Crypto-Machiavellism in Early Tudor England: the Problem of the *Ragionamento dell'advenimento delli Inglesi, et Normanni in Britannia*

SYDNEY ANGLO

There are few things better calculated to stir the blood of those who toil in the field of sixteenth-century political ideas than the discovery of some hitherto unnoticed text in which the "influence" of Machiavelli may be discerned. The possibility that Machiavelli's own naivety might induce naivety on the part of the disciple — or that such texts are not especially uncommon, and that they are frequently intellectual dead-ends — is rarely considered, let alone conceded. The nature of precisely what constitutes "influence" is scarcely ever pondered. And, worst of all, the assumption is frequently made that an author thus "under the influence" never read, nor needed to read, much more than Machiavelli's writings in order to formulate his own ideas.

These gloomy reflections have been prompted by the publication of the *Ragionamento dell'advenimento delli Inglesi, et Normanni in Britannia*, allegedly by Stephen Gardiner; by the misleading title, *A Machiavellian Treatise*, under which it appears for the first time in print; and by the excited reception accorded to it.¹ The work by no means lacks intrinsic interest. Both the circumstances for which it was conceived, and the ways in which it responded to those circumstances, compel the attention of all scholars concerned with the relationship between political thought and practice in the sixteenth century. However, the text itself, and the way in which it is introduced by its editor, raise methodological problems which also demand attention and, I believe, give cause for concern.

The *Ragionamento* is cast in the form of a dialogue and concerns the "more memorable alterations that have occurred in the realm of England and their causes" up to the marriage of Philip of Spain and Mary Queen of England. The work survives in two manuscript versions of an Italian text which purports to be a translation of an English original composed — according to the translator, George Rainsford — by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. The work, as it now stands, was conceived as a means of instructing Philip in his dealings with England and, as the

editor, Professor Donaldson, points out, "the political questions that occupy the interlocutors, especially those concerning the behaviour of a foreign prince in a new possession in which he intends to found a dynasty, assume the Spanish marriage" (p. 2). Indeed, George Rainsford deliberately added to the main treatise a "portrait of the realm" so that "nothing might be lacking in this little book that might contribute to an understanding of the laws, procedures, customs, nature and humor of the people of Britain" (fol. IV^r). The problem envisaged both by the author and his translator (if indeed two people were involved) was Philip's obvious ignorance of everything British — the effect of which would have been exacerbated by the King's notorious tactlessness. How could such a prince make a success of his problem-fraught role in England?

Rainsford's dedicatory letter to King Philip is dated 16 March 1556, that is, long after all belief in Mary's capacity to produce a child had been abandoned: but the precise date of composition cannot be determined. Since the Spanish marriage is the fundamental political assumption of the text as presented to Philip the work cannot have been started before November 1553, when Mary announced her intention of marrying the Spanish prince; and it is unlikely to have been much advanced before Philip's arrival in England in July 1554. There is a reference to the fact that Mary "took for husband and king Philip, son of the Emperor" (fol. 13^v), so that, at least, must have been written after the wedding celebrations of 25 July 1554. Toward the very end of the *Ragionamento*, Philip is lauded as "the arbiter of peace and war of all Christendom" (fol. 139^v), which suggests that composition of the work continued after 25 October 1555, when Charles V formally surrendered his Flemish provinces to his son, Philip. Gardiner died just eighteen days later, so that Professor Donaldson, arguing that the end of his text makes better sense if the latest possible date for its completion is accepted, writes that "Gardiner worked on the treatise during the very last weeks of his life while confined, for the most part, to his bed" (p. 3). This must certainly have been the case — if the work is by Gardiner.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence, apart from Rainsford's assertion, that the treatise really was written by Stephen Gardiner; and the ascription, though not inherently impossible, is open to doubt.² In the first place, the matter and manner of the *Ragionamento* differ from anything else that Gardiner is known to have written at any time in his career, and are certainly widely divergent from the doctrinal preoccupations which filled his polemic during the last fourteen years of his life. Secondly, the editor's attempts to explain away his author's ignorance, and wilful perversion, of English law are wholly unconvincing.

