text β , sections 33-36 (220-228).

(2) XI 5 and 16 (not found in text β); cf. Capit., 99.

of the invidia he met,⁽¹⁾ of how all he did for Rome met with ingiuria,⁽²⁾ his voluntary exile,⁽³⁾ Rome's choice between Scipio and liberty,⁽⁴⁾ and Scipio's refusal to let Rome have his bones.⁽⁵⁾ The facts are there in Livy, of course, but it is clear that the section on Scipio in Machiavelli's Capitolo is closer to Petrarch's work (or perhaps to some intermediary work based on Petrarch's but more accessible to Machiavelli) in the way it looks at various incidents in Scipio's life, in the overall sequence it follows (the events up to his return from Asia; praise for his character; his voluntary exile and death), and in its wholehearted admiration for Scipio. Even Livy, in 38.53. 9-11, qualified his praise, saying for instance that the expedition to Asia was unprofitable and that Scipio's life had its inglorious as well as glorious moments. Nevertheless, Machiavelli's admiration of these republican days, together with the links in thought between this Capitolo and the Discorsi, make this work, with the essay on the Val di Chiana, important evidence of the development during his political career towards the use of Roman history in the prose works of his retirement. Petrarch himself pointed to the possibility of this development in the case of Scipio:

"Et sane quos brevitatis ista non satiat, habent quo sitim suam preter ariditatem ieiune huius narrationis expleant: non Titum Livium modo clarissimum scriptorem,

-
- (1) XII 3-4; 34. 15-25; cf. Capit. 112.f.
 (2) XII 8; 34. 41-58; cf. Capit. 115-117. It is noteworthy that Petrarch - like Machiavelli - judges the populace harshly: "o inepta rerum extimatio et vulgi semper ceca iudicia"(XII7).
 (3) XII 28f.; 36. 1-13; cf. Capit., 118-120
 (4) XII 29; 36. 8-10 ("Cum ... videret ut aut Scipio discederet aut libertas"); cf. Capit., 121-3.
 (5) XII 45; 36. 57-8; cf. Capit., 125-6. Livy (38.53.8) only writes that "it is said" that Scipio asked to be buried at Linternum. The phrase about the bones is to be found in Valerius Maximus, Petrarch and Machiavelli.

cuius hec de fonte magna ex parte libavimus, sed mille alios."⁽¹⁾

Machiavelli's Ritratto di cose di Francia is considered to date from between 1510 (when he conducted his last legation to France) and early 1513.⁽²⁾ Among his observations, he discusses the view that "E Franzesi per natura sono piú fieri che gagliardi o destri", concluding the paragraph with

"E però Cesare disse e Franzesi essere in principio piú che uomini e in fine meno che femmine".

It was not, of course, Caesar who said this, but Livy,⁽³⁾ and this error

- (1) XI 3; 33. 17-21. Text β reads celeberrimum for clarissimum, and fontibus for fonte. Livy is also among Poggio's sources for the account of Scipio's life (praised in contrast with that of Caesar) in two letters (Opera, Basle 1538, 357-365 and 365-390), and those of Maffei (Commentarii urbani, Bk.XIX).
- (2) For a consideration of this question, see Machiavelli, Arte delle guerra, etc. cit., 146-7.
- (3) In 10.28.4. It is possible that this mistake comes from a misreading of the following passage from Roberto Valturio's De re militari (Verona 1472), 6.8, where he is talking of the varying character of soldiers from different regions:

"nec dubium sit...(esse) et feroces procero corpore animoque magno magis quam firmo Gallos, quorum Iulio Cel. belli gallici libro tertio auctore, ut ad bella suscipienda alacer non solum sed promptus est animus, sic mollis ac minime resistens ad calamitates perferendas mens eorum est, utque inquit romanae pater historiae, Horum etiam quidem corpora intolerantissima laboris atque aestus fluere: primaque eorum esse proelia plus quam virorum, postrema minus quam foeminarum..."

If this is the source, M. has correctly read Caesar for "Cel.," i.e. Celso; but he has not noticed that the "father of Roman history" is another author. He was clearly not using the translation of Valturio which appeared in 1483 (and which makes things easier for a less erudite reader by amplifying some references and excluding some detail), this edition points out that Livy is the second author concerned, and gives a less pithy rendering of the quotation, while Machiavelli's version is obviously drawn from the original Latin.

of attribution, rectified in Discorsi 3.36, suggests strongly that Machiavelli's reading of Livy was at this stage by no means as thorough as it was to become during his retirement.

In the first political work to emerge from the years after his loss of office, there are already few chapters that do not refer to some event of classical times, even though its concern with the present is no less than in his previous political works. In spite of the subject of the Principe, Livy, historian of republican Rome, is by no means excluded, though by contrast with the Discorsi the first Decade is of minimal importance. Instead, it is from the third and fourth Decades that Machiavelli takes most of his Livian examples. The first occurs in the third chapter when Machiavelli is considering the management of a newly-acquired province which differs from one's own in language, customs and institutions. One will, he says, always gain power there through its dissatisfied, over-ambitious or terrified citizens.

"come si vidde già che li Etoli missono e' Romani in Grecia!"

It was thanks to the Aetolians (though not, as "messi" might suggest, at their request) that the Romans got a foothold in Greece against Philip V of Macedon. In 26.24 Livy describes how (in 211 B.C.) the Aetolians accepted Marcus Valerius Laevinus' offer of alliance. Discussing the topic of how the Romans entered into other provinces in Discorsi 2.1, Machiavelli refers back to the Principe and to this example and adds several others from Livy; but here he says

"voglio mi basti la provincia di Grecia per esempio" -
to exemplify, that is, how the Romans always did the right things

(helping the weak, crushing the strong, and keeping out powerful foreigners). With a brevity characteristic of the Principe (and which is in contrast with the greater attention to detail of the Discorsi) he sums up in a few lines the events from 198-189 B.C., which took Livy six books (32-37). But the summary of Rome's policy, first against Philip and then against Antiochus III of Syria, Nabis and the Aetolian League, is a fair one. Livy relates the alliance with the Achaeans in 32.19 seqq., the crushing of Macedonia in 32 and 33 (the battle of Cynoscephalae), the driving out of King Antiochus in 36 and 37, and the peace conditions set for Philip after Cynoscephalae in 33.30. The only objection one could make is that Machiavelli has glossed over the anti-Roman attitude of the Aetolians. We see their dissatisfaction in, for instance, Livy, 34.22.4, and another example of their differences with Titus Quinctius Flamininus (the proconsul) in 34.49, where he attacks them for saying the Greeks had been wrong in entrusting their liberty to the Romans. They were discontented because Rome was so occupied with fighting Hannibal that she left them the burden of the war with Philip, failing to give them any help: the result was promises broken by the Aetolians and an insolent attitude towards the Romans. Though efforts were made to curb their insolence (for example, in Livy, 36.27), no change of attitude was effected, as we see from Livy, 37.49.

Also from events in Greece in this period comes Machiavelli's equally brief account in Principe 9 of the Spartan tyrant Nabis. L.A. Burd has shown⁽¹⁾ that if one examines the

(1) In his edition of Il principe, Oxford 1891, 240 n.19.

passages in which Nabis is mentioned (apart from this one, they are Discorsi 1.10 and 40 and Arte della guerra 5) we shall find that "there is absolutely nothing in them which he could not have got from Livy" - to be precise from 34. 22-40, of which he gives a fair account. It is noteworthy that he takes nothing from Plutarch's lives of Flamininus and Philopoemon.⁽¹⁾ The other chief authority mentioned by Burd - parts of books 13, 16, 17 and 21 of Polybius - are unlikely to have been available to Machiavelli.

The next book of Livy - 35 - is used in ch. 21 of the Principe. The subject is what will bring the prince honour, and Machiavelli mentions that

"È ancora stimato uno principe quando elli è vero amico e vero inimico!"

The example he gives is the advice given to the Achaeans by Titus Quinctius Flamininus not, in spite of Antiochus' plea, to remain neutral in the struggle between them and the Aetolians (who had brought in the Seleucid ruler "per cacciarne Romani"). The position of the Aetolians as regards Rome and Antiochus is referred to in Livy, 35.33.6. The discussion which Machiavelli summarises here is related *ib.*, 48.49, though he has altered some of the details. Both Antiochus and the Aetolians had sent the ambassadors (*ib.*, 38.1), not just Antiochus. Quinctius' reply was addressed not to Antiochus' legate but to the second speaker, the Aetolian legate Archidamus. The quotation from *ib.* 49.13 is clearly also based on memory: Machiavelli writes "quod

(1) In 1502 Machiavelli had asked for, and presumably eventually obtained, a copy of the Lives; cf. letter of Biagio Buonaccorsi to M. of 21 October 1502.

autem isti dicunt" for Livy's "nam quod optimum esse dicunt," "interponendi" for "interponi," "nihil magis" for "nihil immo tam," and omits "quippe." In a letter to Machiavelli of 29 August 1510, Biago Buonaccorsi had quoted part of this sentence (inserting "sine honore" after "gratia" and changing "eritis" to "erimus"). Machiavelli quoted his own version in a letter to Vettori of 20 December 1514 from "nihil magis" onwards - showing at least consistency in his errors of memory, or perhaps copying from his manuscript of the Principe. But he makes another mistake by calling Titus Quinctius Flaminius "Tito Flamminio"⁽¹⁾. In spite of this popularity, however, the incident failed to find its way into the Discorsi.

In ch. 24 of the Principe Machiavelli goes back to the third Decade to illustrate how one should go about keeping one's state. His example is Philip of Macedon, whose defeat at Cynoscephalae we have already mentioned but who, says Machiavelli,

"per esser uomo militare⁽²⁾ e che sapeva intrattenere el populo et assicurarsi de'grandi, sostenne piu' anni la guerra contro a quelli: e, se alla fine perdé el dominio di qualche città, li rimase non di manco el regno."

Burd⁽³⁾ refers to an instance of "intrattenere el populo" in Livy, 27.31.4, though Livy goes on to say that Philip displayed only a "libertatem ... vanam" (ib., 31.6) and turned it to the ends of his own "licentia", indulging himself with the women of his subjects and thus contravening the advice of chapters 17 and 19 of the Principe. Machiavelli is also turning a blind eye to the truth when he talks of Philip losing power over "qualche città": the truce stated that

"omnes Graecorum civitates ... quae earum sub ditione Philippi fuissent, praesidia ex iis Philippus deduceret

-
- (1) An error repeated in Discorsi, 2.4 where the Roman is mentioned in another context. It is interesting that Petrarch makes the same error, e.g. in his Life of Scipio.
 (2) The same phrase - "uomo militare" is used about him in Discorsi 3.37, though here M. is making a different point.
 (3) Il principe, cit., 354 n.13.

vacuasque traderet Romanis.... "(1)

So Machiavelli's remark is something of an understatement. But Philip did retain enough strength to stage further resistance to Rome. "Assicurarsi de'grandi" might be implied from Philip's taking the wife of a leading Achaean with impunity (Livy, 27.31.8); and in 28.8.13 we see him entrusting the government of a city to leaders who had proved their loyalty.

Machiavelli refers to later events in Greece in the fifth chapter of the Principe, where he is discussing how to keep possession of a previously autonomous city or principate. The Romans, he says,

"vollero tenere la Grecia quasi come tennono li Spartani, facendola libera, e lasciandole le sue leggi, e non successe loro. In modo che furono costretti disfare molte città di quella provincia per tenerla"

Though he praised Rome's handling of Greece in ch. 3, he is admitting here (presumably with reference to the later years of her rule) that she had not done all she could to prevent "li scandoli futuri". There is an illustration of her leniency in Livy, 35. 46.9-10, where a leading citizen of Chalcis, one Micythio,

"dixit....nullam.... civitatem se in Graecia nosse quae aut praesidium habeat, aut stipendium Romanis pendat, aut foedere iniquo adligata quas nolit leges patiatur."

This was in 192 B.C. But Chalcis paid for her abuse of this freedom later on; in the periocha of Livy, 52 we find that in 146 B.C. Chalcis and Thebes were destroyed (in fact they only had their walls pulled down); Corinth too was destroyed. This, presumably, is to what Machiavelli is referring with "disfare molte città".

(1) Livy, 33.30.1-2.

There is one more reference to this period of history, though not this time to Roman policy. In ch. 14 Machiavelli is talking about "Quello che al principe si appartenga circa la milizia" and advises the prince, among other things, to get to understand the nature of various terrains. As an example he gives the Achaean leader Philopoemon, and, according to Burd,⁽¹⁾ his account is "probably based upon Plutarch" - that is, on his Life of Philopoemon. But it is far more probable⁽²⁾ that Machiavelli's source is Livy, 35, 28. 1-7. As usual in the Principe, he gives a much shortened version of Livy, and the questions he makes Philopoemon ask his friends are similar, rather than identical, to the topics Livy mentions. The questions about retreats are his own inventions. He also omits to mention that Philopoemon considered all these problems even when alone. But the conclusion Machiavelli comes to -

"tale che per queste continue cogitazioni non poteva mai, guidando gli eserciti, nascere accidente alcuno che egli non vi avesse il rimedio" -

is identical with Livy's remark on this particular occasion -

"his curis cogitationibusque ita ab ineunte aetate animum agitaverat ut nulla ei nova in tali re cogitatio esset."

Another occasion on which Burd, too eager to suggest Greek sources, overlooks the more natural possibility of Livy is in ch. 17, where Machiavelli is comparing Hannibal and Scipio. "The account of Hannibal is based upon Polybius, XI 19", he says, though he does not consider how Machiavelli could have had access to this part of the Greek historian's work. It is far easier to attribute Machiavelli's remarks to Livy, 28.12. 1-9, though Polybius is in turn Livy's source

(1) Il principe, cit., 280 n.4.

(2) As has been pointed out by Sergio Bertelli in his edition of the Principe, Milano 1960, 63 n.10. Cf. also Vittorio Osimo, Per la fonte liviana di un passo del "Principe" e per la cronologia dei "Ritratti delle cose di Francia", in "Giorn. stor. della lett.ital." LII (1908), 268-71.

for this portrait of Hannibal, which occurs at an identical point in both their narratives. The point about the unity Hannibal maintained in his army in spite of its size and diversity and the adversity of fortune is made by Livy in *ib.*, 12. 3-4. Polybius attributes this to Hannibal's *ἀγχινοία*, "ability", while Machiavelli's original idea of the cause being his "inumana crudelta" is based, it would seem, on Livy (21.4.9) and his mention of Hannibal's "inhuman crudelitus". It is true that this cruelty is listed by Livy as one of Hannibal's vices rather than virtues, while Polybius (9.22-26) shows a more open mind on this aspect of his character, ready to excuse it, if indeed it is genuine. One might thus detect impatience with Livy in Machiavelli's attack on "li scrittori poco considerati" who, just like Livy in 21.4, praise Hannibal's achievement but attack what Machiavelli considers its cause. On the other hand, this does not prevent Livy being his source, and if he had not preferred Livy's rather than Polybius' authority (even assuming he knew this part of Polybius), he would have been unable to attribute Hannibal's success to his cruelty as Polybius finds it *δυσχερὲς ἀποφύνασθαι περὶ τῆς Ἀννίβου φύσεως* in view of the conflicting evidence.

The account of Scipio in this chapter comes from Livy, 28 and 29, as Burd illustrates. The same comparison between Hannibal and the Roman general is made in the *Discorsi* (3.21) and in Machiavelli's reply (probably of 1512) to Piero Soderini's letter from Ragusa "in pappafico". But in the *Principe* the comparison is aimed at making an entirely different point - the necessity of cruelty, rather than the similarity of effects from different causes, which is the subject both of the discussion in the *Discorsi* and of the letter.

There are, in fact, hardly any cases of the same point from Livy being made in both the *Principe* and the *Discorsi*. One concerns Nabis, about whom Machiavelli has this to say in the ninth chapter of the

Principe:

"Nabide principe delli Spartani, sostenne la ossidione di tutta Grecia e di uno esercitoromano vittoriosissimo, e difese contro a quelli la patria sua et il suo stato; e li bastò solo, sopravvenente el pericolo, assicurarsi di pochi: ché, se elli avessi avuto el populo inimico, questo non li bastava."

Although Nabis is mentioned in Discorsi 1.10 as having been much abused, in 1.40 he is used as an example to be followed. Those, says Machiavelli, who have the support of the populace and the enmity of the nobles are safer;

"Perché con quello favore bastono a conservarsi le forze instrinseche: come bastarono a Nabide tiranno di Sparta, quando tutta Grecia e il popolo romano lo assaltò: il quale assicuratosi di pochi nobili, avendo amico il Popolo, con quello si difese, il che non avrebbe potuto fare avendolo inimico."

In the last chapter of the Principe is the only other borrowing from Livy also found in the Discorsi: that is, the sentence

"instum enim bellum quibus necessarium, et pia arma ubi nulla nisi in armis spes est." (1)

This quotation from Livy, 9.1.10 (though its author is not acknowledged in the Principe) is used (in Latin) in Discorsi 3.12 and (in translation) in Istorie fiorentine, 5.8. This is the only reference to anything in the first Decade of Livy (and even then it is not put in its context), apart from the reference to Romulus in ch.6. Romulus is also, of course, mentioned in Discorsi 1.1, but in the Principe Machiavelli is making a different point - that Romulus founded Rome with his own virtù, Fortune providing only the opportunity. The idea of fate inherent in the circumstances leading to his founding Rome ("conveniva...") is found in Livy too ("debeatur....", in 1.4.1). But in general the lack

(1) Machiavelli writes ubi for Livy's quibus and spes est for his relinquitur spes. Yet another version is offered in the Discorsi.

of reference to the first Decade points to the difference between Machiavelli's use of Livy in the Principe and the Discorsi; a difference which is emphasised by the occasions when, discussing the same subject in both works, he uses in the Discorsi a Livian example he had not given in the Principe. In ch. 20 of the Principe, for example, he talks of fortresses without giving any classical instances; but in Discorsi 2.24 he mentions the absence of fortresses at Privernum and Capua and dismisses the fortress at Tarentum as unimportant.

On the subject of auxiliary troops in ch. 13 of the Principe he mentions that "l'antiche storie" are full of examples of their uselessness, but says that a modern example will suffice him. In the Discorsi (2.20) on the other hand, he gives two examples from Livy (those of the legions at Capua and Rhegium. Livy provides him with examples on the characteristics of Fortune in the Discorsi(2.29 and 3.9), but he is ignored in Principe 25.

Nevertheless, it is clear that Livy is by far the most important classical source in the Principe. Justinus (used for Hiero in ch.6, Agathocles in ch.8 and Philip of Macedon's treatment of the Thebans in ch.12) and Herodian (from whom the account of the emperors in ch.19 is drawn) are of relatively minor account. But there is not yet the detailed attention to classical affairs in general, and Livy in particular, that we find in the Discorsi. Any detailed attention which Machiavelli gives is restricted to modern affairs, with the one exception of ch.21 and the account of the dilemma of the Achaeans; and, as we have seen, the details are not very accurate. Where Machiavelli is offering an example from Livy to be followed (in chs. 3, 5, 9, 14, 17, 21 and 24), in over half the cases the example is provided by a non-Roman (Nabis in ch.9, Philopoemon in ch.14, Hannibal in ch.17 and Philip in ch.24).

Obviously this is partly because there were few Roman autocrats, and Rome's enemies are still praised in the Discorsi. However, there is a definite new emphasis on Rome's power in the Discorsi, where, significantly, Hannibal is praised only with qualifications and Scipio is rehabilitated. Nor has Machiavelli apparently seen the importance of the first Decade; and it is the development of his political thinking occasioned by a new reading of this part of Livy that marks the essential difference between the Principe and the Discorsi. If we accept this difference in his use of Livy, we must now ask what it was that stimulated the change.

The Orti Oricellari

Machiavelli's dedication of the Principe to Lorenzo de' Medici is an expression of his desire to "acquistare grazia appresso uno Principe", a "testimone della servitù mia" towards him. But the dedication of the Discorsi is totally different: Machiavelli is not trying to win favour but expressing a debt of gratitude. There is a tone of polemical reaction to what he had done with the earlier work:

"...e' mi pare essere uscito fuori dell'uso comune di coloro che scrivono, i quali sogliono sempre le loro opere a qualche principe indirizzare; e accecati dall'ambizione e dall'avarizia laudano quello di tutte le virtuosi qualitadi, quando da ogni vituperabile parte doverrebbero biasimarlo."

In order, he continues, not to fall into this error, he has chosen to dedicate the work not to those who are princes but those who deserve to be. He speaks of "gli obblighi che io ho con voi", his "gratitudine de' beneficii ricevuti", says that he has been "forzato a scrivere quello ch'io mai per me medesimo non arei scritto", and invites Zanobi Buondelmonti and Cosimo Rucellai to enjoy "quel bene o quel male che voi medesimi avete voluto." In telling them this he is emphasising that the inspiration of the Discorsi is, exceptionally, not his own but shared with them. Obviously, there is a measure of modesty

involved, but this does not conceal the fact that Machiavelli's gratitude is very real, and that the Discorsi owe their existence and belong to his friends - in contrast with the Principe. The latter work, we know, was written in the solitude of San Casciano; what, then, were the new circumstances in which Machiavelli implies the Discorsi were born?

Bernardo Rucellai, the grandfather of Cosimo,⁽¹⁾ had bought a tract of land along the Via della Scala, to the west of Florence. Pietro Crinito⁽²⁾ and Machiavelli himself⁽³⁾ describe the pleasant shade of the trees which Bernardo had had planted. Busts of famous men of old lined the paths. Before Bernardo's voluntary exile in 1506, friends of his used to meet in these "Orti Oricellari" and hold discussions. The only certain evidence of these early meetings is in Crinito's De honesta disciplina, where he mentions, among other things, the reading there of the "historia de Commodo Antonino imperatore".⁽⁴⁾ Another possible source is Giambattista Gelli who writes of "Bernardo Rucellai, Francesco Diacceto, Giovanni Canacci, Giovanni Corsi, Piero Martelli, Francesco Vettori e altri literati che allora si ragunavano all'orto de'Rucellai."⁽⁵⁾ Allora refers to "ne'tempi della fanciullezza", but the question is whether by this he means the period up to 1506 or from 1511 (when Bernardo returned to Florence) to 1514 (when he died). Prof. Felix Gilbert⁽⁶⁾ says that

-
- (1) Cosimo's real name was Bernardo, but he was also called Cosimo, or Cosimino to distinguish him from his father Cosimo, who died in 1495, the year of his son's birth.
- (2) De Sylva Oricellaria, in Commentarii de honesta disciplina, Florence 1504.
- (3) Arte della guerra, 1.
- (4) De hon. disc., 5.14; cf. also 2.14 and 11.12.
- (5) Ragionamento sopra le difficoltà di mettere in regole la nostra Lingua, in Opere, Torino 1952, 465.
- (6) In Bernardo Rucellai and the Orti Oricellari, "Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes," XII (1949), 117.

"fanciullezza" can hardly refer to a date after 1510, but Armand de
 (1)
 Gaetano has doubts about this, perhaps rightly so. However, Corsi
 was Florentine ambassador in Spain from 1513-16 and Vettori left
 Florence as ambassador to the court of Giulio II on 29 January 1513.⁽²⁾
 But the important points to notice here are firstly the presence of
 Machiavelli's close friend (and Bernardo Rucellai's nephew), Vettori,
 and secondly the fact that Gelli, though of humble birth and occupation
 was in touch with a group that, although of noble birth, did not
 exclude people from a lower class - such as Machiavelli himself,
 of course.

The Orti appear to have been frequented during Bernardo's
 absence in exile; in the fifth letter of the third book of his
Epistolario, which is dated "Florentiae, Cal. Iuniis 1509", Bartolomeo
 della Fonte writes to him:

"Non modo ad portum Neapolitanum commissum praelium,
 sed historiam totam Gallicam tuis in hortis biduo legi
 attentius cum Dante Populescho utriusque nostrum
 amantissimo." (3)

With Bernardo's death the ownership of the gardens passed
 to his two remaining sons, Palla and Giovanni. A new group began to
 dominate the informal meetings still held there, though not necessarily
 to the exclusion of the group we have mentioned - Francesco da Diacceto
 is still there, and Gelli talks of them meeting "con quei più vecchi".⁽⁴⁾
 The chief sources for the names of this group are, apart from Gelli,
 Iacopo Nardi, Filippo de'Nerli, Antonio Brucioli and the works and

(1) In The Florentine Academy and the advancement of learning through
 the vernacular: the Orti Oricellari and the Sacra Accademia,
 "Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance," XXX (1968), 23.

(2) Cf. Louis Passy, Un ami de Machiavel, François Vettori, Paris 1913
 vol. I, 36. His source is the Florentine Archivio di Stato,
Signori, Legazioni e Commissarie, reg. 27, f. 14v.-15.

(3) Ed. cit 49

(4) Op.cit., 485

correspondence of Machiavelli himself. It may be useful to sum up their evidence briefly.

Nardi (1478-1563) was of noble birth but a supporter at the appropriate moments both of the Medici and of the republics of 1494-1512 and 1527-30⁽¹⁾. He gives the names of Iacopo da Diacceto, the two Franceschi da Diacceto ("il Pagonazzo" and "il Nero"), Zanobi Buondelmonti, Luigi di Piero Alamanni, Cosimino Rucellai (with "molti altri uomini dotti"). Thus, he says, "quel luogo era uno comune ricetto e diporto di cosi fatte persone, cosi forestieri come fiorentini". Further on he mentions Antonio Brucioli as "molto domestico e familiare di Luigi Alamanni".⁽²⁾

Nerli (1485-1556) was brother-in-law to Machiavelli and corresponded with him. Writing on the conspiracy of 1522 against the Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (as Nardi was above) he says he was "amicissimo" of "una certa scuola di giovani letterati, e d'elevato ingegno .. infra' quali praticava continuamente Niccolo Machiavelli".⁽³⁾ Apart from the "continuamente", one should note his use, like Gelli's, of the term "letterati", with the addition this time of "giovani". Machiavelli was just 53 at the time of the conspiracy, so that one must remember he was in an exceptional position in the group. Nerli says they had been meeting "assai tempo" in the gardens "mentrechè visse Cosimo Rucellai". Cosimo died in 1519; "assai tempo" is vague, but seems to point to a date near Bernardo's death, though the meetings did not

(1) For further details, see Alessandro Ferraioli's introduction to his edition of Nardi's *I due felici rivali*, Roma 1901. This play was dedicated to Giovanni Battista della Palla, one of the speakers in Machiavelli's *Arte della guerra*. Ferraioli writes that Nardi was employed by the Medici in spite of his support of Savonarola and then Soderini, in 1513 he organised six trionfi at the carnival (cf. his *Istorie della città di Firenze*, VI, Firenze 1858, vol. II, 16) two of which represented Numa and Manlius Torquatus. He later translated Livy.

(2) *Istorie*, VII; ed. cit., vol. II, 72.

(3) *Commentarii de facti civili*, Augusta 1728, VII, 138-9.

necessarily include Machiavelli at the beginning.

