DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 170 CS 502 846

AUTHOR Wiethoff, William E.
TITLE Machiavelli's "Mandragola": Comedic Commentary on Renaissance Rhetoric.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979). Best Copy Available.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Drama; Literary Criticism; Renaissance Literature; *Rhetoric
IDENTIFIERS *Machiavelli (Niccolo)

ABSTRACT

This paper traces Machiavelli's debt to classical rhetoric while outlining the rhetorical tenor of his comedy, "Mandragola." The paper specifically analyzes Machiavelli's attention to the medieval transmission of Ciceronian rhetoric by Boethius, as interpreted from the setting, characterization, and dialogue of "Mandragola." The conclusion addresses critical problems posed by Machiavelli's "reactionary" view of the roles that rhetoric and dialectic should play in Renaissance discourse. (FL)

MACHIAVELLI'S MANDRAGOLA: COMEDIC COMMENTARY ON RENAISSANCE RHETORIC

William E. Wiethoff

Indiana University

MACHIAVELLI'S MANDRAGOLA: COMEDIC
COMMENTARY ON RENAISSANCE RHETORIC

The critical neglect of Niccolò Machiavelli's contributions to the history of rhetoric seems especially arbitrary considering the Florentine's diverse writings. Though critics may rue his utilitarian politics as Second Secretary of the Florentine chancellery and his merely conventional practice of the ars dictaminis, "the eminently practical art of composing documents, letters, and public speeches,"[1] Machiavelli the poet offers a particularly engaging perspective on the Renaissance concepts of rhetoric. Machiavelli's life (1469-1527) spanned a period in which the Italian Renaissance reached maturity. Machiavelli's dramatic literature reflected the renascence of classical Greek authors like Aristophanes, whose artistic links with the later Roman "New Comedy" of Plautus illustrated the long-lived political relationship between dramatic speechmaking and rhetorical precepts.[2] The classical dramatist "was the admirer of olden days. . . as politics as in culture" and contemptuously railed against the political "vices" of his day.[3] Machiavelli composed his own dramatic works after his exile from Florentine politics by the resurgent Medici family (1513), and during his participation in the humanist discussions patronized by Bernardo and Cosimino Rucellai.[4] The humanist influence on Machiavelli's works was articulated consistently in the Oricellari gardens of the Rucellai family and "became predominant in his comedies."[5] In comparison with his other comedies, Andria (translated from the

same second-century B.C. work by Terence)[6] and Clizia (adapted from Plautus' Casina),[7] and with the works of contemporaries, Machiavelli's Mandragola represents perhaps "the only Italian play of this period with vigour, characterization, and style enough to hold the stage today."[8] The perennial qualities of Mandragola make its delineation of Renaissance rhetoric very attractive.

This essay traces Machiavelli's debt to classical rhetoric while outlining the rhetorical tenor of Mandragola. The essay specifically analyzes Machiavelli's attention to the medieval transmission of Ciceronian rhetoric by Boethius, as interpreted from the setting, characterization, and dialogue of Mandragola. Classical norms for the definition and elaboration of rhetoric dictate the interpretive method. The conclusion addresses critical problems posed by Machiavelli's "reactionary" view of the roles which rhetoric and dialectic should play in Renaissance discourse.

The Rhetorical Tenor of Mandragola

Commentators of varied perspectives agree that Machiavelli "uses literary imagination as a vehicle of political truth,"[9] although the relative certitude of such commentaries has provoked rejoinders to "the politicalization of the Mandragola."[10] J. R. Hale sustains the majority decision by identifying within the comedy "rules for the man of action preached by Machiavelli elsewhere."[11] Theodore Sumberg adds the explanation that "the play is a series of illustrations that have the advantage of

being more freely developed than the textual illustrations. . . La Mandragola contributes only something to confirm or correct points made in the other works" (for example, "Machiavelli urges conspiracies only against corrupt states").[12] Allan Gilbert specifies that "[n]ot to know Mandragola is not to know The Prince."[13]