Gardiner was, after all, Lord Chancellor and might be expected to know, for example, that there never had been a law against insult in the reign of Edward VI. Passages such as these are "puzzling" only if we assume Gardiner's authorship: they seem less problematic if we do not. Thirdly it is difficult (if Gardiner were the author) to see why the original text was not written in Latin. Indeed, the problem posed by the fact that the treatise survives only in Italian versions is carefully avoided by the editor, who relegates his discussion of this matter to one especially unsatisfactory footnote:

The fact that the treatise was translated into Italian rather than Spanish is interesting. Philip's English was notoriously poor, and he had been tutored in Italian from a very early age. . . The choice of Italian made the translator's work easier, for the long passages quoted from Machiavelli could be quoted in the original language. Italian may have seemed the proper medium for political discourse, and it may also have been the modern language most easily understood by educated Englishmen, Spaniards and Franc-Comtois alike. (p. 15, n.1)

This does not explain why there should ever have been an English original. It assumes, I think oddly, that Italian was widely accepted as an especially political language in the mid-sixteenth century. And it assumes that Rainsford recognised the Machiavellian passages for what they really were, and that he used some edition of Machiavelli's work to facilitate his own translation — despite the fact that Machiavelli's name nowhere appears in the *Ragionamento*; and despite the fact that, had such recourse to Machiavelli been taken, certain discrepancies and anomalies might well have been eliminated. I do not know the answer to this particular group of difficulties: but certainly it is not that offered by Professor Donaldson. Moreover, it is worth remembering that, although details concerning Gardiner's last illness are obscure it is evident that he was already grievously sick by the beginning of October 1555 and that, in the fortnight before his death, he was in the kind of agony which, while not precluding the possibility of polishing up a political treatise for an absentee monarch, was scarcely conducive to it.³

The Italian text is edited by Professor Donaldson from MS. Escorial I. III. 17, collated with Besançon MS. 1169; and, as far as one can tell without repeating the editorial labour, the task has been accomplished with skill and precision. The editor has also provided a lucid, concise, and readable English translation. Folio divisions and linear references are given for both text and translation, so that the end-notes are easily used to clarify points in the dialogue itself, and material in the notes is equally well located in the body of the work. All of this is admirable,

as are those parts of the editor's introduction which succinctly state the problems facing Gardiner in his dealings with the Spanish faction at court, and how circumstances forced him to come to terms with a policy to which he was not initially sympathetic. Equally succinct and helpful is the delineation of Philip's own difficulties in England. On the level of straightforward political history all is well. It is, however, when the introduction attempts to move from this level of events, factions, and negotiations, to that of the history of ideas, that matters go awry: and they go awry even before the ideas are arrived at.

Methodological debility is already revealed by that section of the introduction which purports to enlighten us about the translator, George Rainsford (pp. 4-9). Half a dozen pages are devoted to this necessary preliminary. They tell us about George's eldest brother, William, gentleman usher to Henry VIII from 1516 until the end of the reign; and they tell us that the second brother John, and his son Thomas, served Lord and Lady Lisle. But what of George? Well, all that the editor can tell us with certainty about George Rainsford concerns an unimportant marriage and will. And apparently all these trivia are "ample indication that several members of his family must have known Gardiner." The crudity of this procedure is enhanced by the information that Gardiner took James Basset, Lady Lisle's son by a former marriage, into his own service; and then, with a resounding "Thus," we conclude that "George Rainsford was connected, through his family, both to the court at which Gardiner served, and to members of the inner circle of Gardiner's acquaintances, the Lisles and Bassets." The *non sequiturs* are painful; and the intellectual biography which might have been relevant, were it extant, is confined to the information that George was "probably educated at the university or at the Inns of Court," and that he "probably travelled as well, almost certainly to Italy."⁴

This notion, that to accumulate circumstantial scraps of evidence about an author's relatives is somehow equivalent to elucidating that author's ideas, is an unfortunately common affliction among historians attempting to deal with the complexities of a literary text. Nonetheless, it is not the weakest part of this enterprise. More disturbing is that failing of vision which frequently visits those who edit hitherto unknown treatises: that is the tendency to see everything too big. Professor Donaldson's critical evaluation of the *Ragionamento* is inflated. He regards it as a skilful application of key ideas from Machiavelli to the current political problems in England, and believes that the author was trying to "lay the theoretical basis for the new reign, which he saw as a new dynasty ruled by a Machiavellian new prince" (p. 38). Donaldson adds that, in his view, Gardiner saw in Machiavelli "a way of reconciling Habsburg rule with English national interests and English national

integrity, for the new prince is advised by Machiavelli to reach an accommodation with his new subjects if his circumstances permit him to do so." This is the crux of the matter. That little "if" is the rock upon which the entire argument founders. For it was as obvious to contemporaries as it is to us that there was no way in which Philip and his Spanish entourage could be acceptable in England. And it was this awareness — coupled with a firm grasp of what does happen when new rulers are unable to win the confidence of their subjects by amicable means — that undermined the consequentiality of the *Ragionamento*.

