University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1-1930

Machiavelli and Shakespeare.

Edith M. Stark

University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stark, Edith M., "Machiavelli and Shakespeare." (1930). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1373.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1373>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Machiavelli and Shakespeare ✓

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

Department of English

By

Edith M. Stark ✓

1930

CONTENTS

	Page
I. An Introduction To Nicola Machiavelli	1
II. Conditions In Italy Which Made Machiavelli's Philosophy Possible	12
III. Analysis Of "The Prince", An Outline Of The Machiavellian Principles ..	25
IV. Shakespeare's Machiavellian Princes And Politie Knaves	33
V. Allusions To Machiavellian Philosophy	62
VI. Summary	72
VII. Bibliography	76

Machiavelli and Shakespeare

An Introduction To Nicola Machiavelli

A brief introduction to Nicola Machiavelli is necessary for a better understanding of the influence he exerted upon English thought.

He was a descendant of old Florentine nobility and lived from 1469 to 1527. Little is known of his early years and education, but it is evident from his works that he read widely in the Latin and Italian classics, particularly the Roman histories, and that he was a student of men and things.

His first entrance into public service was made in 1494. He was made clerk of the second chancery and four years later was appointed second chancellor of the republic, and secretary. He retained this position until the return of the Medici to power in 1512. His superior officers had charge of the department of war and the interior, and while thus steeped in Florentine diplomatic service and voluminous correspondence he had every opportunity to study state-craft and the relative strength of nations, and to estimate the essential elements of success or failure.

With the return of the Medici to power his political career came to an end, and the remaining years of his life, from 1512 until 1527, were spent in writing the works which have made his name immortal. They are the condensed result of practical experience combined with meditations on the Latin historians; and the principles set forth in them have been far-reaching in their influence.

The work by which he is best remembered is "The Prince" a short prose dissertation on monarchical institutions. It consists of twenty-six chapters of political science telling how an ambitious man may rise to power. It is dedicated to Piero Lorenzo, son of Piero de Medici. This work has been both praised and condemned. His political theory is full of moral contradictions - in fact, his ideas are cold, calculating, scientific and un-moral. He assumes that human nature is the same throughout all ages, has no patience with half measures, and cites as his model Cesare Borgia, a man who relegated morality to the background and bent all his efforts to his one great object, namely, political attainment. Machiavelli idealized the man. Borgia was his conception of a perfect prince.

In speaking of Borgia, Machiavelli says, "He exerted his utmost endeavors and employed every means that skill or prudence could suggest to retain those states which he had acquired by the arms and good fortune of another (his father). If the measures he adopted did not succeed it was not his fault, but rather owing to the extreme perversity of fortune. He laid a firm foundation for future greatness."¹

The following quotation is taken from Machiavelli's letter to Francesco Fettori, dated December 13, 1513, and it gives us an insight into his purpose in "The Prince."

1. Machiavelli, Nicola, Bohn's Standard Library Edition, "The Prince", Chap., 7, London, 1876.

"The evening being come, I return home and go to my study; at the entrance I pull off my peasant clothes, covered with dust and dirt, and put on my noble court dress, and thus becomingly re-clothed I pass into the ancient courts of the men of old, where, being lovingly received by them, I am fed with that food which is mine alone; where I do not hesitate to speak with them, and to ask for the reason of their actions, and they in their benignity answer me; and for four hours I feel no weariness. I forget every trouble, poverty does not dismay, death does not terrify me; I am possessed entirely by those great men. And because Dante says:

"Knowledge doth come of learning well retained,
Unfruitful else",

I have noted down what I have gained from their conversation, and have composed a small work on "Principalities", where I pour myself out as fully as I can in meditation on the subject, discussing what a principality is, what kinds there are, how they can be acquired, how they can be kept, why they are lost, and if any of my fancies ever pleased you, this ought not to displease you. And as to this little thing, when it has been read it will be seen that during the fifteen years I have given to the study of state-craft I have neither slept nor idled; and men ought ever to desire to be served by one who has reaped experience at the expense of others".

