Introduction

The design and purpose of one of the academy's most popular books, *The Prince*, written by a former public servant named Niccolò Machiavelli and first published in 1532, remain mysterious. In the last thirty years alone, *The Prince* has reemerged as a résumé for a patronage job, as a satire, and as an intellectual battle with time. Centuries ago, Spinoza and then Rousseau claimed Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* in order to reveal the machinations of princes to the people.[1] Placed on the Index in 1588, condemned by the Jesuits, contested in writing but followed in practice by Frederick the Great, *The Prince* has eluded the cognitive grasp of each generation.

Lacking the seductive bravura of *The Prince*, the *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livy* was all too often overlooked in favor of its glamorous companion. At first glance, the *Discourses* is a rather plodding book on republics that appears to contradict the teaching of *The Prince*, and therein lies another, deeper mystery. We know that Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor and the greatest political figure of the sixteenth century, kept both works together by his bedside – a noteworthy clue. Going backward in time may bring us nearer the light.

To the scholars and activists of the Risorgimento, Machiavelli was a prophet of Italian unity, a patriot of the Italian people, not of princes, as evinced by his

[1] Benedictus de Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise*, trans. Michael Silverthorne and Jonathan Israel, ed. Jonathan Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, trans. G. D. H. Cole (New York: Knopf, 1993). Rousseau writes, "Machiavelli was a proper man and a good citizen; but being attached to the court of the Medici, he could not help veiling his love of liberty in the midst of his country's oppression" (63). It is believed that Alberico Gentili was the first to make this claim in writing, in 1585. Alberico Gentili, *De legationibus livri tres*, trans. Gordon J. Laing (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924), II, 156. His claim that *The Prince* reveals the machinations of tyrannical rule to the people while ostensibly guiding the ruler is quoted in L. A. Burd's splendid edition of *The Prince*. Niccolò Machiavelli, *Il Principe*, ed. L. Arthur Burd (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891).

acid criticisms of the Italian ruling class in both works. Oreste Tommasini, Pasquale Villari, and Alessandro Manzoni saw a kindred spirit in the man of the people who yearned for a free Italy and who wrote, "Truly no province has ever been united or happy unless it has all come under obedience to one republic or to one prince, as happened to France and to Spain."[2] To scholars in the twentieth century, it seemed that the earnest Risorgimento generation read too much of their triumphant selves into Machiavelli, subsuming his political thought under the current of nationalism. However, they left us with important insights on Machiavelli as a populist and patriotic writer and confirmation that old things concerning Machiavelli have been forgotten.[3]

The question of what precisely constitutes Machiavelli's originality and hence the nature of his contribution to the history of political thought has produced a variety of answers. To Benedetto Croce, who bridged the gap between nineteenth- and twentieth-century interpretations, Machiavelli's original contribution to political thought was his formulation of the autonomy of politics.[4] Isaiah Berlin refined this notion into an interpretation of rival moral universes at the heart of Machiavelli's work.[5] For Leo Strauss, Machiavelli's assumption that people are driven by interests and desires inaugurated a new kind of modern political philosophy that jettisoned the civic virtue previously thought necessary for political freedom.[6] Ernst Cassirer claimed that Machiavelli's originality lay in his technical and lucid style, which holds moral judgment in abeyance.[7] Why do Machiavelli and *The Prince*, in particular, seem so modern? This is at once a question of theory and of style.[8] Had Machiavelli not written *The Prince*, it is unclear how many people would read his works today despite the fact that the

[2] Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy*, trans. and eds. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), Book I, chapter 12, 38.

[3] For a classic reading in the nineteenth-century Italian view of Machiavelli, see Francesco De Sanctis, *Storia della letterature italiania*, ed. B. Croce (Bari: Laterza, 1958), I: 141–92. See also Oreste Tommasini, *La vita e gli scritti di Niccolò Machiavelli nello loro relazione col Machiavellismo* (Rome: E. Loescher, 1883–1911).

[4] Benedetto Croce, *Elementi di politica* (Bari: Laterza, 1925), 60.