The work comprises a series of reflections upon the mistakes and weakness of Vortigerius the British king, which led to his overthrow by the Anglo-Saxons, and upon the skill and ruthlessness of William the Conqueror, which resulted in the foundation of the Norman dynasty. Despite this clear basic structure, the work is ill-organised and digressive: and the author's use of Machiavelli compounds rather than dispels this clumsiness.

We may accept, with the editor, that the author of the *Ragionamento* was seriously concerned that the Spanish marriage should not lead to the domination of Englishmen by foreigners; should not involve England in foreign wars; and should in no way violate the laws and customs of the land. The author also advises the ruler to consider the well-being of his subjects; to listen to their complaints, and not hesitate to arm them — because Englishmen are not rebellious by nature and had only risen against their princes when provoked beyond endurance. The king must heed the fate suffered by Canute and his Danes who, through their exactions, aroused the oppressed English to bloody vengeance. The editor, stressing the importance of the succession question, points out that the advent of Philip was set within the dynastic context and that, in the closing references to Philip's succession, "Mary's role is understated, and the contingent nature of the Habsburg succession is completely ignored. The implication is that if Philip rules wisely, he will, like the Anglo-Saxons and Normans, found a lasting dynasty in England" (p. 31). The difficulty here is that Philip, while being warned against the deeds of Canute and the Danes, is being encouraged to act like the successful William the Conqueror who "fortified himself with his Normans against the natives"; killed off rivals in the royal line; deprived the English of their offices and dignities, which he bestowed upon his own people; oppressed his subjects with "new tributes and taxes every day"; and built fortresses to subjugate the land (fols. 99^v - 101^r). New princes, writes the author, cannot avoid cruelty, the use of force, and the practice of what might conventionally be deemed vices. William the Conqueror had to face continuous revolts and plots.

Nonetheless he conquered his enemies, pacified the revolts, transformed the kingdom, gave it laws and honors, and left it to his successors in peace and trust: and he did so by employing cruelty which was without doubt more praiseworthy than that harmful compassion and mercy of Richard II and Henry VI, who through their ill-considered mercy lost many places and cities in France and Scotland which their predecessors had gained, and gave occasion to their subjects to scorn them and to plot against them, whereby both of them lost their states and their lives (fol. 111).

This belief in laudable cruelty, together with a long argument that it is safer to be feared than loved, obviously derives from Machiavelli: and, as was the case with that sparkling but tainted spring, the topsy-turvy morality leads to utter confusion. What is really being advocated? The efficacy of severity, perhaps? But then the author, having presented this case convincingly, remembers that he is advising the new king of his own beloved England and therefore suddenly asserts that such methods are only for those who have obtained a realm by force of arms. One who has obtained it "through favor of friends, hereditary laws or by matrimony must take a different course to keep his state" (fol. 123).

That is a comforting caveat. It only becomes disturbing if we bear in mind that to many Englishmen the Spanish marriage seemed not in the slightest like the "legitimate succession" (rather than "change or alteration in the kingdom") fulsomely presented by the author (fol. 135). Wyatt's rebellion, though successfully suppressed, had not expressed the violent emotions of some insignificant minority. Personal relations between Spaniards and Englishmen began badly with the very arrival of Philip and his entourage, and deteriorated without respite.⁵ Few informed observers could really have expected even an attempt at the soothing policies described in the *Ragionamento*: and the grim alternatives are set out there with stark clarity. Nor is the matter made easier if Gardiner's authorship is accepted: for then we would have to believe that somebody who had so clearly anticipated the dangers arising from the Spanish match imagined that a treatise of this sort would have some practical effect. And secondly, if he did entertain such a notion, we have to believe that he was prepared to elucidate those methods whereby William the Conqueror had crushed his new subjects into submission.