Four centuries have passed since the production of

this little book, yet its ethical problems are still interesting. To Machiavelli, ethics and politics were two separate and distinct fields. His doctrine is harsh in the justification of iniquity for public ends, yet on the other hand it is full of serious truths. He lived in the midst of corruption, during the demoralizing era of Lorenzo de Medici Il Magnifico. He foresaw the ruin of Italy and wanted above all things to save her and place her among the foremost nations of the world. Machiavelli taught that the secret of Italy's ruin was weakness of will, want of fortitude, force and resolution.

None of Machiavelli's works were printed during his lifetime. They were circulated in manuscript form in Florence and in Rome. His larger works were printed within a few years after his death. Their extensive circulation soon gave rise to the violent controversy which continued for several centuries. Cardinal Pole was the first to commence the warfare. He vehemently assailed the principles set forth in "The Prince".

To the people of today the evil significance of his name has faded, but to Renaissance England his name became a synonym for murder and treachery. Dr. Mario Praz in his lecture, "Machiavelli and the Elizabethans", tells us that the popular legend of Machiavelli, the wicked politician, originated in France at the time of Catherine de Medici, and that it "represented the culmination of that anti-Italian

feeling which naturally spread among French people under the rule of the Florentine sovereign".¹ Catherine de Medici was the daughter of the man to whom Machiavelli dedicated his book. It was her policy in religious affairs and the partiality which she showed to Italian adventurers at the French court that aroused resentment among the French people and was "mainly if not solely responsible for the unprecedented amount of obloquy cast on the name of the Florentine secretary".² All of the outrages and sins of these Florentine courtiers were heaped upon Machiavelli's head. The French contended that the Italians set up the lordship of the Pope in order to get the French money, and that through Italian subtlety great amounts of French money levied in the kingdom were used to erect the great buildings of Florence.

Gentillet's "Contre-Machiavel" published in 1576 has been recognized as the source of anti-Machiavellian sentiment in England. Dr. Praz does not think that this book was the only source, but that the feeling had previously spread to England from Scotland. However, the book did much to spread that feeling and Machiavelli became "a sort of rallying-point for whatever was most loathsome in state-craft and indeed in human nature at large. The political devices he had studied in past history, in order to infer from them the

1. Praz, M., *Machiavelli And the Elizabethans*, London, 1928, Italian Lecture of the British Academy, From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIII.

2. Ibid.

laws of a political science, were "fathered upon him as if he had been not their expounder but their actual inventor. He became the common denominator for all sins."¹ Methods which had been used for ages were now labeled Machiavellian.

Saint Thomas Aquinas, Savonarola, Aristotle and others had described the despot, but they looked at the despotic prince from an ethical standpoint and condemned him, while Machiavelli took the scientific point of view and described him in Renaissance fashion as a superhuman hero. He put the level of human character very low. He claimed to have looked at things clearly as through a field glass. Bacon said, "We are much beholden to Machiavel and others that wrote what men do, and not what they ought to do."² Naturally then, his description of the Prince "read as a monstrous travesty of the traditional description of the tyrant", and "that description was calculated to impress short-sighted interpreters either as a moral enormity or as an ironical double entente."³

Italy was the cradle of the Renaissance and she was looked upon as the source of all evil. It was her pomp, her religious power, and the Italian travel which caused the eyes of foreigners to be turned upon her. "All these elements combined together in creating the Elizabethan picture of a bloodthirsty, deceitful, impious, and picturesquely emotional Italy."⁴ However, murder, poisoning and political cunning were just as prevalent in England as in any part of Renaissance

1. Praz, Mario, op. cit.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Europe. The intellectual awakening spread to England from Italy and along with it went political and private debasement. Morley says that "politics were divorced from morals and so was theology." The name Machiavel and Satan became inter-changeable. Morley speaks of a German writer who noted three hundred ninety five references to Machiavel in Elizabethan literature.

Dr. Praz points out that in "The Prince" the word "politico" means "in conformity with sound rules of statecraft" but in England it took on the sinister connotation of scheming, shrewd and crafty. Politic became a synonym for Machiavellism or knavery by the end of the sixteenth century and was used by the dramatists in this sense. Shakespeare uses it dozens of times. The Machiavel became an important character in Elizabethan drama and Machiavellism an important factor.