[5] Isaiah Berlin, "The Originality of Machiavelli," in *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays*, eds. Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer (New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1998), 269–325.

[6] Leo Strauss, *Thoughts on Machiavelli* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958). This statement, of course, does not do justice to Strauss's ruminations on Machiavelli. For a recent study of Machiavelli and English political thought influenced by Strauss, see Paul A. Rahe, *Against Throne and Altar: Machiavelli and Political Theory Under the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), and Harvey Mansfield and J. G. A. Pocock, "An Exchange on Strauss's Machiavelli," *Political Theory* 3, no. 4 (1975): 372–405.

[7] Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

[8] Or in a more scholarly vein, this is a question of ideology on the one hand and of rhetoric on the other. Some scholars would argue that the notion that Machiavelli is "modern" is merely a quality scholars have projected onto an author who was in many respects a Florentine typical of his era and milieu. See Niccolò Capponi, *An Unlikely Prince: The Life and Times of Machiavelli* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2010).

Discourses is a more substantive exploration of republicanism, the *Florentine Histories* a mature and highly ruminative work, and his constitution for Florence more relevant in terms of constitutional theory.[9]

In the latter half of the twentieth century, inspired in part by Hans Baron's *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, scholars rediscovered the "republican Machiavelli" and sought to place him in context, more specifically within a long line of Florentine republican thought.[10] Studies investigating Machiavelli's intellectual and political milieu have sought to identify ways in which he reflects his time and circumstance, intellectual and political, and to freight him with the civic humanist tradition.[11] The label of civic humanist has been given to Machiavelli, not without controversy, to place him in what is termed an ideological world.[12] To be clear, thinking of Machiavelli as a republican goes back to Rousseau if not earlier and differs from defining him as a civic humanist. Both identifications came to the forefront in the wake of Baron's thesis (which held that the Italian republics became aware of their unusual status as polities governed by citizens enjoying liberty and equality under law during the late trecento and early quattrocento wars against the tyrannical Giangaleazzo Visconti of Milan) and the simultaneous rediscovery of the history of republicanism by political theorists inspired by the work of J. G. A. Pocock. There is no

[9] Niccolò Machiavelli, *Istorie Fiorentine*, ed. F. Gaeta (Milan: Feltrinelli,1962); Allan Gilbert, ed., *Machiavelli: The Chief Works and Others* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1965), III; Niccolò Machiavelli, "Discursus florentinarum rerum post mortem iunioris Laurentii Medices," in *Arte della Guerra e scritti politici minori*, ed. S. Bertelli (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1961); Myron P. Gilmore, ed., *Machiavelli: The History of Florence and Other Selections*, trans. Judith A. Rawson (New York: Washington Square Press, 1970).

[10] Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966). John M. Najemy writes, "What Burckhardt was to nineteenth century Renaissance historiography, Baron is to its twentieth century counterpart." John M. Najemy, review of *Essays* by Hans Baron, *Renaissance Quarterly* 45 (1992): 340–50.

[11] For example, Quentin Skinner, *Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), I: 3–189; Maurizio Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State: The Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics 1250–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 2–177.

[12] In answer to the question whether Machiavelli was a humanist, Robert Black writes that Machiavelli knew enough to fill a subordinate rank in the Florentine Chancery, and that "[t]hat should tell us enough." Robert Black, "Machiavelli, Servant of the Florentine Republic," in *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, eds. G. Bock, Q. Skinner, and M. Viroli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 71–99. J. G. A. Pocock's reconstruction of the ideological world of civic republicanism can be considered part of the Baron tradition. However, Pocock's emphasis on innovation differentiates him slightly from Skinner's focus on anchoring Machiavelli in the civic humanist tradition. Both Skinner and Pocock approach Machiavelli from a perspective that stresses a vocabulary shared by a specific category of intellectuals in various places and times and the chains of meaning elaborated around core concepts. See J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975). For a skeptical take on the civic humanist approach to Machiavelli, see Mark Hulliung, *Citizen Machiavelli* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

doubt that this proved a fruitful line of inquiry, leading, among other things, to reinterpretations of American revolutionary and founding era thought. While these endeavors, in more deeply coloring Machiavelli with the tones of his intellectual milieu, have proven illuminating, they have tended to obscure Machiavelli's originality. This forces us to ask again: if Machiavelli is so much a product of his time, so thoroughly soaked in its ideology, theories, habits, and systems of thought, what is so innovative about his work?[13]