Judgements concerning the acuity of a thinker tend, of course, to be personal; and other readers might find themselves more in accord than I with Professor Donaldson who regards the *Ragionamento* as an intelligent political text. What is less equivocal, however, is the postulated importance of this work in the history of Machiavellism and the way in which the editor has sought to expound this. Here Professor Donaldson's lack of familiarity with sixteenth-century political writing is a serious

drawback — not merely because he fails to recognise material which was used in the composition of the *Ragionamento* but, more significantly, because this failure vitiates his view both of the early reception of Machiavelli and, more generally, of the transmission of ideas.

The trouble arises from the way in which the editor, having found extensive borrowings from Polydore Vergil, Paolo Giovio, and Machiavelli (though he misses one striking passage),⁶ then felt that his search was over. Unfortunately, it was no more unusual for men in the sixteenth century than for those in the twentieth to read more than just three books in preparing their own. I have not myself pursued the *Ragionamento* very far: but it is obvious that its author was not exceptional in this matter. A noteworthy instance of research failure is the story of the horse which, in order to overcome a trespassing stag, allowed itself to be ridden by a man who thereafter kept it bridled (fols. 21^v–22^v). This fable is cited to illustrate the dangers of calling in one group of foreigners to rid oneself of another. Professor Donaldson contents himself in his note with informing us that the “fable is not in Polydore”; and his index, under “Aesop,” refers to this note, which does not, however, allude to Aesop. The index also refers us to Aesop in the introduction (p. 17), where the animal fable is mentioned but Aesop is not. As a matter of fact the story is in Aesop, but the original source is Stesichorus, where it is used to show the dangers faced by the people of Himera in making Phalaris their military dictator. Stesichorus’s fable is, perhaps, not an obvious text: but the story is repeated in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, which is.⁷

Far more important than this detail is the fact that the author of the *Ragionamento* studied Lucio Paolo Rosello’s *Il Ritratto del vero governo del principe dall’esempio vivo del gran Cosimo de’ Medici*, which had been published at Venice in 1552. The borrowing from Rosello is confined to that section of the *Ragionamento* devoted to the use of cruelty; but material is slipped into the text so unobtrusively as to suggest that several other sources may have been exploited in similar fashion. For example, when discussing effective cruelty, the *Ragionamento* cites the additional instance of Cambyses in words evidently derived from Rosello:

La crudeltà giovò a Cambise, il quale ottenuta la vittoria non perdoni à persona. Silla medesimamente con crudelta monstrata a quelli che sono ossessi et poi espugnati è piu volte utile, perche gli altri temendo la medesima crudeltà, si sottomettino senza resistentia. (fol. 112^v)⁸

Similarly, when extending the idea of beneficial cruelty to include the right of princes to punish those whom they merely suspect, the *Ragionamento* says,

Io credo che quella non è crudeltà alcuna ma giusticia. Anzi il principe puole punire chi è sospetto colpevole, in alcuni casi, quantunque non

provato manifestamente, come i parenti ò figlioli di ribelli. . Questo il principe puole giustamente fare, havendo locchio alla pace commune deli subditi piu che al privato commodo o particular vendetta. (fol. 114^v)

This is a slight modification of Rosello, who argues that such despatch may be employed for the common good even against those who are guiltless.⁹ It is important, says Rosello, when using cruelty to have regard to the time, the place, and the person; for sometimes cruelty works especially well as in the Kingdom of the Turks, which would otherwise fall into ruins.¹⁰ The *Ragionamento* adapts this section in its entirety:

Vedremo in alcuni luogi, et tra alcuni popoli, che la crudeltà si nella pace, come nella guerra, è piu utile et necessario, che la clementia, et in altre provincie tutto contrario, pero volendo alcuno usare l'uno ò l'altro li bisogna considerare il luogo, tempo, et le persone. Senza la crudelta, l'imperio turchesca andrebbe in precipitio, et questo avvenne, che tutta la authorita é in tal manera rinchiusa nella persona del signore che ogni altro principe del suo regno aspetta aver la testa tagliata, per ogni capriccio che venerà nella sua testa; perche i sono tutti suoi schiavi, egli lo muta di ufficii et dignitate, come pare a lui senza altro rispetto. (fols. 117^r-118^r).