In the second edition Brucioli's Dialogi della morale filosofia ⁽¹⁾ real names are substituted for the fictitious ones of the speakers in the first edition. ⁽²⁾ We then find Zanobi Buondelmonti and Iacopo Alamanni talking on marriage, these two with Iacopo Nardi and Battista della Palla talking on the family, Giangiorgio Trissino, Francesco Guidetti and Cosimo Rucellai discussing the upbringing of sons, and Bernardo Salviati (Prior of Rome), Gianiacopo Leonardi (a military engineer from Urbino), Trissino and Machiavelli discussing the republic and the republic's laws. The imagined scene varies between the Orti and Urbino, but, as Giorgio Spini points out, the work is clearly "il frutto dei suoi studi giovanili di filosofia e della sua partecipazione alle conversazioni degli Orti Oricellari e dell'ambiente di Francesco Cattani da Diacceto". ⁽³⁾

From 17th December 1517 Machiavelli's correspondence provides confirmation of his own involvement with this younger group. On this date he wrote to Luigi Alamanni ⁽⁴⁾ (who was in Rome);

"So che vi trovate costì tutto el giorno insieme col Rev.^{mo} de'Salviati, ⁽⁵⁾ Filippo Nerli, Cosimo Rucellai, Cristofano Carnesecchi, et qualche volta Anton Francesco delli Albizzi, et attendete a fare buona cera, et vi ricordate poco di noi qui, poveri graziati, morti di gelo et di sonno. Pur, per parere vivi ci troviamo qualche volta Zanobi Buondelmonti, Amerigo Morelli, Batista della Palla et io, et ragioniano di quella gita in Fiandra..."

There are letters to Machiavelli from della Palla (26th April 1520), Filippo de'Nerli (1st August and 17th September 1520), Buondelmonti (6th September 1520), and, after the disastrous consequences for most of

-
- (1) Venice, 1537-8 (quarto)
 (2) Venice, 1525 (folio). Other changes are also made in the text itself.
 (3) In Tra rinascimento e riforma: Antonio Brucioli, Firenze 1940. On Brucioli cf. also D. Cantimori, Rhetoric and politics in Italian humanism, in "Journal of the Warburg Institute", I (1937)n.2, 83-102.
 (4) Giovambattista Busini, in Lettere a B.Varchi, Firenze 1860, 243, says Machiavelli knew Alamanni well at the time of writing L'asino—that is, in 1517, probably.
 (5) Cardinal Giovanni de'Salviati.

the group of the conspiracy of 1522 - with the notable exception of the older and more prudent Niccolò, still hoping for office - a final letter from de'Nerli of 6 September 1525, talking of a letter he has seen from Machiavelli to Zanobi, and mentioning "l'antica amicizia nostra".

Clearly, the year 1522 - when (as a result of the abortive plot against Giulio) Alamanni, Buondelmonti, Brucioli and della Palla fled Florence and Iacopo il Diacettino was sentenced to death - brought an end to any meetings that might have gone on after Cosimino's death, though not to the "amicizia" of the group. We see de'Nerli still in touch with Buondelmonti, who himself joined Alamanni in France. De'Nerli, in his Commentarii, implies that, though with the death of Cosimino the use of the Orti may have ceased, the group remained linked between each other. It is probable that at this stage Machiavelli thought it prudent not to get involved with the revolutionary aspect of the circle, but clearly (if de'Nerli could write in such warm tones in 1525) a strong sense of friendship remained. X

As regards the radical, precocious nature of the younger group's interests, one could say that almost by tradition it was an opposition faction: just as Bernardo Rucellai opposed Soderini, so his grandson's guests came to oppose the Medici - perhaps partly as a result of Leo X's high-handed campaign against the Duke of Urbino in 1516 and the weakness of Lorenzo di Piero. But Bernardo did not go so far as conspiracy; at the age of 59 he simply left Florence. His late grandson's friends were in general, at the time of the 1522 conspiracy, very much younger - Alamanni, for instance, was born in 1495, and Brucioli probably also in the last decade of the century. Their opposition existed in spite of family ties to the Medici and their supporters: apart from the Rucellai-Medici link, the Buondelmonti

family, for instance, was also related to the Medici and Alamanni's father was a fierce pallesco. But when Machiavelli dedicated the Discorsi and the Arte della guerra to people from this milieu he would hardly have won favour with those in power.

In letters as in politics there is much of the avanguardia about the younger Orti Oricellari group. Their intelligence is well-attested; "dotti", Nardi calls them, and de'Nerli describes them as "giovani letterati, e d'elevato ingegno". We may look for signs of the group's literary adventurousness above all in their interest in the questione della lingua. They gave hospitality to Trissino, supporter of Dante's newly-discovered linguistic views and author of the first Italian tragedy. Gelli testifies to their discussions on the language problem.⁽¹⁾ Buondelmonti, in his letter of 6 September 1520, says he has criticisms of Machiavelli's parole in the Vita di Castruccio Castracani. In a conversation recorded in Carlo Lenzone's Difesa della lingua fiorentina⁽²⁾ Gelli refers to Machiavelli's part in a discussion on the questione della lingua in which he points out the folly of criticising current spoken usage.⁽³⁾

Together with these novel aspects of the younger group's interests went an interest in the ancient world which, though obviously descending from the tradition of the Quattrocento, manifested itself

(1) Opere, cit., 479, 484-5, 488.

(2) Firenze 1561, 26-27.

(3) Machiavelli points out the folly of criticising current spoken usage - for instance for a person who had learnt Venetian elsewhere and then found that his idiom, let alone his pronunciation, didn't tally with actual usage.

In the Discorso intorno alla nostra lingua, "N" is talking about the use of Florentine by "forestieri" - "la qual lingua ancora che con mille sudori cerchino d'imitare, nondimeno se leggerai attentamente loro scritti, vedrai in mille luoghi essere da loro male o perversamente usata, perche gli è impossibile che l'arte possa più che la natura". Here the subject is of course written usage, but the point about the difficulty of learning another idiom is the same - perhaps a point to consider in debating whether "N" is Machiavelli.

in literature in the volgare. But if Machiavelli was in sympathy with this he could hardly have shared their predominating interest in Greek (more than Latin) literature, since the probability is that he did not know Greek. One of Bernardo's sons Giovanni (1475-1525), imitated Virgil in Le api (written in 1524) but also Euripides in Oreste and Sophocles in Rosmunda.⁽¹⁾ Trissino too imitated Greek drama with his Sofonisba. The Byzantine scholar Giovanni Lascaris, translator of Greek authors including Polybius, wrote a poem on Cosimino's death and was a close friend of his uncle Giovanni; and since he appears in one of Brucioli's Dialogi set in the Orti it is more than probable that he was welcomed into the circle on a visit he made to Florence for Leo X. Alamanni knew Greek as well and in 1518 had annotated a manuscript of Homer.⁽²⁾

Although, then, one must stress that the group's principal concern seems to have been with using Greek literature in works in the vernacular this did not mean that interest in Roman affairs was altogether excluded. Like Alamanni, and like Palla, Giovanni and Cosimino Rucellai, Antonio Brucioli was a pupil of Diacceto, but showed in his Dialogi a knowledge of Roman history as well as Platonism, and the influence of Machiavelli can be seen in several places. In the dialogue

(1) Spini, op.cit., LXII, writes that he was Trissino's greatest co-operator when the latter "schiese all'italiano i campi larghissimi della imitazione classica". Giovanni dedicated the Api and Oreste to Trissino,

(2) Cf. Henri Havvete, Luigi Alamanni, Paris 1903, 23. It is interesting to note what he has to say about Alamanni's epigrams, of which many are translations or reminiscences of Greek and Latin sources (including Livy). Having mentioned an epigram closely based on Theocritus, he writes "Il ne s'astreint pas toujours cependant à traduire aussi exactement. Souvent il se contente de tirer d'une idee, d'une image classique, un distique ou un quatrain exprimant une pensée un peu plus personnelle"(261). The same could be often said of Machiavelli's use of Livy.

Della repubblica (No. 5 in the first edition, No.6 in the second, where the speakers are given as Bernardo Salviati, Prior of Rome, Gianiacopo Leonardi da Pesaro, Trissino and Machiavelli), Salviati asks Trissino to talk about republics -

"secondo quelle dico, che sono state, o che possono essere, e non secondo quelle impossibili che d'alcuno sono state imagnate",

to which Machiavelli adds,

"O quanto ha dato questa domanda per lo mio intendimento, nè cosa più grata mi potrebbe venire che questa".

Brucioli, then, recalled Machiavelli's interest, even if he makes Trissino the main speaker - surprisingly, perhaps, from our point of view, and an indication that it took some time for Machiavelli to gain the respect he deserved. Nevertheless, Brucioli repeats such ideas as that the dictatorship made Rome servile because of the prolongation of its power, ⁽¹⁾ that the republic should have magistrates on the Roman model, ⁽²⁾ that the captain of an army must have a knowledge of terrain ⁽³⁾ and that religion is a powerful weapon in the hands of a prince, as in the case of Numa, "avvegna ch'ella fosse falsa". ⁽⁴⁾ These are all ideas we have seen associated with Bernardo Rucellai or Pontano as well as Machiavelli - in fact Brucioli goes farther than any of them in recommending that a republic should actually have praetors, consuls, two tribuni plebis and so on. There are points of difference - as when Brucioli asserts that the Romans were inferior to the Carthaginians and the Greeks in prudentia - but on the whole one can see the Dialogi as a continuation of their ideas.

(1) In Della repubblica.

(2) Trissino is speaking in Delle leggi della repubblica

(3) Del capitano di uno essercito; in the 2nd. ed., Del capitano.
He gives examples from Livy.

(4) Del governo del principe; in the 2nd. ed., Del giusto principe

The same must be said of the Discorsi, while recognising that though there was an interest in these ideas among the younger members of the Rucellai group, it probably took second place to an interest in Greek and vernacular literature. If discussion with Cosimino and Zanobi Buondelmonti stimulated Machiavelli to write "quello ch'io mai per me medesimo non arei scritto", it was, then, the inheritance of Cosimino's grandfather which provided his starting point. To illustrate this common ground, as well as their radical differences, it seems worthwhile quoting at some length part of Bernardo's dedicatory letter to his son Palla of his De urbe Roma; a letter which forms a kind of manifesto for his study of ancient Rome.

"Medicibus exactis, armisque turbata Republica, quum de ordinanda civitate, constituendoque imperio cives inter se dissident ... tum demum ambitione paucorum factum est, ut civitas distracta seditionibus laxiorem Reipublicae formam, ne dicam popularem, amplecteretur. Haec ego, qui post exactos Medices, legatus abfueram, quum in reditu meo offendisem, non destiti ea cogitare, ac monere, quae ad expoliendam rudem illam ut primam materiem pertinerent: quod ut facilius adsequi possem, nisus sum auctoritate exemplisque tum veterum, tum vero etiam Venetorum⁽¹⁾, quorum annales, ut non ignoras, iampridem domi habemus perraros illos quidem, atque exscriptos de commentariis sanctioribus. Sed quum seditione civium nihil profecissem, non fuit consilium inter dissidentes, et ut libertas loquar, infectos partibus homines frustra reliquam aetatem agere, sed ad honestum reversus otium ... statui ex Romanorum gestis, quaecumque obscuriora viderentur aperire, proque viribus ante oculos ponere priscum illum in regenda Republica ordinem civitatis, ut si minus aetatis nostrae civibus, posteris salutem, aut alienigenis conferre possimus."

(1) Cf. Crinito, De hon. disc., 2.14, where he records the group's interest "de veterum institutis; de regenda civitate; ac de Venetum clarissimo atque summo imperio." One may contrast Machiavelli's rejection of Venice as a model state.

He goes on to announce a programme of works (apart from the De urbe Roma) :

"de Re Militari, de Sacerdotiis, de Magistratibus, ceterisque id genus suscepturus, si modo illa, ut graviora, non improbari a doctioribus viris, quorum auctoritate fulti esse volumus, intelligimus."

The similarities with Machiavelli's intentions in writing the Discorsi need no emphasis; there is a clear continuity of ideas between the two men. But also of importance are the differences between them; not only between Rucellai's eagerness to please other scholars with his work on the rather limited subjects of architecture, priesthoods and so on, and Machiavelli's indifference to conformity, but between their different political backgrounds - something we have mentioned before. In a way, these points are linked. The Medici personified not only certain political values but, through their patronage of various figures, a certain type of scholarship. Machiavelli was one of the very few who served under Soderini who failed to be able to continue to work under Giuliano de' Medici. In spite of his efforts to get back some sort of job from 1513 onwards, he was politically as essentially opposed to the Medici as Bernardo Rucellai was in favour of them. In the Orti Oricellari he had, as we have seen, a young audience who knew very well what he stood for and who developed their own anti-Medici sentiments to a more violent point than Machiavelli's. We need go no further than the dedication of the Discorsi to see the work's polemical rejection of the Medici and instead its link with this young group; and from a political point of view the work, with its immediate call for a mixed constitution, is in direct opposition to the idea of oligarchy. But as regards the link between the use of Livy in the Discorsi and humanist scholarship in Florence, the situation is more complex: on the one hand, we can see how

Machiavelli accepts and develops aspects of the humanism of Bernardo Rucellai (as well as of non-Florentine scholars), but on the other, as we shall see, his treatment of Livy has features which are entirely original in comparison with his predecessors.

Having discussed this positive and negative link with Bernardo Rucellai, as well as what we know of the younger group, it remains only to consider the part played by this younger group in the development of Machiavelli's use of Livy. Although (as we have seen from Brucioli's work) the ideas of the earlier group were still alive, perhaps partly through Machiavelli's influence, one must acknowledge that the younger group's contribution was not so much one of ideas, as was Bernardo's, but rather psychological, in that their youth and enthusiasm for novelty put Machiavelli in the position of a master before eager and gifted pupils. First, though, we must attempt to get some idea of the date when he could have come into contact with them, though to give a precise date, in view of the lack of evidence, is impossible. As for the terminus ad quem, the letter of Machiavelli to Alamanni of December 1517 shows that by then he was well acquainted with them. We may move tentatively earlier (with Ridolfi⁽¹⁾) to 1516, when, if we may have faith in Machiavelli's "finzioni letterarie", as Ridolfi calls them, Fabrizio Colonna is said in the Arte della guerra to have visited the Orti. It is quite possible that the encounter took place earlier, of course, though 1514 seems too early, as we find Machiavelli saying that he spends his time in Florence, "fra la bottega di Donato del Corno et la Riccia"⁽²⁾ or "in villa ... tra' miei pidocchi."⁽³⁾ In August, he says

(1) Cf. his Vita di N.M., Roma 1954, 441

(2) Letter to Vettori, 4 Feb. 1514

(3) Letter to Vettori, 10 June 1514.

he has left "i pensieri delle cose grandi et gravi; non mi diletta più leggere le cose antiche, nè ragionare delle moderne."⁽¹⁾

In February of that year, Vettori wrote to Machiavelli in a tone that suggests his friend knew little of the Orti: "Anton Francesco ... non dorme più a chasa sua, ma a uno orto presso a Bernardo Rucellai."⁽²⁾

Here is the first possible link between Machiavelli and the Orti - not a very scholarly one, as the connection seems to be his interest in "la Riccia"; but not outside his field of interest. If one is looking for a less hazardous way of bringing the date earlier than 1516, as well as providing a likely means of entry into such apparently hostile surroundings, one might consider the possibility that Machiavelli was introduced in May 1515, when his friend and ex-colleague Francesco Vettori (mentioned by Gelli as having already participated in the meetings) returned temporarily to Florence from Rome.⁽³⁾

We must now assess the influence of this group on Machiavelli when they were finally acquainted, though it should be remembered that Machiavelli must have also had a great influence on them. There was, inevitably, some distance between them; his not participating in the 1522 conspiracy demonstrates that he did not completely share their outlook in the political field, and we have already mentioned their

(1) Letter to Vettori, 3 Aug. 1514.

(2) Vettori to M., 9 Feb. 1514. "Anton Francesco" may be the A.F. degli Albizzi mentioned in M's letter of 17 Dec. 1517, and Buondelmonti's to M. of 6 Sept. 1520.

(3) Cf. L. Passy, op. cit., I 114. A climate of opinion hostile to the Medici probably did not develop until 1516-17, as we have mentioned (Leo X visited the gardens during his visit to Florence from Dec. 1515 to Feb. 1516, for instance), but in view of the links of the Discorsi with Bernardo Rucellai the genesis of the work, though not its full development, may have been before this time.

interest in Greek.⁽¹⁾ But their family backgrounds appear not to have created a gulf - they turned against theirs to welcome the poverty-stricken Machiavelli into their midst, as they also did with Gelli.⁽²⁾ Inevitably, Machiavelli's poverty, as well as his

- (1) An illustration of the ambivalence in the group's relationship with Machiavelli is given by the case of Luigi Alamanni. He wrote a sonnet on M's death, but discarded it from the collection of his works published by himself in 1531. Then in his second Satira he makes what is probably a reference to the Principe, calling it, with heavy irony, the "aureo libro moral" and deploring the triumph of its views.
- (2) There is a sonnet by Cosimino to M. (published in Rime di poeti italiani del secolo XVI, Bologna 1873, 44-5) which may well refer to the Orti, but all one can say is that it was surely written after 1512 (1.2) and shows M's friendship with the group as well as their admiration for him and his studies (11.1-8). The last six lines, with their distaste for the intrigue of city life (cf., in the same volume, Cosimino's sonnet to Guidetti and Alamanni, p.46, and one of Guidetti's to Cosimino, p.68) go well with the polemical tone of the dedicatory letter of the Discorsi. Here is the sonnet:

Spirito infra gli eletti al mondo eletto,
 Che schifi i colpi d'una sorte avara,
 Non già con altri schermi, che con chiara
 Virtude, e de'bei fini alto concetto;

Se 'l studio onesto tuo non fa disdetto,
 Deh! lassando la ria città, rischiara
 L'amica schiera tua suave e cara,
 Col venir al bel nostro ermo ricetta.

Qui non s'ode ad ogn' or si come varia
 Fortuna volga sue volubil rote,
 Qui non ingiuste imprese, amare doglie,

Ma in lor vece sicure, oneste voglie,
 Ed a vaghi augellin la terra e l'aria
 Di dolcezza ingombrar con chiare note.

On the poetry of Cosimino (as well as Guidetti), see Henri Hauvette's articles in the "Bulletin Italien" published by the Faculté des lettres de Bordeaux, IV (1904), 2 (85-102) and 3 (186-9).

greater age and experience, did have some effect, as we can see from this portrait of Nardi's, where he says that for having written and dedicated the Discorsi to Cosimino and Zanobi Buondelmonti

"Niccolò era amato grandemente da loro, e anche per cortesia sovvenuto, come seppi io, di qualche emolumento: e della sua conversazione si diletta- vano maravigliosamente, tenendo in prezzo grandissimo tutte le opere sue." (1)

Machiavelli was, then, more than a primus inter pares, but there seems to have been an atmosphere of companionship and mutual respect. References to "compagni" and "amicizia" are standard, and it is hard to remember their differences when reading their correspondence, for instance Zanobi's letter to Machiavelli of 6 September 1520 where his praise for the life of Castruccio and encouragement to write the Istorie is blended with criticism, as frank as his praise is unaffected. If we accept this evidence, as well as that of the letter of dedication of the Discorsi, that the Orti group had considerable influence on Machiavelli's writing, it is logical to look to them as the stimulus to the composition of the work. In further support of this, there is this passage from Book 7 of Nerli's Commentarii on the members of the group:

"s'esercitavano costoro assai, mediante le lettere, nelle lezioni dell'istorie, e sopra di esse, ed a loro istanza compose il Machiavelli quel suo libro de'discorsi sopra Tito Livio, e anco il libro di que'trattati, e ragionamenti sopra la milizia."

Ridolfi is not happy about this, in view of his acceptance of the dating of part of the Discorsi before the Principe. He has therefore to say that Nerli

"non era intorno a questo bene informato, o gli fallì la memoria, o ciò che sapeva della seconda opera egli

(1) Nardi, op. cit., Firenze 1858, II 72.

lo estese per comodità di discorso anche alla prima."⁽¹⁾

We will discuss the inevitable question of dating later when considering the structure of the Discorsi, but for the moment the evidence we have cited, together with the link through Livy with the work of Bernardo (however frivolous his kind of humanism may have appeared to Machiavelli), seems to point to the Orti as the probable starting-point of the work. When Machiavelli says he would not be writing it but for Cosimino and Zanobi, it is probable that he means more than that he owed them just the encouragement to write what he had already talked about but would not have written down.⁽²⁾

A final point is that we certainly should not doubt the sincerity of Machiavelli's study of Livy with his younger friends. This, it seems, is what Giuseppe Toffanin does in the first chapter of his book Machiavelli e il Tacitismo. He does not doubt the influence of the Orti group, but sees Machiavelli taking up the study of Livy merely through the "gusto del tempo":

"Poichè Livio era di moda, e i suoi amici lo amavano, egli s'attenne a quello con letizia, comprendendo che, anche sulla scorta di quelle grandi pagine repubblicane si potevano lumeggiare verità politiche eterne." ⁽³⁾

His main interest, his sincere one, according to Toffanin, was Tacitus :

"i suoi giorni non avevano da imparare assai più da quelli (libri) di Tacito che da quelli di Livio?" ⁽⁴⁾

(1) Ridolfi, op. cit., 442.

(2) This is what Sasso says, considering that from the Nerli passage "si può ricavare solo questo: che il M. compose i Discorsi ad 'istanza' dei giovani che, avendolo sentito discutere quegli argomenti, ritenevano utile che egli li sistemasse in un'opera organica" (Intorno alla composizione dei 'Discorsi' di N.M.), in the "Giorn. stor. della lett. it.", CXXXIV (1957), fasc. 4, 490.

(3) M. e il Tacitismo, Padova 1921, 24.

(4) Ib., 34.

In writing the Principe, Toffanin continues, Machiavelli

"si trovò a giudicare senza mezzi termini quella borghesia Oricellaria che, tutto sommato, amava la libertà repubblicana nelle prime decche di Livio, all'umanistica, ma riadattava il collo alla cavezza medicea, senza disagio eccessivo. Eravamo dunque in pieno ambiente tacitiano !" (1)

This is not only to ignore the seriousness of the young men of the Orti who, far from submitting to the Medici, suffered exile or death at their hands in 1522, and the sincerity of Machiavelli's devotion to the republican ideal;⁽²⁾ it is also to overlook the unlikelihood that at this time anyone not in the avanguardia of humanist studies should know very much

(1) *Ib.*, 35.

(2) Cf., Discorsi 1.10, for instance. Here M. mentions the assassination of Caesar by Marcus Junius Brutus, and there is a sonnet apparently on a statue of Brutus by Cosimino Rucellai (Rime.. del sec. XVI, cit., 44), praising "la man giusta cotanto, Che Roma il mondo di servile ammanto Spoglio, sua libertade essendo a riva;" and condemning the modern "etade... si maligna e stolta, Sdegnosa dell'altrui libero bene" that it has let the statue become overgrown by ivy.

about Tacitus. (1)

- (1) The popularity of the Histories and Annals, though as much as was then known of them had been published in the fifteenth century, appears not to have developed until after the probable starting date of the Discorsi. The manuscript which is the sole authority for Annals 1-6 did not come to Italy until 1509, though it is mentioned in a letter from Francesco Soderini in Rome to Marcello Virgilio Adriani, dated 1st January 1509 (surely by the Florentine calendar). An edition of Tacitus' works containing the first five books of the Annals (the sixth being only fragmentary) was brought out in Rome only in 1515 by the younger Beroaldo. It was closely followed by Minuziano's edition, prepared in 1516 and published the following year (cf. C.W. Mendell, Tacitus, New Haven 1957, and, for the Minuziano edition, C. Dionisotti, Notizie di A. Minuziano, cit., 357-8). The Milanese edition contains an essay on historiography in antiquity by Andrea Alciato, pupil of Parrasio between 1504-6, in which, perhaps predictably, he says that Tacitus is the greatest Latin historian. He compares him especially with Livy, preferring Tacitus for his style and seeing harm in the reading of the Decades: "Bella, tribunitiae seditiones, armorum strepitus, optimatum conspirationes, minimum ad bonos mores exemplo conducant". The things Tacitus wrote were "digniora" - "nisi magis mortalibus prodesse longas prodigiorum narrationes aliquis credat... tum fusius explicatos annos magistratus". In other words, he sees as harmful or merely boring in Livy points which Machiavelli sees as useful - the account of Rome's internal and external struggles, and the indications of future events through prodigies. Modern tastes may concord with Alciato's, but he realised that at the time he was saying something revolutionary, and finishes by modifying his polemical tone: "Eo temeritatis progredi nequaquam ausim, tantum virum vel in levissima re ut damnare velim, sed cum utrunque (i.e. Tacitus and Livy) summopere et probem et admirer, alterius tamen in delectu iudicium praepono." In spite of Toffanin's conviction of the importance of Tacitus to Machiavelli, relatively little use of him (and none of Annals 1-5) is made in the Discorsi. On the other hand, it is possible that M.'s knowledge of Tacitus grew later, since Annals 1.79 is mentioned in Ist. fior. 2.2 (on the origin of Florence - the same point as is mentioned in Soderini's letter; cf. Nicolai Rubinstein, Machiavelli e le origini di Firenze, in the "Rivista storica italiana," LXXIX (1967), 952-9. He suggests incidentally, that since Machiavelli does not mention the triumvirate of Octavian, Anthony and Lepidus as the founders of Florence until the Istorie, omitting to record this in Discorsi 1.1, the latter chapter may have been written before M. met the Orti group, as they would probably have known of Poliziano's letter on the subject to Piero de' Medici, published in his Opera omnia, Venice 1498, ff. 3v.-5r. But Prof. Rubinstein is careful not to make too much of this point. Indeed, M. still considers Sulla the possible founder in Ist. fior., 2.2.).

The Structure of the "Discorsi"

No overall order is apparent in the Discorsi. They are neither composed, like a commentary, entirely according to Livy's order, nor completely according to their author's choice of topic, as in a work like Crinito's De honesta disciplina. So on the one hand a chapter dealing with an incident from Livy, 10 may be followed by one using an incident from Livy, 2, as in Discorsi 1. 15-16; on the other hand, Machiavelli, following Livy's order, may talk in one chapter of corruption in a city and in the next of prodigies and other indications of the future, as in 1.55-56.

Attempts have been made to analyse the structure of the Discorsi. Fr. Walker, in the introduction to his edition of the work, quotes Machiavelli's own words on the division by subject-matter into three books, and on the structural method used within each book writes that Machiavelli's method is to

"run through the events narrated by Livy roughly in chronological order, selecting such as he deems more important from the standpoint of the general topic of the book The basic order is .. chronological in each of the three books, but is less precise in Bk.II than it is in Bks. I and II." (1)

In Bk.II, he suggests, "the chronological order is duplicated". He also draws attention to the "introductory" nature of 1.1-18, "so that it is not until we reach D.I.19 that Machiavelli begins to comment on the topics of Livy, Book I."

Prof. F. Gilbert (2) has also noted this apparent difference between the first eighteen chapters and the rest of Bk.1, and suggests as a hypothesis that they began as a work on republics, started before the Principe (and hence the reference to a work on

(1) The Discourses of N.M., ed. Leslie J. Walker, London 1950, I 60-61

(2) In The composition and structure of M's Discorsi, "Journal of the History of Ideas", XIV, I (Jan.1953), 136-156.

republics in Principe 2) but eventually lost. As for the rest of the Discorsi, he points out that there are two long sections mainly ordered chronologically (1.19-60, 3.30f), and says that

"these sections originated as a series of successive commentaries on Livy's first Decade; when this material was transformed into a literary work, the series was broken in the middle, and the second part arranged into two books. The comments on Livy's fifth and eighth books, which deal chiefly with military and foreign affairs, were lifted out and assembled in a special, second book, while the remainder of the material forms the third book."