Machiavelli's political experience was quite conventional, which makes his originality all the more astonishing, observes Robert Black. For John Najemy, Machiavelli's style is original: he "speaks of empires, kingdoms, principates, or republics" and is already a comparativist.[14] According to Friedrich Meinecke, Machiavelli's momentous discovery was the doctrine of reason of state.[15] As previously mentioned, for Ernst Cassirer, originality was a matter of an analytical style and an empirical, objective approach. This focus on style received renewed life in the many rhetorical studies of *The Prince* and the *Discourses* that blossomed in reaction to the overtly ideological readings of the "Cambridge School." In the view of Maurizio Viroli and Quentin Skinner, Machiavelli's primary contribution to the history of political thought is in the *Discourses'* theory that conflict between classes, the "two humors" rather than concord, is essential to the survival of a republic and ensures the liberty of its citizens.[16] Elena Fasano Guarini makes the subtle observation that Machiavelli's originality lies in the discontinuity between the civic humanist language he knew and the phenomenon he was witnessing for which there was no established answer – the rise of the territorial state.[17] To explore such valuable insights and others, it behooves us to look more closely at the early sixteenth century.

Unlike the bright and brilliant fifteenth century, which lured legions of historians into the archives to make detailed examinations of its political, cultural, economic, and everyday life, the brooding sixteenth century remains a comparative stranger. The rise of cultural, economic, and micro history and the concomitant decline of archive-based diplomatic history, which reigned supreme

[13] Some readers may claim this is not a question worth asking, but if one is curious about Machiavelli's placement in the canon of great political thinkers, the question is worthwhile. The persistent allure of Machiavelli's writings is due in part to the fact that he is both a product of his time and an avatar of things to come.

[14] Robert Black "Machiavelli: servant of the Florentine republic," 71. Quote from John Najemy, in Black, "The controversy surrounding Machiavelli's service to the republic," in Bock, Skinner, and Viroli, 117.

[15] Friedrich Meinecke, *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'état and its Place in Modern History*, trans. Douglas Scott (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).

[16] James Tully, "The Pen Is a Mighty Sword: Quentin Skinner's Analysis of Politics," in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. J. Tully (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987). See also Hulliung, 230–31, and Paul A. Rahe, "Situating Machiavelli," in *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections*, ed. James M. Hankins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 270–308.

[17] Elena Fasano Guarini, "Machiavelli and the Crisis of the Italian Republics," in Bock, Skinner, and Viroli, 17–18.

in the nineteenth century, played a part in dooming the sixteenth century to oblivion or, at best, unpopularity. For example, no one since Ludwig von Pastor has seriously examined the documents of Leo X's pontificate.[18] As a result, materials of consequence for Machiavelli studies have been lingering unread in the Vatican Archives. In seeking to conjure the dimensions of that vanished century, we do not illuminate Machiavelli, but we finally comprehend the darkness that enveloped him. Sixteenth-century Europe was an environment of stunning political transformation. "Every day one sees miraculous losses and acquisitions," Machiavelli observed, of great monarchies on the move, of republics dying, and collectivities uniting in protest movements.[19]

This work seeks to interpret *The Prince* and the *Discourses on Livy* in light of early modern state formation, archival documents from Leo X's pontificate, and the history of popular politics. In recent decades, groundbreaking historical research on the Florentine political arena and Machiavelli's place within it has markedly influenced historians of political thought.[20] Our task is to place these careful studies of the Florentine context against the backdrop of large-scale political and geographic transformation to further illuminate Machiavelli's thought. Scholarship on both early modern-state formation and the history of popular politics has enriched our understanding of various routes that led to the formation of larger states and the role popular collective action played in the development of the early modern state.[21] If we deploy research into state

[18] Recently, Professor Maurizio Gattoni, University of Siena, launched an extraordinary effort to transcribe and publish primary material from the sixteenth century in the archives. For his explanation of why no one has done so until now, see his plea for a renaissance of what he refers to as "geo-political" or diplomatic history in the introduction to his *Leone X e la geo-politica dell Stato Pontifico (1513–1521)* (Citta del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2002), 18–21.

