gram naturally leads to a consideration of problems which the writer encountered in endeavouring to compose some semblance of an objective history of Florence, when the two most conspicuous spheres of influence at the time, the Church and the State, were securely in the hands of those who had commissioned the work.

The panoramic view is expanded in the fourth chapter, to embrace the decade 1542-1552. Mon. Plaisance here treats the genesis of the Florentine Academy illustrating clearly how it became, increasingly, an instrument of the Cosimo de' Medici government, imposing on its members a severe censorship in matters relevant to the State. In this chapter are presented the personal views of many of the principal figures involved in the seemingly constant struggles over policy (such notables as Martelli, Giambullari, Lasca and Varchi). The nature of their work is studied in the light of periodic manifestos issued by the Academy after each election. As the author himself contends, there is an effort made to equate the evolution of the Academy with various phases in the Medici rule. A useful appendix containing key correspondence of many of the prominent personalities is also included, such letters corroborate many of the observations made.

The final essay on Cinzio is a résumé of his career with particular emphasis on his relationship with the Este family of Ferrara. The article's interest lies mainly in Mon. Lebatteux's discussion of the similarities and differences in attitude between Cinzio and Boiardo and Ariosto, who preceded him at the court of Ferrara. Cinzio's harmonious relationship with power is the basic point expounded.

In conclusion, the text is a well conceived clarification of a critical question in Renaissance literature and a thoroughly researched treatise. Each chapter complements the others, providing essential information on the first half of the sixteenth century and its most conspicuous achievers.

C. FEDERICI, *Brock University*

Alfredo Bonadeo, *Corruption, Conflict and Power in the Works and Times of Niccolò Machiavelli*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: U. of California Press, 1973, Pp. x, 127. Peter E. Bondanella, *Machiavelli and the Art of Renaissance History*, Detroit: Wayne State U. Press, 1973. Pp. 186. \$10.95.

Unlike some political thinkers, Machiavelli has yet to suffer much from over-documentation. Indeed, the variety of interpretations of his thought has been startling, and few other figures have suffered so much from misleading, but influential, accounts of their ideas and intentions. These two studies attempt to set the record straight in relation to various aspects of the story. Thus they contribute to that general re-assessment of Machiavelli stimulated by Professor Allan Gilbert's edition of the *Works* and by the growing body of Renaissance scholarship published by Princeton and other centres. It is rather surprising that until recently even scholarly judgments about Machiavelli were excessively focused on *The Prince*. Now, however, that famous book has receded somewhat into a complex environment formed by an enhanced awareness of the political life of northern Italy and of the entire corpus of the Florentine's writings.

Professor Bonadeo's book is addressed to those themes in Machiavelli's political thought—corruption, conflict and the shaping of a political order—that have most con-

cerned recent students of civic humanism. Happily, he brings to the task a sound knowledge of the relevant political history and a sure feel for what is still relevant in the rather inchoate texts. Rarely have commentators in English dealt effectively with what Machiavelli meant by corruption, and Bonadeo's insistence that an uncorrupt people had, above all, to enjoy "freedom from absolute power" sets the stage for a number of illuminating comments.

Especially interesting is the observation that Machiavelli appreciated the inadequacy either of laws or of institutions (e.g., a militia) in effecting the moral regeneration of a corrupt polity, that indeed the adherence to legal forms might serve even to fix the chains of corruption more securely. The point is crucial, since it provides the rationale for Machiavelli's vigorous prescription of extra-legal violence in the name of liberty.

Considering the importance of this theme in Bonadeo's interpretation of Machiavelli, it seems a pity that he did not tell us more of Machiavelli's opinions about the relations of forms and realities in political life. Any student of Roman history would know of the sinister potential of a tyranny masquerading under the appearances of freedom—even one who favoured Livy over Tacitus—and the experiences of Machiavelli's time gave further evidence of the danger. So Machiavelli had opinions on the matter, and his thoughts on the relationship between laws and manners—a major theme in the political thought of later centuries—are still of interest. There seems to be a problem in formulating Machiavelli's thoughts on such matters. For, in eighteenth-century England people invented Machiavellian dicta about illusions of legality and "legal tyranny," because the texts did not say the right things. Other scholars who join Bonadeo in raising the issue but treating it obliquely include Giuseppe Prezzolini.