In other words, though Prof. Gilbert agrees that there are signs of conscious organisation in the Discorsi (such as the division into three subjects), the work is not homogeneous but is the amalgamation of three separate stages.

His views, though courageous in their challenging of traditional ideas on the Discorsi, were not considered acceptable on this side of the Atlantic. A valuable article by Prof. Whitfield⁽¹⁾ shows, among other things, the continuity of Discorsi 1. 1-18 with subsequent chapters. Gennaro Sasso⁽²⁾ sees the problem of the Discorsi not in its structure, for to judge Machiavelli by this is "estrinseco e astratto" since he clearly did not intend to write a commentary on Livy "ma solo appoggiare a quel testo considerazioni teoriche nate sotto lo stimolo di ben altri pensieri." However, even if Prof. Gilbert's conclusions do not convince one, I think it is still worthwhile to consider the question he has raised about the structure of the work, as it sheds some light on the question

(1) Discourses on Machiavelli, VII: Gilbert, Hexter and Baron, in "Italian Studies", XIII (1958) 21-46 (with 21-30 on Prof. Gilbert's article).

(2) He reviewed Prof. Gilbert's article in the "Rivista storica italiana", LXV (1953). In the following year (vol. LXVI) Gilbert replied, and in the same issue Sasso makes the remarks cited here.

of the originality of the Discorsi in respect of contemporary humanism, as well as on their genesis. If we are to accept them as homogeneous, not written haphazardly (even though Machiavelli may not have finished revising and adding to them), what are we to accept as the key to their structure? We must at least agree with Prof. Gilbert that there are at first sight two types of construction, though one must point out that the second main chronological sequence starts at 3.25, not 3.30, and that one cannot talk about the overall chronological sequence being "broken in the middle" if the first part ends with Livy, 7, and the second begins with Livy, 3. The alternative to a chronological structure was a thematic one - selecting incidents from Livy to illustrate a particular topic over a number of chapters - and this was clearly adopted in 1.1-18, the whole of 2, and 3.1-24. But one may go further than this and see a relationship between these two methods of procedure. If one superimposes a thematic analysis of the Discorsi on the chronological one, one can see how far Livy's order influences Machiavelli's. There is by no means an absolute uniformity of pattern, but in this way we can, to some extent, both explain the exceptions within the two long chronological sequences and diminish the apparent chronological irregularities of the rest, and here we may find a basis for preferring to Prof. Gilbert's opinions a view of the homogeneous evolution of the Discorsi.

Gilbert tries to explain the irregularity within the chronological sequence of 1.31 and 35 by suggesting that they may be later insertions, due to Machiavelli realising contradictions in what he had said in 1.34. But, as Prof. Whitfield has pointed out in the article mentioned, Machiavelli was not on a "myopic course" through Livy. Apart from this, the reason why we should not see the

four chapters in Discorsi 1. 19-60 which are out of chronological order (nos. 20, 31, 35 and 54) as separate from the others is that they are all occasions when Machiavelli has allowed himself to look elsewhere in Livy to illustrate a point made in the previous chapter. Thus 1.20 connects with 1.19 on the theme of succession; 1.31 with 1.30 on ingratitude; 1.35 with 1.34 on the supreme authority in the state; and 1.54 with 1.53 on the excitability of the masses. (In only one case, incidentally, does he go far afield in Livy for his follow-up - in 1.31, where he goes to Bk. 8 and, for "il più bello esempio", to Bk.22) In the same way he may break the chronological order within a chapter by referring to incidents elsewhere in Livy; for instance, to Bk. 5 in 1.29 or to Bk.6 in 1.37. However, the chronological irregularity at the end of Discorsi 3 cannot be explained so easily. After dealing with Livy, 9. 8-12 in 3.42, Machiavelli spends the next three chapters within Livy, 10 before returning to Bk.9 with 3. 46-47 and then proceeding back to Bk.10 with 3.48. The main example in 3.49 is taken from Bk.9, but as this chapter can be seen as a general statement rounding off the book, and parallel to 3.1, one need not expect it to conform to any pattern. It is possible that the mention of the younger Publius Decius Mus and Fabius in 3.45 led to the writing of 3.46, which has a particular reference to Livy, 9.34, and then to the starting, as it were, of a new minor chronological sequence. Fr. Walker ⁽¹⁾ points out that Fabius had a descendant famous for his lack of haste, but one might add that Livy's account of the battle of Sentinum emphasises rather the Decius family traits. But this is not much help where 3.47-48 are concerned.

(1) Discourses, cit., II 212

There are also exceptions to any general rule in the parts of the work where the structure is apparently mainly dictated by Machiavelli's use of particular topics as themes for a number of chapters. But just as in 1. 19-60 and 3. 25-48 he may use one incident as a starting point, breaking the chronological order for a digression on a theme, so in the rest of the work he may, though in a looser way, take a starting point and develop it in succeeding chapters with other incidents which are often in chronological order. Obviously, there is no rigid scheme here, but we can see a greater adherence to Livy's order than the relatively irregular structure of these sections would at first suggest. Thus the minor chronological patterns help us to discern Machiavelli's thematic pattern, since in many cases the two coincide.

The clearest way to examine the pattern of the references to Livy will be to set them out in a table giving the chapter of the Discorsi, the book (or books) of Livy which it uses, and the subject of the chapter or group of chapters.

	<u>Discorsi</u>	<u>Livy</u>	<u>Subject</u>
Bk.1	1	1.1-7	The beginnings of cities, and of Rome in particular.
	2	general	Chs. 2-8 discuss, after a preliminary examination of types of republics in ch.2, how Rome derived liberty and strength from class conflict.
	3)	2.1-33	
	4)		
	5	9.26	(On which class is the better guardian of liberty)
	6	general	

	<u>Discorsi</u>	<u>Livy</u>	<u>Subject</u>
Bk. 1	7	2.33-35; 5.33	A sub-development, marked by the return to Livy, 2, is formed by these two chapters, which are more specifically on the subject of liberty than the preceding five.
	8	6.11-16	
	9	1.7 and 14; 2.1	Going back to Bk.1, ch.9 indicates a new major theme: that of reform. Ch. 10, on the misuse of the sole authority (in contrast to Romulus), is an appendage to this.
	10	general	
	11	1.18-21; 22.53 and 7.4-5.	Another starting point, this time for Machiavelli's views on religion.
	12	5.22	
	13	5.13-16; 3.10,15-21	The slight chronological irregularity provides an exception to any pattern.
	14	10.40-1	
	15	10.31,38-9	
	16)	2.1-5	Coming back to Livy, 2, Machiavelli takes up a new major theme - liberty and its incompatibility with what he calls "corruption".
	17)		
	18	general	
	19	1.7-31	Machiavelli returns to the first book of Livy and starts a chiefly chronological sequence which continues to the end of the book.
	:	:	
	60	7.32	
Bk. 2	1	general	The first two chapters introduce the theme of Rome's <u>virtù</u> in her expansion and show how <u>virtù</u> is ensured. After this introduction, Machiavelli comes down to more specific points. Ch. 5 is an appendage to his mention of the Tuscans in ch.4.
	2	general	
	3	1.30	
	4	5.1,33-4; 32. 32-4.	
	5	5.33	
	6	general	Machiavelli now turns to the subject of war and colonisation. After the
	7	5.24	

	<u>Discorsi</u>	<u>Livy</u>	<u>Subject</u>
Bk.2			
	8	5.33-4	introductory ch.6 the theme of colonisation is developed in chs.7 and 8 and that of war thereafter.
	9	7.31; <u>Periocha</u> 16; 21.5; 7.30-1	It will be seen that, in this apparently irregular section, the references to the first Samnite war (Livy, 7) provide a link. Ch. 12, on "la difesa propria" is an appendage to ch. 11. on "la difesa d'altrui".
	10	27.48;9.17; 7.29-31.	
	11	7.29; 9.14	
	12	34.60;28.43	
	13-16	8.2 seqq.	These chapters are connected chronologically rather than thematically, emphasising that there can be no clear distinction between the two methods of construction even in Bk.2.
	17	-	Ch.17, on artillery, obviously has no specific reference to Livy; ch.18, on the superiority of infantry to cavalry, could be seen as a complementary section on the subject of weapons and troops.
	18	2.20;22.49; 9.22	
	19	7.38-41 (and, briefly, 23.18)	Ch. 19 starts a section on the subject of the state's acquisitions. Ch. 20 on mercenary and auxiliary troops, refers to the same episode from Livy, 7, which took place in Capua; and Rome's dealings with Capua perhaps suggested the reference to Livy, 9 in the following chapter.
	20	7.32-41	
	21	9.20	
	22	8.3	The rest of <u>Discorsi</u> 2 can be more easily divided into chronological than thematic groups, though Machiavelli does preserve some continuity of argument, for instance between chs.23 and 24, and between 26 and 27.
	23	8.13,21 and 9.3-4	
	24	8.13,21 and 27.15-16	
	25	2.44 seqq.	
	26	2.45;7.41; 22.57	
	27	23. 11-12	
	28	5.35-37	
	29	5.35-55	
	30	5.48-49 and 23.13	

	<u>Discorsi</u>	<u>Livy</u>	<u>Subject</u>
Bk.2	31	8.3,17,24	The final three chapters all fit within the book's military framework but are otherwise exceptions to any pattern. The similar irregularity at the end of Bk. 3 might suggest the addition of chapters to these books at a later point.
	32	general	
	33	9.35-37	
<hr/>			
Bk.3	1	general	Ch.1 takes the place of a formal preface using various incidents from Livy to illustrate remarks on the need for constant reformation in a state or <u>setta</u> . There seems to be three developments of this theme of maintenance and reformation: chs.2 and 3 on Brutus and how he helped to maintain the liberty of a republic; 4 and 5 on kingdoms; and chs.6-8 on violent change, with ch.6 on conspiracies in general and chs.7 and 8 on particular points.
	2,3	1.56-2.5	
	4,5	1:35-60	
	6	24.4-7; 35.34-36; 7.38-41	Ch. 9 forms an echo of ch.1 and closes the opening section.
	7	1.59-60	
	8	2.41;6.11-20	Machiavelli turns to the subject of the tactics of command. This section is the most confused from a chronological point of view, and thematic connections are also loose. Some order may, however, be discerned, with the main references in 13 and 14 being to the Volsci in Livy, 2, followed by references in 14, 15 and 18 (though not in order) to Livy, 4.30-41.
	9	22.12,18; 28.40	
	10	7.12;32.9-12	
	11	4.48	
	12	9.1;2.47;4.28; 5.21	
	13	2.39-40;25.36-9	
	14	2.64;7.14;4.33	
	15	4.30-1;3.70	
	16	no specific ref.	
	17	26.17;27.40 seqq.	
	18	4.37-41	

	<u>Discorsi</u>	<u>Livy</u>	<u>Subject</u>
Bk.3	19	2.55-60	The starting point for a new theme (though connected with the general theme of command), that of kindness and severity and their effect on one's popularity. As in the preceding section, Machiavelli ranges widely for his examples, with chs. 21 and 22 out of chronological order. The rest of the book is, with the exceptions mentioned earlier, chiefly in chronological sequence.
	20	5.27; 26.42-50	
	21	3rd <u>Decade</u>	
	22	7 and 8 (and, in passing, 2.7)	
	23	5.23-32	
	24	3.21; 8.26	
	:		
	:		
	:		
	49	8.18; 39.41; 23.25; 9.46	

One must repeat, then, that there is no absolute pattern in the structure of the Discorsi; there is no way of completely resolving the two methods - chronological and thematic - least of all in Bk.3. However, this necessarily laborious examination of the references to Livy shows that at times these methods alternate but at times coincide, with the chronological structure becoming subordinate to structure by theme, though there are several exceptions. This is true of Discorsi 1.1-18 as of parts of the other two books, and would suggest that one should not assume, as does Prof. Gilbert, that this first section has a separate origin. So also it has emerged that, although one can certainly say that in some sections of the work the chronological or thematic structure is dominant, they are never inseparable. Certainly there is much more to the problem than Fr. Walker's idea of Machiavelli just "running through ... Livy roughly in chronological order". This does not mean that Livy's role in the structure of the Discorsi is unimportant; Machiavelli often uses it as the basis of his own. But ultimately Machiavelli alone is the final arbiter

of the work's structure. He is writing more than a commentary on traditional lines - this was something that had lost popularity a decade earlier. Prof. Gilbert, in the article mentioned, writes that the fact that before the Discorsi took their present form

"they were strictly a series of comments on Livy gives still greater emphasis to the point that, in the Discorsi, Machiavelli followed a method which he believed to be the recognised scholarly procedure of his time. The Discorsi were conceived in the form of a traditional literary genre and in line with what Machiavelli considered to be the modern scholarly tendency of elaborating general rules from ancient authors. In other words, with the Discorsi Machiavelli adjusted his new political concepts to the method and normative approach of humanism, the dominating intellectual trend of his time."

Whether or not the Discorsi had its origin, as Prof. Gilbert suggests, in a commentary - a possibility but, as we have seen, not necessarily so - Machiavelli could hardly have thought it was in keeping with the times; not even a line-by-line commentary, let alone one where he selected incidents at random, would have been. Of course, to say that commentaries were going out during the period of the Discorsi is to judge from a retrospective viewpoint; but even if this was not visible to all by around 1515, there is such a gulf between even the chronologically regular parts of the Discorsi and a typical commentary that to make such a comparison is very difficult. And the idea that the Discorsi as a whole are traditional or orthodox in their structure is even more bizarre, even though they may have links with humanism in other respects. In fact, Machiavelli has woven together three separate strands of previous humanism: the straightforward annotations on a classical author, the zibaldone type of work (like Poliziano's Miscellanea, Crinito's De honesta disciplina or D'Alessandro's

Geniales dies); and the formal treatise on the state (like Patrizi's). Here, then, is another aspect of Machiavelli's originality, in addition to that of his thought; and the structure of the Discorsi was surely partly to what he was referring when he wrote in the introduction to the first book that he was entering on a path "non... ancora da alcuno trita".

Machiavelli's use of Livy in the "Discorsi"

(1) His choice of Livy; their differing views

Although Livy's conservatism meant that he supported a republican régime rather than that under which he was working, his outlook remains in many ways the antithesis of Machiavelli's. As far as politics is concerned, Livy clearly favours an aristocracy as did many of Machiavelli's contemporaries; but in general he is not so much interested in political as in moral and ethical values, in spite of the dual aim he expresses:

"ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit; labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentis primo mores sequatur animo ... " (I, praefatio 9).

Livy's grasp of both internal and external politics, it must be admitted, is confused, and the facts are not presented in the coherent manner of one who sees a pattern in them. Why, then should Machiavelli have chosen Livy as his source when Polybius, dealing with the same material, had an outlook and interests much closer to his own? Certainly, what is undoubtedly the most important new idea in the Discorsi - that the state should be controlled by all parts of society

(1) See for the differences between the political ideas of Polybius and Machiavelli, see Thayer's essays on Polybius & Machiavelli's constitutions, politics, republics and the theory of the encyclopaedia in Stuart et al., 1967.

- comes, directly or indirectly, from Polybius.⁽¹⁾ To write a work with at least some resemblance to a commentary on a Greek author was, by the normal standards of that time, unthinkable. It is true that Machiavelli apparently knew no Greek; but the first five books of Polybius existed in the Latin translation of Perotti, and although it was not normal to write on a work in translation he was not obliged to write "discourses" on a text. Indeed, it is significant that a writer with no obligation to concentrate on classical texts, and even less obliged to choose a particular one, should go out of his way to do so, even though he intended a work of general political advice rather than a textual commentary. No other writer on the state had gone about his task with such self-imposed limitations, let alone chosen an author whose views were in some respects antithetical to his own, and whose diffuseness and length demanded a considerable amount of labour even by humanist standards. The answer to this problem seems to be that, while for the great scholars of his time Livy was of little importance, Machiavelli was going back to the type of humanism we discussed in the previous chapter, typified by Rucellai and Pontano, with its regard for Livy's authority; but that at the same time he was challenging this tradition, aiming to emulate but to surpass it. He chooses Livy precisely because the Decades are associated with a certain type of humanist scholarship, and goes even further by focussing attention on something previously of only relative importance. But he deals with Livy in a way that goes beyond that of his predecessors. Moving from the admiration of republican Rome already glimpsed in some of his earlier works, he takes some of the traditional subject matter of the

(1) But for the differences between the political ideas of Polybius and Machiavelli, see Sasso's essays on Polibio e Machiavelli: costituzione, potenza, conquista and La teoria dell'anacyclosis in Studi su M., Napoli 1967.

humanists and subjects it to a new inquiry. He is in a position between reverent and iconoclastic; he is prepared to treat Livy polemically, but also to enthuse to a greater extent than anybody before over some of what he finds in him. We must therefore now consider in more detail this novel approach, and assess how much Machiavelli accepts and rejects of his chosen subject-matter.

The occasions on which Livy makes his views on a subject explicit are rare (in contrast with, say, Polybius). When he makes some generalisation on a minor topic, however, Machiavelli seems eager to agree with him. In 1.47 he quotes Livy, 4.6.11 to the effect that "*alios animos in contentione libertatis et honoris, alios secundum deposita certamina in incorrupto iudicio esse*" and goes on to explain why this is so. In 3.15 he cites, again in Latin, Livy's opinion that it is wrong to have more than one commander in a war (4.31.2). On major issues, cases where Machiavelli takes up Livy's views are equally few, but here we find that they are in serious disagreement. 1.58 opens thus:

"Nessuna cosa essere piú vana e piú incostante che la moltitudine, cosí Tito Livio nostro, come tutti gli altri istorici, affermano."

Apart from the two instances of Livy's viewpoint that Machiavelli quotes (6.20.15 and 24.25.8) one might also mention his "*ut sunt mutabiles volgi animi*" (2.7.5) and the many events in his account which controvert Machiavelli's individual points in favour of the multitude; for in general the impression one gets from him is that they are a selfish, fickle lot, rarely willing to act for the common good unless cajoled into it by the patricians. What we remember from Livy is episodes to the discredit of the plebs like the secession to the Mons Sacer (2.31.7. seqq.), the threats of boycott of military service, the subversion of the state by blocking

executive procedure (3.11), or the Terentillian proposal (3.9 seqq.). To the credit of the patricians there are numerous episodes - the gallantry of the Fabii, for instance, or the stoicism with which the old nobles face death at the hands of the Gauls in 5.40. Of course, Livy is not comparing the plebs with a prince, as is Machiavelli; but he leaves us in no doubt as to what are his views on the reliability of the masses.

Another serious disagreement occurs in 2.1 on the question of whether Rome owed her empire more to virtù or to fortuna. Some, according to Machiavelli, say that fortune was more important; "e pare che a questa opinione si accosti Livio ... La qual cosa io non voglio confessare in alcun modo". Neither Machiavelli nor Livy of course deny the power of fortune - indeed, another example of the Florentine's agreement with Livy's views on this subject is to be found in 2.29 - but they have rather different concepts of the part played in Rome's expansion by her arms and laws. There is no dynamic quality of virtù apparent in the Decades; the main qualities of Livy's Romans (their honour and patriotism and so on) have no part in Machiavelli's insistence on a conscious and constant concern for the state in its own right, its internal stability and expansion externally. Here lies the key to the difference between the two authors: Livy's Romans are talented and upright, but almost passive compared to those whom Machiavelli portrays as battling against all the forces which attack the State. Because he is aware of the difficulties of politics, those who are politically successful immediately acquire the attribute which he calls virtù. He is not, then, saying that when Livy ascribes a Roman success to fortune he is necessarily wrong; but that the part played by fortune is over-emphasised in Livy's account

at the expense of virtù. Machiavelli does not make any specific reference to passages where Livy's views are apparent, but one imagines he is thinking of passages like this one :

"Plurimum in bello pollere videntur militum copia
et virtus, ingenia imperatorum, fortuna per omnia
humana maxime in res bellicas potens" (9.17.3).

An instance of the power of fortune is found a little further on:

"sic fortuna exercuit opes ut insignes utrimque
clades et clara ipsorum ducum ederet funera" (9.22.5)

One might also mention the conventional pairing of virtus and fortuna, without any special emphasis on the first quality, which is found occasionally and which does nothing to diminish the haphazardness of the picture which Livy gives of Rome and to which Machiavelli objects so strongly. (1)

(2) Change and continuity in the state

Machiavelli is, then, at odds with Livy's attitude, at best a negative one, towards the plebs and Rome's virtù. But as regards the facts of Livy's account, rather than his opinions, Machiavelli of course finds a great deal to admire; indeed, his admiration is often uncritical, an exaggeration of what Livy gives as the truth. And with this excessive praise goes on occasions a carelessness in contrast with the critical eye for detail of a scholar like Poliziano.

The first major theme raised in the Discorsi - and the most important - is that of change and continuity in the state. Polybius, though unacknowledged by Machiavelli, is generally credited as being behind the exposition in Discorsi 1.2 of how Rome became "una repubblica perfetta" and maintained its stability instead of passing through a cycle of change. But when Machiavelli comes to develop this idea further he uses, of course, Livy rather than Polybius. Immediately after 1.2 he goes on to examine Rome's stability, and how it paradoxically

(1) On the pairing of virtus and fortuna in Livy, cf. R.M. Ogilvie's Commentary on Livy, 1-5, Oxford 1965, 708 (n.to 5.34.2.)

grew out of strife, but in later chapters he comes back to the other problem, that of change in the state, since continuity alone is not enough to make the state strong. In 1.20 he talks briefly of the succession of rulers, pointing out how a republic is bound to be better off in this respect than a monarchy (and incidentally talking in the conventional, Livian manner of Rome "godendosi.. la virtù e la fortuna"). In Book 3 he raises the problem of how a state must, if it is to survive, keep regenerating itself by going back to its roots. In 3.1 he takes an overall look at the Roman republic and sees a pattern of decline and renaissance in its public life, with its men and institutions periodically bringing it back towards its beginnings. This is, of course, not Livy's pattern, but one that is consistent with his account. 3.6 on the question of violent change, does not depend primarily on Livian examples, but some of those used are specially emphasised ("ed è rado lo esempio indotto da Tito Livio"; "non lo può meglio dimostrare Tito Livio.."; "né può essere questo maggiore esempio nell'una e nell'altra parte").⁽¹⁾

The subject is further examined in chs. 7 and 8, in both cases with Livian examples. But Machiavelli rather exaggerates the swiftness and unanimity of the Romans' judgement on Manlius Capitolinus in ch.9; in fact there had to be two trials as the first took place within sight of the Capitol, and hence a "damnandi mora" before what Livy calls the "triste iudicium" (6.20. 5 and 11). In 3.26 an unusual aspect of the collapse of a state is discussed: the detrimental effect of women. Livy provides the examples of Lucretia, Virginia and the girl from Ardea, who incidentally was not "ricca", as Machiavelli would have it, but "plebei generis" (4.9.4). Finally, as we have mentioned before, 3.49 returns to the idea of 3.1 with several, accurately given,

(1) In this chapter one might also compare Machiavelli's "nella roba, nel sangue e nell'onore" with Livy, 6.35.6: "rerum, quarum immodica cupido inter mortales est, agri pecuniae honorum"; but this is probably just coincidence.

examples from Livy.

Change, though, as in the case of Ardea, is often harmful rather than necessary, and besides the chapters we have examined Machiavelli also develops a theory of how continuity of strength can also be given by a certain internal stability. We have already seen how Machiavelli rejects Livy's explicit judgement on the plebs; and in the case of Machiavelli's views on the justification and benefits of the strife between the plebs and the patricians there is basically a similar clash of views, though this time Livy's opinions are only implicit. However, it is impossible to overlook the polemical tone of 1.3, where, after a deliberately controversial opening sentence, Machiavelli talks of the patricians as setting out to do all the harm they could to the plebs, "spitting forth the poison in their breasts" after the expulsion of the Tarquins. This is in contrast with what Livy implies in 2.1.3-6, where he expresses no qualms about Rome's new-found liberty and thinks it just as well that it came no earlier, or else the city would have been shaken by the "tribuniciiis procellis" of "illa pastorum convenarumque plebs" in a city which belonged not to them but the patres. But on the specific point that the tribunes were appointed to safeguard the plebs and "ovviare alla insolenzia de' Nobili", Machiavelli is justified by Livy's remark that the tribunes should be to the plebs "auxilii latio adversus consules" (2.33.1); and of course the consuls were rarely anything but senatorial in their sympathies - Valerius and Horatius, for instance, "quorum consulatus popularis sine ulla patrum iniuria nec sine offensione fuit" (3.55.1), caused a scandal with their mildly left-wing sympathies. However, though Livy offers no explicit opinion on the tribunes at the time of their first appointment, we

find later this remark:

"Tribuni ... semper reguntur a multitudine magis quam regunt" (3.71.5).

Earlier, too, the impression that, unlike Machiavelli, he did not regard the tribunate as an essential or valuable institution is confirmed by his consideration of how the nobles could have avoided this and other concessions:

"Haud tam facile dictu est faciendumne fuerit quam potuisse arbitror fieri ut condicionibus laxandi annonam tribuniciam potestatem et omnia invitis iura imposita patres demerent sibi" (2.34.12).

It seems impossible to reconcile Machiavelli's view (developed in 1.4) of the class discord in Rome as ultimately beneficial with the theme, running through Livy's first books, of the alternating dangers of war and internal strife that Rome had to face to her disadvantage. Nowhere is there any suggestion that discord made Rome "free", and certainly not that it made her "powerful". If Livy had set out his views on this subject explicitly, there is no doubt that we would have found them tallying with Guicciardini's consideration on this chapter, which is highly critical of Machiavelli's viewpoint. Livy of course sees the problem of internal strife as fundamental - hence, no doubt, the importance Machiavelli attaches to it. He first mentions it in 2.23.1:

"civitas secum ipsa discors intestino inter patres plebemque flagrabat odio."

He speaks of it always as a nuisance, and sees it tending to arise when the preoccupation of war ceases and tending to disappear when this reappears. So we find the strife described as a

"malum... per aliorum quietem malorum semper exoriens" (3.16.4).

Earlier Livy writes, after the end of a threat from Veii,

"Urbi cum pace laxior etiam annona rediit... Ex copia deinde otioque lascivire rursus animi et pristina mala, postquam foris deerant, domi quaerere. Tribuni plebem agitare suo veneno, agraria lege; in resistentes incitare patres, nec in universos modo sed in singulos" (2.52 1-2).

One can contrast Machiavelli's mention of the patricians' "veleno" in 1.3. Further examples of this recurring pattern may be found in Livy, 2.54.2, 3.9.1, 3.66.3, 4.7.1 and 4.52.8; but Machiavelli does not take it up at all.⁽¹⁾ Nor does he see the effects of the discord in the same terms as Livy; his attitude is that, if the tumults led to the creation of the tribunes, they deserve the highest praise, while in Livy we find a profusion of illustrations of the negative and even harmful effect of such occurrences. The most explicit one concerns not Rome but Ardea (whose troubles, and the solution to them, are mentioned in Discorsi 3.27); however, the passage is worth quoting as its application is not limited:

"Frui namque pace optimo consilio cum populo Romano servata per intestina arma non licuit; quorum causa atque initium traditur ex certamine factionum ortum, quae fuerunt eruntque pluribus populis exitio quam bella externa, quam fames morbive quaeque alia in deum iras velut publicorum malorum vertunt" (4.9.2-3).