[19] *Discourses*, Book II, chapter 30, 202.

[20] Examples include Nicolai Rubinstein, "Florentina Libertas," *Rinascimento*, n.s. 2 (1986); "Oligarchy and Democracy in Fifteenth Century Florence," *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations*, eds. Sergio Bertelli, Nicolai Rubinstein, and Craig Hugh Smith (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1979–80), I: 107; John Najemy, "Civic Humanism and Florentine Politics," in *Renaissance Civic Humanism Reconsidered*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 75–104; Alison Brown, "The Republic's Two Bodies," in *Languages and Images of Renaissance Italy*, ed. Alison Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 237–62; Alison Brown, *The Medici in Florence: The Exercise and Language of Power* (Florence: Olschki, 1992); "The Language of Empire," *Florentine Tuscany: Structures and Practices of Power*, eds. William Connell and Andrea Zorzi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 32–47; James Hankins, "The Baron Thesis after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 309–38.

[21] Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States, A.D. 990–1990* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990); Thomas Ertman, *Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Mark Greengrass, ed. *Conquest and Coalescence: The Shaping of the State in Early Modern Europe* (London: Edward Arnold, 1991); Charles Tilly, ed., *Cities and the Rise of States in Europe A.D. 1000 to 1800* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994); J. H. Elliott, "A Europe of Composite Monarchies," *Past and Present* 137: 48–71; Thomas Brady, *Turning Swiss: Cities and Empire 1450–1550* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolute State* (London: Verso Press,

formation and popular political action in the early modern period alongside the republican Machiavelli revealed by J. G. A. Pocock; the careful historical work of Alison Brown, John Najemy, James Hankins, and Nicolai Rubinstein; the civic humanist emphasized by the work of Quentin Skinner; the comprehensive studies of the bureaucrat Machiavelli's early works and themes by Gennaro Sasso, Sergio Bertelli, and J. J. Marchand; and examinations of the Florentine republic's territorial expansion, we move toward an ever-more richly hued appreciation of *The Prince* and the *Discourses on Livy*.[22]

Niccolò Machiavelli lived and breathed politics during an especially tumultuous epoch, in a republic that was as frenetic in its constitutions and mutations of state as its *soi disant* rival republic, Venice, was imperturbable. With a mixture of contempt and admiration, Machiavelli watched a popular insurrection that brought Florence a most unlikely leader and protector of its liberties, Savonarola.[23] The rise of a Dominican preacher who, thanks to religious fervor and French arms, managed to shape a new constitution and lead Florence from 1494 to 1498, foreshadowed a century that would explode with popular action. "Popular political action helped to precipitate and fashion entirely new polities like the Swiss Confederation and the Dutch Republic."[24] In the early modern period, most Europeans lived within composite states made up of various formerly independent cities and territories that had been assembled by acquisitive princes.[25] Focus on the nation-state at the expense of the early modern

1979); Wayne te Brake, *Shaping History: Ordinary People in European Politics: 1500–1700* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Brian M. Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

[22] For Skinner and Viroli, see footnote 11. For Viroli, see also *Machiavelli* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). Viroli's interpretations of Machiavelli seem to me to be moving beyond contextualizing him as civic humanist; see Pocock, footnote 12. Studies of Machiavelli's early writings from his years in the Florentine Chancery include Sergio Bertelli, "Nota introduttiva," *Niccolò Machiavelli, Arte della Guerra e scrittici politici minori*, ed. S. Bertelli (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1961); J. J. Marchand, *Niccolò Machiavelli. I primi scritti politici 1499–1512* (Padua: Antenore, 1975); and Gennaro Sasso, *Niccolò Machiavelli: Il pensiero politico* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1980), I. Studies of the Florentine territorial state include Giorgio Chittolini, "The Italian City-State and Its Territory," *City-States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, eds. Anthony Molho, Kurt Raaflaub, and Julia Emlen (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1991), 589–602; Marvin B. Becker, "The Florentine Territorial State and Civic Humanism in the Early Renaissance," in *Florentine Studies: Politics and Society in Renaissance Florence*, ed. Nicolai Rubinstein (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 109–39; and William J. Connell and Andrea Zorzi, eds., *Florentine Tuscany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[23] Donald Weinstein, *Savonarola and Florence: Prophecy and Patriotism in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970); Lauro Martines, *Fire in the City: Savonarola and the Struggle for the Soul of Renaissance Florence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Roberto Ridolfi, *The Life of Girolamo Savonarola*, trans. Cecil Grayson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959).