Dr. Praz again suggests that Machiavellism as set forth in Gentillet's "Contre-Machiavel" "provided an up-to-date equipment of ideas to the worn-off classical or Senecan tyrant; that Machiavellism was merely grafted on a pre-existent Senecan type." ¹ Mr. Lewis says, "the master figure of Elizabethan drama is Machiavelli" - "he was at the back of every Tudor mind." ² Be that as it may, Machiavellism did supply certain characteristics of the despotic prince and

1. Praz, M. op. cit.

2. Ibid.

knave, and it therefore enjoyed great popularity with the dramatists.

The "Jew of Malta" and "The Spanish Tragedy" are looked upon as the two plays which gave rise to the Machiavellian villain in Elizabethan drama. It is impossible to tell whether the knaves of succeeding and contemporary dramatists are borrowed from Marlowe and Kyd, or whether the dramatist was acquainted with Machiavelli's writings or with Gentillet's legend.

Holinshed was the source of Shakespeare's history plays. It is logical to believe therefore that the political knavery of his historical characters has been derived from historical sources as well as from popular legend. He preaches in these plays the awful responsibilities of the ruling power and the uncertainty of this power, but his philosophy is ethical. He was interested in the passions of men, and not in governmental principles. There is one political sermon, however, found in all of his histories. He emphasizes the fact that whether the succession to the throne be a clear one or not, the only way to hold it is to govern with strength; not only attacking foes at home but uniting the people by foreign war as did Henry V, who, by the way, was Shakespeare's ideal prince. Shakespeare lived in the age following Machiavelli, and up until his time, about the only notion that England had of political party

was that of conflicts between rival houses or of personal ambition. Even when England was deluged with blood as in the Wars of the Roses, she had no great object in view; that is, the object was not the attaining or looking forward to any result of a truly public nature. It was merely a change of rulers or dynasty.

There is a story in circulation that Thomas Cromwell, the trusted adviser of Henry VIII, spent his youth in Florence. Whether this be true or not, he certainly modeled his statesmanship on the ideal of the Florentine politics. It is said that Machiavelli's book was constantly in his hand. J. R. Green, in his "History of the English People" tells us that "even as a servant of Wolsey, he startled the future Cardinal Pole by bidding him to take for his manual in politics the "Prince" of Machiavelli".¹ Just as Machiavelli wanted Cesare Borgia or Lorenzo de Medici to crush all rival tyrannies and unite Italy, so Cromwell wanted to secure order for England by raising the king to absolute authority on the ruins of every rival power within the realm. This was calculated to reduce the Church to a mere department of the State in which all authority should flow from the king alone and "in which his will should be the only law, his decision the only test of truth".² The divorce was just the forerunner of a series of changes which he was bent upon accomplishing.

1. Green, J. R., "Short History Of The English People", New York, 1916.

2. Ibid.

Henry VIII has been called "Machiavelli's Prince in action".¹ True, Shakespeare did not make him so. He stopped the play before his era of real crime began. These plays were enacted before Queen Elizabeth, Henry's daughter, and the dramatist dared not go too far in depicting Henry's sins.

Whether Shakespeare read Machiavelli or not, all of these influences are bound to have left their stamp upon him and we might conclude therefore that history supplied the pattern for Shakespeare's princes, but that Machiavelli supplied the characteristics of his politic villains, and guided him, whether directly or indirectly, in his problems of relationship between nations and rulers, between men and their neighbors.

1. Praz, M. op. cit.

CONDITIONS IN ITALY WHICH MADE
MACHIABELLI'S PHILOSOPHY POSSIBLE.

Machiavelli lived at a time when political corruption was general throughout Europe, and in "The Prince" he has given us, not an abstraction, but a real and living personage - the type and image of the sovereigns of the early Renaissance. Boccacino, a contemporary, who wrote a satirical burlesque upon Machiavelli, represents him as defending himself in these words: "I do not understand why I should be condemned when my only crime has been to describe the conduct and deeds of princes in the manner narrated to us by all histories. If they are not punished for that which they do, why should I be condemned to the flames for having described their deeds?"¹