It is rare for Livy to be so outspoken, and the contrast with Machiavelli could hardly be clearer. Livy is evidently one of those who pay attention

"piú a'romori ed alle grida che di tali tumulti nascevano, che a'buoni effetti che quelli partorivano!"

We have seen what Livy thought of the garden law - the plebs' poison. In 1.37 Machiavelli admits that it was harmful

(1) Except briefly in Discorsi 2.25; but he uses it himself, as we shall see, in the Istorie fiorentine.

and an embodiment of their rather aimless ambition but sees as good in it exactly what Livy criticises: that it was a stumbling-block in the path of the patricians. He writes that although it took three hundred years for the struggle over the law to bring Rome down,

"si sarebbe condotta per avventura molto piú tosto in servitú, quando la plebe, e con questa legge e con altri suoi appetiti, non avesse sempre frenato l'ambizione de'nobili."

But though his opinion of the beneficial effects of the attempts at agrarian reform contrast with Livy's account, he clearly derives his appreciation of the importance of the matter from Livy. One may compare Livy's

"tum primum lex agraria promulgata est, nunquam deinde usque ad hanc memoriam sine maximis motibus rerum agitata" (2.41.3)

and Machiavelli's typically more familiarly expressed

"talché .. mai non si parlò di questa legge in Roma che quella città non andasse sottosopra."

In several other chapters in Book 1, and then later in Book 3, Machiavelli goes on to discuss particular aspects of the plebs; and, when it is a question of facts rather than opinions, generally follows Livy's version of things. 1.46 is entirely based on his account of how, after the fall of the Decemvirate, the nobles began to become overbearing, and Machiavelli considers that Livy had given a very shrewd analysis of the reason for this. The next chapter is on another episode in the struggle - the elections of tribunes with consular power - and again he is in entire agreement with Livy's judgement on the weakness of the plebian candidates. (1)

(1) Ironically, one of the tribunes was a plebeian (Lucius Atilius - cf. Livy, 5.13.3), though neither Livy nor Machiavelli noticed this.

In 1.48 he goes even further and praises the senate's tactics in preventing the election of plebeians either by putting up excellent candidates of their own or corrupt plebeian ones (cf. 4.57.11).

In 1.47 he mentions Pacuvius Calavius' success in restraining the plebs in Capua, but his view of the man is more generous than

Livy's:

"senatum et sibi et plebi obnoxium Pacuvius Calavius fecerat, nobiljs idem ac popularis homo, ceterum malis artibus nactus opes ... Rationem iniit qua et senatum servaret et obnoxium sibi ac plebi faceret" (23.2.2 and 4).

1.50-54 go on to other aspects of the struggle. How the tribunate avoided a constitutional impasse (though this did not always happen - cf. Livy, 3.11) is described in 1.50; and, in 1.51, how the senate got its way through apparent generosity (on which one may compare Discorsi 1.32). Again, it is typical of Machiavelli that he can take both sides, realising that the senate had its importance and needed to be able to get its way. Again, too, we find Machiavelli's vivid "Roma andò sottosopra per l'allegrezza" for the more sedate "Nihil acceptum unquam a plebe tanto gaudio traditur" (4.60.1). 1.52 is really an appendage to this, dealing with Florence and with Rome in later days, but Machiavelli appears to imply at the beginning that the practice of paying the troops and levying tributes chiefly on the nobles was discontinued. As there is no evidence for this - on the contrary, there is plenty of evidence that payment was continued - one should perhaps take "ordine" as referring not to this particular decision but to the general attitude of the senate to the plebs. 1.53 also implies that the plebs is easily influenced - this time the example is that of the proposed move to Veii. Livy does not make clear what was wrong with the proposal (nor does Machiavelli, in spite of his talk of "una falsa spezie di beni") unless it is in his record of the patricians' suggestion that it would only be to multiply

strife (5.24.9-10) or in Camillus' invocation of religious scruples (5.30 and 50 seqq). But the first line of thought seems enough to have justified a rejection of the move, and since, after its victory in the referendum and the distribution of some land (5.30) the plebs seemed happy (5.31), one assumes that its desire for Veii was not as strong as its desire to score a point for itself. Livy is also used for the examples of Fabius Maximus and Marcus Centenius Paenula. Another aspect of the malleability of the masses is provided by Livy in the next chapter of the Discorsi (1.54), which was presumably suggested by his imposing portrait of Camillus and such passages as 5.25.3 (on the leaders of the senate). But the speech of Camillus which ends Livy, 5 did not have such success as that in 5.30 (cf. "rem dubiam decrevit vox opportune emissa...", "5.55.1). A final discussion of the weaknesses of the plebs in Book 1 sums up the situation by reminding us of the strength which Machiavelli insisted upon earlier in the book; the discussion is in 1.57, headed "La plebe insieme è gagliarda, di per sé è debole." It will be noticed that while in some other chapters a consideration of Livy is relatively incidental, in all these (with the exception of 1.52) it is fundamental, demonstrating Machiavelli's debt to the Decades in evolving his ideas on this important question. Often there is no modern example at all to go with the Roman one. The same is true of a chapter in Book 3 where Machiavelli returns to consider "Quale fama o voce o opinione fa che il popolo comincia a favorire uno cittadino; e se ei distribuisce i magistrati con maggiore prudenza che un principe" (3.34). Here he uses with accuracy the examples of Titus Manlius, Scipio Africanus and Fabius Maximus. Earlier, in 3.11, he again mentions the problem of how the patricians should deal with the tribunes - by corrupting them or appealing to their love

of the common good.⁽¹⁾

If Machiavelli is prepared to accept the existence of a patrician class, and even to advise them, provided they do not have a monopoly of government, he cannot tolerate what in 1.55 he calls "gentiluomini". Where these parasites exist - as, he says, in contemporary Venice and elsewhere in Italy - there can be no equality, and corruption must follow. In such a state, a republic cannot exist, but there is instead need of a reforming "mano regia". This is a crucial chapter, for within the major theme of maintaining continuity it brings together the two ways of doing this: by having a balance between the classes within the state, or, where such stability (even if it arises out of strife, as in Rome) is impossible, by giving unlimited power to a single person. It is worth noticing that, like the question of the relationship between the plebs and the patricians, the parallel question of the "mano regia", based on the Roman dictatorship and the Decemvirate, is dealt with in Books 1 and 3 of the Discorsi.

The first chapter on the autocrat is 1.9, which deals, apart from some non-Romans, with Romulus. Machiavelli's analysis of his motives is not altogether contradicted by Livy, who praises him in 1.15. 6-8 and mentions his "immortalia opera" in 1.16.1; but in 1.6.4 he gives "regni cupido" as the cause of the "foedum certamen" between Romulus and his brother. Romulus is again briefly mentioned in Discorsi 1.10. The subject is next raised in 1.33-34, on the dictatorship and its advantages. Livy, too, is aware of the potential danger of such an institution (cf. 3.26.12)

(1) Fr. Walker, in a long footnote (Discorsi, ed. Walker, cit., vol. 2, 172 n.3) refers his readers to Livy, 6.37-42. It is true that here Appius Claudius Crassus is attacking the tribunes, if unsuccessfully. However, Machiavelli's remarks would seem to refer to 4.48, where the technique of "divide and conquer" is outlined by the same man; though there is no mention of "il commune bene" - an addition typical of Machiavelli's more optimistic view of the plebs.

but praises it, at least implicitly, in a passage which has a correspondence, probably only coincidental, with Machiavelli's thought. In 5.37.1-2 (just after the remark on fortune quoted in Discorsi 2.29) we find:

"civitas quae ... ultima experiens auxilia dictatorem multis tempestatibus dixisset ... nihil extraordinarii imperii aut auxilii quaesivit".

The use of "extraordinarius" is of course very similar to Machiavelli's concept of "straordinario" (found, for instance, in Discorsi 1.9 and 18).

1.35 and 40-45 examine the other side of the coin - the evils to which the Decemvirate gave rise. As often, Machiavelli offers advice to both sides, to the prospective tyrant as well as to the oppressed who have lost their freedom. The first part may be diametrically opposed to what one imagines were Livy's ideas, but the evidence which he uses is none the less Livy's; he feels no obligation to put reverence for the historian before a full consideration of the facts he relates. And in general he does keep close to Livy's account, though Fr. Walker has pointed out a couple of slips in 1.40⁽¹⁾ and Machiavelli has rather exaggerated the consistency of the Roman army in 1.43. While it is true that before the Decemvirate there is another example in support of his thesis (2.58. 6-8) and victories over neighbouring tribes followed its fall (cf. 3.61, 62-3, 66-70), the army was capable of cowardice (cf. 4.46.6), and in Livy, 2.24 and 43 we have examples of threats to withdraw their service (as routine as modern strikes, Livy implies in 2.43.2 - "redibat .. mos detractandi militiam"). In the second case, when the threat failed, the army expressed its resentment by refusing victory. This time they had no justification; Livy stresses the excellence of their commander (2.46.6 seqq). No

(1) Discorsi, ed. Walker, vol.2, 72 nn. 7 and 20.

ambition was involved on his part; the motive was the troops' own ambition. One must again ascribe this oversight on Machiavelli's part to his charitable disposition towards the plebs which made up the fighting forces. But, as I have said, Machiavelli has otherwise paid close attention to Livy in his account of the Decemvirate, quoting him frequently in 1.40 and clearly relishing his vivid style. The "saltare" in 1.41 is well justified by the dramatic quality of Livy, 3.36, and the quotations in 1.44 (one in Italian, one in Latin but rather inaccurate) had clearly struck the stylistically aware Machiavelli. Finally, in 1.45 Machiavelli has as usual provided his own judgement on an event; Livy only records the outrage at the idea of an appeal by Appius (3.56.6 seqq.) and the uneasiness, nevertheless, at his treatment, while Machiavelli selects one of these two reactions as the correct one and gives his reasons for doing so.

1.55, however, which we have already mentioned for its importance, is less careful in its use of Livy's account. As Fr. Walker points out,⁽¹⁾ since the booty from Veii was never called in (as Machiavelli admits), nothing is proved. The edict was issued by the senate not in order to get an account of the booty but to fulfil Camillus' vow (Livy, 5.23.8). The means of collecting the booty was chosen as being "quod lenissimum videbatur" but "ea quoque conlatio plebis animos a Camillo alienavit" (5.23.10-11). And the "bontà" and "religione" which Machiavelli considers then prevalent hardly transpire from Livy's picture of the plebs, unwilling to concede anything to the nobles even for Apollo's sake.

Having discussed Romulus in Book 1, Machiavelli turns to the last kings of Rome in 3.4-5, relying closely on Livy's account in the first chapter, where one can only make the small point that

(1) Discorsi, ed. Walker, vol. 2, 84 n.2 on ch. 55

Tarquinius Priscus' power was not formally confirmed by the senate, though Livy shows how he won their support (in 1.35.6). In the fifth chapter, however, Machiavelli's case is rather different from Livy's: searching to rationalise, he claims that Tarquinius Superbus' downfall was caused primarily by his abuse of power in general, not by his son's rape of Lucretia. In Livy's dramatic account - clearly intended to arouse emotion - we see that Lucretia was the direct cause of the revolt; but perhaps only the spark that lit the tinder of already existing discontent; this could be inferred from Brutus' speech at the end of Livy, 1.59. Later, however - though this is incidental to this chapter - both authors cite Lucretia as the cause of the expulsion of the Tarquins, without mentioning the other factors involved (Livy in 3.44.1, Machiavelli in Discorsi 3.26).

In a later chapter in Book 3 the relationship of the prince and his people and his responsibility for their character is examined, though all that Livy provides is the example of the pirate chief from Lipari.

Ultimately, and though it may not appear very often, the point of Machiavelli's concern with the internal strength of the state is the protection of its liberty. This is also a matter of concern for Livy, for whom the word has the same meaning; that is, the freedom of the people as a whole from subjugation either by another state or by some person or class within the state. As examples of the freedom of the people as a whole from the dominance of the kings one may cite Livy, 1.56.8, 3.54.7, 3.55.2 and 4.5.1; from the decemviri, 3.54.7; and of the plebs from the patricians, 3.55.2 and 4, and 3.56.1. However, it is difficult to see in Livy any evidence that the plebs was the "guardia della libert " (in other words, the body with control over the destiny of the state). Livy

certainly shows that the plebs, through the army, the tribunes and later through other offices, had a strong voice in government; but that its power was given deliberately or was absolute, and that this voice was the voice of good sense and one to which all Rome lent an attentive ear, is far from being his view. The second part of the chapter similarly tends to read more into the Decades than is justifiable, since there is no suggestion in them that "si disputo assai" on the ambition of those who want to keep what they have and those who want to get more, unless it be in 9.26.11, where the nobles say that the "novi" were the conspirators, not themselves, "quibus pateat via ad honorem".

1.49 examines the difficulty of maintaining liberty through laws, and the impossibility of this for states which were not free from the start. Machiavelli suggests that the establishment of the censorship helped to avoid corruption, but in the first place at least the senate regarded it merely as a means of increasing the number of plebeian magistrates (Livy, 4.24.3).

In 3.2-3 Machiavelli uses Livy's account of Iunius Brutus to show firstly his prudence in restoring Rome's liberty (Mamercus too was called "prudent" for his actions in 1.49) and then the necessity of "killing the sons of Brutus" if one wishes to preserve the state's freedom. In both cases he uses Livy accurately. The fall of the Tarquins is also the subject of 1.16-17, which (together with 1.18) concentrate on the incompatibility of liberty with corruption. One should remember, however, with reference to these chapters, that the transition from Tarquins to consuls was only a gradual one, as Livy is careful to point out (2.1.7-8) and as Machiavelli mentions himself in Discorsi 1.25.

(3) Religion

The subject of Discorsi 2.2 is the strength which results

from the liberty of a state. While free, the Samnites resisted the Romans extraordinarily well - "e Tito Livio lo confessa", writes Machiavelli. In 10.31.14, indeed, Livy says that, in spite of heavy Samnite losses,

"Adeo ne infeliciter quidem defensae libertatis
taedebat et vinci quam non temptare victoriam
malebant."

Earlier in the chapter Machiavelli attributes the greater love of liberty in ancient times to

"la diversità della educazione nostra dall' antica,
fondata nella diversità della religione nostra dalla
antica."

At a suitably early point in the *Discorsi* religion is in fact dealt with at some length. In 1.11 he takes up Livy's account of Numa's reforms and quotes two later examples of Roman religious devotion. Livy, of course, would be the first to agree on the importance of religion to republican Rome, and his emphasis on this clearly led to Machiavelli's interest. He points out the effects of Numa's actions:

"Qui regno ita potitus urbem novam conditam vi et
armis, iure eam legibusque ac moribus de integro
condere parat" (1.19.1);

"rem ad multitudinem imperitam et illis saeculis
rudem efficacissimam, deorum metum iniciendum
ratus est" (1.19.4).

But he does not go so far as Machiavelli does in putting Numa above Romulus;

"Cum valida tum temperata et belli et pacis artibus
erat civitas" (1.21.6)

implies that both were of equal value. It is possible that Machiavelli's higher opinion of religion is due to his seeing the

possibility of its use in politics, while Livy sees it as an end in itself, not subservient to a practical end. This idea is developed in 1.12. But Machiavelli is certainly right in saying religion played its part in public life in Rome, (even if this is a limited viewpoint); as well as the examples he gives to illustrate this in 1.13, one might mention 1.32.5 (Ancus Martius), 5.40 and 46 (during the Gallic invasion) and Camillus' appeal to religion to halt the proposed immigration to Veii in 5.50-52. A particular aspect of religion - auguries, and their psychological effect - is dealt with in 1.14 and later in 1.56. In 1.15 Machiavelli, "per non dividere questa materia", mentions the Samnites' use of religion but, no doubt through a slip of memory, confuses details from Livy, 9.40.2 seqq. with the events described in 10.38.2 seqq. (1)

(4) The state and the individual

Although religion for Machiavelli has to do with the state rather than with the individual, he is concerned elsewhere in the Discorsi with the mutual obligations of the state and its members. In general, the governing principle, enunciated in 2.2 (and a theme running through humanist literature) is that

"non il bene particolare ma il bene comune è quello
che fa grandi le città."

The state must nevertheless show gratitude to the citizens, and he discusses this in Discorsi 1. 28-31 with various examples from Livy. That of Scipio, he says, is the only instance of Rome's ingratitude (as in the Capitolo we have already mentioned); he is prepared to accept Camillus' exile as justifiable, although Livy is not disposed to look on it very charitably (cf. 5.33.1). 1.30 is not based on any specific event, but Machiavelli illustrates his point with

(1) Incidentally, both the MS. Harl. 3533 and the Giunta edition of 1531 give 40,000 as the size of the Samnite army, while Blado (1531) has LX.M.huomini, which agrees with Livy's figure (10.38.4).

a reference to the swift resignation of dictators in Rome, and this is borne out by such examples as those of Cincinnatus (3.29) Mamercus Aemilius (4.24 and 34), Aulus Postumius Tubertus (4.29) and Quintus Servilius Priscus (4.47). The next chapter goes on to the treatment of captains, which was always generous. In the first case - that of Sergius and Verginius - there was such chaos that nothing happened for a year and then only as a ploy on the part of the next military tribunes to strengthen their own positions (Livy, 5.11.4). Even so, it is remarkable that anybody had taken their side in the first place, even if only doing so "ut quosque studium privatim aut gratia occupaverat" (5.8.13), and that only a heavy fine was eventually imposed. A similar result had occurred in the affair of Marcus Postumius (cf. Livy, 4.41.10).

The following chapter (1.32) gives a rather different aspect of the behaviour of the state towards its citizens, saying that it should appear to do out of generosity what necessity compels it to do anyway; a similar point to that made in 1.51, which could also be seen as a chapter concerning the state as well as its component classes, as in both cases the titles refer to "una republica o uno principe". In the case of 1.32 and the remission of taxes, Livy leaves us in no doubt of the senate's aim:

"timebant... ne Romana plebs .. receptis in urbem regibus vel cum servitute pacem acciperet. Multa igitur blandimenta plebi per id tempus ab senatu data." (2.9.5-6).

At the end of the first book of the Discorsi Machiavelli points to another duty of the state: to give magistracies irrespective of the candidates' age, as Rome did with Valerius Corvinus, Scipio and Pompey. Again we see a hint of the point in 1.32 and 51 about the plebs being managed by the city (in other words, by the patrician class)

and of the conclusion in 1.55 that if one wants to do as Rome did one must not employ any discrimination against one's citizens.

On the other hand, it is made clear that the individual has reciprocal obligations in a free state. He must not, it is stated in 1.36, turn down lesser honours than those he may have had previously. The example from Livy is that of Quintus Fabius, who served under his brother although he had been consul three years before (cf. Livy, 2.46.4; not "lo anno davanti" as Machiavelli says)⁽¹⁾. Nor must the citizen hold private injuries against the state, but rather follow the example of Fabius Maximus given in Discorsi 3.47.

If the individual looks like being a potential danger to the state's liberty, there must be some means of accusing him, says Machiavelli in Discorsi 1.7-8, where the Livian examples considered are those of Coriolanus and Arruns in 1.7 and Manlius Capitolinus in 1.8. Later (in 3.28) the same idea is behind the examination of the case of Spurius Maelius. Here the contrast between "publico" and "privato" is made very clear, as indeed it is by Livy:

"Hic Minucius eandem publice curationem agens
quam Maelius privatim agendam suscepit" (4.13.8).

The state's liberty, then, depends on individuals as well as on its constitutional arrangements. But we have already seen that Rome's particular constitution was, in Machiavelli's view, of the sort that goes with territorial expansion rather than a mere concern to preserve what it already has. Which brings us to the other major aspect of the Discorsi (as opposed to the study of the internal policies of the state, with which we have dealt up to now): republican Rome's management of her external affairs.

(1) Fr. Walker (vol. 2, 66, n.1 to ch.36) seems wrong in saying that Livy praises Quintus in 2.46.4; rather, it is Marcus who is the hero since Quintus was "incautus" rather than brave.

(5) External affairs. Techniques of expansion.

There are several chapters in Book 2 of the Discorsi on Rome's method of expansion, starting (in ch.3⁽¹⁾) with her earliest efforts - her destruction of Alba Longa. Livy's evidence on the increase in the size of Rome bears out Machiavelli's point: "duplicatur civium numerus" (1.30.1); and for the "per amore" technique one might compare Livy, 1.8 4-7 on Romulus' immigration policy. However, it was Livy's express view that the destruction of Alba was "parum memoris legum humanarum" (1.28.11) - a consideration which Machiavelli typically overlooks; but Livy admits it helped Rome (cf. "hac fiducia virium Tullus Sabinis bellum indicit", 1.30.4). Similarly in 2.13 Machiavelli urges the use of fraud to help expansion, which is a most un-Livian sentiment, and anyway one which is not justified by the instance he gives. According to Livy it was not the Romans but the Latins who betrayed the foedus Cassianum of 496 BC and the renewed treaty of 358 BC; treaties which in any case allowed the Latins considerable freedom. Far from accusing the Romans, we find Livy talking of the "Latinorum infidum...foedus" (7.42.8).

Discorsi 2.4 outlines three methods of expansion, and Livy provides the evidence for the first as regards its use by the Etruscans (Livy, 5.1 and 33-4) and the Aetolians (32.32-4), and for Rome's method (referred to by Livy in 28.34.7), though Machiavelli's account of this is unappreciative of its complexities, its variations to suit particular cases. But he does come down to details in 2.7 (a chapter similar to something from the Miscellanea or De honesta disciplina). Here Fr. Walker and Bertelli give the reference to Livy as 5.30.8 ("septena iugera"), but it is clearly to 5.24.4 ("terna

(1) Incidentally, the form of this ch. is, exceptionally, like that of part of a commentary, opening (and, even more exceptionally, closing) with the quotation on which the discussion is based.

iugera et septunces"⁽¹⁾). For "preso Veio" cf. 5.24.1, "Veiiis captis". The colony was not being sent there, however, but to Volscian territory (cf. 5.24.4); hence the confusion on the part of commentators with 5.30.8, which concerns the distribution of land at Veii. Machiavelli is quite right in saying that the amount of land given to each colonist varied according to circumstances; apart from the figures mentioned we find "bina iugera" in 4.47.7, 6.36.11, 8.11.14 and 8.21.11. But he has not seen fit to give a full assessment of the problem; and here the similarity with humanist scholarship ends.

In 2.8 Machiavelli goes on to consider the causes of migration, and uses Livy for the Gallic invasion of the fourth century BC. He quotes the two causes which Livy ascribes to this (in 5.33.2 and 5.34.2) but then makes the error of saying that "Sicoveso passò in Ispagna"; in fact he was allotted the "Hercynei saltus" (cf. 5.34.4) which are in Southern Germany.

Machiavelli comes back to a more detailed point in 2.21, developing this into a general assessment of the part that law and order, as well as arms, played in Rome's expansion, mentioning the sending of a pretore to Capua and the Antiates' ensuing request for a Prefetto for themselves. He himself points to a mistake of his own in saying that "gli Anziati...domandarono ancora loro uno Prefetto" since it was not a praetor but a praefectus who was sent to Capua (cf. Livy, 19.20.5).⁽²⁾

The ideas expressed in the essay on the Val di Chiana reappear

(1) Fr. Walker says (vol.2, 103 n.1) that this is an "alternative reading" given by Farnsworth in his translation of the Discorsi (publ.1762), but it is of course merely the correct one for 5.24.4, with the omission, however, of viritim.

(2) Fr. Walker, who has noticed this error, seems to have misinterpreted Livy himself in saying that "L.Furius was sent there" (vol.2,126 n.3); L.Furius was the praetor who gave the laws about the sending of praefecti (Livy, 9.20.5).

in 2.23, which, like 2.3, opens with a quotation from Livy on which Machiavelli proceeds to expound. This chapter is also unusual in that it gives a lengthy quotation from Livy; and its being in Latin helps to show the more scholarly position Machiavelli had adopted since the earlier work. In addition to Camillus' speech he now takes two further examples from Livy. The first, concerning the judgement of the senate on the Privernates, also uses copious quotations from Livy (8.21); the second shows the harmfulness of being neither cruel nor kind to one's subjects with the example of the Samnites' folly in merely humiliating the Roman army at the Furculae Caudinae, in spite of Herennius Pontius' advice. Livy's account of his speech in 9.3.4-13 is in fact very like what Machiavelli thinks himself, with its talk of the "media via" especially close to the advice on the "via del mezzo" which is first found in the Val di Chiana essay.

The success of the Romans' methods is followed up in the next chapter (2.24) by a discussion of the usefulness of fortresses. Apart from making the point that they were not used even in the cases of the Latins and the Privernates, Machiavelli says that the fortress at Taranto was no great help to Fabius Maximus (cf. Livy, 27.15-16). Livy emphasises the help given by the Bruttian's treachery (27.15.9), which would cast doubt on Machiavelli's version, but doesn't say that it was all-important, and talks of the inferiority of the Tarantini in any case. (27.16.1).

The Roman procedures of never purchasing territory and never leaving one's citizens unarmed are the subjects of 2.30. For the first point, Livy, 5.48.8-49.1 is used, where Camillus turns up in time to stop the Gallo-Roman bargain over Rome. Livy's "dique et homines" becomes "fortuna" in Machiavelli's version, which is rather unfair on Livy. But Machiavelli's vocabulary when

discussing the Florentines and the Venetians ("le cose che si acquistano con l'oro, non si sanno difendere con il ferro") clearly reflects Livy's "(Camillus) ferro... non auro recipere patriam iubet" (5.49.3). And there is one more example from Livy - Hanno's remark (in 23.13.2) which admirably bears out Machiavelli's claim of the loyalty of Rome's subjects.

(6) Techniques of warfare

Although, as we have mentioned, law played its part in the beginnings of the Roman empire, the Discorsi pay much more attention to arma rather than iura in Rome's external affairs, with Book 2 especially concentrating on techniques of warfare and Book 3 on captaincy. But the importance of military matters is also recognised in Book 1. In chapter 19 he claims that the succession of Rome's first kings shows that being "armato di prudenza e d'armi" is the only way to ensure one's rule, although Livy's account of Tullus Hostilius implies that it is wrong to be immoderately warlike. But Tullus earned Machiavelli's admiration even more by refusing to use auxiliary troops (Discorsi 1.21), though the idea of it being possible to appeal to the Samnites at a stage when Rome was concerned with local raids from Alba and the Sabines shows a lack of a sense of historical proportion.

One of the conclusions arising from the case of the Horatii-Curiatii encounter (Discorsi 1.22) is examined in 1.23: that one should not risk all of one's fortune except on all of one's forces. It is pointed out that one should therefore not try to defend passes, although as Guicciardini pointed out there is indirect evidence in Livy to suggest this is not necessarily true. But if Machiavelli is for once too critical of Rome over

the Horatii, he is rather too generous in 1.38 when he describes the "generosità e prudenza" of the senate in refusing troops to the Latins and Hernici; Livy makes it clear that there was no choice for a people "vix instantes sustinentibus clades" (3.6.4).