[24] Te Brake, *Shaping History*, 4.

[25] "It was often in the interstices and margins of these composite early modern state formations that ordinary people enjoyed their greatest political opportunities" (te Brake, *Shaping History*, 2).

composite state, the smaller regional territorial monarchy that dotted the map of sixteenth-century Europe, has obscured the various paths taken in the assemblage of larger territorial states and the critical role popular rather than elite action played in legitimating or contesting elite consolidation. The fractious nature of consolidating conquests meant that popular movements were forces to be reckoned with – a fact that was ignored by previous elite-centered historical accounts of European state formation.[26] Historical research into popular movements and state formation in the early modern period unites the venerable interpretation of Machiavelli as a populist with the detailed contextualist work carried out in recent decades to help us discern the role popular insurrection played in Machiavelli's political thought.[27] If ordinary people were "active participants in the formation of the modern political landscape," one can view *The Prince* and the *Discourses* as Machiavelli's attempt to be a creative participant in the formation of the modern political landscape.[28]

The sixteenth century was a dark time for republics. Republican government, the tradition of conducting government by means of dialogue, was increasingly dismissed as quaint and outmoded. The new era of territorial states ruled by decisive princes in command of mass armies made the small size and collective decision making of municipal republicanism seem a tradition that had outlived its relevance.[29] Those polities that could not compete in the new Europe would be conquered; therefore, values and traditions would have to be sacrificed. The institutions and concepts of republicanism had developed inside the walls of cities, in small face-to-face communes. It was not at all clear how those institutions and concepts could be altered to encompass a larger territory and population.[30] Republics and monarchies faced one another on the plains of Europe and the plateaus of thought in the sixteenth century, and history records the victor. Monarchs would reign preeminent for the next three hundred years.

Machiavelli was not willing to surrender so easily knowing something of great value was in danger of being lost. He wrote, "For a licentious and tumultuous people can be spoken to by a good man, and it can easily be returned to the good way; there is no one who can speak to a wicked prince, nor is there

[26] Te Brake, *Shaping History*, 2.

[27] This approach unites the Spinoza, Gramsci, Althusser, de Grazia interpretive tradition with the detailed historical investigations carried out by Rubinstein, Najemy, Skinner, Viroli, and Brown, for instance.

[28] Te Brake, *Shaping History*,10.

[29] Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

[30] "Historical criticism has given much attention in fact to Machiavelli's stance on the Florentine political struggle; in general his works have been interpreted in that light, although opinions diverge as to what his political attitude actually was. However, only rarely have historians observed the way in which he considers the problems of the territorial state" (Fasano Guarini, in Skinner, Bock, Viroli, 29). If historians have rarely considered Machiavelli in light of the territorial state, it is doubly true of political theorists who, naturally, rely on historians to anchor theoretical works in historical context.

any remedy other than steel."[31] He was determined to figure out how to adapt traditions of popular rule to the new world order of territorial states. This aspect of Machiavelli's work has not attracted attention; hence the full extent of his role in the history of political thought has not been properly assessed. His solution involved the daring effort to conceptualize a popular territorial state in Tuscany, an extended republic. In a sense, *The Prince* and the *Discourses on Livy* are interlocking parts of a project to found a Tuscan state based on Medici territories in central Italy. *The Prince* presents a blueprint for the acquisition of a Tuscan territorial state while the *Discourses* attempts to graft participatory public freedom onto an extended territory.[32] This interpretation of the relationship between the two works is one way to resolve the problem of the distinction between principalities and republics announced in the first chapter of *The Prince*; it is inspired by J. R. Hale's astute observation that Machiavelli wanted a state that was a prince on the outside and a republic on the inside.[33]