Machiavelli explicated his rhetorical motives in the introductory lyrics written especially for a 1526 performance planned for Francesco Guicciardini, "in whom may be seen all virtues that unite in the Countenance Eternal" (p. 776). The Prolog further explains Machiavelli's strategy for making the best of his political exile: "Since he has been cut off from showing other powers with other deeds, there being no pay for his labors. . . . He plays the servant to such as can wear a better cloak than he can" (p. 778). True to the antique deference shown by predecessors such as Aristophanes and Plautus, Machiavelli also complained that "from ancient worth the present age in every way is degenerate" (p. 778). Machiavelli's regard for ancient rhetoric expanded throughout his education and professional experience. General training in the classics was commonplace in the "ordinary" educational sequence,[14] and humanist training particularly stressed "the central role of rhetorical skill" as outlined by Cicero's De Inventione and the anonymous Rhetorica ad Herennium.[15] Machiavelli's secretarial duties followed the tradition of medieval dictatores who fostered a rhetorical "sensitivity" to language and style while stressing the political "ability of

the word to shape, determine, and fix social hierarchies."[16] The dynamic relationship between rhetoric and politics in the comedy also indicates Machiavelli's debt to classical theories of dialectic.

The Prolog identifies the character of Nicia, "a judge by no means shrewd," as a likely antagonist because he supposedly "learned in Buethius a great deal of law" (p. 777). The comic appraisal of Nicia, in which Machiavelli exploited a pun linking ox-like stupidity (bue) and the sixth-century scholarship of Boethius, illustrates the special value attached to dialectical skill. "[P]olitical interests" sustained the popularity of Boethius' commentary on classical dialectic, De differentiis topicis (especially Book IV), and insured "a general currency approaching. . . the Ad Herennium and De Inventione."[17] Machiavelli apparently shared the traditional appreciation of Boethius' integration of dialectical and rhetorical topics,[18] though most Italian humanists subordinated dialectic to rhetoric.[19] Boethius became valuable because his "dissociation of rhetoric from a specific subject area" and his detailed explanation of the propositum, causa, and status of controversies permitted wide, pragmatic applications of his work in civil affairs.[20] Nicia should have been conversant with "Boethius' restricted view of rhetoric" because any reputable judge should be professionally "preoccupied with law."[21] Nicia's actual lack of dialectical expertise and the other antagonists' preference for sheer eristic illustrate deficient Renaissance standards of rhetoric. The comedy's

ideological support for Machiavelli's political theory and practice and its satirical treatment of Florentine academic norms imbue Mandragola with a thoroughly rhetorical tenor. The following interpretation of Mandragola emphasizes its rhetorical significance on both explicit and esoteric levels.

Mandragola: An Interpretation

Machiavelli published Mandragola at Florence in 1518.[22] The canzones, or transitional lyrics, were added in 1526 but were not published until the 1570's.[23] Machiavelli's dramatic literature did not gain the international influence achieved by his explicitly political works. Although Machiavelli's dramatic characterizations might be traced in related works by Elizabethans like Christopher Marlowe, Machiavelli's fiction was not as highly regarded as the more pragmatic works like his Art of War (first translated into English about 1560 by Whitehorne).[24]

In Five Acts Mandragola depicts the successful efforts of Callimaco to seduce Lucretia, young wife of the old and foolish Nicia. Other major characters include Ligurio, a cunning aide to Callimaco, and Fra Timoteo, a corrupt friar who is bribed for his religious influence over Lucretia. The comedy derives its title from the mandrake root whose legendary medicinal qualities are used to secure Nicia's cooperation in the seduction. The setting of the comedy recreates a "sensual carnival" familiar to Florentines,[25] as well as "a world without virtù."[26] Machiavelli designed Mandragola to amuse audiences