It is not until Discorsi 2.6 that Machiavelli formally examines the question of Roman military procedure, and he singles out three points: that wars should be "corte e grosse" and that afterwards colonies should be sent out to the conquered lands. The question of pay and booty is also important. Then in 2.9 he deals with the causes of wars, and the Decades provide two examples of them arising by chance and one of a deliberate war, started by Hannibal. Finally a referency to Livy, 7.30-1 provides an example (which goes with a contemporary one) of how to defend yourself when you are not strong enough - but the connection with the rest of the chapter is chronological rather than thematic.

If the rewards of war to the soldiers and the state are important, wealth does not necessarily ensure success, and the tenth chapter of Book 2 shows that the Romans recognised this. Again, there are three references to Livy (who like Machiavelli is indifferent to economic factors); but, as Fr. Walker points out,⁽¹⁾ it was not always the case that generals in Livy's account preferred battle to flight. The last example given - of the surrender of the Capuans, allies of the Sidicines, to Rome - leads on to the next chapter where Machiavelli points out the folly of this alliance. He then takes from Livy, 9.14 the example of the attempt of the Tarentini to stop the Roman-Samnite war (with his "ridendosi" a typical adaptation of Livy's description of the consul as "motus dictis eorum," 9.14.2).

(1) Vol.2., 108 n.11.

The evidence taken from Livy in Discorsi 3.12 for and against the question of whether to take the offensive in war concerns Hannibal, Scipio and the Roman forces after the first Punic war, as well as Agathocles' attack on the Carthaginians. That Scipio sailed to Africa in order to save Italy transpires from Livy, 29.26.6, though Scipio only "volgaverat" this story, he says. But, of course, Hannibal did return to Africa (Livy, 30.19). Scipio's motives in 28.44 seem to be patriotic pride and revenge; the specific one of drawing off Hannibal clearly dates only from the following year (204 BC). The number of troops sent against the Gauls after the first Punic war Machiavelli claims to have been "diciotto centinaia di migliaia"; this is perhaps a confusion of the figure given in the periocha of Livy, 20, "octaginta milia".

Discorsi 2.14 and 15 both derive from the same incident in the Latin war, described at the beginning of Livy, 8. It is interesting to note again that as in the Principe Machiavelli is willing to use Rome's enemies for examples of correct procedure - the Latins in this case, Hannibal and others elsewhere; a bold step in comparison with most authors we have mentioned. In 2.15 two more examples from Livy follow; the first, from the third Decade, again holds up a non-Roman (Apollinides, a Syracusan) as an object of praise. The third is again from Livy, 8, and shows how the Lavinii, "dum deliberando terunt tempus" (cf. Machiavelli's "differirono tanto a diliberarlo"), earned Rome's enmity without actually having helped the Latins.

Machiavelli turns in 2.16 to the examination of Rome's troops, a subject to which he comes back in 2.18 and 20. He starts by talking about the battle in 340 BC between the Romans and Latins. Machiavelli says it is Livy's "opinione" that the two sides were so

equal that the losers would have had to become "servi" of the victors. This is not a view explicit in Livy's account, but the significance of the conflict is quite clear; Appius in 8.5.4-5 could hardly talk of "consanguinitas" and propose a constitutional merger unless both sides considered themselves equal; nor would Livy portray the Romans working up so much religious fervour (cf. 8.6.5-6) over a mere skirmish. The consuls' vow adds to the feeling of a crisis. And in two places (ib. 6.15 and 8.2) Livy makes the point of the similarity of the two sides, adding in the second case that the only difference was the "animi" of the Romans. But when Machiavelli says

"ma solo (Livio) vi fa differenza, che i capi dell'esercito romano furono piú virtuosi che quelli dello esercito latino,"

he is either referring to the glory implicit in Livy's account of the consuls, or perhaps remembering (and confusing) the place where he says

"ut facile appareret ducibus validiorem quam exercitu rem Romanam esse" (2.39.2; cf. Discorsi 3.13).

While dealing with this battle, Livy gives a sketch of Roman battle formation (8.8), which Machiavelli borrows in order to contrast that of "gli eserciti cristiani". In talking about the relative thinness of the rear ranks he is amplifying Livy, 8.8.9 and 12 with common sense. Nor does Livy specifically mention alae here, only saying that each of the four legions had 300 horse attached.

But while Machiavelli has intelligently amplified what Livy writes here with information from elsewhere, he has perhaps been a little too quick to ignore evidence in favour of cavalry (as opposed to infantry) in Discorsi 2.18. Tullus Hostilius had a

victory over the Sabines due to his cavalry (Livy 1.30.10), and shortly afterwards Tarquinius Priscus doubled the number of equites (1.36.7). The dismounting of the cavalry in Livy, 2.20 (at Lake Regillus) could be said to have taken place merely to put heart into the weaker infantry, as in 3.62-3 where significantly the cavalry remounted after having shamed the infantry into further efforts:

"equites ... ex equis desiliunt..., pudore deinde animos peditum accendunt... Eques... se ad equos recipit;... simul et in hostes impetum facit.
Non aliorum eo proelio virtus magis enituit."

But such cases are few, and in support of Machiavelli (whose anti-⁽¹⁾ aristocratic feelings no doubt biased him against cavalry anyway) there are such instances as those in Livy, 7.7, 7.33 and 9.39, as well as that from 9.22 which is mentioned here (with the confusion, incidentally, of Sora for Saticula). It is surprising that Machiavelli doesn't mention the incident in 4.38: it is referred to in Discorsi 3.18, but without making clear what was Tempanius' exact ploy.

With the use of two Livian examples ⁽²⁾ Machiavelli amplifies in Discorsi 2.20 what he had previously written in the Principe (12 and 13) on auxiliary and mercenary troops. The way he phrases his introduction ("ne mi è paruto in tutto da passarla, avendo trovato in Tito Livio, quanto a' soldati ausiliari, si largo esemplo") would suggest either that his attention was drawn to these examples after writing the Principe, or that, not wishing to depart in 1513 from "gli esempli italiani e freschi", he had considered the

(1) As well as his feelings about contemporary armies.

(2) There is a brief mention of the Rhegium incident in the periocha of Livy, 12; it seems unnecessary to look to Polybius, 1.7 as the source.

mention of Hiero and of the Goths sufficient; though both these examples, while more dramatic and important respectively than those of Capua⁽¹⁾ and Rhegium found in the Discorsi, were inappropriate in a chapter on auxiliaries as opposed to mercenaries. It would have been logical to include the early Roman examples in the Principe, but it may have been that Machiavelli was looking for something striking, if not strictly appropriate, rather than that he was unaware of the incidents he mentions in the later work. Similarly, just afterwards, in chapters 24 and 29 he uses Livy where he could have done in the Principe, on fortresses and fortune; though in the latter case Livy may well have been too pessimistic for his mood of 1513.

Book 2 of the Discorsi contains several other chapters on various aspects of warfare. Occasionally Machiavelli's point is relevant to other situations, even though his example may be taken from wartime; this is the case for instance with 2.22, where from a discussion of what Numisius, a Latin praetor, advised his people to do after a defeat by the Romans he arrives at a generalisation about the mistakes made by men in affairs of importance. Chapter 25, however, does not carry its conclusions so far. It opens with a summary (hardly verbatim, as Fr. Walker claims) of Livy, 2.44.7 - the only occasion, incidentally, in the Discorsi where Machiavelli acknowledges the explicit theme running through the first books of Livy of the alteration and interdependence of internal and external strife. He notes the unifying effect of "la paura e la guerra" in this instance, though he could have strengthened his case by pointing out Livy's own insistence on this point (all the more

(1) The Capuan incident is also mentioned in Discorsi 2.19 as an example of the harm which acquisitions can do even to a well-constituted republic.

noticeable in view of his usual reticence in explaining what is going on) in such places as 3.66.3, 4.7.1 and 5.7.10. The offence given by the Veientes on the occasion mentioned in this chapter is further considered in the subsequent one (2.26) where it is shown that insults are two-edged weapons. It is true that they didn't harm the Samnites in Livy, 9.2.14, but then the Samnites were in rather a strong position. Two more incidents from Livy underline Machiavelli's point. They show Rome's care not to rile people, presumably lest they should turn against them, presumably, though in the case of Capua Livy talks of "bona venia" (7.41.3) as the reason for the dictator's banning of any reproof of the deserters. This sort of difference in motivation between the two authors' interpretation of events is characteristic of the Discorsi.

Such insolence as is described in this chapter arises, says Machiavelli at the start of 2.27, from victory or the false hope of victory, and he goes on to say that one should be content with victory. The two examples he takes from Livy come from the third Decade, and in both cases he has praise for non-Romans (Hanno and Hannibal) for preferring a prudent peace to a rash war. The subsequent chapter comes back to a consideration of the effect of insults, and is in close agreement with Livy on the rashness of the three Fabii, though the Roman author perhaps had politeness rather than political expediency in mind when he criticised the ambassadors. He is, characteristically, concerned with their lack of "Roman" behaviour: "mitis legatio, ni praeferoces legatos Gallisque magis quam Romanis similes habuisset" (5.36.1). Both this chapter of the Discorsi and the preceding one, incidentally are addressed to a republic or a prince, as are chapters 20 and 30 of this book.

In 2.31 "uno memorabile esempio adotto da Tito Livio nelle sue istorie" serves, together with a Greek one, to show how exiles should not be trusted. This time again an example from a military context is given general relevance. Livy's account of Alexander's campaign is brief (cf. 8.24.18) but he describes his death in detail. Machiavelli's reason for the king's expedition amplifies Livy's (given in 8.24.2). In the Decades the betrayal by the Lucanians is put down to their race, not to their banishment. ("ut pleraque eius generis ingenia sunt," ib.24.6).

2.32 (on Roman methods of occupying towns) is unusual in that no modern examples are given for comparison. In his early essay on the taking of Pisa, Machiavelli concluded that assault is best, surrender being in that case unlikely and a siege wasteful; here, however, he says that in most cases the Romans brought about surrender by "una continova oppressione di scorrerie, dipredazioni ed altri mali trattamenti"; sieges, assaults and a victory through conspiracy in the town are all unreliable. He first considers Roman methods of assault, referring to the technique of "aggredi urbem corona" (cf. Livy, 10.53.1, 23.44.3) and those of battery and tunnelling (he refers to Livy, 5.19 and could also have mentioned 2.17). Since these last are too tiring, he shows how Scipio used an alternative method, and how Rome also had recourse to a straightforward siege. Livy, 8.22-26 provides an example of "violenza furtiva"; but a small slip can ruin this approach, as in the case of the Capitoline geese. After the only non-Roman example (from Plutarch) Machiavelli mentions the possibility of surrender through a desire to be protected (as in Capua) or to be well governed (as in Rhodes and Marseilles). But more often than not surrender is forced, and this was the method most often used by Rome; no examples are given, however.

(7) The Commander

Machiavelli gives even more attention in the Discorsi to the army's leader than to its composition and such general aspects of warfare as we have been discussing. This is perhaps surprising in view of his personal concern with the practicalities of the training of troops, but it reflects Livy's own emphasis on the part played by Roman generals, as well as, it may be, the admiration for heroic military leaders evident in Italy in Machiavelli's time. Most of the chapters on this subject are in the third book, but there are also references to it in the first two. We have already mentioned 1.31, on the treatment of Roman captains, when discussing the chapters on gratitude. In 2.33 he illustrates the free hand given to Roman military commanders; as often, he is condemning circumspection, though he mentions no possible abuse of this freedom of action. But it is true that Rome accepted the necessity of unfettered leadership, both in military and civil life.

Discorsi 3.10, starting in the style of a commentary with a quotation from Livy, uses examples from the first and third Decades to show how a captain cannot avoid battle when his opponent wants it. In 3.12, however, the usual order is reversed, and after some introductory remarks (on how a captain should make it necessary for his troops to fight, and not necessary for the enemy) Machiavelli gives a contemporary example and a late Roman one before coming to four Livian examples; one notices how he uses a variety of techniques in the structure of the chapters themselves, just as in the work as a whole. The first example uses the quotation already found in Principe 26. In 3.13 he discusses whether one should have more faith in a good captain with a weak army or in a weak captain with a good army and, as we would expect from the number of chapters devoted to

captaincy, he prefers the former. The next chapter is on the effect of "le invenzioni nuove che appariscono nel mezzo della zuffa e le voci nuove che si odino". The first of the three examples from the Decades is condoned by Livy too, who describes Quintius' ploy as a "salubre mendacium" (2.64.6). 3.15 is on the sharing of the imperium and the confusion it gave rise to against Veii; and on Agrippa Furius' standing down to avoid such a situation⁽¹⁾. But 3.16, on the link between real virtù and difficult times, does not make any specific reference to Livy.

Three mistakes are made in the short seventeenth chapter of this book, where Machiavelli is talking about the folly of appointing somebody to a command after having offended him in some way. Firstly, Livy makes no mention of Claudius Nero being reproached after allowing Hasdrubal to escape. Secondly, though Nero's manoeuvre caused considerable alarm in Rome, it was brilliantly successful; and Machiavelli's view of it as reckless seems to be caused by his third error, the confusion of Nero with M. Livius Salinator, who was the one guilty of harbouring a grudge. This mistake was corrected in the 1532 Giunta edition, but the emendation cannot have been Machiavelli's, as has been pointed out. As often, he seems to have been relying on an inevitably imperfect memory; and the same appears to be true in the next chapter. Here he writes "Aequi" for "Volsci" (the opposite of the mistake made in Discorsi 1.40). And Tempanius was not, with his section of the army, "ritirandosi anche esso"; on the contrary, when he heard that Sempronius' camp had been abandoned, he refused to move, "metu insidiarum". Nor did he sack the camp of the Volsci, but after visiting the Roman camp marched off to Rome

(1) Fr. Walker incidentally translates the latter incident as if the remark was Agrippa's, while M's "e'dice" seems rather to refer to Livy himself, as the Latin text confirms.

before the Volsci could return. Machiavelli is, then, hardly justified in saying "se ne tornò a Roma vittorioso".

3.19 deals with the treatment of the troops by their commander and claims that kindness, as used by Titus Quintius Capitolinus, is more necessary than the kind of cruelty employed by Appius Claudius (Livy, 2.55 seqq.). Here, incidentally, we find Machiavelli reiterating his view that the plebs and patricians in Rome had "equale imperio" and that hence neither could treat the other harshly. In view of such a description of the position of the plebs as is given by Livy in, for example, the questions of marriage between the classes (conubium) in Book 4 and debtors in Book 6, Machiavelli's picture is surely too idealistic, ignoring the real ability of the nobles to maintain social privilege.

3.20 gives three Roman examples and one Greek one. All three Roman ones occur both in Livy and in Frontinus' Strategemata, and the fact that the first two (concerning Camillus and Pyrrhus) are found in the same section of the latter work (4.4, De iustitia) suggests that Machiavelli had it in mind. But, although his accounts of Camillus and the Falisci and Pyrrhus and Fabricius are very similar to Frontinus', he has clearly consulted Livy for such details as the nobility of the schoolmaster's pupils and the stripping of his clothes before sending him back (cf. 5.27.1 and 9); nor does Frontinus state that Pyrrhus left Italy as a result of Fabricius' generosity, while this may be implied from the statement at the beginning of the periocha of Livy, 14 that Pyrrhus went to Sicily, after the mention in the periocha of Book 13 of Fabricius' action. The chapter ends with a reference to Hannibal's success in spite of his apparent indifference to such kindness, and this is further discussed in the following chapter, using Scipio as a contrast. Machiavelli's portraits of the two men accord with Livy's. In 28.25.8 Livy says that Scipio was unfamiliar with mutinies and scared both of the resulting chaos

and of excessively punishing those guilty. In the end he chose what he considered a mild course - summoning and executing them. On the other hand, in one detail Machiavelli is a little too kind to Hannibal when he says that all the cities of Italy rebelled to him, a mistake which he corrects himself in Discorsi 2.30 and later in this very chapter where he talks of "Napoli, e molte altre terre che stettero in fede del popolo romano." A similar type of comparison (though this time between leaders on the same side) follows in 3.22, between the harsh Manlius Torquatus and the humane Valerius Corvinus.- Again, the account is correct except in one minor respect: the two men, if Machiavelli is referring to the honour of triumpha, were not "di pari trionfi", according to Livy, who records four for Valerius but none for Manlius.

3.23 compares Camillus to Manlius in the harm that befell him because of his attempts to serve his country. Machiavelli gives three reasons for the hatred of Camillus; the first that, as he alleges Livy says,

"i danari che si trassono de'beni de'Veienti che si venderono, esso gli applicò al publico, e non gli divide con la preda."

But in 5.20.10 -21.1 Livy says that on the adoption of Licinius' proposal the army helped themselves to the booty. No "beni" were sold, but only the "libera corpora" of the Veientes (cf. ib.22.1), and it was this that caused grievance: "Ea sola pecunia in publicum redigitur, haud sine ira plebis." But the second and third reasons are correct (and Fr. Walker seems wrong in saying they are only "facts" rather than "reasons for hatred"). The use of the white horses was "clarior quam gratior", and the vow to Apollo "plebis animos a Camillo alienavit" (Livy, 5.23).

The main subject of the next two chapters (3.24 and 25) is Cincinnatus: his rejection of the move to prolong his consulship (with a mention of the first prorogation of an imperium) and his poverty.⁽¹⁾ It is rather idealistic, though, to say that because there was poverty in Rome - the result, no doubt, of her feudal organisation, with patrician landowners and plebeian clientes - it was therefore honoured. It is not until Livy, 8.28 that we read that there is a continuous struggle on the part of the plebs to shake off the hold of the rich patricians on their lives.

Machiavelli returns to the subject of captaincy a few chapters later, in 3.30, where he discusses how Camillus distributed power among his fellow-tribunes instead of having recourse to the dictatorship. In fact this had been done just previously (cf. Livy, 6.2), but he does not mention the less important occasion. He makes a couple of slight errors: Livy tells us (in 6.6.4) that the Roman concern had been diverted from the Etruscans with the appearance of a threat from Antium. It was against the Antiates that Camillus decided to lead his army, not the Etruscans, leaving Q. Servilius to guard against these as well as the Latins and Hernici. That "del primo volle essere capo lui" (i.e. Camillus) is wrong too, as he made Publius Valerius his fellow-commander - incidentally in contrast to what Machiavelli, in Discorsi 3.15, considers good practice. More errors are again found in the next chapter. The generalisation that bad luck never made Romans "abietti" is obviously an over-simplification; exceptions are found in, for instance, Livy, 4.12 and 5.38. We can see that while at times Machiavelli is considerably more realistic than Livy, for instance in his appraisal of policy, at others he idealises Roman virtues even more than him. On minor points, one might mention

(1) In 3.25, as with Frontinus in 3.20, Machiavelli has supplemented examples of poverty from Valerius Maximus (4.4) with details from Valerius' original source, Livy.

that the phrase in the passage about Scipio and Antiochus "ed il resto lasciasse nello arbitrio del Popolo romano" has no basis in Livy's account; and that Camillus (who again is said to have been fighting the Etruscans) did not exactly go about the camp "parlando.. a questi e quelli soldati" but rode out "ante signa obversus in aciem" to address them (Livy, 6.7.3). The next two chapters (3.32 and 33) each contain another minor error; in the first case, according to Livy (6.21.6) the reason for the suggestion to send envoys to Rome was not that the Latins had been beaten but that a pestilence delayed the Roman campaign, and in the second, Machiavelli wrongly says that the Manlii were consuls, when they were two of the tribuni militum consulari potestate (Livy, 6.30:1-2).

In 3.37 Machiavelli has also departed somewhat from Livy's account. Firstly, according to him, Valerius carried out his skirmishes in order to remove fear of the enemy; according to Livy they were "temptandi hostis causa", and before them Valerius exhorted his troops that in them they might not be afraid of the enemy. Then his account of what happened after the battle of Cannae differs somewhat from that of Livy, who says that the Campanians, who were the allies whom Rome told to look after themselves, wanted in fact to revolt; their mission to the Romans was ostensibly to offer assistance (but in reality perhaps only to sound out the Roman situation). What Rome told them meant that assistance was of no use; they would simply have to fight singlehanded. Having thus ascertained Rome's weakness, the Campanians proceeded to revolt.⁽¹⁾

The group of chapters on the use of dishonest methods (3.40-42) all disagree with Livy in another way - in that we can hardly imagine the Roman historian countenancing such methods. Notably, the

(1) Fr. Walker's phrase "loyal Campanians" (vol.2, 202 n.8) is thus also erroneous.

two examples of fraud given in 3.40 are of non-Romans; in 1.53.4, Livy shows that he thinks such action (even within the limits Machiavelli mentions) is not the done thing in Rome: "(Tarquinius Superbus) Gabios... minime arte Romana, fraude ac dolo, adgressus est." 3.41 also goes considerably further than is justified by anything in the Decades when it talks about ignoring considerations of justice or injustice. But the facts given by Machiavelli are accurate : the difference with Livy is in the way he generalises from these facts.

3.45, on the other hand, in which Machiavelli advocates cautious rather than impetuous generalship, is in line with the general Roman approach (although he might have mentioned that Fabius' defensive tactics were designed to suit his opponents and not an invariable attitude - c.f. Livy, 10.28.3-4). There is a condemnation of headstrong action in 6.23. Rarely was precipitate action advocated (Varro's example at Cannae was a disastrous exception), and with good reason, since Roman armies were usually fighting in strange country and with little numerical superiority over their opponents.

3.47 takes an example from military events (Fabius' ignoring of his private dislikes for the public good) but applies it to any "buono cittadino". The distinction between "public" and "private" is, as we have mentioned, fundamental in Machiavelli's political works; it had been made in connection with civic life in 3.28 (on the subject of Spurius Maelius) and in 2.2, where he contrasts the "bene commune" with the "bene particolare", and is equally important in warfare, as has already been seen in 1.36.⁽¹⁾

(1) This is a point further emphasised in the first few pages of the Arte della guerra by Fabrizio Colonna.

The last chapter concerned with captaincy is 3.48, where there is another small error. The dictator had in fact returned from Rome; Machiavelli seems to have confused this incident with an earlier one (in Livy, 10.3.6) when he was still absent, although Livy is inclined to disbelieve that this earlier incident could have happened to Fabius (then magister equitum). It was, however, the legate in any case who saw through the deception; hence perhaps the mistake.

Having dealt with the main themes that run through the fabric of the Discorsi - so well interwoven that such distinctions are rather arbitrary - we may finally look at one or two general points which throw more light on the difference between the use of Livy by Machiavelli and by others.

(8) The continuity of history

Firstly, although it is a commonplace in Renaissance historiography that the study of history is useful in deciding one's own courses of action, the proemio to the first book of the Discorsi shows that Machiavelli felt that in practice people failed to apply the lessons of their readings and to realise the similarity between ancient and modern situations. He thus gives greater emphasis than other scholars to the continuity of history, not only by comparing examples from Livy with those from his own times but also by occasionally devoting a chapter to the continuity of character that exists between nations or within a nation or family. In 1.39 he compares the re-election of the consuls in Rome with that of the Dieci in Florence and concludes that "In diversi popoli si veggano spesso i medesimi accidenti". In Book 3 he devotes two chapters (36 and 43) to the French character and another (46) to the reasons "Donde nasce che una famiglia in una città tiene un tempo i medesimi costumi."

(9) Topics which Machiavelli does not discuss. His uncritical approach to Livy

This emphasis on continuity is only an aspect of the essentially practical way in which Machiavelli read Livy; a method which, as we have already seen, meant that he was indifferent to the assiduous scholarship which one normally associates with those who had used Livy in their works. But he was writing neither a compendium of Roman institutions nor an inquiry into the accuracy of what Livy says; and we thus find in the Discorsi on the one hand omissions of some aspects of Roman political life and on the other an indifferent attitude to historical truth - for not only was Machiavelli not a Valla, ready to criticise what Livy claims to be true, but he ignores Livy's own warnings as to the authenticity of certain events.

The omissions are of no great importance, for in general Machiavelli has seized on all the main aspects of Roman policy. An exception is the use of interreges, a practice originating in the intervals between the tenure of the monarchy but often used thereafter to break constitutional deadlock (e.g. in Livy 4.43 and 50, and 5.17). We have seen that he almost completely ignores as well the connection between internal and external strife. Rather more significant is the omission of some evidence concerning the position of the plebs. The problem of conubium (Livy, 4.1-5) gives an important insight into their segregation. He seems to want to gloss over the gross inequality between the two classes, for if we look at the two longest passages in the first five books of Livy's narrative which are passed without comment (2.23-31 and 48-57) we find that he seems to be avoiding the times of some of the worst effects of the strife between plebs and patricians - reluctant perhaps to argue in detail his case for the paradoxical benefits of class conflict.

As for Machiavelli's uncritical approach to Livy's account, we find that he is prepared on a few occasions to accept as fact what Livy offers as legend or hypothesis. In Discorsi 1.7 he gives the story of Arruns and the Gauls about which Livy (in 5.33) is rather vague. And the one example he quotes from Livy in 1.12 is perhaps not the best one he could have chosen in view of Livy's open mind on why the man offered the remark - "seu spirito divino tactus seu iuvenali ioco" (5.22.5). Again, one may observe that he sometimes tends to generalise from a rather frail basis, though elsewhere he is quite prepared to attack Livy's interpretation of events.

(10) Quotations from Livy; his texts of Livy and the development of his reading of the "Decades"

Another aspect of Machiavelli's inattention to detail is the inaccuracy of most of the quotations he gives from the Decades, although the very fact that he could make a close approximation from memory, where he is not deliberately paraphrasing, is an immense tribute to his learning. In an age when books were not widely diffused it was obviously natural for scholars to rely more on memory, and one cannot judge Machiavelli by modern standards, even if he had a copy of Livy beside him or could have checked his quotations from somebody else's. But apart from telling us something of Machiavelli's working habits, through their inaccuracies, the quotations from Livy in the Discorsi have another use in helping, through the passages which we may presume to be accurate, to narrow down the field of the possible texts from which he worked. The first possibility is that he used the printed copy his father had from Nicolò Tedesco in exchange for having compiled an index of "tutte le città e monti e fiumi di che in dette Deche si fa menzione." (1) The date of the agreement is 1475;

(1) Bernardo Machiavelli, Libro di ricordi ed. Olschki, Firenze 1954, 14, and 35.

the edition must therefore have been either one of the two Roman ones of Sweynheym and Pannartz (probably 1469 and 1472; the second in two volumes and probably only a reprint of the first), the Roman one of Ulricus Gallus (i.e. Ulricus Hahn; the date is 1470 and it is in two volumes) or the de Spira edition of 1470, published in Venice. In 1486 Bernardo writes that he has sent a copy of the Decades to be bound (and Niccolò is sent to collect it) but it is not clear whether this is the copy he had earlier or a new one; in view of the expense of such a large work, however, it is almost certainly the same one as before.⁽¹⁾ The second possibility is that Machiavelli used a later edition, one of the thirteen published in Italy before the Aldine edition of 1518-21 (there were also editions published in Lyons, Paris and Maintz); the third, that he had a manuscript copy of Livy; and the fourth, that he used at various times two or all three of these sources. The last possibility appears the most likely, for the following reasons. In the Blado (1531) edition of the Discorsi, we find in 2.23 a reading that is only given by Gallus - "sit Latium an non sit"; all other editions of Livy have "sit Latium deinde an non sit", and so does the Giunta edition of the Discorsi (published later in 1531 but independently of the Roman edition). Modern texts of the Discorsi, which are based on a Harleian manuscript as well as the two 1531 editions, mostly omit the "deinde"; an exception is the "Italia" edition of 1813. On the other hand, in Discorsi 3.36 modern editions read, in the long quotation near the end, "sola se ubi velint" and

(1) This is assumed by Prof. Whitfield Discourses on M., VII, cit., 29. But Cesare Olschki in his note to the Libro di ricordi, cit., 220 (on p. 260) thinks that this refers to another edition, "verosimilmente l'edizione di Pavia del 1483 (HAIN, 10078)". But no such edition is to be found in the Hain-Copinger bibliography.