The treatment of conflict is perhaps less interesting if only because others—Neal Wood and Harvey Mansfield Jr.—have cleared away some of the difficulties. Bonadeo is perfectly correct in saying that most of Machiavelli's comments on conflict are negative in tone; certainly all the positive comments are qualified as to appropriate circumstances. One wonders, however, whether Bonadeo pays quite enough attention to the remarkable fact that Machiavelli had anything at all good to say about divisions and conflict. The consequences of Machiavelli's qualified approval for the quarrels of republican Rome seem to have been momentous, for Machiavelli appears to have been responsible for the later opinion that a healthy commonwealth might well be divided.

Scholars seem not to have concerned themselves much with such questions, but it seems probable that Machiavelli had a very profound effect on later thinkers, such as the Englishman Henry Wright, who claimed in 1616 that factions were permissible and fruitful in a commonwealth. Of course Bonadeo's choice of emphasis is dictated by his argument, and that calls for noting the dangers inherent in factional struggles between Guelf and Ghibelline. Undoubtedly it is important to establish the basis of Machiavelli's distaste for the selfish nobility, but sometimes the argument seems to be pressed too hard. Thus Bonadeo stresses that the fomenting of factions was perceived by Machiavelli as a cynical instrument of absolute rule, neglecting those passages where Machiavelli said that only weak rulers would employ such measures because of their danger to all concerned.

In his final two chapters Bonadeo spells out the implications of his skilfully constructed case. It is a very sympathetic and rather satisfying interpretation of Machiavelli, one that argues that he was both an idealistic republican and simultaneously an advocate of ruthless measures. This assimilates the figure of the legislator to Machiavelli's *Prince* and effects a

plausible reconciliation between the ostensibly different concerns of Machiavelli's two major political works. The argument that *The Prince* was only a manual for aspiring tyrants is ably refuted, although Bonadeo's opponents here seem to include few major figures.

This is a valuable book for students of political ideas. It is not intended as a complete survey of Machiavelli's political thought, but it serves its limited purpose admirably. The author showed commendable restraint in not making more use of his own useful article on the role of the "people." Probably it was a wise choice not to add it as a chapter, though it would have assisted the argument. One surprising slip, arising in that article, persists in the book. It is odd that a Renaissance scholar should adhere so resolutely to the notion that there is such a body as the "Warburg and Courtland (*sic*) Institute."

Professor Bondanella's book is a literary study of Machiavelli as a master of historical portraiture, so the focus of concern is the "humanism" in the tradition of civic humanism.

Though the study is no mere appreciation, the subject matter does not seem to allow for so pointed an hypothesis as one finds in Bonadeo's monograph. The theme that is best sustained through the various essays—several of which have appeared as articles—is that Machiavelli must not be dismissed as no more than a public person who occasionally amused himself by writing. The point emerges in most of the chapters. It seems significant that in the course of noting the literary merit of Machiavelli's novella *Belfagor*, Bondanella quotes from Hales's edition of Machiavelli's *Literary Works*. True enough, it is unfortunate that these writings are frequently "picked over for material that will help in the erection of some monument to his [Machiavelli's] fame as a political, military, or historical writer," rather than being judged as artistic creations. But the judgment has already been voiced by literary scholars, while the source of their distress—the judgment of time—has pronounced rather conclusively that Machiavelli is most to be honoured for substance rather than form. This accounts for the absence of any very novel arguments in this careful and scholarly book.