with the first depiction while rhetorically equating it to the second. The characterizations may suggest an allegory of noted political and religious leaders of Renaissance Italy.[27] Machiavelli's abiding concern for virtu, or the human integration of political, martial, and philosophical excellence,[28] surely suggests a moral typology of characters. Callimaco, for example, represents "a transposition of Machiavelli's own embittered patriotism" while Fra Timoteo symbolizes "the narrow commercial outlook of the corrupt monastic orders."[29] Machiavelli revealed the rhetorical tenor of Mandragola most clearly in the dialogue. His characters' argument and elocution define Machiavelli's understanding of rhetorical theory and his pragmatic estimate of dialectical skill. Other works such as The Prince and the Discourses on Livy reflect a substantial Ciceronian influence on their structure and tactical prescriptions.[30] Medieval and Renaissance definitions of rhetoric typically followed Cicero in stressing the "subject matter, nature, and end of the art."[31] The dialogue in Mandragola exhibits Ciceronian and Boethian influences while following traditional norms of rhetorical definition.

Callimaco's discourse in Act One, Scene One, quickly delineates Machiavelli's standards of "virtuous" rhetoric. Callimaco hints at his rhetorical indebtedness by initially recounting how the careful apportioning of his time into "studies. . . amusement. . . business" (studii, piaceri, faccende) produced personal happiness, peace, and prosperity (p. 779). The parallel between Callimaco's three categories and

Cicero's summary of the three ends of oratory--to teach, to please, to move--is striking.[32] Callimaco also defines the end, nature, and matter of his current labors. He plans to win Madonna Lucretia for his lover (p. 780), carefully considering "the nature of the woman" and other characters involved (pp. 780-81), through the materials supplied by Ligurio's considerable skill in persuasive "communication" (p. 781). Machiavelli did not have Callimaco list the rhetorical elements in reversed order arbitrarily. Mandragola includes testimony to the decay of Renaissance discourse and, later in the comedy, flawed characters like Timoteo exhibit grossly eristic preferences. Callimaco's reversal of definitional elements in rhetoric illustrates the extensive influence of the decadent philosophy that the end justifies the means. Callimaco eloquently expresses his awareness of the dilemma facing him. The rhetorical questions--"But what can I do? What plan can I take up? Where shall I turn?"--and the asyndeton--"I've got to try something even if it's strange, risky, injurious, disgraceful"--and the antithesis--"It's better to die than to live as I do"--color Callimaco's discourse with distinctly polished style (p. 784). The canzone reasserts Callimaco's dilemma--"how one can search for ill and run away from good"--while stressing the "dread" with which rhetorical "weapons" must be viewed (p. 785). Act One clearly suggests standards of argument and elocution against which Machiavelli intended to measure his characters. Although the dramatist indulged himself in commentaries on political practice--

Callimaco's slur on the French invasion of Italy in 1498--and on political theory--Callimaco's lament on the power of 'Fortune" in men's affairs (p. 779)--the rhetorical commentary within Act One is equally strident.

Callimaco and Ligurio decide on their plot as Act Two opens. Ligurio must help to convince Nicia that Callimaco is an expert physician who can insure Lucretia's pregnancy. Nicia must also be tricked into believing that his fervently desired offspring will be secured without extensive moral and physical complications. Machiavelli traced the decay of rhetorical proofs in Act Two. Ligurio assures Nicia in Sene One that Callimaco's medical credentials are impeccable, "in bearing, in learning, in speech" (p. 786). The categories of presenzia, dottrina, and lingua parallel Cicero's account of ethical, rational, and pathetic modes of proof (after Aristotle).[33] Machiavelli mocked the supposedly learned man who speaks in latin throughout Act Two, driving home the point that such a man should also understand the rhetorical doctrine behind the technical latin terminology. Callimaco interrogates Nicia in Scene Two about the possible "causae sterilitatis" behind Lucretia's failure to bear a child (p. 787). The series of dialectical questions in latin should have been a familiar process for a student of Boethius. Nicia obviously does not grasp the matter behind the dialectical form and eventually succumbs to another interrogation by Callimaco in Scene Six: "Well then, Judge, either you have faith in me or you haven't; either I can tell you of a sure cure or I can't" (p. 790).