"iussu iniussu", while both the 1531 editions omit the "se" and the "iussu". Gallus' is the only early edition of Livy which has the "se"; and no editions until the editio Frobeniana of 1535 have the "iussu".⁽¹⁾ There is no critical edition of the Discorsi establishing whether and, if so, how far the original quotations were emended by the printers of the work. In its absence, and if we give weight to the readings on which modern texts are based, the reading which coincides with the Frobeniana suggests that at some time Machiavelli may have worked from a manuscript copy of Livy. On the other hand, as far as the two Gallus readings are concerned, the fact that, in modern texts based on both the Harleian manuscript of the Discorsi and the earliest editions, a reading appears which is peculiar to one particular text of Livy strongly suggests (if we exclude the possibility of coincidence) that Machiavelli may at another time have used the Roman edition of 1470.

Yet we find other instances where every edition except Gallus' (and sometimes the Aldine) has the reading found in the Discorsi; for example, in 2.14, "... nisi conscientia.." where Gallus has "... nisi a conscientia..."; in 3.15, "...alii aliud..." where Gallus and Aldo have "... aliud alii.."; in 3.25, "...nisi effusae.." where Gallus has "...nisi ubi effusae..."; in 3.30, "...eius..." where Gallus and Aldo have "...eius viri..."; and in 3.40, "...neque..neque.." where Gallus has "...neque.. nec...". (But again, coincidental misquotations are possible). One may conclude, then, that unless Machiavelli had a manuscript copy which combined all these readings he could have used at various times the Gallus edition, a later one, (which he may have owned or borrowed) and (if "iussu iniussu" is correct)

(1) If "iussu iniussu" is the correct original reading, this would help to remove the doubts about the authenticity of the codices used by Gelenius in his revision of Livy, 7-10 for the 1535 edition.

a hand-written copy. If this is so, the implication is that his familiarity with Livy was acquired gradually, rather than just from his father's copy as is often assumed in spite of the size of the work in question. But above all, one must not forget the development, even if it is the culmination of years of study, which has taken place in the Discorsi in comparison with Machiavelli's previous works, and which is only attributable to a new reading of Livy, to a new attention and keenness. To the ideas of the Principe, which are often repeated in the Discorsi, are added the new concepts which we have been examining: those which concern the internal conduct of the state - the position of the classes, its religion, the "mano regia", the mutual obligations of state and citizen - and the state's external activities, its expansion by military means. The reading of Livy has added another dimension to Machiavelli's thought, providing him with the pattern of a state where citizens were not yet corrupt, where the public good came before private considerations, yet which had provisions for an autocratic power in times of crisis. The Decades provide Machiavelli with a complete political solution, leading him to combine new ideas with those of the Principe. The work on principates is obviously limited to a particular phase of the state, and dedicated to the personification of this phase in Florence: the Medici; and one cannot help seeing as the catalyst of the Discorsi - the reason for his increased attention to an author with whom he was already partly acquainted - his reaction to the Medici (seen in the dedication of the work) which is closely linked with his new friendship with Cosimino Rucellai and his circle. In the Orti Oricellari was to be found the combination of humanism and novel thought which typify the way in which, out of his reading of Livy, Machiavelli derived the Discorsi.

III

THE USE OF LIVY IN WORKS AFTER THE "DISCORSI"

The "Arte della guerra"

The Libro dell'arte della guerra was published by Giunta in August 1521, while Machiavelli's other major prose works only came out after his death. The Principe, though it has some formal links with previous works in the genre, had a revolutionary content; and the links between both the form and the content of the Discorsi and those of other works are outweighed, as we have seen, by the many unique features of Machiavelli's use of Livy. But the Arte della guerra, for all its originality (such as the introduction of the dialogue form), is recognisable as belonging to a traditional genre, not least in Machiavelli's use of classical sources; and hence its more immediate popularity. Long before its composition,⁽¹⁾ there had appeared (in Verona, 1472) Roberto Valturio's long and comprehensive work De re militari. Its popularity is testified by the publication (Verona, 1483) of a translation of it by Paulo Ramusio, who like Valturio came from Rimini. Later came the De re militari of a writer from Piacenza, Antonio Cornazano; a work in terza rima which was also published, some years after its first edition, by Giunta in 1520 in a version purged of as much of its lombardisms as the verse would allow.⁽²⁾

-
- (1) The discussions on which the work is supposedly based are generally considered to have taken place in 1516. If the work is really a memorial to Cosimino Rucellai, then it must date from between 1519 and 1520; Cosimino died in 1519, but no mention is made of Fabrizio Colonna's death in the following year.
- (2) It is quite possible that Machiavelli himself was involved in the preparation of the work for the Florentine edition.

In 1524 in Venice appeared the "libro Vallo nominato", an essentially practical work by Battista della Valle, very different from its predecessors, against whose classical erudition it reacted by claiming that though "la scientia è il fiore", "la militia" is the fruit to which one should give one's attention.⁽¹⁾ There are no examples given (let alone classical ones) but an abundance of practical details; chapter 21 of the first book is like an extract from a Boy Scout manual with its advice on how to rub two laurel sticks together to make fire.

This kind of detail certainly has its place in the works of Valturio, Cornazano and Machiavelli, but these all rely primarily on Roman literature for their examples and advice; they are the sort of people to whom della Valle refers when in his first chapter ("Del sapere de Capitani") he says that other authors have written

"solamente per autorità, e imitatione de altri authori,
e non per propria exercitatione";

unlike himself.⁽²⁾ Machiavelli of course knew something about soldiery at first hand, but one can contrast the constant appeals of Fabrizio to "i miei Romani" with della Valle's anti-literary intentions:

"Et ad tal che piú chiaramente da tutti potesse essere inteso (perché son certo questo libro pervenera in mano de dotti, e indotti) non ho voluto exquisitamente solum per gli huomini eruditi, e intelligenti scrivere, ma con basso, inculto e trivial parlar..."

Both Valturio, on the other hand (in 1.3, and cf. 2.1) and Cornazano (1.7) agree that the captain must be well-read, and though Machiavelli ranked men of letters below successful captains (Discorsi 1.10

(1) He is quoting from Cornazano (1.1, line 3) but clearly he rejects the latter's approach.

(2) Cornazano, however, came of a family which included distinguished condottieri; cf. M.A. Silvestri, Gli antenati e la famiglia di messer A.C., Torino 1914.

and Istorie fiorentine, 5.1) he also said

"debbe el principe leggere le istorie"

with special attention to military matters (Principe 14). Similarly, all three authors give close attention in their military works to examples of classical procedure.

Valturio, like Machiavelli, acknowledges the worthiness of examples provided both by "nostri" (that is, Romans) and "alienigeni" like Hannibal. Cornazano, who calls the Carthaginian "el buon Annibal ceco E grande" (1.7), is also eclectic, even giving modern examples, but also gives great emphasis to Roman supremacy in the art of war -

".... quest'arte, che da i buon Romani
Come da fonte suo par che si spanda" (1.3)

In 3.2 he condemns modern warfare as a "mistier bastardo" because of the influence of "oltramontani"; the chapter starts :

"L'arte del soldo già solea fiorire
Ne gli inclyti Roman come anzi appare
Si che'l sexto del ver non si po dire.
Ma questa nostra vita, è come un mare,
Gotti e barbari assai la Italia entoro,
E cominciossi l'arte adulterare.

But he praises the Italian soldiery, singling out such individuals as Braccio Sforza and Niccolò Piccinino; although like Machiavelli he says that today "el ben publico è in fondo" (3.2), and this is the reason for their failure.

The Arte della guerra is also concerned with the resuscitation of "alcuni degli ordini antichi" of what Fabrizio calls "i miei Romani". In Book 6, for instance, we read:

"Io vi dico, di nuovo, che gli antichi facevano ogni
cosa meglio e con maggiore prudenza di noi."

Machiavelli does impose some limit on his devotion, though he does not go so far as Cornazano in saying that the Romans would not have stood much chance against modern methods. Yet the concessions he makes to modern methods (and here we can see the influence of his own military experience) are quite significant. Fabrizio says in Book 6, on the subject of encampments, that he will not observe all the Roman methods but only "quella parte quale mi pare che a'presenti tempi si confaccia." Other concessions include a combination with Roman techniques of German weapons (in Bk.2) and the Greek phalanx (in Bk.6). His admiration for the Germans and Swiss in contrast with Cornazano, who died ten years before the invasion of Charles VIII,⁽¹⁾ which soon put an end to any faith in Italian military techniques. On the contrary, Machiavelli condemns the Italians (though Fabrizio has some kind words for Machiavelli's own "ordinanza"!) and speaks less harshly of the "oltramontani":

"Io vi dico di nuovo che i modi e ordini della guerra in tutto il mondo, rispetto a quegli degli antichi, sono spenti; ma in Italia sono al tutto perduti; e se ci è cosa un poco più gagliarda, nasce dello esempio degli oltramontani" (Bk.7).

Here he is talking about German methods of constructing a portcullis; he goes on:

"Voi potete avere inteso ... con quanto debolezza si edificava innanzi che il re Carlo di Francia nel mille quattrocento novantaquattro passasse in Italia"

and considers what techniques in building fortresses can be learnt from the French. He is also rather different from the encyclopaedic Valturio in limiting the details of the Romans which he gives; Fabrizio-

(1) Cf. G.Bertoni, La data della morte di A.C., in the "Giorn.stor. della lett. ital." 74 (1919), 176-8.

says in Bk.7:

"la intenzione mia non è stata mostrarvi appunto come l'antica milizia era fatta, ma come in questi tempi si potesse ordinare una milizia che avesse piu virtù che quella che si usa."

But if the Arte has a slightly different attitude to the Romans from its predecessors, it is more like them than the Discorsi not only in its willingness to modify Roman methods but in its avoidance of the restrictions of basing oneself on one particular source.

Livy is now, in the Arte della guerra, a minor source compared to Sextus Julius Frontinus' Strategemata and, especially in the earlier parts of the work, Flavius Vegetius' Epitoma rei militaris.⁽¹⁾ Perhaps Machiavelli did not want to duplicate the material he had recently used in the Discorsi; he may also have felt Livy was not an adequate source on military matters, though he showed no hesitation in this respect in the earlier work. But he no doubt felt it much less convenient to unravel from other irrelevant material the limited information offered by Livy. The Decades nevertheless still have their importance, even if it is a limited one; and the same was true for Valturio and Cornazano, even though both these authors, especially the former, show a much wider range of reading than Machiavelli. In the first chapter of Valturio's second

(1) For an account of the sources, see L.A. Burd's Le fonti letterarie nell' "Arte della guerra" (Roma, Atti dell'Accademia dei Lincei, ser. 5., Classe di scienze morali, etc. vol. 4, 1896-7); but unfortunately he only includes classical and not contemporary literary sources.

There is an article by Neal Wood on Frontinus as a possible source for M.'s method, in the "Journal of the History of Ideas," XXVIII No.2 (Apr.-June 1967), 243-8. But again, recent sources are, curiously, ignored; nothing later than Marsilius of Padua is mentioned as a possible influence on M.'s method.

book (on the fruits provided for the military art by philosophy and history) Livy is only mentioned at the end, after such major authorities as Josephus, Caesar and Suetonius. But he is drawn upon on several occasions in the course of the De re militari. We have already (in the first chapter) seen the reference on the character of the Gauls in 6.8,⁽¹⁾ and one might add other examples. In 4.1 (on law) Valturio talks of the effects of the laws of Romulus, Numa and the other kings, as well as those of the Decemvirate. Talking of the exercising of one's body in 4.3, he mentions Scipio saving his father on the Ticino (cf. Discorsi 3.34) as well as a modern example. In 5.1, which is on the four types of virtue and the captains who have possessed them, we find as examples of prudentia Numa Pompilius, Fabius Maximus and Hannibal; and under benignitas Scipio Africanus (cf. Discorsi 3.21). It is interesting to note that just as the examples of Valerius Corvinus and the cruel Manlius Torquatus follow that of the kindness of Scipio in Discorsi 3.22, so Valturio went on to contrast Valerius and Manlius as well as others such as Hannibal:

"Est huic confinis aequalitas quaedam familiaritasque cum exercitu quae res maxime milites ducum amantissimos effecit: in qua notus Valerius Corvus (sic) et Marius ex nostris, ex externis Hannibal; et hae quidem artes benivolentia et amore sicut obiectae severitas atque imperiositas exercitum ac subiectos metu frenant. His artibus Marcus Curius et Q. Cincinnatus et Papirius Cursor et Fabius Maximus notissimi. Sed nullus in ea re Iunio Bruto Manlioque par Torquato...;"

and he goes on to describe how patriotism drove them both to kill their sons (for Brutus, cf. Discorsi 3.3). Then in the sixth book Livy, 22

(1) In this chapter there is also a reminiscence of Livy, 26.44.9 in the phrase "in ferrum ruunt, et vulnera". In the first chapter we have seen how Rucellai also used a version of Livy's phrase in his De bello italico.

is quoted on

"Quando ex voluntario inter ipsos foedere militare sacramentum ad tribunos ac legitimem iurisiurandi ad actionem translatum est quidque iurarent se facturos" (6.5);

and in 7.1 Hannibal's "astucia" at Cannae in making the Romans fight with the sun in their eyes is mentioned, as it is in the fourth book of the Arte della guerra. In Book 9 several figures from Livy are given on the size of the Roman legion.

Cornazano also borrows occasionally from Livy; in 3.4, for instance, we find the examples of Camillus and the Falisci (cf. Discorsi 3.20) and Spurius Postumius (cf. Discorsi 3.42), to illustrate the subject of justice in war. Valturio is also concerned with this (in 4.1), but Machiavelli of course uses the example of Spurius Postumius to support the idea that forced promises need not be kept. Earlier, in 1.2, Cornazano writes :

"Hor qui un bel dubio a disputar m'invita:
Se Alexandro a'Roman guerra movea,
Come l'impresa gli fusse seguita."

What follows is clearly a summary of Livy, 9.17-19, where he asks the same question and of course comes to the same conclusion. But Machiavelli does not mention this rather interesting insertion in Livy's account except, rather vaguely, in Book 2 of the Arte.

As we have mentioned, the main sources for Machiavelli in the Arte della guerra are Frontinus and Vegetius. But if we are to say that Livy has now been relegated in importance, we should see first to what extent the Strategemata and Epitoma rei militaris were used in the Discorsi. There is one instance where Vegetius could have been used. In Discorsi 2.16, as in Arte della guerra 3, Machiavelli uses Livy, 8.8 for details of Roman battle formation,⁽¹⁾ and in both

(1) Or what Livy thought it was: for its impracticability cf. P.Pieri, Guerra e politica negli scrittori italiani, Milano-Napoli 1955, 33-36.

cases he adds details about the position of the cavalry and their formation in alae. Livy does not mention this in the particular chapter used for Machiavelli's description, and if it was not deduced from elsewhere in Livy it is possible that Machiavelli got this information from the Epit. rei mil. 2.15. However in the Arte della guerra he adds more information from Vegetius (2.8) on the funditores and so on, and one might say that if he had been using Vegetius in the Discorsi as he was in the later work he would have mentioned this as well. It is difficult, then, to prove the use of Vegetius in the Discorsi, and if he was used there is certainly no comparison with the extent to which he is used in the Arte della guerra.

There are several common subjects in both the Discorsi and the Arte della guerra for which, in the latter work, examples from Frontinus have been used but for which, in the Discorsi, there is no evidence of the use of the Strategemata. Instances are the use of religion in war (1.11, 13-15; A. della g. 4, where Frontinus 1.11.8-16 is used); sieges (D. 2.32; A. della g. 7, where Frontinus 3.1-11 is used); "invenzioni nuove" in battles (D. 3.14; A. della g. 4, where Frontinus 2.4 is used); and foreseeing the enemy's plans (D. 3.18; A. della g. 6, where Frontinus 1.2 is used).⁽¹⁾ It thus emerges as possible that Machiavelli didn't know the works of Vegetius and Frontinus at the time of writing the Discorsi; but it is more likely that he chose not to incorporate evidence from the former author and examples from the latter, as he shows little interest in using other authors he may have known to supplement Livy. Around 1518-20, though, he may have turned to one of the volumes incorporating the two authors (Vegetius was published ca. 1475 in Utrecht, but in 1487 Eucharius Silber in Rome brought out both authors in one edition, and this was reprinted in 1494 and 1497, with another edition published

(1) In Discorsi 3.20 it is unlikely that Frontinus rather than Livy is M's. source.

in Bologna, 1496 and 1505). This, together with the reading of contemporary works which undoubtedly influenced Machiavelli's choice of subjects and his approach to them, may well have been the inspiration of the Arte della guerra; nor must we forget his own experience with the organisation of the Florentine militia from 1506-12, which contributes several points to the work. Certainly the Arte does not owe its inspiration to Livy. Of the examples Machiavelli takes from Frontinus, only about one third are derived originally from the Decades; and several are posterior to the time of the Gracchi, which in both works is mentioned as the beginning of Rome's decline. This does not stop him giving as examples Caesar and Sulla, for instance, in the Arte della guerra, with Frontinus as his source. As for Vegetius, he provides exactly the sort of information about details of Roman military procedure which Livy neglects to offer. However, we must now consider the extent, and then the limitations, of the use of Livy in this work.

In Book 1, Livy (the epitome of Bk.18) may have been used for the story of Regulus Attilius, though, as in Discorsi 3.25, Valerius Maximus could equally well be the source. But the general remarks throughout the book on the broad aspects of Roman policy, the defeats of the Roman army and of Hannibal's, and the refusal to hire mercenary soldiers against Carthage all clearly come from Livy; so too does the reference to "gli ordini che quelli primi re fecero in Roma, e massimamente Servio Tullo." The next book has a general reference to the rarity of mentions of aste in "tutte le giornate nella sua istoria da Tito Livio celebrate", and what appears to be a loose paraphrase of 9.17.10 to show that Roman armies were "i meglio armati eserciti che fussero mai".

The third book, with its description of Roman battle formation, is that which is most indebted to Livy, but there are a number of minor examples in Book 4. There is firstly the ploy we have mentioned

of Hannibal at Cannae⁽¹⁾ (Livy, 22.43. 10-11), and shortly afterwards those of Scipio against Hannibal and Hasdrubal.⁽²⁾ For the latter Frontinus (2.3.4) could be the source, but Machiavelli uses a detail which he doesn't mention - the middle section of Scipio's army marching slowly, which must be derived from Livy, 28.14.14. (This also comes in the Vita di Castruccio Castracani, where Castruccio is supposed to have used this tactic). Later, discussing the question of avoiding battle, Machiavelli uses two examples also found in Discorsi 3.10, those of Fabius Maximus Cunctator and Philip V of Macedon, derived from Livy, 22.18 and 32.11-12; but the example of C. Sulpicius, fundamental in this chapter of the Discorsi, is omitted here. There is also an episode from Livy not previously used, that of Fabius and his magister equitum. This is found in Frontinus (2.5.22) as well as Livy, 22.24 seqq., but Livy is more probably the source; Frontinus is talking about ambushes, not soldiers being keen or otherwise on battle, and no other examples from this chapter are used until Book 6, while usually Machiavelli groups together more than one from the same chapter. Nor does Frontinus give the detail about "ritenne i suoi negli alloggiamenti".

In Book 5, Livy was probably used for the information on booty: for the quaestors, cf. Livy, 4.53.10; for the consul being able to "concedere una preda a'soldati", cf. 7.27.8 and ib. 37.17; for the booty going to the treasury, cf. 10.46.5 and 37.57.12, as well as 36.36.2, where however we see it was possible for a reserve to be held back for such purposes as holding games. Then, after Fabrizio has warned against not being suspicious of some foolish move on the part of

(1) Also mentioned by Valturius (7.1) and Cornazano (7.4). They also both give the subsequent example of Marius and the Cimbri, but Valturius calls them Gauls, which suggests M. was using Cornazano.
 (2) Also found in Valturius (6.12); the Zama example only in Cornazano, 3.1.

the enemy, but without using the Livian example of Discorsi 3.48, he uses the example of Nabis (Livy, 34. 39.8-9) to supplement the examples from Frontinus on defence in a tight corner. But in Book 6 there is only one instance of use of Livy - the populace's judgement of Manlius Capitolinus (Livy, 6.19-20; cf. Discorsi 1.58).

Book 7, chiefly on the defence of and attacks on positions (cf. Cornazano, 8 and 9), uses the same phrase - "aggredi urbem corona" - and the same example from Livy, 26. 42-6 as in Discorsi 2.32. The capture of Veii (Livy, 5.19 9-11) also comes in this chapter of the Discorsi, where we find exactly the same phrase ("nel quale modo i Romani presono la città de'Veienti", though without "i Romani"). The example of Marcellus at Nola could have come from Livy, 23.16 or Frontinus, 3.16.1; in many cases, as we have mentioned, the only indication that Frontinus is the more likely direct source is the presence of other examples from the same chapter of the Strategemata, and here this example stands on its own. Just afterwards come the final Livian examples. The selling of the field where Hannibal was encamped occurs in Livy, 26.11.6. The Roman decision to keep a force outside Capua is in *ib.*8. Livy refers to the importance of the siege in 25.15.18 *seqq.*; it was carried on even after the defeat at Herdonea (*ib.* 22.6 *seqq.*) and "vis omnis belli" put into it (26.4.1). Hannibal's decision to move to Rome was designed to force Rome to loosen her grip on Capua (26.7.3-5) but Rome, as Livy puts it, retained her pertinacia (*ib.* 12.1).

Apart from these occasions when Livy is used in much the same way as in the Discorsi, there are two points in Book 4 where Livy appears to have been used to supplement the Strategemata. After Fabrizio's account of the organisation of the troops in the battle of Zama, which comes in Frontinus, 2.3.16, he goes on to answer Zanobi Buondelmonti's question about the deployment of troops during the battle. The disposition of the troops is described by Livy in 30.33 (Frontinus'

source, of course) but it is likely that Machiavelli was using Frontinus when writing this passage as immediately afterwards he uses the example from the subsequent section (2.3.17). However, Livy is used for the answer to Zanobi; or rather, Machiavelli's memory of Livy. The point about the "seconda schiera" is alright (cf. Livy, 30.34.12); but that about the manoeuvre of putting troops out on the wings is completely confused. Hannibal's front line went out on the wings - the treacherous mercenaries whom the second line refused to let through but forced to flee to either side (ib.34.5-8); but Scipio did the opposite of what Machiavelli says - the principi and triarii went out onto the wings while the hastati remained where they were (ib.35.11). A few pages later, we find a mention of Fabius Maximus Rullianus, probably suggested by Frontinus (who in turn derived the example from Livy, 10.28) since examples from Strategemata 2.1 are used immediately before and after it. But as in Discorsi 3.45 Machiavelli also mentions P. Decius Mus, to whom Frontinus does not refer.

In contrast, there are a few instances where Machiavelli has used Frontinus without checking his facts with Livy's account. Again in Bk. 4, Livy does not say that Hannibal began to fear Marcellus, as Frontinus does; rather, he points out, in 27.26.1, Hannibal's equal grounds for hope and fear. (Nor, incidentally, does Livy mention Hannibal looking for a refuge, but describes him seeking out suitable territory for ambushes - 27.12.8, ib.26.7). Later in the same book, in spite of using the detail from Livy, 28.14.14 about the middle of Scipio's army marching slowly, Machiavelli uses the phrase "si ritirassono", which is closer to Frontinus' "retractam" (2.3.5) than to Livy's version. In the next book he uses Frontinus (1.5.16) for the example concerning Q. Minutius;

however, the Strategemata wrongly give the name as "L.Minutius", and he follows this rather than Livy, 35.11. Similarly, towards the end of Book 6, he gives Frontinus' "Cimbri" rather than Livy's correct "Celtiberi" (Livy, 40.30).

There are also one or two disagreements with Livy's account, when he is using it, just as we have seen in the Discorsi. The census instituted by Servius Tullus was not, as Machiavelli claims in Book 1, primarily designed for a military end but for both war- and peacetime (cf. Livy, 1.42.5, "...belli pacisque munia"; and he calls the division "paci longe maximum opus"). In Book 3 there is the disagreement we have already found in Discorsi 2.16 about the hastati being close together; but passages such as Livy, 30.33 would imply that the ranks were in fact normally closed, as common sense suggests.

Finally, there is the problem of the sources of Machiavelli's figures for the size and composition of the Roman army. In Books 3 and 6 he states that the number of Roman and allied troops in a normal consular army were equal, both consisting of two legions which together made about 11,000 infantry and 600 cavalry, though the allies could provide more cavalry. Thus the army consisted of 22,000 infantry and about 2,000 cavalry. There are two factors here: the size of a legion and the proportion of Roman and allied troops. It would have been natural for Machiavelli to have used a secondary source - unless we are to assume that he went through Livy himself to look for his information when others had done it before. He has not used Vegetius, 2.2, which only gives the figure of 6,000, nor Cornazano who in 3.1 merely repeats Vegetius ("Ciaschuna legione el numer tange Almeno di sei milia buon guerrieri"). Maffei, in Book 30 of the Commentarii urbani goes a little further by saying

that the numbers ranged from 3,300 to 6,600, but this is of course insufficient information for Machiavelli. Biondo, however, in Book 6 of his Roma triumphans, has this to say :

"Numerum quem legio habuerit omnium militum ostendit Livius in septimo... Senatus... decem legiones , conscripsit, quinum milium et ducentorum militum, equitumque trecentorum... " (1)

And he gives other figures from Livy, going up to 6,000 infantry and 200 horse, which could account for Machiavelli giving a compromise figure. Valturio (Book 9) is another possible source: he gives six other sources before giving figures from Livy varying from 5,000 foot and 300 horse to 6,000 foot and 200 horse.

But the obstacle to assuming that one of these is the source used in the Arte is the fact that they both offer evidence to contradict Machiavelli's other assertion that the number of Roman and allied troops were equal. Biondo writes :

"Sed maiores multo copias Romani per omnia stantis Romanae dignitatis tempora a latino nomine et Italis acceperunt... Livius enim praelium apud Trebiam libro XXII describens, Duodeviginti milia Romanorum erant, sociorum nominis latini viginti milia",

as well as other non-Latin troops. However, one could point out that this is mentioned a page or so earlier than the information on the size of the legions and could well have been overlooked by Machiavelli. Valturio quotes Livy, 40.36.6, where there were more Latins than Romans in an army, but previously he has given one instance (from Livy, 38) where there were less Latins and another (from Livy, 36) where they both provided two legions of 5,400 men.