Indeed, Italy was a land of emancipated individuality, and a glance at her history presents a picture of chaos and confusion. We find it almost impossible to fix a definite period of transition from ancient to modern civilization. The Western Empire and the Holy Roman Empire were the dual forces that ruled the Middle Ages, but neither succeeded in molding the nation into unity. Each city was called a Republic, but each was individual and differed from the other in external and internal conditions; so that the study of Italian politics and Italian history becomes the study of "markedly divergent characteristics." Each Republic had a separate nomenclature for its magistrates, and every municipality a different method of distributing administrative power. Each title suggests a period of civil strife

1. Boccacini, Trajano, Ragguagli di Parnaso, Geneva, 1612.

and is important in Italy's social evolution. Italy, as a whole, was unheard of - there were just numberless communities. The cities were at war with one another, and within each city there was ceaseless strife, augmented by attacks of other nations. The Emperors and Papal Legates seemed only to make matters worse. There was but conflict and anarchy. The cradle of the Renaissance was a bed of disorder - her cradle song, the tumult of seven thousand revolutions.

Let us briefly consider the history of the Communes, as the Italian units were called, to see how their growth necessitated the despotisms of the fifteenth century - why they did not achieve national unity and why Italy was so corrupt in the midst of her intellectual glory.

In the first place, she had no inclination to national unity. The dominant idea was that each municipality should rule its conquests for its own particular profit. This idea had been handed down to them from ancient Rome, for she in all her greatness was not a nation but a sort of federation of municipalities under the guidance of Rome. When Rome and ancient civilization passed away, there was no longer a government or social bond. Power belonged to the barbarian conqueror. These new Italians were always looking toward the past rather than to the future, and in their political systems they ventured on no new beginnings. Then too, there was no immediate reason why they should have given up their

local independence in order to have obtained the security afforded by a sovereign.

Feudalism prevailed in Europe during the latter part of the Middle Ages and reached its highest development in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. When feudalism took possession of Europe, the cities became a part of the system. They became, as it were, vassals and suzerains. In time the suzerains' demands became unendurable and a long struggle broke out between them and the burghers. Eventually the greater number of the towns of the countries of Western Europe either bought with money or wrested by force of arms, charters from their lords or suzerains, and, as under the protection of their charters these cities grew in wealth and population, many of them in some countries became strong enough to throw off all actual dependence upon lords or other cities. They became, in effect, independent states - little commonwealths. Especially was this true in the case of the Italian cities.¹ While they appeared to be small states, yet in reality they were just agglomerations of a thousand different associations or guilds. These were carried on as so many republics. Each had its own assemblies, statutes, tribunals, and ambassadors. There were several reasons for their rapid development, but one of the main causes of their prosperity was the trade with the East and the enormous impulse which

1. Myers, P.V.N., General History, Boston, 1906.

the Crusades gave to this commerce. Wealth brought on power, and the chief Italian cities became distinct self-governing states with merely a nominal dependence upon Pope or Emperor. Towards the close of the thirteenth century Northern and Central Italy were divided among two hundred "contentious little city republics,"¹ most of which had fallen into the hands of domestic tyrants who were as odious as those who usurped supreme power in the cities of ancient Greece.

They were indiscriminately called "Republics", for all of them, down to the very smallest, bore the attributes of individuals. Within the limits of a single province there were democracies, oligarchies, and aristocracies according to the laws of natural selection. There was constant civil strife. One town recognized the feudal lordship of great families, another looked upon nobility as a crime and respected labour, whether in reality or under pretense. While some recognized the Supremacy of "The Church", others like Venice drew away from Roman Christianity and resented any encroachment of the Church. Some towns held maritime interest, others military, and still others directed their attention to industrial, financial or educational pursuits.

Geographical position or foreign alliances connected

1. Myers, P.V.N. General History, Revised, Boston, 1906.

one centre with the Empire of the East, a second with France, a third with Spain. Germany overshadowed the North and Islam disturbed the South. At the same time the Republics exhibited keenest jealousies and mutual hatreds. In the conflict of commercial interests Pisa destroyed Amalfi, Genoa destroyed Pisa, and Venice subdued Genoa. Florence enslaved Pisa because she needed a way to the sea. Siena and Perugia wore themselves out in unavailing efforts to expand. Milan engulfed the lesser towns of Lombardy. Verona absorbed Padua and Treviso. It seems that proximity stimulated hostility, so that strife and covetousness reigned supreme from the Alps to the Ionian Sea, but it was the strife of "puissant units." Not only were the cities at war with one another, but the people within each city were plunged in ceaseless strife. The men of commerce fought the men of arms and ancient lineage; the people rose up against the nobles. One half of the city drove out the other half. The exiled formed new alliances and returned to conquer their conquerors. There was woven a tangled web of madness, which the Emperors made worse. The Princes of France and Kings of Bohemia and Hungary marched from North to South, formed leagues, and headed confederations, which amounted to nothing. Italy became the battlefield of a conflict between Pope and Emperor.