There are several other passages in this section of the *Ragionamento* where the use of Rosello is apparent.¹¹ But the most striking instance arises from the comparison between Scipio and Hannibal where the latter's cruelty is alleged to be unique in military history:

Questo essemplio d'Annibale di voi allegato di crudeltà è solo di tutti l'altri capitani, che fussero al mondo, ma havendo l'occhio al fine vederete che piu valle la benignità di Scipione nell'animi di soldati che la crudelta d'Annibale, laqual benchè vaglia di tenere un essercito unito quando i sono discosto dal nimico, perche lor disunione non havrebbe effetto, ma poi che si veggono in ordinanza, et gli nimici apresso piu giova la benignità del capitano il qual tal hora indarno supplica i soldati, che combattono valorosamente, si per innanzi e stato inhumano et crudele et questo si vede in Annibale, ilqual benchè sotto Carthagine haveva ordinato l'essercito con grand prudentia contra Scipione, nondimeno fu sconfitto, et non li valse esser feroce, per tenere i soldati in ordinanza, perche senza dubio nelli pericoli piu vale la benignita che l'asperezza (fols. 116^r-117^r).

This is, of course, a significant gloss on what Machiavelli says about Hannibal in *Il Principe*; and it derives almost verbatim from Rosello.¹²

All this amounts to far more than just another source overlooked by the editor. The use of Rosello, slight though it is, illuminates the transmission and transmutation of ideas in ways not recognised by Professor Donaldson. Rosello's *Ritratto* concerns such matters as the preservation of a state by a new prince; the use of cruelty and clemency; the extinc-

tion of one's enemies; the danger of overmuch liberality; the proper employment of councillors; the importance of military knowledge to princes; arms as the basis for the security of the state; the decadence of modern soldiery; the inutility of mercenaries; the superiority of national forces; and the disadvantages of fortresses. All of this is familiar. Rosello reads, for much of the time, like a commentary upon Machiavelli's *Il Principe*; and many of his themes were patently of interest to the author of the *Ragionamento*. The crucial fact, however, is that the greater part of such material in Rosello's *Ritratto* derives not from Machiavelli himself but from Augustino Nifo's *De regnandi peritia*, that notorious Aristotelization of *Il Principe*, despised by generations of Machiavelli scholars as a ruthless plagiarism of their hero's work.¹³ As a matter of fact, Nifo does not differ in this respect from most Renaissance authors who rarely acknowledge their manifold obligations to contemporaries and predecessors. Nifo's practice is no worse than the wilful distortion of sources in Machiavelli's *Storie Fiorentine* or his wholesale cannibalization of the ancients in the *Arte della guerra*. In any case, Rosello avenges Machiavelli by nowhere acknowledging Nifo: and, what is especially noteworthy, on one occasion Rosello goes back beyond Nifo to consult *Il Principe* itself.¹⁴

The complexities of the transmission of the ideas with which we are concerned are thus as follows. The author of the *Ragionamento* consults and adapts several authors, but makes especial use of Machiavelli. He also consults the *Ritratto* of Lucio Paolo Rosello, an author who had seen *Il Principe* but who preferred, in the main, to base his arguments upon Nifo's *De regnandi peritia* which is itself an expansion of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*. And, curiously, several passages borrowed by the *Ragionamento* from Rosello derive ultimately from Nifo.¹⁵ This, it seems to me, is the principal interest of the *Ragionamento*. The text does not offer a particularly intelligent argument. It is not a very deft adaptation of Machiavelli to English circumstances. And it led nowhere. But it does serve as an object lesson in the way ideas could travel about in mid-sixteenth-century Europe.

The large claims made on behalf of the *Ragionamento* by its editor cannot be substantiated. It is difficult to see why, even if it could be established that the work were written by Gardiner, it would impose any need for a "fresh and thorough examination" of that prelate's "whole career" (p. viii). The editor may believe that it is "worth insisting that Machiavelli's influence on Gardiner's practice in this period was coherent and decisive" (p. 39): but the notion that Gardiner revised his attitude toward Philip and the Spanish marriage, and conducted his negotiations, on the basis of a reading of Machiavelli remains not only

unproven but absurd. And all that, it must be remembered, assumes Gardiner's authorship as fact: whereas, at best, it is unlikely.