(1) However, the text of Livy, 7.25.8 reads "quaternum milium" and some MSS even have "trecentorum peditum" instead of two hundred. But the mistake does not seem to be Biondo's as just afterwards he says that at Cannae the numbers were raised by 1,000 and 100 to make 5,000 and 300.

It is possible, then, that Machiavelli used Biondo or Valturio, but only on the size of the Roman legions - the alternative being that he used Livy directly. In any case, he has overlooked evidence in all three that more often than not there were more allies than Romans in a consular army and gone direct, unless there is another secondary source,⁽¹⁾ to Polybius, 3.107.12. The information is repeated briefly in 6.26.7 and ib.30.2, but it is not necessary to look to the less easily available source. But even Polybius, in spite of his categorical assertion, provides a contradictory example in 3.72.11. He is not, incidentally, the source for the size of the legion, as in 3.107 he only gives the range of 4,000 foot and 200 horse to 5,000 foot and 300 horse. It is typical that Machiavelli differs from his more scholarly predecessors in only giving one approximate figure.

In the Dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua, however, we find it stated that the allies outnumbered the Romans. The figures given as an example are 12,000 Romans to 20,000 allies (perhaps a misreading in the passage quoted above of "duodecim" for "duodeviginti"?).

(1) A possible intermediary source is Crinito, De honesta disciplina, 12.4, where he gives, with Polybius as his avowed source, the information that the Roman army consisted of four legions, that the size of the legion was normally 4,000 foot and 200 horse (rising exceptionally to 5,000 foot and 300 horse), that the allies provided the same number of troops as the Romans and that eight legions were raised at the time of the Punic wars. Carlo Angeleri (in his ed., Roma 1955) gives Crinito's source as Polybius, 6.19.5 seqq., but it is clearly 3.107.10-15 (with a short passage omitted in the middle). Prof. Whitfield, in Discourses on M., VII, cit., also mentions that Polybius, 6 might be the source but adds that "it is not a perfectly clear case" (36). But this hardly weakens his argument on the subject of the availability of the book in Florence. Nor should one overlook the use of Polybius, 6 in the Arte della guerra.

Dr. Hans Baron (1) considers that the contradiction shows that the Dialogo precedes the Arte as Machiavelli was coming to prefer Polybius to Livy rather than vice versa. But it is much more probable that in the Arte he overlooked rather than ignored evidence which went against Polybius, and very unlikely that in the Dialogo he would have preferred his authority to that of Livy, whether derived directly or through Biondo. This would suggest that, if Machiavelli did write the Dialogo, he wrote it later than 1520.

In answer to a question from Batista della Palla later in Book 6 Fabrizio states that 24,000 was the normal and 50,000 the maximum size for a consular army. The first figure coincides with the figures of 22,000 foot and 2,000 cavalry given earlier; the second appears to take into consideration the exceptionally large numbers of legions raised on occasions (e.g. Livy, 7.25 or 22.36), although all the legions formed more than one army. Again, Machiavelli contradicts Vegetius who says in 2.4 that in a single army there were never more than two legions "additis auxiliis sociorum".

But, in general, as one would expect from a work of this nature, Livy is of less importance than secondary sources; although Machiavelli would surely never have deliberately rejected his evidence. There is no question of changed allegiance (as Dr. Baron would have it). Since he was not interested in comparative research, the only question was that of the most easily available source. His enthusiasm for republican Rome, within the limits of what is relevant to the modern world, is still the same as in the Discorsi, and still linked closely to the Orti Oricellari. The Arte della guerra is written in memory of Cosimino, and has the young Alamanni, Buondelmonti and della Palla as the questioners of Fabrizio Colonna, a member of the family fiercely opposed to the Orsini (in spite of the "pace romana" instigated by

(1) In his article, M. on the eve of the "Discourses": the date and place of his "Dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua", in "Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance", XXIII (1961), 449-476.

Giulio II in 1511); and the Orsini were traditional allies of the Medici. Fabrizio is in some sense the alter ego of Machiavelli in the Orti - in real life of the same generation as him but instructing young men, and in the dialogue referring to Machiavelli's discussions in the Discorsi of artillery and avoiding pitched battle as his own. The work is dedicated to another man of the younger generation, Lorenzo Strozzi (1482-1549); but although he married Lucrezia di Bernardo Rucellai, and his brother Giambattista (but called Filippo after their father) married in 1508 Clarice di Piero de' Medici, (1) Lorenzo, according to Litta, hated the Medici in spite of these family ties. (2)

The change from the Discorsi, then, is one of method rather than outlook. Machiavelli has turned from the untrodden path of the Discorsi to more orthodox ways. After his experiment he has preferred to write in an established genre and to use classical sources with something approaching the normal eclecticism, even if this meant paying to the Roman ideal homage which, from a scholarly and literary point of view, was less original and perhaps more superficial. One can point to no close forerunners of the Discorsi, but the Arte della guerra follows in the footsteps of Valturio and Cornazano not only in details which are outside the concern of this work but also in its natural preference of other, more convenient, sources to Livy.

Works of 1520 and after

In 1520 Machiavelli was sent by the Priors and the gonfaloniere di giustizia of Florence to sort out in Lucca the affair of a citizen

-
- (1) Giambattista was exiled for having married a member of a banished family, but returned in 1510, and in this year denounced to the Signoria the plot of Princivalle della Stufa against Piero Soderini.
- (2) Sergio Bertelli (in N.M., Arte della guerra e scritti politici minori, Milano 1961, 312) takes another point of view, pointing out the links between the Strozzi and the Medici and contrasting the dedication of the work to that of the Discorsi: "Il M., che non aveva voluto dedicare i suoi Discorsi ad un principe, tornava però ad insistere con chi dei Medici era ascoltato consigliere, convinto del valore politico delle sue proposte."

of that city who had gone bankrupt and left several Florentine creditors unpaid. There he wrote his life of the fourteenth century hero Castruccio Castracani.⁽¹⁾ This was the first time since the Principe, with its chapter in modified praise of Cesare Borgia, that Machiavelli had given such attention to a modern figure as a model for imitation. Even if Castruccio is presented in classical dress (provided chiefly by Diogenes Laertius and Diodorus Siculus) the work is a considerable concession to post-classical times, in contrast with the Discorsi and the Arte della guerra; and in any case the classical borrowings, in which Livy is now of little importance, are superficial, merely added decoration and not based on an original enquiry like the Discorsi. The Vita di Castruccio is surely Machiavelli's most bizarre work, caught uncomfortably between what remained of his period of humanist erudition and what appears to be a new interest in the didactic value of recent times.

The impression that in 1520 Machiavelli was undergoing a change of this sort is confirmed by the other work which his visit to Lucca produced: the Sommario delle cose della città di Lucca. Having described the institutions which govern the city, he says it is good that the Signoria of nine elders do not have "autorità sopra i cittadini," and adds that "i consoli romani, il doge e la signoria di Venezia non avevano e non hanno autorità alcuna sopra i loro cittadini." But it is bad that it has only a short period of office (two months) with a ban from office thereafter of two years, because this means that "uomini non reputati" will hold office and "quella maestà e quella prudenza che non è nel pubblico, si cerca a casa il privato...E se si considera chi siede dei signori a Venezia, o chi era console a Roma, si vedrà che i capi dello stato loro, se non hanno autorità, hanno maestà..... " . He goes on to say that the way

(1) It was dedicated to Zanobi Buondelmonti and Luigi Alamanni "suoi amicissimi".

that they distribute the Signoria and other offices is good; though "vero è che devia dall'ordine delle passate repubbliche, perchè in quelle il numero maggiore ha distribuito, il mezzano consigliato, il minore eseguito". This, he shows, was true of republican Rome and is true of Venice. What is striking in these three examples is the juxtaposition as ideal examples of these two states. It is true that in the Discorsi he praises certain aspects of Venetian organisation (the Doge in 1.35, the punitive powers of the various institutions in 1.49 and in the following chapter the arrangement to ensure continuity in the occupation of the various positions of government) although he also has criticisms to make (in 1.36 and especially in 3.31). But in Discorsi 1.5 and 6 he is at pains to emphasise the essential difference between Rome and Venice, one a state which gave power to the populace and was thus suitable for expansion, the other an aristocracy and thus territorially static; and the former is obviously his ideal. Here, however, in the work on Lucca, the two states are on an equal footing, both equally worthy yardsticks to measure a lesser constitution. And Machiavelli even has respect, if not praise, for methods which deviate from these two examples. The same is true of the Discursus florentinarum rerum post mortem iunioris Laurentii Medices, also written in 1520 (for the cardinal Giulio de' Medici), which proposes sweeping changes in existing institutions but is entirely adapted to contemporary needs. By contrast with the Discorsi, which kept to the Roman division of the citizens into patricians and plebs, the Discursus admits the existence of a middle class, the mezzani, and suggests the creation of a Council of 200 to represent them, elected by Giulio. Moreover, though he is as preoccupied as in the Discorsi and elsewhere (e.g. Istorie fiorentine, 7.1) with the predominance

of the public over the private interest (the reverse of which he considers to be the case in the existing situation), he makes considerable concessions to Florence's oligarchic tendencies, again in contrast to the ideal he had seen in Livy of the guardianship of liberty residing with the plebs. As we have seen, the mezzani were to be more or less controlled by the Medici, and authority was to be given to the ultimi only in part with the rest promised. The Consiglio de'mille was to be reopened but elections were again to be in Medici hands, as were in effect the proposed appointments of sixteen gonfalonieri delle compagnie del popolo. Obviously Machiavelli's suggestions were for a more widely-based republic than that which existed, but not so widely-based as that which, on the Roman model, he had advocated a few years previously.

On the 8th of November, 1520, Machiavelli was engaged by the Studio fiorentino to write a history of Florence; and in 1525, in Rome, he presented to Giulio de'Medici, now Pope Clement VII, his Istorie fiorentine. Having seen the decreasing use of Livy, starting in the Arte della guerra and followed afterwards by a corresponding decline in references to ancient Rome, we would hardly expect him to have made of the work something in the genre of Bruni and other humanist historians. But though he would certainly never have yielded to convention by writing the Istorie in Latin (and he stipulated as a clause in his contract that he should have the choice of writing either in the volgare or in the normal Latin), to depart in an official history from the methods that previous official historians like Bruni and Bracciolini had established as traditional was even in 1520 a notion whose novelty is diminished for us by the knowledge of what followed Machiavelli. Even he felt the need to go

about this tactfully, however, and hence what he says in his proemio. Here he tells us that his first intention was to take 1434 - the year of the start of the ascendancy of the Medici - as his starting-point. What then changed his mind was, in reading the histories of Bruni and Bracciolini, the discovery that they were silent or, at best, brief on the internal history of the city. He justifies the importance of this aspect of Florentine history, criticises their neglect of it, and presents his revised plan for the work.

As regards Bracciolini, this criticism is of course justified. His history sets out specifically, as the first sentence shows, to describe the wars which Florence had waged with the Visconti and others up to the time of writing. On the other hand, Bruni does give attention to internal events; his accounts of them, in general, are briefer than Machiavelli's, but occasionally longer - for instance on Giano della Bella in Book 4; contrast Machiavelli in Istorie fiorentine 2.13 - and of course Machiavelli is not above using him as a source. But we have only to compare, for instance, Machiavelli's account of the Albizzi-Ricci feud (3.2 seqq.) and the Ciompi troubles (3.8 seqq.) with Bruni's (Books 8 and 9) to see that we must accept his word in the proemio, even if he did not do Bruni full justice. His explanation of the neglect by these "eccellentissimi storici" of internal matters also seems genuine: the idea that they were afraid to offend the descendants of those they would have to criticise is reflected in Machiavelli's own dedication to Clement VII, where he says "io giudico che sia impossibile senza offendere molti, descrivere le cose de'tempi suoi."

But why does he not do Bruni full justice? And why does he

pair together the apparently different works of Bruni and Bracciolini when it is ingenuous to criticise the latter for something he never said he would do? What he tells us of his reasoning must be accepted as sincere, but it is surely only part of the picture; he must have been conscious that the common denominator of the two authors - and the real reason for his rejection of them together - lies elsewhere.

There are two aspects of Bruni and Bracciolini which could be seen as forming this common denominator. The first, which seems the less important, is their political outlook.⁽¹⁾ Machiavelli is writing his work for a Cardinal who (on 19th November 1523) became Pope; but his attitude to the Papacy in the Principe and the Discorsi is highly critical, and it does not change in the Istorie. If his views could to some extent be compared to those of the Ghibellines, so those of Bruni and Bracciolini could be compared to those of the Guelphs. This is not to say that they never coincide in their views with Machiavelli: he and Bruni both, for instance, criticise the modern papacy by contrast with the early one,⁽²⁾ and together with Bracciolini, the Bolognese legate of Gregorio XI who gave rise to the so-called guerra degli otto santi.⁽³⁾ On the other hand, it is perhaps significant that Bruni speeds over the events from 800-1238, while Machiavelli in this period (Ist.fior. 1.12-21) deals, among other things, with Frederico Barbarossa's opposition to the Papacy

-
- (1) This idea, together with many others which have influenced what follows, is found in C. Dionisotti, Machiavelli storico, Accademia naz. dei Lincei, Quaderno N.134, "N.M.nel V centenario della nascita", Roma 1970, 19-32.
- (2) Bruni, RR.II.SS.,19; M., Ist.fior. 1.9
- (3) Bruni, Bk.8, ed. cit., 210,11. 8-17; Bracciolini, at the beginning of Bk.2, where he includes the Pope in his attack; Machiavelli, Ist. fior.3.7.

and the election of anti-popes by the imperial party - subjects perhaps not congenial to Bruni. And the latter's only regret in discussing Adrian I's summoning of Charlemagne to help him against Desiderio is the division caused in the Roman Empire; he will leave to those "qui iuris pontificii peritiores habentur" the question of the Pope's right to elect an emperor.⁽¹⁾ One may contrast Machiavelli's virulent attack in Istorie 1.9 and 11 (on the wrong Pope, as it happens - he writes "Teodoro I" for Adrian). There is another contrast between Bruni's mention of the "antiquata licentia" of the anti-papal party⁽²⁾ and, in a different context, but referring back to this period, Machiavelli's remark that the fourteenth century Guelphs tried to regain power "...reducendo tutto lo stato nella setta loro, a imitazione degli antichi guelfi."⁽³⁾ Bracciolini, like Bruni, worked in the Papal court and is, if anything, firmer than his friend in his ideas on Papal rights. In Book 4 of the Historiae florentini populi, writing on Giangaleazzo Visconti after his death, he acknowledges his generosity and dignity but criticises him, firstly for placing too much faith in force and fraud, and then in these terms :

"Ut reliquos omittam, an Pontifices omnes romanos ita ignavos, insulsosque putabat fore, ut quae summo iure ad Ecclesiam pertinerent, diutine a tyrannis possideri paterentur? et patrimonium tanto tempore possessum, tanto impendio saepius ab imperatoribus tyrannisque recuperatum auferri sibi per ignaviam aequo animo ferrent ?"

Notable is the terminology of "summo iure" and "patrimonium". Bruni (at the end of Book 12) has no generalisation on Giangaleazzo's death. Machiavelli's comment in 3.25 is

"la qual morte non gli lasciò gustare le sue passate

(1) Ed. cit., 22
 (2) Ed. cit., 25
 (3) Ist.fior. 3.8

vittorie, e a' Fiorentini non lasciò sentire le loro presenti perdite":

totally different from the tone of Poggio's.

But the question of Papal politics was not enough on its own to lead Machiavelli to reject his two predecessors as historiographical models, though no doubt he found their views irritating. More fundamental seems the question of historiographical method: in evolving a new one, he is making a far greater departure from their precedent than in giving more details of internal politics or criticising Papal intervention in temporal affairs.

It is clear from the proemio that Machiavelli realised it was expected of him to imitate the technique of "Messer Lionardo d'Arezzo e Messer Poggio". Nor does he entirely break from it, as we shall see. But when he writes that he read them

"per vedere con quali ordini e modi nello scrivere procedevono, acciò che imitando quelli la istoria nostra fusse meglio dai leggenti approvata,"

he is surely only bowing to tradition, with tongue perhaps in cheek. Since he implies that this is the first time he had read either of the two works - and it is unlikely that he should want to display ignorance - one assumes that either the contemporary intellectual climate or, much more likely, Machiavelli's personal tastes were unfavourable to such important works. He had, on the other hand (as we know from the Discorsi), read Biondo's Decades.⁽¹⁾ It seems significant that his taste in history was the unorthodox (by humanist standards) work of Biondo; yet he tries to tell us that he had gone through Bruni and Bracciolini, the humanist character of whose work he must have known, to try and learn to imitate their methods. If we turn to the text, however, expecting to find there Livian or Sallustian techniques, we will be disappointed. Whether he really

(1) His father had bought a copy in 1485 (Libro di ricordi, cit., 207). But Biondo was an important source for Poggio too; cf. N. Rubinstein, P. Bracciolini cancelliere e storico di Firenze, Arezzo 1965 (in "Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca", nuova serie, vol. 37).

intended to imitate them or not - and this seems highly improbable - Machiavelli has only followed their "ordini e modi" to a limited extent. He realised no doubt that, if he did, his history would be "dai leggenti approvata;" by those of conservative taste, at least, but not by the friends that really mattered, like Guicciardini or Buondelmonti.

How far, then, has Machiavelli rejected the Livian technique, re-created with modifications by Bruni, in his history of Florence, which like Livy's was now to go ab urbe condita to the present day, dealing with events both in and outside the city? There is the difference, though, that for the first three books at least (he gets involved in foreign affairs at the start of the Quattrocento in Bk. 4 in spite of his avowed aim) Machiavelli is going rather rapidly through events, so that one does not expect to find the annalistic technique characteristic of Livy and, to a lesser extent, Bruni, in this part of the work. However, neither does one find it in the latter part of the work, so that the basic construction of the Istorie can be contrasted to that of the Decades, even though the important annual consular elections in Rome had no parallel in the Florentine constitution.

Within each consular year Livy tends to divide events into those outside Rome (foris) and inside the city (domi), and sees between them, as we have mentioned, a mutual influence, peace at home enabling the city to turn to external affairs and external calm leading to domestic strife. To some extent, this pattern is reproduced in the Istorie, surely under the influence of Livy and Bruni. Examples are: "Posate le cose di fuora, si volsono a quelle di dentro"(2.39); "rimasa la città senza guerra di fuora, si viveva dentro in grande confusione" (3.8); "Seguita la pace di fuora, ricominciò la guerra dentro" (4.15); "seguita la pace ...

rimase la città senza guerra e senza freno" (4.28), and "Stettono pertanto i Fiorentini nel tempo di questa guerra, quanto alle cose di fuori, in pace, ma non posarono già drento..." (6.38). The similarity of vocabulary between these examples ("fuora", "dentro", "guerra", "pace", "rimanere", "seguire") shows their formulaic nature. Machiavelli sums it up in 7.4: "... in modo che se Firenze non aveva guerra di fuori che la distruggesse, dai suoi cittadini era distrutta." Another important example is found in 3.11 in a speech by Luigi Guicciardini: "...la fortuna di questa città... fa che, fornite le guerre di fuora, quelle di dentro cominciono' ".

When it comes to describing events fuora, nevertheless, Machiavelli's accounts are very different from Livy's. In the Decades the descriptions of diplomatic relations and battles are presented with a sense of drama, with great attention to psychological considerations. In Actius Pontano gives as the classical formula for battle narratives the description of the omens, the terrain, the leaders and the disposition of troops and war machines, before the description of the encounter itself, and Bruni follows Livy in building up battle-scenes in this way. Machiavelli does the opposite, and one is tempted to think he did so deliberately. Conscious, as in the Arte della guerra, of the pathetic inadequacy of Italian armies⁽¹⁾, he allows no majesty to military encounters but in his laconic accounts emphasises their lack of grandeur, their chaos and their bloodlessness. There are examples in 4.6, 4.33 and 7.20 of falsification of the numbers of dead, in the first two cases he claims that three and one died, respectively. in all cases by falling

(1) Cf. what he says in Ist.fior. 5.1, and cf., incidentally, Cornazano in De re mil. 3.2 "Ne le guerre, che prima solean farse Morte imperava, si che 'l triumpho alto Per vintimilia occisi solea darse. Hor si fa fatto d'arme, e ogni assalto Si piglia si che da cavallo a pena Sei ne moran nell'uno e l'altro smalto!"

from their horses, and in the last that there were no deaths at all. In 4.23 there is another undignified encounter, and in 8.16 he describes how the Florentine army fled at the sight of the dust raised by the Duke of Calabria's army;

"di tanta poltroneria e disordine erano allora quegli eserciti ripieni, che nel voltare uno cavallo o la testa o la groppa dava la perdita o la vittoria d'una impresa."

Rather than put contemporary armies in Livian dress, like Bruni, Machiavelli prefers to emphasise the difference between his and Roman times, and one may contrast what he does in the Vita di Castruccio, attributing to his hero something that Scipio had done. If the Vita was supposed to be a sort of trial run for the Istorie, this does not mean that Machiavelli followed its methods; Buondelmonti's criticisms certainly had their effect.

In domestic affairs, both Livy and Bruni like to emphasise the moral aspect of things. Bruni casts Giano della Bella, for instance, as an altruistic patriot in the mould of a Camillus, preferring exile to causing civil strife ("sed non permisit Janus civile bellum sui causa moveri. 'Cedamus, inquit, potius inimicorum calumniis..."). One might compare Livy's picture of C. Servilius Ahala (4.57.3), putting the good of his country above the favour of the other military tribunes. Machiavelli's account of Giano (2.13) is undramatic; and when he does dramatise episodes it is to make a political point, while Bruni tends to make a moral as well as a political point.⁽¹⁾ This preference of Machiavelli's for the practical side of things is also found in the speeches in the Istorie, a device which plays an important part in domestic and also diplomatic affairs.

(1) This is not to say that Machiavelli was not concerned with personal morality; he often condemns the moral corruption that arises from idleness (for the Istorie, cf. 7.28)

There are fifteen speeches in oratio recta, and others in oratio obliqua, which are long enough to fit into the genre of contiones established by classical historians. There are none in Book 1 - which incidentally coincides with the practice of Livy, who has none until this third book, perhaps not wishing to inflict upon us the horridus modus of primitive times (cf. 2.32.8). Every other book of the Istorie contains at least one contio, and Bks. 3 and 4 have as many as four each. The tradition of the contio⁽¹⁾ was established by the Greeks and analysed by such Latin authors as Cicero and Cornificius. The writing of history was an opus oratorium maxime⁽²⁾ and of course especially so in the speeches, developed from the writers' sources (as well as invented) but almost always reworked, and aimed to characterise the speaker as well as to enliven the proceedings. Various precepts are accepted by Latin authors as, with rare exceptions, standard procedure. Firstly, the division into the main categories of exordium, tractatio and conclusio (though other divisions could be added); secondly, the use in the tractatio of τόποι - a speaker advising some course of action must base his counsel on one or more qualities from the two categories of honestum and utile. Examples of the former are iustum, pium, dignum, rectum, laudabile; of the latter, facile, sine periculo, tutum, possibile, necessarium. A speaker opposing a course of action has to show it is inutile, iniustum and so on. Livy followed Cicero, who established utile and honestum as the two essential τόποι, in emphasising the moral as well as practical aspects of a subject, though if he wants to characterise someone as somewhat evil he will give him utile alone. This is the case with Hannibal,

(1) For this, with special regard to its use by Livy, cf. Ragnar Ullmann, La technique des discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite (Oslo 1927) and Etude sur le style des discours de Tite Live (Oslo 1928); H.A. Taine, Essai sur Tite Live (Paris 1856); P.G. Walsh, Livy (Cambridge 1963).

(2) Cicero, De legibus 1.5

for instance, in contrast with Scipio (Livy, 21.40-44).

Thirdly, the authors rely on various stylistic devices; a list of these would include *ἐνάργεια* (detailed description of a scene), similes, generalisations, tropes (such as metaphors, synecdoche, metonymy), figures (such as the rhetorical question, exclamatio, apostrophe) and word-play (such as anaphora and chiasmus).

How does Machiavelli make use of this tradition, to which Livy gave great attention? It is clear that some aspects of rhetoric are going to be less important - style especially, since the metaphor, for instance, had become a less daring usage. The relative lack of the ornate in Machiavelli's style should not, however, be taken for granted. Also important is, firstly, what *τόποι* he used - what considerations, in other words, he thought fundamental in proposing or condemning something; and, secondly, how far his treatment in the speeches of various subjects is influenced by any comparable speeches of Livy. One might also consider what is the aim of his speeches, and how frequent they are in comparison with Livy's .

To begin by answering the last two questions. The speeches are not always meant to characterise; five of them are delivered by unidentified men (not counting that in 4.21, by one of the Serravezzese ambassadors, which is paralleled by Livy in 7.30), and even when the speakers are identified their speeches are often practical and dry rather than emotional. As for the frequency of the speeches, Machiavelli has rather less than Livy; the latter has 25 in his first ten books while Machiavelli, as mentioned, has fifteen as well as those in indirect speech in his eight books.

The style of the speeches could only be said to be "rhetorical" by Livy's standards in 4.21 and 7.23. In the former we find exclamatio ("Quanto sono...!") and *ἐνάργεια* ("la valle tutta rovinò e arse, e gli abitatori e le robe di quella rapì, spogliò...").

In the latter there are several rhetorical questions and an example of anaphora ("non vi basta" repeated three times). There are rhetorical questions also in 5.8, as well as generalisations, but we can hardly call these rhetorical devices as they are so much a part of Machiavelli's normal way of thought, by contrast with Livy's. In 6.20 the phrase "non dico" is used with some frequency; a phrase also used by Livy (e.g. 5.3.9). Here too there is exclamatio ("o infelice quella città ... !"; "ahimè!") and a reference to Philip of Macedon. Examples of chiasmus may be found in 3.5 and 3.13; metaphor is frequent, and in 3.5 there is a medical metaphor which is paralleled by one in Livy, 5.5.12. But in most cases the style is straightforward.

As for the τόποι, there is no consistent balance between utile and honestum. Only three speeches rely more or less equally on both. The first, in 3.11, is made by Luigi Guicciardini, the gonfaloniere, to some magistrati delle Arti to try to prevent tumults, and he appeals both to honestum ("la disonestà vostra", "disoneste cose", "onestamente.. desiderare", "se la onestà lo consente", "quando le siene oneste") and to utility ("noi vogliamo dirvi quello che vi sia utile"). The other two are made in 4.33 and 5.8 by Rinaldo degli Albizzi; and it is significant that other speeches of his given in oratio obliqua (cf. 4.19, 22 and 28) also make this twin appeal, including such categories as pium, laudabile on the one hand and tutum, facile and necessarium on the other. There are three other speeches which rely chiefly on utile but with a brief mention of a τόπος from the other category. Nor does this mean, as it would in Livy, that the author rather disapproves of what is being said. In 3.5 a citizen urges legislation against sette, appealing to the utile ("per bene e utilità pubblica") the possible

("il che vi potrebbe, ancora che la impresa paia difficile, riuscire") and condemning lack of faith and corruption, but with the good of the state, not morality alone in mind. In 5.11 "uno de'piú antichi e piu savi" speaks to the people of Lucca "per accenderla alla difesa", and immediately dispenses with the idea of laudabile in favour of what is necessary ("dobbiamo", "dobbiamo", "debbe", "debbono", "debbe", "necessità") and after briefly mentioning again the glory of defence, finally appeals to what is useful for them ("sanza nostra utilità...") and difficult for the enemy. Later, Piero de'Medici in 7.23 condemns the ambitious citizens partly on the grounds of their lack of respect for the patria (in other words, pium) but mostly because they are harming the state (going against the utile).