In the convulsions that shook Italy from North to South, the Guelf and Ghibelline parties were formed and

acquired an ineradicable force. All the previous contentions of the nation were absorbed by them. The Guelf party meant the burghers of the consular Communes, the men of industry and commerce, the upholders of civil liberty, the friends of democratic expansion, the adherents of the Pope.

The Ghibelline party included the naturalized nobles, the men of arms and idleness, the advocates of feudalism, the politicians who regarded constitutional progress with disfavor. The banner of the Church floated over the camp of the Guelfs, that of the Empire over the Ghibellines. The population was thus divided by ideals which could never become reconciled, and each side was prepared to die for its adopted principles. It was a social strife and there was no standing ground in Italy outside one or the other hostile camp. The parties tore each other to pieces. Whole families were extirpated, or split asunder. Men did not recognize the sanctity of any bond. The only exit from the situation was in despotism. Every branch of the municipal administration was strained to the utmost by party conflict, and the "combining effort of a single thinker" was necessary to reunite the scattered forces or "to absorb them in himself".

So we see that the growth of the Communes necessitated and determined the despotisms of the fifteenth century. A few centuries before this time, the ideal of unity was

recognized in theory under the leadership of Pope and Emperor who were to support each other for the common welfare of the people, but even this conception failed to have effective value during the Renaissance. The Southern Italian Communes freed themselves from all but a mere nominal subjection to the Empire and were practically independent of the Papacy during the "Babylonian Captivity" and the Pope's exile in Avignon. They yielded to Despots, and from Italian Despotism emerged Machiavelli's conception of the State. He repudiated feudalism, mercenary troops, political power of guilds, arts and trade, and opposed temporal dominion of Popes. He realized that unity could never be established until subjects were treated not as inferiors but as equals.

When the civil wars of Communes were converted into personal feuds, each individual, left practically to his own guidance, was ruled by egotism, and moral corruption became inevitable. The outbreak of ambitions caused the uprising of tyrants or despots, and no conventions or traditions were binding. It was not necessary for a despot to be of noble birth - any adventurer might command an army, anyone might tempt fortune, and as a consequence Italy entered upon another phase of warfare and license, violence, treason and bloodshed.

Since these adventurers had to snatch their power from a thousand risks, wrong doing had no limits for them. It was only necessary for them to have astute cunning and

a profound knowledge of men and things. It seems that the science and art of government were born with the tyrant, but at the same time the opinion was diffused which later became a very general and fatal error; namely, that laws and institutions are inventions of the Statesmen rather than natural results of the nation's history and social and civil development. During the Middle ages these things were believed to be the work of Providence, but during the Renaissance everything was thought to be the work of man. In those days every Italian seemed a born diplomatist.

There were no standing armies in those times and it was the universal policy of the despots to disarm their subjects and to have recourse to foreigners and to mercenary troops. Bands of adventurers were formed who sold their swords and services to the highest bidder. It was in this way that the "Condottieri" or moving despotisms came into existence. Their numbers multiplied rapidly and very soon they began to form native companies. These frequently sought in warfare the liberty they had lost at home when their republics fell into the hands of others. Naturally, the strength of the band depended upon the military genius of the leader. The soldiers obeyed their head, but were not bound to him by any personal fealty and would forsake him for a more famous leader or better pay. They were free from all conventional ties, and consequently were always held in suspicion by the States. War became a commercial

enterprise, and leaders rose to power from the lowest stations in life. The life of the despot was usually one of prolonged terror for his office had no legal justification.