Machiavelli ridiculed the old man's lack of dexterity during his disputation with Callimaco in the concluding lyrics: "This judge of yours, in hope to have children, will believe that an ass can fly" (p. 793). Nicia's deficiency in dialectic violates general standards of virtue as defined in Machiavelli's other works. The judge's lack of basic study in law suggests an unacceptable level of "moral energy;" his dogged attempts to muddle through the disputation with Callimaco seems to violate norms of "political expediency."[34] The dialogue of Act Two also provides Machiavelli with another forum for political commentary: Nicia mouths the lament in Scene Three that "a man who doesn't have pull with the government of this city, though of my standing, can't find a dog to bark at him" (p. 788).

Machiavelli portrayed foolish submission to dialectical questioning in Act Two and intensified his criticism of flawed rhetoric through portrayals of eristic in Act Three. The characters of Ligurio and Timoteo successfully persuade each other and other characters through grossly "specious logic."[35] The relatively minor character of Sostrata introduces the contorted arguments of Act Three with the observation that "it's the part of a prudent man to take the best among bad choices" (p. 793). Ligurio plays his role in the eristic exhibition by assuring Nicia that, regardless of the confusing and seemingly contradictory arguments which he will hear, "it'll all fit in" with the plot (p. 795). Ligurio's overtures to Fra Timoteo in enlisting his cooperation illustrate eristic premises and form clearly. Ligurio explains in Scene Four that he supports

"what does good to the largest number, and with which the largest number are pleased" (p. 798).[36] Ligurio demonstrates an allied antithetical form in persuading Timoteo later to accept a conspiracy "that'll be less blamed and gossiped about, more pleasing to us, more profitable to you" (p. 799). Fra Timoteo ultimately contributes the most extensive eristic illustration in Act Three himself. Friars like Timoteo, described as "nasty" by Nicia and "knavish, crafty" by Ligurio (pp. 794-95), have been denigrated for contributing a peculiarly "Jesuit influence" which sustained political machiavellism.[37] Timoteo's speech to Lucretia in Scene Eleven, a masterpiece of "pre-Jesuitic casuistry,"[38] proclaims the "end justifies the means" ethic so fundamental to Machiavelli's civil philosophy.[39] In the case of un bene certo e un male incerto, Timoteo advises Lucretia "never to give up the [certain] good for fear of the [uncertain] evil"; and "as to the action, the notion that it's a sin is a fairy story, because the will is what sins, not the body. . . . Besides this, one's purpose must be considered in everything" (p. 802). Timoteo's advice echoes both the illustration and explanation in Boethius' analysis of the common topic "from the end": "If happiness is good, then justice is good, because the end of justice is to bring happiness. This proposition depends on the belief that all means that have a good end are good in themselves."[40] Dissatisfied with merely distorting the dialectical process, Timoteo also apes the ideal man's use of eloquent figures (see Callimaco's soliloquy in Act One, Scene Three): "There are many things that at a

distance seem terrible, unbearable, strange; yet when you get close to them they seem mild, bearable, normal" (p. 802). Machiavelli summarized the Act's rhetorical commentary in the concluding canzone. The lyrical reminder of Ligurio's and Timoteo's "trick", which "makes sweet every bitter thing that has been tasted" (p. 804), restates typical indictments of the classical sophists for making the worse appear the better through eristical skill. In Scene Two Ligurio's criticism of Nicia as a bookish fellow who "can't manage practical affairs" (p. 795) sustains Machiavelli's complaint about his political exile.[41]

Machiavelli reasserted the antidote to decadent rhetoric in Act Four. Callimaco delivers a soliloquy punctuated with mercantile, nautical, and organic imagery, as well as flowing rhetorical figures. The "virtuous" character meditates on the phenomena "that Fortune and Nature keep their account balanced," that he is "a ship tossed by two opposing winds," and that as a result "[m]y legs tremble, my vitals are shaken, my heart is torn out of my breast, my arms lose their strength, my tongue falls silent, my eyes are dazzled, my brain whirls" (p. 804). Callimaco does not only express an eloquent reluctance about his conspiratorial acts which is absent in other characters' discourse but also grounds his antitheses and asyndeta in regrets about his moral dilemma. The integration of substance and style, matter and form, distinguishes the soliloquy. Callimaco's organic imagery further suggests an intellectual debt to the classics: the images recount those used by the