Why does *The Prince* call out and claim its readers, involving them in the drastic action it urges at every turn? The urgency and vitality that constitute the book's perennial youth result from the fact that it speaks to the young, the brave, and the ambitious.[34] *The Prince* is a revolutionary manifesto of liberation. It tells readers to take destiny into their hands and calls out for someone "prudent and virtuous" to lead an Italian rebellion against invaders and save Italy, introducing "a form that would confer honor on himself and be good for all her people."[35] It counsels determined and drastic action, and history has shown that the Swiss, Dutch, French, and American revolutionary regimes have all been the products of drastic action.

[31] Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), Book I, chapter 58, 115. Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discorsi sopra la prima Deca di Tito Livio*, ed. Francesco Bausi (Rome: Salerno Editrice, 2001), 276.

[32] This thesis diverges from the interpretation of Fasano Guarini, who holds that Machiavelli realized that the political concepts and languages he inherited were incapable of adequately addressing the political phenomena he witnessed. In her view, he cannot see a way out of the crisis. See Fasano Guarini in Skinner, Bock, Viroli, 35, 40. Mikael Hörnqvist makes an erudite case for Machiavelli's goal of a republican empire. Mikael Hörnqvist, *Machiavelli and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[33] John R. Hale, *Florence and the Medici* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977). Again, though other scholars have resolved the conundrum by stating that Machiavelli was in favor of empire, this study hopes to show that an extended republic is closer to the mark.

[34] Sebastian de Grazia noticed that *The Prince* is a recruiting device: "Niccolò has one task of recruitment and another of education." Sebastian de Grazia, *Machiavelli in Hell* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 276. Other readers, including Louis Althusser, have noticed this as well. Louis Althusser, *Machiavelli and Us*, ed. Francois Matheron (New York: Verso Press, 1999).

[35] Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince, with Related Documents*, ed. and trans. William J. Connell (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005), 119, and Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

The entire sixteenth century was a time of chaos and popular rebellion across Europe. Republics were urban. Principalities and monarchies were territorial. City and territory were opposed in the state-building process and republics were falling far behind. Republics needed to become territorial by encompassing both city and countryside. Was this theoretically and practically possible? Machiavelli melded theory and practice in a variegated plan that unfolds through *The Prince* and the *Discourses*.[36]

In brief, Machiavelli's ideal prince was an aggrandizing prince *in favor of liberty*.[37] A prince would lead a popular rebellion against foreign overlords and, leading a citizen army, assemble a composite state rooted in popular rebellion rather than in an alliance between the prince and local elites. As outlined in the *Discourses*, the composite principality would evolve into an extended composite republic. The Medici or fortune's prince would surrender power and bring good to the people or there would be a non-violent revolution, "a mutation of state," and the prince would be thrown out, as the Romans exiled the Tarquins, with "none . . . injured but the head."[38] At the same time, republican elites such as the Strozzi would need to be persuaded to join the revolution and the new republic, for a republic, even a popular one, cannot survive without the audacious spirit of the *grandi*. Then would come the greatest challenge: to develop institutions and procedures that would support an extended territorial republic. Is it possible to involve more people in city and countryside in the political life of a republic? Machiavelli answered by renovating the institutions of that other great territorial republic, ancient Rome, for modern Tuscany. Moreover, Machiavelli was the first political thinker to fully appreciate the crucial role played by ordinary people in sustaining the life of a republic. In his analysis of nonviolent regime change and in his sweeping study of the role of the plebeians in Rome, Machiavelli explored ways of assimilating the power of the people and