The author certainly takes issue, gently but effectively, with a number of scholarly opinions about Machiavelli. There is, for instance, the well-argued refutation of the views of J. H. Whitfield and others about Machiavelli's *Life of Castruccio Castracani*. Showing that Machiavelli was being neither careless nor disingenuous in distorting the facts in the life of this *condottiere*, Bondanella argues, with an abundance of evidence, that historical portraits of the period were intended as archetypal and recognized as such. An appreciation of this fact is obviously essential to historical or literary pursuits in the period, and this chapter does a service to both. Comparable insight into Renaissance literary conventions is afforded by the claim that private letters were very often consciously fashioned with a wide audience in mind.

No doubt Professor Bondanella would feel that his worst fears had been confirmed if a student of political ideas were to express most interest in his incidental comments on Machiavelli's opinions—especially the views on luxury contained in the *Description of German Affairs*, a work with which this reader was not previously familiar. It is less easy to express much useful reaction to the major point of the book—that Machiavelli was a serious, indeed a masterly, artist. In the absence of major errors of interpretation that may have followed from the past neglect of this point, there is little to add. The historian, who perhaps needed the advice, still does not have his concerns greatly illuminated, while the

student of literature was perhaps in less need of the advice in the first place. One feels that one has been usefully instructed and resolves to read Machiavelli again with this book in mind.

The notes are ample and most informative. An especially valuable feature is the use of English translations in the text with the Italian original in the notes. This allows us to discover, for example, what Machiavelli actually said when he is credited with having written of "national character." The absence of such apparatus occasionally leads to problems in Bonadeo's book.

Machiavelli and the Art of Renaissance History is a useful, brief and unpretentious study. Perhaps my only complaint about it—discounting those that arise from a very different set of interests—is a slight sense of dismay (Fowler notwithstanding) at the author's recurrent habit of using "none" as though it were always a plural.

J. A. W. GUNN, *Queen's University*

Francesco Petrarca, *Petrarch's Book without a Name: A Translation of the Liber sine nomine*. Tr. with introduction and notes by Norman P. Zacour. Toronto: The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1973. Pp. 128. \$3.00.

Petrarch's *Liber sine nomine* is a collection of nineteen letters on the corruption of the papal court at Avignon and, secondarily, on Petrarch's hopes for the reestablishment of the temporal and spiritual preeminence of Rome. The title suggests the fact that this collection was revised and rearranged before publication even more carefully than the *Familiars*. The virulence of his attacks on the papacy, which led Petrarch to withhold these letters for posthumous publication, led him also to delete the names of the addressees, most other clues to their identities, and indeed all names of contemporaries.

Professor Zacour's editorial work is unpretentious, as befits an epistolary collection that is relatively slight both in length and in content. A sixteen-page introduction includes material on the relation between the *Liber* and the *Familiars*, some of the sources of Petrarch's feelings toward Avignon and Rome, and the nature of the *Liber*. Introductory notes to individual letters offer information about the presumptive addressees, likeliest dates, and occasions. (None of this material goes beyond previous biographical studies.) Footnotes, in addition to identifying quotations, occasionally illuminate features of the text—e.g., Petrarch's Latin word play and his use of conventional wisdom of the period—that the reader would otherwise miss. The translation is the first complete English version of the letters and is straightforward and clear. I wonder, however, whether the occasional use of contractions and other informalities (e.g., "So what?" for "quid ad me?" [p. 28]) is appropriate. If Petrarch's language, translated literally, seems formal and flowery now, so did the original in the fourteenth century, when classicizing Latin was by no means common.

Zacour points out that the book exhibits "a marked thematic unity": "In effect the work treats of two cities, Rome and Avignon, two women, so to speak, the one majestic, dignified, slowly rousing herself from long slumber, soberly reaching out to reclaim her sceptre, the other a cheeky harlot queening it over the world, heedless of her impending doom" (p. 23). One may add that stylistic unity is equally apparent. Petrarch views his