"learned" Catullus in his first-century B.C. poetry.[42] Timoteo's later caution--"many times one comes to harm by being too accommodating and too good, as well as by being too bad" (p. 810)--comprises a predictably shallow retort to Callimaco's meditation. Act Four concludes with lyrics depicting Callimaco's successful tryst with Lucretia as the "happy hours" which "set every icy heart afire with love" (p. 815).

Act Five stresses the excellent prospects for Callimaco's continuing liason with Lucretia. The Act also summarizes Machiavelli's contempt for characters whose deficiencies have been revealed in their flawed rhetoric throughout preceding Acts. For example, Timoteo assails his own type of friar for having "few brains" (p. 815); later Lucretia is quoted as condemning Timoteo's "rascality" (p. 819). Nicia receives unanimous criticisms as "stupid" in Scenes Three and Four (p. 818); Lucretia, once a dutiful spouse but now a willful mistress, is quoted as seconding her "husband's stupidity" (p. 819).

Summary and Conclusion

Machiavelli dramatically adapted Ciceronian disposition to Mandragola's indictment of Renaissance rhetoric.[43] An introductory Prolog identifies the dramatist's motives; Act One narrates the ends and definition of rhetoric as well as apt style; Act Two depicts a preliminary clash of erudite and foolish rhetors while partitioning their mutual need for dialectical analysis and rhetorical proofs; Act Three refutes ad absurdum the philosophical premises, argumentative techniques,

an allied style of decadent rhetoric; Act Four confirms that classical rhetorical alternatives are available; Act Five summarizes the lasting judgments which befall "virtuous" rhetors and their antagonists. The structure of Mandragola, though remarkably clear in its debt to Ciceronian disposition, predictably illustrates rhetoric's centrality among Renaissance esthetic principles.[44] The rhetorical structure would have been just as obvious had Machiavelli chosen brush strokes instead of literary flourishes.

Machiavelli's political editorials assume a tactically secondary position in Mandragola. The exiled chancellor probably sought no more solace than that provided by regular productions of his societal burlesque. Machiavelli's practical illustrations of argument within the comedy emphasize thoughtful and occasionally valid standards of analysis. The relative ease with which both virtuous characters and their opponents achieve polished elocution demeans rhetorical criticism which merely stresses stylistic merit. Correct dialectical technique emerges as virtuously expedient in the comedy. Machiavelli's high regard for valid yet expedient argument corroborates his principle, expressed in the Prolog to Clizia, that "[c]omedies exist to benefit and to please the audience" (p. 824). Illustrations of valid dialectic could benefit the audience's education while the dramatist's expedient choice of dialectical premises could more immediately please the ear. The choice of Ciceronian and Boethian sources for rhetorical theory also corroborates Machiavelli's humanist ode in Clizia: "How happy is the day

on which we can bring up old memories and do them honor" (p. 822).

The internally consistent view of rhetoric expressed in Mandragola challenges coherent criticism of Machiavelli. The master of utilitarian politics and progressive martial arts seemed to espouse reactionary ideals in his poetry by not subordinating dialectic to rhetoric. Although the inconsistency may be dismissed simply as a formulary adoption of the literary medium to take advantage of its freer forms and palatable materials, Machiavelli's rhetorical strategy should be evaluated at a less incidental level. Ultimately Mandragola decries rhetorical excesses on the one hand and an extreme lack of rhetorical training on the other hand. If Machiavelli remains "a typical witness to the Renaissance,"[45] and if he realized the tactical limitations of universalism, permanence, conventionality, and naturalness for dramatic statements about Renaissance society,[46] then his deference to ancient rhetoric comprised a rather sophisticated challenge to the audience. Machiavelli promoted the Ciceronian mean of philosophical oratory as both an ideal and an expedient alternative to existing extremes. The poetic medium provided Machiavelli with expedient forms and materials of expression. However, the comedic context also permitted Machiavelli to dictate his selected, reactionary ideals under the guise of fictional characters. Temporarily dissociated from the authorship of political and military manuals, the dramatist indulged in an ideological selectivity which would be denied him otherwise on the grounds of personal inconsistency. He exercised a