Milan was the most conspicuous example of the large class of Italian cities which were governed by an absolute and despotic ruler, who secured control of a town either by force or guile and then managed its affairs for his own personal advantages. The Visconti family seized this government and their practices offer a fair example of Italian despotic rule. Their power was first established by the Archbishop of Milan, who imprisoned in three iron cages the leading members of the family who were then in control, and had his nephew, Matteo Visconti, appointed by the Emperor as the imperial representative. Matteo before long became ruler of Milan and was followed by his son. For over a century and a half some one of the family was skillful enough to hold rule. The most famous of these despots was Gian Galeazzo. He began his reign by poisoning his uncle, who was ruling over a portion of Milan's extensive territory. In 1300 Milan occupied no more territory than her neighboring states, but under the Visconti, who conquered a number of towns, she became, next to Venice, the largest state of northern Italy. It seemed for a time that Gian might capture all of northern Italy, but his progress was checked by Florence and cut short by an early death.

Gian Galeazzo exhibited all the characteristics of the Italian despots. He was a successful ruler and organized his government well. He had literary men about him, and the buildings begun by him indicate his love of art. He was most unprincipled and used any means to gain possession of towns which he could not buy or conquer outright. By 1450 the Visconti family had died out, and the citizens hired a captain named Francesco Sforza to assist them in a war against Venice. He repelled the Venetians and then the people of Milan found it impossible to get rid of him. As a consequence, he and his successors became rulers over the town.

There are many stories of the incredible ferocity of the Italian despots. They were rarely legitimate rulers, but usurpers, and had to retain their power by keeping their subjects in check and by defending themselves against other usurpers. Many found it to their interest to govern well, but the tyrant as a rule made many bitter enemies. He was suspicious of treason on the part of those about him, and was constantly in danger of his life.

The despotisms of Florence, perhaps the most important of the Italian cities, differ from the despotisms of Milan. In this city all classes claimed the right to interest themselves in the government. There were frequent changes in the constitution and frequent political struggles.

When one party rose to power it generally expelled its chief opponents from the city. During the fifteenth century Florence came into the control of the Medici, a great family, whose members played the role of very enlightened political bosses. They quietly watched the elections, secretly controlled the selection of city officials, and in this way governed without letting the people know that they had their power. Florence, whose "primacy in literature, the fine arts, law, scholarship, philosophy, and science was acknowledged throughout Italy,"¹ reached the height of her glory under the rule of Lorenzo the Magnificent, the most distinguished of the Medici. Under his political tact and sagacity, the principle of balance was introduced into Italian politics, and diplomacy was introduced, wherever it was possible, for warfare. This balance was maintained until 1494, when Lodovico Sforza appealed to France; and then the disastrous descent of Charles VIII changed the whole tide of events. It was an apparently insignificant event but it determined a great catastrophe. Instead of internal self government Italy became the victim of successive invasions, terminating in foreign tyranny. Lodovico ruled Milan for his nephew. In a conspiracy with Charles VIII of France it was agreed that the latter was to assert right to the throne of Naples, and that Lodovico was to be established in the Duchy of Milan. The Italians, however,

1. Robinson, J.H. History of Western Europe, Boston, 1902, 1903

having no national militia, were exposed to the inroads of their warlike neighbors and were defenceless when the selfish tyrant called on foreign aid. Italy now became the spoil of the victor - the game was in the hands of French, Spanish, and German invaders. It was now too late for that unification which might have saved Italy, and for which Machiavelli pleads at the end of his "Principe". Unity at any cost and under any form, said Machiavelli, although he came to the conclusion that the universal employment of mercenary troops was the chief secret of Italy's insecurity.

In conclusion, we might speak of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as the "Age of the Free Burghs", the fourteenth and fifteenth as the "Age of the Despots", and the sixteenth and seventeenth as the "Age of Foreign Enslavement". Although the results of Charles' expedition seem trivial, it was now clear to Europe that the Italians had no real national feeling, and from this time down to the latter half of the nineteenth century Italy was dominated by foreign nations, especially Spain and Austria.

It was this state of affairs that Machiavelli set forth in "clear, concise, convincing, and cold blooded style" in his little book, which aimed to teach a beginner how to be a despot. He tried to show from classical history and from Italian politics, that cruelty, violence and deceit had to be employed occasionally.