Nor do the editor's comments on the reception of Machiavelli inspire confidence. He claims that Pole's criticism of Machiavelli in the unpublished *Apologia ad Carolum Quintum* was "influential," and that Ambrogio Caterino Politi was "probably influenced by Pole" (p. 18). The evidence for such views would be valuable: but none is offered. The editor sets up as an Aunt Sally the old belief that "real knowledge of Machiavelli did not exist in England in the sixteenth century, and that what knowledge there was came late in the century through the distorting medium of Gentillet's *Contre-Machiavel*" (p. 19). Such a belief, we are solemnly assured, is no longer tenable: "on the one hand Machiavelli was read in the early Tudor period, and on the other the English translation of Gentillet has now been shown to be a seventeenth century work." Gentillet may, or may not, have been as important in the history of the English reception of Machiavelli as Edward Meyer once thought: but the fact that there was no published Tudor translation itself proves nothing. Would Professor Donaldson similarly argue that, because there was no complete early Tudor translation of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* and *Discorsi*, such works could not possibly have been read and that, therefore, his "Machiavellian treatise" must be a late Elizabethan forgery? As for the early Tudor reception of Machiavelli, Donaldson goes on to say that "Gardiner's treatise itself is the most impressive evidence to date of Machiavelli's penetration of England in the sixteenth century." This statement is silly when we consider, for example, the popularity of Whitehorne's translation of the *Arte della guerra* in Elizabethan England; or bear in mind later readers of Machiavelli, such as Richard Beacon. But, even if we confine ourselves to the early Tudors, the *Ragionamento* is no more impressive than William Thomas's surviving discourses in the Machiavellian mode. And, evidently, Professor Donaldson has never progressed beyond Horrocks and Raab in his study of Sir Richard Morison whose propagandist writing includes the *hitherto unnoticed* (that phrase cannot be resisted here) first published translation into English of any part of Machiavelli's work: and this appeared sixteen years before the *Ragionamento* was completed.¹⁶

That the "new evidence" compels us totally to rethink our notions concerning sixteenth-century Machiavellism is mere hyperbole. We do need to rethink this problem: but not on the basis of a single manuscript virtually unknown to contemporaries. Rather the need arises precisely as a result of the palsied methodology employed by historians who have fumbled with the subject, and have postulated theories on

the basis of exaggerated responses to a few scattered texts. Scholars are certainly in debt to Professor Donaldson for his care in transcribing and translating the *Ragionamento*. His critical comments and annotations do not impose a commensurate obligation.

University College of Swansea

Notes

- 1 *A Machiavellian Treatise by Stephen Gardiner edited and translated by Peter Samuel Donaldson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975). Pp. ix, 173. \$35.75.
- 2 Dermot Fenlon, in an otherwise enthusiastic review, has drawn attention to Professor Donaldson's failure to recognise the possibility of doubt concerning Gardiner's authorship. See *The Historical Journal*, 19 (1976), 1019-23.
- 3 For references to Gardiner's last illness, see *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian), 1555-1556*, Nos. 215, 237, 240, 246, 274, 275, 276, 282. John Foxe, characteristically, has a grisly version of Gardiner's death which he reports on "hearsay." See *Acts and Monuments*, ed. Townsend and Cattley (London, 1837-41), VII, 593. One other matter is worth noting in connection with this putative authorship. One of the two interlocutors in the dialogue is Alphonso whose curiosity concerning "knowledge of the rule and governance of different countries and realms" is the starting point for the discussion. The other speaker is Stephen, the Englishman who enlightens the foreigner and who clearly represents Gardiner: and if Gardiner was the author then he certainly evaluated his own capacities highly. Alphonso, having arrived at the splendid court of Philip, King of England, tells Stephen, "I find that your authority (which shows the man), your singular prudence in public affairs, your firm constancy in the Catholic faith, and the incorruptible justice you minister to all, show me clearly that all your qualities merit no less praise (rather much more) than their public repute throughout Europe, however honorable" (fols. 7^v-8^r).
- 4 This kind of thing continues with another six pages on the "Transmission of the Text," where what is initially an "attractive conjecture" (p. 10) ends up as part of a "likely sequence of events" (p.15).
- 5 See for examples *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. J.G. Nichols (Camden Society, 1848), pp. 74, 79, 86, 96; *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary*, ed. J.G. Nichols (Camden Society, 1850), p. 81; *Calendar of State Papers (Spanish)*, XIII, Nos. 26, 56, 60, 72, 148, 149, 161, 164, 216.
- 6 See *Ragionamento*, fol. 132^{r-v}: "Oltra le cosa sopradette, un principe acquista reputatione nel monstrare in tutti li suoi attioni una grandezza, fortezza, et gravità d'animo, et circa li manegie de li subditi privati, che la sua opinione et sententia sia irrevocabile. Et quel principe che si mantiene in tal opinione nullo ardirà d'ingannar, ne di aggirarlo, et e riputato assai. Et contra, chi e riputato, con difficulta si congiura, la qual è causa dunque d'una grand sicurtà." This is derived from *Il Principe*, Cap. XIX (pp. 35^b - 36^a in Mazzoni and Casella's edition).
- 7 See Sir Edward French Bromhead, *The Remains of Stesichorus in an English Version* (n.p., 1849), p. 22. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, II. 20.
- 8 Cf. Lucio Paolo Rosello, *Il Ritratto del vero governo* (Venice, 1552), fol. 14^v: "la molta crudeltà ha pur giovato alcune volte, percioche giovò la crudeltà à Cambise, il quale ottenuta