technical virtuousity which fulfilled his own expansive concept of the term virtù, just as he prescribed selective abrogations of the universal, permanent, conventional, and natural norms which dictate behavior for all but the most loved and most feared demagogues.[47] Fortunately for the history of rhetoric, Machiavelli's statement of rhetorical idealism heightened the comedic effect and made Mandragola publicly "accessible in the highest possible degree."[48]

Renaissance humanists typically preached a reconstitution of classical norms for society and Machiavelli adhered to the traditional end of humanist appeals. Further research on this period should specifically examine the possibly novel means with which humanist goals were pursued through nominally non-rhetorical media. Substantial directions already exist for analyzing the grammatical tactics of expressing "personality" or "sensibility" by Renaissance historians such as Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, and Poggio Bracciolini.[49] Machiavelli's History of Florence, for example, or the History of Italy by his friend and eventual fellow exile, Francesco Guicciardini, may provide more complete clues to the technique of rhetorical insinuation in Renaissance historiography.

ENDNOTES

[1]Paul Oskar Kristeller, The Classics and Renaissance Thought, Martin Classical Lectures, 15 (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1955), p. 12.

[2]Charles T. Murphy, "Aristophanes and the Art of Rhetoric," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 49 (1938), 69-113.

[3]A. W. Gomme, "Aristophanes and Politics," Classical Review, 52 (1938), 97-99.

[4]J. R. Hale, Machiavelli and Renaissance History (N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1960), p. 171.

[5]Felix Gilbert, "Machiavelli in Modern Historical Scholarship," Italian Quarterly, 14 (1970), 20.

[6]Hale, p. 183.

[7]Edmond Barincou, Machiavelli, trans. Helen R. Lane (N.Y.: Grove Press, 1961), p. 106. Plautus himself borrowed freely from the earlier κληροῦμενοι of Diphilus.

[8]Hale, p. 23.

[9]Anthony Parel, "Machiavelli Minore," in The Political Calculus, ed. Anthony Parel (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972), p. 183. Also see the opinions that "Mandragola is the comedy of a society of which The Prince is the tragedy" in Pasquale Villari, The Life and Times of Niccolo Machiavelli, trans. Linda Villari, 2nd edition (London: Unwin, 1883), p. 349, and that "Machiavelli the artist is the same, after all, as Machiavelli the politician" in Francesco De Sanctis, History of Italian Literature, trans. Joan Redfern (N. Y.: Basic Books, 1959), p. 582.

[10]Dante Della Terza, "The Most Recent Image of Machiavelli: The Contribution of the Linguist and Literary Historian," Italian Quarterly, 14 (1970), 104. Also see Peter F. Bondanella, Machiavelli and the Art of Renaissance History (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1973), p. 122.

[11]Hale, p. 185.

[12]Theodore A. Sumberg, "La Mandragola: An Interpretation," Journal of Politics, 23 (1961), 339 and 328.

[13]Machiavelli: The Chief Works and Others, trans. Allan Gilbert (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1965), II, p. 775. All subsequent citations of Mandragola and Clizia within the text refer to Gilbert's second volume.

[14]Villari, p. 223.

[15]Hanna H. Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence," Journal of the History of Ideas, 24 (1963), 498.

[16]John O. Ward, "From Antiquity to the Renaissance: Glosses and Commentaries on Cicero's Rhetorica," in Medieval Eloquence - Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1978), p. 67.

[17]Ward, p. 54.

[18]See Richard McKeon, "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Speculum, 17 (1942), 10.

[19]James R. McNally, "Rector et Dux Populi: Italian Humanists and the Relationship between Rhetoric and Logic," Modern Philology, 67 (1969), 168-76.