[36] The notion that Machiavelli had a plan is not new. In 1538, an Englishman named Reginald Pole stated that Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* in order to trick the Medici, cited in Burd, 36–38. Mary Dietz and Albert Ascoli have each written articles on the topic, and Maurizio Viroli has acknowledged in passing that Machiavelli's aim was to influence policy making, albeit primarily indirectly through education. Maurizio Viroli, "Machiavelli and the Republican Idea of Politics," in Skinner, Bock, and Viroli, 170.Mary G. Dietz, "Trapping *The Prince:* Machiavelli and the Politics of Deception," *American Political Science Review* 80 (1986): 777–99. Albert Ascoli, "Machiavelli's Gift of Counsel," in *Machiavelli and the Discourse of Literature*, eds. Arthur R. Ascoli and Victoria I. Kahn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 238. The differences between those interpretations and the one proffered here, which emphasizes the role of Tuscany, will be addressed in the following chapter.

[37] As mentioned, Sebastian de Grazia noticed that *The Prince* is intended to recruit a leader: "He undertakes these tasks most directly in *The Prince*." De Grazia, 276. See also Corrado Vivanti's introduction to his edition of Machiavelli's works, Niccolò Machiavelli, *Opere*, ed. C. Vivanti (Turin: Einaudi, 1997), I. Vivanti interprets the *Discourses* as a political proposal to reorganize Italian republics during uncertain times.

[38] *Discourses*, Book III, chapter 3: "That It Is Necessary to Kill the Sons of Brutus If One Wishes to Maintain a Newly Acquired Freedom." Mansfield and Tarcov, 214–15; Bausi II: 539–43.

channeling collective action so as to revive rather than destroy republics. Above all, it was his praise of popular movements and his understanding of the vital political role of the common people that drew the leaders of the Risorgimento, one of the great popular movements of the nineteenth century, to Machiavelli.

If *The Prince* can be interpreted as a revolutionary manifesto, the *Discourses* can be read as a work of comparative politics, a survey of the past and present political map of Europe, embracing republics ancient and modern, confederacies, the Tuscan and Swiss leagues, Dutch cities, principalities, the Roman and Ottoman empires, and the kingdoms of France and Spain.[39] It is plausible to analyze the *Discourses* as Machiavelli's effort to solve the three problems faced by an extended republic: how to expand in space, how to survive in times of both war and peace, and how to graft participatory politics onto an extended territory. Chapter 2 of this work, "The Spaces of Fortune," covers early modern state building and, more precisely, how Machiavelli envisioned the expansion of the Florentine republic to embrace city and territory under a single sovereignty. Chapter 3, "Necessity: The Survival of the Republic," examines Florentine foreign policy institutions, the problems Machiavelli discerned in them, and the solutions he believed he found in Roman institutions for ordinary and extraordinary times. Machiavelli's prescriptions appear more traditionally Roman than deceptively elitist or democratically innovative.

Chapter 4, "Early Modern and Eighteenth-Century Transitions," discusses how the transition from a principality to a republic might be effected, various forms of union in the early modern period, from princely consolidation to republican confederations, as well as composite government in theory. In addition, the chapter considers the Articles of Confederation, as both a conventional republican league and as a critical conduit in the practice and theory of federalism, and finally how powers over foreign policy – executive, legislative, and prerogative – the fundamental powers of the Confederation, were debated and allocated in the new American republic. Chapter 5, "Envisioning an Extended Republic," delves into Machiavelli's answer to the question that bedeviled the framers of the American republic: is it possible to extend the concepts and institutions of popular government to large states? Republicanism in practice and theory requires the face-to-face polity. "Why is the experiment of the extended republic to be rejected merely because it may comprise what is new?" James Madison observed in *The Federalist Papers*.[40] This study seeks to demonstrate that Machiavelli had his own "Madisonian Impulse."[41] Chapter 5 reviews Madison's impulse to construct a form of compound union

[39] This is of course one of many ways to interpret *The Prince*.

[40] Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, *The Federalist with Letters of "Brutus,"* ed. Terence Ball (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 63.

[41] This term harkens to Jack Rakove's "Madisonian Moment" in an article that attempted to locate Madison's authoritative interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. See Jack N. Rakove, "The Madisonian Moment," *University of Chicago Law Review* 65 (1988): 473–505.