la vittoria, non la perdonò ne à gli huomini, ne à Dei. Silla medesimamente usando crudeltà, si mantenne la dittatura.”

- 9 Cf. Rosello, fol. 15^r: “Questo à me pare piu tosto humanità, poi che di molti, che si sarebbono degni di crudeli supplicij, sono puniti pochi, per non punir gli tutti . . . Anzi per comune parere de’ savi, il Prencipe può punire chi non è colpevole, come sarebbe cacciare in essilio alcuni di famiglie sospette, ovvero i figliuoli de’ ribelli; havendo tuttavia l’occhio alla commune pace.”
- 10 Cf. Rosello, fol. 15: “Ma tornando à ragionare della crudeltà, dico che bisogna haver risguardo à tempi, à luoghi, & alle persone. In alcuni paesi la crudeltà piu vale à conservare la concordia, ò per dir meglio à tenere gli animi in spavento, che non ardiscano di levarsi contra’l feroce Prencipe. Il Regno Turchesco senza la crudeltà andrebbe in ruina. & questo avviene perche tutta l’autorità è rinchiusa di maniera nella persona del Signore, che ogni suo Bassà per grande che sia, aspetta in premio delle sue fatiche, che per un capriccio, che venga al Signore, gli sia tagliata la testa, che è appo loro un dono singulare à petto à que’fieri tormenti, e dure morti, che usano di dare.”
- 11 For example, *Ragionamento*, fols. 119^v – 120^r, derives from Rosello, fol. 14^v; *Ragionamento*, fol. 122, derives from Rosello, fol. 15^v.
- 12 Cf. Rosello, fol. 17: “Questo esempio di Annibale è solo di quanti Capitani mai fossero al mondo: ma havendo l’occhio alla riuscita, piu valse ne gli animi de’ soldati la benignità di Scipione, che la fiera di Annibale, la quale posto, che vaglia nel tenere un’esercito in pace, poi che i soldati si veggono in ordinanza piu vi giova la benignità del Capitano, il quale allhora indarno supplica i soldati, che combattano valorosamente, se per altro tempo è stato feroce, & inhumano. Et questo si manifesta in esso Annibale, il quale benche sotto Cartagine avesse ordinato l’esercito con una via singulare, come esso Scipione appo Livio lo commenda, nondimeno fu sconfitto, e non gli valse l’esser terribile, et crudo à ritenere i soldati in ordinanza, perche veramente piu vale ne’ pericoli la benignità, che l’asprezza.”
- 13 Augustino Nifo, *De regnandi peritia* (Naples, 1523). The relationship between Nifo’s work and *Il Principe* was first noticed by Jean-Félix Nourrisson, *Machiavel* (Paris, 1875), and has since been frequently cited to demonstrate Nifo’s villainy. For some sensible observations on the matter, see G. Procacci, *Studi sulla fortuna di Machiavelli* (Rome, 1965).
- 14 Rosello, fol. 8, discusses the relations between the King of France and his Parliament, and goes back beyond Nifo, *De regnandi peritia*, IV, iii, which is very brief, to *Il Principe*, Cap. XIX, where the matter is treated more fully.
- 15 For example, those referred to above, notes 8, 9, 10, 11.
- 16 Richard Morison, *An invective ayenste the great and detestable vice, treason, wherein the secrete practises, and traitorous workinges of theym, that suffrid of late are disclosed* (London, 1539), sigs. a. ii^r–v^v (“A preface to the reders”), uses selected passages from Machiavelli’s *Discourses*, III, 6, to substantiate his general arguments against conspiracy.