[20]Michael C. Leff, "Boethius' De differentiis topicis, Book IV," in Murphy, p. 23,

[21]Michael C. Leff, "Boethius and the History of Medieval Rhetoric," Central States Speech Journal, 25 (1974), 141.

[22]The actual date of the play's composition remains moot. Most critics base their judgment on the play's reference to a potential Turkish invasion of Italy.

[23]Roberto Ridolfi, The Life of Niccolò Machiavelli, trans. Cecil Grayson (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 170. The songs may well have been designed to "showcase" the talents of Machiavelli's paramour, Barbera; see Barincou, p. 100.

[24]Edward Meyer, Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama (N. Y.: Burt Franklin, 1969 (1897), pp. 38-41.

[25]Ridolfi, p. 11.

[26]Parel, p. 193.

[27]See Bondanella, pp. 111-14.

[28]See the survey of definitions in William E. Wiethoff, "The Martial 'Virtue' of Rhetoric in Machiavelli's Art of War," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64 (1978), 306-7.

[29]Barincou, p. 100.

[30]William E. Wiethoff, "Machiavelli's The Prince: Rhetorical Influence in Civil Philosophy," Western Speech, 38 (1974), 98-107.

[31]McKeon, p. 1.

[32]Cicero, Orator 21. 69, trans. Harry M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1962).

[33]Cicero, De Oratore 2. 27. 115, trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1967).

[34]See derivations of the term virtù respectively in Felix Gilbert, "On Machiavelli's Idea of Virtu," Renaissance News, 4 (1951), 54, and in Linton C. Stevens, "Machiavelli's Virtù and the Voluntarism of Montaigne," Renaissance Papers, (1957), 123.

[35]Bondanella, p. 120.

[36]See a parallel explanation of oratorical effectiveness in Cicero, Brutus 50. 186-89, trans. G. L. Hendrickson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1962), and the extensive analysis in Richard Leo Enos and Jeanne L. McClaran, "Audience and Image in Ciceronian Rome: Creation and Constraints of the Vir Bonus Personality," Central States Speech Journal, 29 (1978), 98-106.

[37]Mario Praz, Machiavelli and the Elizabethans, reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy (London: Folcroft Library, 1928), p. 37.

[38]Douglas Radcliff-Umstead, The Birth of Modern Comedy in Renaissance Italy (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 129.

[39]See The Prince, Ch. 18, 21, and 26, in Machiavelli: The Chief Works and Others, trans. Allan Gilbert (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1965), I, pp. 64-7, 81-4, 92-6.

[40]Boethius, De differentiis topicis 2. 1189D; and see variants of the analysis for translations by Eleonore Stump (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1978), p. 53, and by Leff, "Boethius' De differentiis topicis, Book IV," p. 7.

[41]On May 28, 1498, Machiavelli won the position of second Florentine chancellor over, among other, Francesco Gaddi, a "bookish" teacher of rhetoric at the University.

[42]Catullus, The Poems, 51, trans. James Michie (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1969), pp. 84-5. Catullus was regarded as doctus by classical critics due to his scholarly concern for technical perfection.

[43]See the terse outline of exordium, narration, partition, confirmation and refutation, and peroration in Cicero, De Inventione 1. 14. 19, trans. Harry M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968).

[44]See Vincent M. Bevilacqua, "Rhetoric and the Circle of Moral Studies: An Historiographic View," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (1969), 343-44.

[45]Ernst Cassirer, The Myth of the State (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1946), p. 129.

[46]See the discussion of "limits" which theoretically mandate a rhetorical tenor in all fictional works in Wayne C. Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 110-16.

[47]See Machiavelli's consistent stress on the virtuous leader's need to "be loved and feared" in The Prince, Ch. 7-23 (pp. 27-88).

[48]Booth, pp. 103-05.

[49]Nancy S. Struever, The Language of History in the Renaissance: Rhetoric and Historical Consciousness in Florentine Humanism (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1970).