There are four speeches which rely on moral appeals alone: those in 3.23 (one made in private, unlike anything in Livy), 4.21 (which mentions justice, honesty, piety and the wrath of God), 6.20 (justice and piety) and 8.10 (given by Lorenzo de'Medici and concentrating on justice, the word "ingiuria" and its derivatives recurring at least ten times). On the other hand, there are five speeches which only use τόποι from the utile category, and these are made by people who certainly do not meet with Machiavelli's disapproval: citizens inveighing against the oppression of the duca d'Atene and the optimates, Giovanni de'Medici, father of Cosimo,⁽¹⁾ Niccolò da Uzano (mentioned in 5.2 as one of those who "sustained" Florence after 1381), and Neri di Gino Capponi (one of Niccolò's party).⁽²⁾ The speech of the plebian is the most violent in the work, and after appealing to the necessity and the ease of what he proposes, as well as its safety, he says: "e della coscienza noi non dobbiamo

(1) Even if M's praise in 4.16 is not completely heartfelt, he was not in a position to put the Medici in a discreditable light in the Istorie.

(2) These speeches occur in 2.34, 3.13, 4.16 and 27, and 5.21.

tenere conto." The speech of Niccolo da Uzano in 4.27 mentions only the facile and the possibile. But more interesting is his speech in oratio obliqua a little earlier, in 4.19. Here he is urging peace in opposition to the war-mongering Rinaldo degli Albizzi (who eventually wins the day). Rinaldo concludes

"che niuna impresa mai fu fatta da il popolo fiorentino né piú facile né piú utile né piú giusta".

Then Niccolo, after saying why he thinks war would be unjust, says

"Ma poiché si viveva oggi in modo che del giusto e dello ingiusto non si aveva a tenere molto conto, voleva lasciare questa parte indietro e pensare solo alla utilità della città!"

The impression that this is the polemical voice of Machiavelli is increased when we compare the speech that Bracciolini (in Bk.4) gives to Niccolò. It is long-winded and, though talking of the utile involved and which had been Rinaldo's only concern, deals mainly with considerations of justice. It seems very possible that Machiavelli, presenting the reverse of the situation in Bracciolini, is deliberately reacting to the humanist precedent: choosing another man as his hero and yet making him reject justice as of no consequence in the world he lives in.

Before leaving the subject of these speeches we may consider whether there are any deliberate reminiscences of Livy in them (as there are in the historical works of Bruni, Bracciolini and Rucellai, for example). There is only one definite parallel - in 5.8, where Rinaldo degli Albizzi quotes Livy, 9.1.10 on the justice of necessary wars (cf. Principe 26, Discorsi 3.12). A few other instances might conceivably be reminiscences of Livy. A comparable situation to that in Istorie 4.21 is found in Livy, 7.30-31, where Campanian

envoys are asking the senate for help against the Samnites. There is a description of the destruction wrought by the latter (in 7.30.15) similar to that given by Machiavelli, and also an appeal to justice (ib.30.17). But the idea of pium is excluded: in ib.31.2 the consul points out that to help the Campanians would be to violate the treaty with the Samnites and thus to wrong the gods. After the senate's rejection of their plea, the envoys "pleni lacrimarum in vestibulo curiae procubuerunt" (ib.31.5); rather like Machiavelli's "e detto questo si gittorono in terra". In the next book of the Istorie, the speech to the people of Lucca (5.11) could be compared to the situation in Livy, 3.17 where Valerius exhorts the plebs to stay and fight. But by contrast, Valerius' τόποι are honestum and dignum as well as utile. There is a closer parallel to the description of devastation we have just mentioned; one may compare especially Machiavelli's "guastati i vostri campi, arse le vostre ville" and Livy's "incendia villarum ac ruinas, omnia ferro ignique vastata". Again, in 7.23, Piero's speech reproving the nobles' ambition is comparable to Titus Quinctius Capitolinus' speech in Livy, 3.67, though here he is addressing the plebs. And "ci ha fatti vittoriosi (la patria) perché noi la destruggiamo?" recalls, if only vaguely, Livy's "Quid enim repetimus, quid obsessam ex hostium manibus, si reciperatam ipsi deserimus?" (5.51.3, in Camillus' speech against the move to Veii). But in general there is no deliberate seeking out of parallels on Machiavelli's part; for instance he does not take up the opportunity of comparing the speech of one of the Signori against the duca d'Atene in 2.34 with that of P.Sempronius against Appius Claudius Caecus, also refusing to give up office, in Livy, 9.34, nor that of the plebeian in 3.13 with that of Canuleius in Livy, 4.3-5, though both speeches are exceptional.

in that they are given by plebeians rebelling against the upper class.⁽¹⁾

In spite of Machiavelli's proemio, then, it is probable that he never had more than a slight intention of imitating the "ordini e modi" of Bruni and Bracciolini. The proemio seems to be a roundabout way of making his apologies for not writing in the traditional manner without saying explicitly that he rejected it. Instead, he gives the most acceptable reason - a genuine one, no doubt, but not the whole truth. His antipathy for Guelph ideas would not have pleased the Pope, and his novel ideas on historiography (though he has not entirely rejected the Livian model) would not have pleased those who expected him, as official historian, to have trodden the path of his predecessors in the previous century. In his own times, Bernardo Rucellai had continued the tradition as a private citizen and in a work of more limited scope. But his most recent predecessor in the post of official Florentine historian, Bartolomeo Scala (who as we have seen may well have known Machiavelli's father) is a rather different case. Judging from the small proportion of his history that Scala completed as well as, for instance, from his correspondence with Poliziano, it can be seen that his concern was less with historical truth, with the comparative evaluation of sources, than with the rhetorical aspect of historiography; and Machiavelli too tends to follow one source at a time. However, the other consequence of Scala's rhetorical interest was that he was even

(1) There is a speech to the Signori in Ist.fior. 3.5, but it is against sette rather than against them. It is not specified who speaks in 6.20, but it could equally be a patrician or a plebeian. In general Livy too avoids giving speeches to plebeians. When the proposals of Licinius and Sextus come up, it is Appius Claudius who holds forth at length, the two proposers of the law being relegated to brief speeches given by Livy in indirect form. There is a speech inciting the plebs to violence, given by Manlius Capitolinus, in Livy, 6.18, but the only common point with Machiavelli's is the mention of felicitas (ib.18.13), rather like M's. mention of fortuna.

more interested in classical historiographical technique than Bruni and Bracciolini. So if in one respect Scala and Machiavelli are closer to each other than to earlier official historians, in another - their use of classical models - they are more distant; for although the Istorie were a work written for a public figure, rather than his friends in the Orti, for the first time since the Principe with the exception of the 1520 essay on Florence, Machiavelli showed little hesitation in revising the accepted genre, replacing its "ordini e modi", which to him were irrelevant, with his own.

Humanists from Bruni to Rucellai, as we have seen, used the comparison between antiquity and their own times to give dignity and glory to the latter. There was no suggestion that such a confrontation detracted from contemporary events; there was no criticism involved. But Machiavelli with few exceptions used this comparison in favour of antiquity, in order to castigate the world he lived in. As early as the essay on the Valdichiana he contrasted the mismanagement of Florentine affairs with the Roman approach. But it was not until the Discorsi, inspired by his new attention to Livy, that we see the culmination of this contrast. The Capitolo dell' ingratitude, for instance, points out the harsh treatment of Scipio, but in the Discorsi it is emphasised that this was an exception to the general way of things in Rome. The Principe, in spite of its disgust with contemporary life, accepts the concept of the "prince" and sees some hope in it, if correctly employed, as it nearly was by Cesare Borgia and might be by a new prince. With Machiavelli's new friendships, however, and the evolution of the Discorsi and then the Arte della guerra, Rome, as seen, at least to start with, through the Decades of Livy, is supreme, and modern examples either become negative rather than positive - examples of what to flee rather than what to follow - or else simply reflections of what the Romans had done previously. Then, after the Arte, together with

Machiavelli's declining interest in Livy, the situation changes. In the works produced in 1520 we see again some hope in modern affairs, whether it be in the Venetian constitution or a hero reminiscent of the Valentino of the Principe; but Machiavelli appears unable in the Vita di Castruccio either to praise a modern figure in his own right (as with Valentino in the Principe) or to continue to hold up antiquity as an ideal in its own right. Instead, he tries to fuse the two together and produces a figure who belongs neither to antiquity nor to the fourteenth century. It was an attempt to resolve the crisis which existed in certain respects between the two major works produced for his friends in the Orti and the feeling manifested previously that, whatever the short-comings of the world he lived in, a solution to its problems had to be evolved from within, not merely imposed on it from outside. In the Istorie he rejected the solution of Castruccio as false and attempted to resolve the problem in a new way. If the solution was not an easy one, at least it is, by contrast with that of Castruccio, an honest one.

In the introductory chapters to the various books of the Istorie we can see that antiquity and modern times are again contrasted, as they were before 1520. In 2.1, as in Principe 3 and Discorsi 2.6 and 7 and elsewhere, Machiavelli praises the practice of sending out colonies, although he doesn't specifically mention the Romans, and says that a lot of the world is now uninhabited

"per non essere ne'principi alcuno appetito di vera gloria, e nelle repubbliche alcuno ordine che meriti di essere lodato."

This is the voice of the Machiavelli of the Discorsi, and it is heard again in Istorie 6.1 when he contrasts the conduct in war of "le antiche e ben ordinate repubbliche" (again, not specifically the Romans)

with that of the times he is describing. In the chapter which starts the subsequent book he attacks the private interests which in Florence have given rise to sètte; as he explained at the beginning of the Discorsi, disunity can be beneficial, but when citizens start to think only of themselves the disunity that results can only be harmful. But again, significantly, Rome is not mentioned. Although this chapter clearly stems from his reading of Livy, it seems that it is no longer thought useful to point to the instance where Machiavelli's ideal was embodied; it is more important to pay attention to the modern situation.

This new viewpoint is confirmed in the introductory chapters when he does mention Rome. As before, the contrast is to the detriment of modern times; but what is new is that this is not just a negative contrast. In Istorie 3.1 he talks of the enmity between the plebs and the nobles;

"Questo tenne disunita Roma; questo, se gli e
lecito le cose piccole alle grandi agguagliare,
ha tenuto diviso Firenze."

In Florence the enmity resulted in exile, death, and lack of "virtù militare"; but it also created "una mirabile ugualità" among the citizens, whereas in Rome it led to "una disagguaglianza grandissima," and, in spite of Rome's virtu, in the end this inequality was her downfall. However, in Florence he sees hope in spite of everything.

"Firenze a quel grado è pervenuta che facilmente
da uno savio datore di legge potrebbe essere in
qualunque forma di governo riordinata."

This is reminiscent of the last chapter of the Principe - with the important difference that it calls for a Solon rather than a prince. It adds an entirely new dimension to what he had said in the Discorsi: Rome still has more virtù than Florence, but in the end, if one looks at things from his own day rather than through Livy's eyes, it all came to nothing, while there is still hope for Florence.

But the hope lies in the future, not in recent events:

this is the difference from the Principe. The recent history of Italy is now seen not as merely partly bad, as in the Principe, nor as entirely overshadowed by Rome, as in the Discorsi and the Arte della guerra. Rome is still the supreme ideal and her methods still valid, but, as we have been seeing, something to look back on, even if with regret for her passing. This new approach is epitomised in the chapter which introduces the fifth book of the Istorie, where Machiavelli is talking of the rise and fall of cities.

He acknowledges the fall of Rome which has left Italy wretched; but

"avvenga che di poi sopra le romane rovine non si sia edificato cosa che l'abbia in modo da quelle ricomperata... nondimeno surse tanta virtù in alcune delle nuove città e de' nuovi imperi i quali tra le romane rovine nacquono, che... da' barbari la liberarono e difesono. Intra i quali imperi i Fiorentini, se gli erano di minore dominio, non erano di autorità ne di potenza minori...."

Thus from 1434 to 1494 there was a time of relative peace - for nobody, he says, could call the fighting that took place worthy of the name of "wars". Only with the intervention of the "barbari" (in other words, Charles VIII) was virtù lost. But if this appears to be praise indeed, coming from the pen of Machiavelli, the end of the chapter shows that it is praise born of paradox rather than genuine admiration. If the things which our princes have done, he says, will not be read, like those of the ancients, with admiration for their virtù and greatness, they will perhaps be appreciated for other qualities, seeing how so many great peoples were held in check by such weak weapons. This is certainly not the same point of view as that of the Discorsi and Arte della guerra, and the new development

needs no further elaboration.

But, as we have said, this was not a simple solution nor, in spite of all his efforts, a complete one. Machiavelli in this and other chapters was looking back at the ideal he had seen in Livy's account, the ideal to which the Discorsi and to a lesser extent the Arte della guerra are dedicated. Having written in terms as optimistic as he could manage of the century in which he was born, he can nevertheless only conclude the chapter like this:

"E se nel descrivere le cose sequire in questo guasto mondo non si narrerà o fortezza di soldati o virtù di capitano o amore verso la patria di cittadino, si vedrà con quali inganni, con quali astuzie e arti i principi, i soldati, i capi delle repubbliche, per mantenersi quella reputazione che non avevano meritata, si governavano. Il che sarà forse non meno utile che si sieno le antiche cose a conoscere, perche, se quelle i liberali animi a seguitarle accendono, queste a fuggirle e spegnerle gli accenderanno."

Here Machiavelli was returning, after the Discorsi and what followed, to write of his own times, those from which the Principe was born, and we glimpse an underlying bitterness that no previous work possessed, a new depth to his sense of the tragedy of Italy. He tried to see some good in the past few centuries and some hope in the future; but though Rome was now in ruins, Livy's testimony to her former glory remained to emphasise the contrast between the selfishness and corruption of Machiavelli's own times and the greatness he had extolled in the Discorsi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Livy

(a) Texts published up to 1521

- Rome 1469 (Sweynheym and Pannartz)
 Rome 1470 (Ulricus Gallus; 2 vols.)
 Venice 1470 (de Spira)
 Rome 1472 (Sweynheym and Pannartz; 2 vols.)
 Milan 1478 (Lavagnia)
 Milan 1480 (Zarothus; 2 vols.)
 Treviso 1480 (Manzolinus)
 Treviso 1482 (Vercellius)
 Treviso 1485 (Vercellius)
 Venice 1491 (Herasmius Novocomensis)
 Milan 1495 (Scinzenzeler)
 Venice 1495 (Pincius)
 Venice 1498 (de Zanis)
 Venice 1501 (de Rusconibus)
 Milan 1505 (Minutianus)
 Venice 1506 (Vercellenses)
 Lyons? 1510? *
 Venice 1511 (Pincius)
 Paris 1511 (Parvus)
 Paris 1513 (Parvus)
 Maintz 1518 (Schöffler)
 Venice 1518-21 (Aldus)

* I have not been able to see this rare edition.

(b) Critical works

- BARONI (Alberto), Livio nel rinascimento, Pavia 1889
 BILLANOVICH (G.), Petrarch and the textual tradition of Livy,
 in "Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes",
 XIV (1951);
Il Boccaccio, il Petrarca e le più antiche traduzioni in
 italiano delle decadi di Tito Livio, in "Giornale storico
 della letteratura italiana", CXXX (1953)
 CASELLA (M.T.), Nuovi appunti intorno al Boccaccio traduttore
 di Livio, in "Italia medioevale e umanistica", IV (1961)
 DEAN (R.J.), The earliest known commentary on Livy is by
 Nicholas Trevet, in "Medievalia et humanistica", 1945
 DIONISOTTI (C.), Tradizione classica e volgarizzamenti,
 in Geografia e storia della letteratura italiana, Torino
 1967, 113-117.
 MAGGINI (F.), Le prime traduzioni di Tito Livio, in "La
 Rassegna", XXIV (1916), pts. 5-6, and in I primi
 volgarizzamenti dai classici latini, Firenze 1952, 54-89.
 MONFRIN (J.), Humanisme et traductions au Moyen-Age and Les
 traducteurs et leur public en France au Moyen-Age, in the
 "Journal des Savants", 1963 and 1964.
 OGILVIE (R.M.), A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5, Oxford 1965.

- SCHERILLO (M.), Dante e Tito Livio, in "Rendiconti dell'Istituto lombardo", s.II, XXX (1897)
- SCHIAFFINI (A.), Tradizione e poesia, Genova 1934, 2nd.ed. Roma 1943.
- TAINÉ (H.-A.), Essai sur Tite Live, Paris 1856
- ULLMAN (B.L.), Studies in the Italian Renaissance, Roma 1955
- ULLMANN (R.), La technique des discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite, Oslo 1927;
Etude sur le style des discours de Tite Live, Oslo 1928
- WALSH (P.G.), Livy, Cambridge 1963.
- WEISS (R.), The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity, Oxford 1969.

2. Machiavelli

(a) Opere, Milano (Feltrinelli) 1960-1965:

- vol. I, Il Principe e i Discorsi, a cura di Sergio Bertelli, 1960.
- II, Arte della guerra e scritti politici minori, (Bertelli) 1961
- VI, Lettere, a cura di Franco Gaeta, 1961
- VII, Vita di Castruccio Castracani e Istorie Fiorentine, (Gaeta) 1962
- VIII, Il teatro e tutti gli scritti letterari, (Gaeta) 1965.
- Il Principe, ed. L. Arthur Burd, Oxford 1891
- The Discourses, translated and edited by Leslie J. Walker, S.J., 2 vols., London 1950.

(b) Critical works

- ANDERSON (W.S.), Livy and M., in "Classical Journal", vol. 53 No.5 232-5.
- ANGLO (S.), Machiavelli, a dissection, London 1969.
- BARON (H.), M. on the eve of the "Discourses": the date and place of his "Dialogo intorno alla nostra lingua", in "Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance", XXIII (1961)
- BURD (L.A.), Le fonti letterarie nell'"Arte della guerra", Roma, Acc. dei Lincei, Atti, ser. 5, Classe di scienze morali etc. vol. 4 (1896-7).
- DIONISOTTI (C.), Machiavelli storico, Roma, Acc. nazionale dei Lincei, Quaderno N.134, 19-32
- DYER (L.), M. and the modern state, Boston 1904.
- GILBERT (Allan), M's Prince and its Forerunners, Durham, N.C. 1938
- GILBERT (Felix), The composition and structure of M.'s Discorsi, in "Journal of the History of Ideas", XIV (1953);
M. and Guicciardini, Princeton 1965.
- RIDOLFI (R.), Vita di M.M., Roma 1954
- RUBINSTEIN (N.), M. e le origini di Firenze, in "Rivista storica italiana", LXXIX (1967)
- SASSO (G.), review of Gilbert's 1953 article in "Rivista storica italiana", LXV (1953);
Intorno alla composizione dei "Discorsi" di N.M., in "Giornale storico della letteratura italiana", CXXXIV (1957)

- TOFFANIN (G.), M. e il tacitismo, Padova 1921
 TOMMASINI (O.), La vita e gli scritti di N.M., 2 vols., Roma 1911
 WHITFIELD (J.H.), Discourses on M., VII: Gilbert, Hexter and Baron, in "Italian Studies", XIII, 1958, and in Discourses on M., Cambridge 1969.
 WOOD (N.), Frontinus as a possible source for M's method, in "Journal of the History of Ideas", XXVIII (1967)n.2.

3. Predecessors and contemporaries of Machiavelli

(a) Texts

- ALAMANNI (Luigi), Opere toscane, Lyons 1532-3
 ALCIATO (Andrea), essay in edition of Tacitus, Milan 1517
 ALESSANDRO (Alessandro d'), Geniales dies, Rome 1522
 BEROALDO (Filippo the elder), Opusculum eruditum, Bologna 1497
 BIONDO (Flavio), Roma triumphans, Mantua 1472?
Decades, Venice 1483
 BRACCIOLINI (Poggio), Historiarum florentini populi libri VIII, Rerum italicarum scriptores, tom. 20 (1731); trans. Iacopo Bracciolini, Venice 1476
 BRUCIOLI (Antonio), Dialogi morali, Venice 1525 and 1537-8
 BRUNI (Leonardo), Historiarum florentini populi libri XII, Rerum italicarum scriptores, tom. 19 pt.3 (1914-26); trans. D. Acciaiuoli, Venice 1476.
 BURMANNUS (P.) ed., Sylloges epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum, Leyden 1727
 CAPPELLI (Antonio) ed., Rime di poeti italiani del secolo XVI, Bologna 1873
 CONTI (Sigismondo de'), Storie de'suoi tempi, Roma 1883
 CORNAZANO (Antonio), De re militari, Florence 1520
 CRINITO (Pietro), Commentarii de honesta disciplina, Florence 1504 and ed. Carlo Angeleri, Roma 1955
 FENESTELLA (i.e. Andrea Fiocchi), De magistratibus sacerdotisque romanorum, Milan 1477.
 FONZIO (Bartolommeo), Epistolario, ed. L. Juhász, Budapest 1931
Orationes, published in the late 15th Century without place or date
 FRULOVISIIS (Tito Livio de'), Opera hactenus inedita, ed. C.W. Previte-Orton, Cambridge 1932
 GELLI (Giambattista), Opere, Torino 1952
 GUARINO (Battista), De ordine docendi ac studendi, Heidelberg 1489
 GUARINO VERONESE, Epistolario, ed. R. Sabbadini, in "Miscellanea di storia veneta", ser. III, tomi 8, 11 and 14, Venezia 1915-19
 LENZONI (Carlo), Difesa della lingua fiorentina, Florence 1561
 LETO (Pomponio), De romanis magistratibus,
 MACHIAVELLI (Bernardo), Libro di ricordi, Firenze 1954
 MAFFEI (Raffaele), Commentarii urbani, Rome 1506
 MAIO (Giuniano), De maiestate, Bologna 1956
 NARDI (Iacopo de'), Istorie della città di Firenze, Firenze 1858
 NEGRI (Stefano), Praefatio in Titum Livium, in a collection published Milan 1521.
 NERLI (Filippo de') Commentarii de fatti civili, Augsburg 1728
 PANORMITA (i.e. Antonio Beccadelli), 80 lettere inedite, ed. Sabbadini, Catania 1910.
 PARRASIO (Aulo Giano), Praefatio in Livium, in F.Lo Parco, Parrasio, Vasto 1899

- PATRIZI (Francesco, Bishop of Gaeta), De institutione reipublicae, Strasbourg 1594
- PETRARCA (Francesco), Le familiari, ed V. Rossi, 4 vols., Firenze 1933-42
La vita di Scipione l'Africano, ed. G. Martellotti, Milano-Napoli 1954.
- PICCOLOMINI (Aeneas Sylvius), De liberorum educatione, in W.H. Woodward, Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators, Cambridge 1897
- PLATINA (i.e. Bartolomeo Sacchi), De optimo cive, in a collection published Venice 1504.
- POLIZIANO (i.e. Angelo Ambrogini), Della congiura dei Pazzi, Rome 1479? and ed. A. Perosa, Padova 1958;
Miscellaneorum centuria, Florence 1489
Epistolae, in a collection of his and others', Strasbourg 1513
- PONTANO (Gioviano), De prudentia, Florence 1508
Dialoghi, ed. C. Previtera, Firenze 1943
- RUCELLAI (Bernardo), De bello italico, London 1733;
De magistratibus romanorum veterum commentarius, Leipzig 1752;
De urbe Roma, Florence 1770
- RUCELLAI (Cosimo), see under CAPPELLI
- RUCELLAI (Giovanni), Opere, Bologna 1887
- SABELLICO (i.e. Marcantonio Cocchio), Rerum venetarum decades IV, Venice 1487, and Venice 1718 with life of S. by Apostolo Zeno;
Ab orbe condito ad inclinationem Romani imperii Enneades, Venice 1498
- SCALA (Bartolomeo), De historia Florentinorum, Rome 1677
- TOMMASO DA FERRARA, Trattato del modo di ben governare, ed. Alfredo Acito, Milano, no date.
- VALLA (Lorenzo), In B. Facium recriminationes, in Opera, Basle 1540
- VALLE (Battista della), Vallo, Venice 1524
- VALTURIO (Roberto), De re militari, Verona 1472
- VERGERIO (Pier Paulo), De ingenuis moribus, Rome 1475?
Epistolario, ed. L. Smith, in "Fonti per la storia d'Italia", Rome 1934

(b) Critical works

- BARON (H.), The Crisis of the early Italian Renaissance, second edition, Princeton 1966
- BANDINI (A.M.), Specimen literaturae Florentinae saeculi XV, Florence 1751;
De Florentina Juntarum typographia, 1791
- CANTIMORI (D.), Rhetoric and politics in Italian humanism, in "Journal of the Warburg Institute", I (1937) n.2.
- DIONISOTTI (C.), Notizie di Alessandro Minuziano, in the "Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati", Città del Vaticano 1946, IV
- GAETANO (A.de), The Florentine Academy and the advancement of learning through the vernacular: the Orti Oricellari and the Sacra Accademia, in "Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance", XXX (1968)
- GILBERT (F.), Bernardo Rucellai and the Orti Oricellari, in "Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes", XII (1949)
- HAUVETTE (H.), Luigi Alamanni, Paris 1903;
Les poesies de Cosimo Rucellai et de Francesco Guidetti and Encore Cosimo Rucellai et Francesco Guidetti: rectification et addition, in the "Bulletin Italien" of the Faculté des lettres de Bordeaux, IV (1904) 2 and 3
- KRISTELLER (P.O.), Un uomo di Stato e umanista fiorentino: Giovanni Corsi, in "Bibliofilia" XXXVIII (1936) and in Studies in Renaissance thought and letters, Roma 1956
F. da Diacceto and Florentine Platonism in the 16th Century, in the "Misc. G. Mercati" IV and in Studies in Renaissance thought, etc., cit.
- MAFFEI (D.), Alessandro d'Alessandro, giureconsulto umanista, Milano 1956.

- MAIER (I.), Ange Politien, Genève 1966
- MARCHESI (C.), Bartolommeo della Fonte, Catania 1900
- MATTEI (R.de), Dal premachiavellismo all' antimachiavellismo,
Firenze 1969
- PASCHINI (P.), Una famiglia di curiali: i Maffei di Volterra,
in "Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia", VII (1953)
- PASSY (L.), Un ami de Machiavel, François Vettori, Paris 1913
- PELLEGRINI (G.), L'umanista Bernardo Rucellai e le sue opere
storiche, Livorno 1920
- PIERI (P.), Guerra e politica negli scrittori italiani,
Milano-Napoli 1955
- SANTORO (M.), Uno scolaro del Poliziano a Napoli: Francesco
Pucci, Napoli 1948;
Il Pontano e l'ideale rinascimentale del "prudente", in
"Giornale italiano di filologia", XVII (1964)
- SPINI (G.), Tra rinascimento e riforma: Antonio Brucioli,
Firenze 1940
- SYME (Sir Ronald), History writing in Latin, in "Society and
History in the Renaissance", Folger Shakespeare Library,
Washington 1960
- WILCOX (D.J.), The development of Florentine Humanist Historio-
graphy in the Fifteenth Century, Cambridge, Mass., 1969.