ANALYSIS OF "THE PRINCE"
AN OUTLINE OF THE MACHIAVELLIAN PRINCIPLES

The principles stated in the following outline have been gathered from W. K. Marriott's¹ translation of "The Prince" and also from the "Bohn's Standard Library Edition".² Many are quoted verbatim.

I. There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. A prince who is raised by favor of the nobles will find much difficulty in supporting himself because he is surrounded by men who, thinking themselves still his equals, submit reluctantly to his authority. If the innovators can rely on themselves and use force they are rarely endangered. It is by conquering difficulties that princes raise themselves to power. Therefore, it is advantageous for a prince to have enemies.

II. A prince ought to have no other aim or thought, nor select anything else for his study, than war and its rules and discipline, for this is the sole art that belongs to him who rules. A wise prince should never in peaceful times stand idle, but increase his resources with industry in such a way that they may be available to him in adversity. Nothing is so common as a thirst for conquest, and when rulers can satisfy it they deserve praise.

III. There are fewer difficulties in holding hereditary states than new ones. Men change their rulers willingly, hoping to better themselves and this hope induces them to

1. Marriott, W. K., "The Prince" by Nicola Machiavelli, A translation, New York, 1908.

2. Machiavelli, N., "The Prince", A translation, Bohn's Standard Library Edition, London, 1871.

take up arms against him who rules. It is best for a prince to get rid of those who helped him to the crown, for he will be unable to preserve their friendships since he can not reward them as they wish. Furthermore, he is sure to render those persons inimical to him whom he has injured by seizing the principality. Therefore, "make a man your friend, or put it out of his power to be your enemy".¹ People ought either to be well treated or crushed and the injury that is done to a man ought to be of such a kind that one does not stand in fear of revenge. Injuries ought to be done all at one time, so that, being tasted less, they offend less; benefits ought to be given little by little, so that the flavor of them may last longer.

IV. It is necessary for a prince to have the people friendly, otherwise he has no security in adversity, and neither genius nor fortune is altogether necessary to attain to it, but rather a happy shrewdness, so that the citizens will always, in every sort and kind of circumstance, have need of the state and of him.

V. It is safer to be feared than loved, when, of the two, either must be dispensed with, for men are more generally inclined to submit to him who makes himself dreaded than to him who merely strives to be beloved. One, however, should

1. Machiavelli, N., *The Prince*, Translation, Bohn's Standard Library Edition, Chap., III.

wish to be both. A wise man will inspire fear in such a way that if he does not win love, he will avoid hatred.

VI. A prince should guard himself above all things against being despised and hated, and liberality leads to both. The Roman emperors have perished chiefly by having made themselves odious and contemptible. It is wiser to have a reputation for meanness which brings reproach without hatred, than to gain a name for rapacity which begets reproach with hatred. It is well to be reputed liberal, nevertheless, liberality exercised in a way that does not bring you the reputation for it, unjures you. Of that which is neither yours nor your subjects you can be a ready giver (Caesar). Abstain from the property of citizens and subjects and from their women, because men more quickly forget the death of a father than the loss of their patrimony. The prince who acquires friends by means of money alone, courts his own destruction, for they will abandon him when he most requires their service.

VII. A wise man ought always to follow the paths beaten by great men and to imitate those who have been supreme, so that if his ability does not equal theirs, it will at least savour of it. Opportunity makes men fortunate, but high ability enables them to recognize the opportunity.

VIII. He will be successful who directs his actions according to the spirit of the times, that is, changes his conduct with the times. It happens that of two who follow the same route, one may arrive at his destination and the other fail; two others may pursue the same object by wholly different means and yet both shall equally prosper.

IX. He who is the cause of another's becoming powerful is ruined. Never make alliance with one more powerful than yourself for the purpose of attacking others.

X. A prince ought always to take counsel, but only when he wishes and from whom he wishes. He should be a constant inquirer and a patient listener concerning the things of which he inquired and afterwards form his own conclusions.

XI. It is the duty of a prince not only to provide a remedy for present evils, but at the same time to anticipate such as are likely to happen. By foreseeing them at a distance they are easily remedied. If he who rules cannot recognize evils until they are upon him, he is not truly wise and this insight is given to few.

XII. The choice of servants is of no little importance. Whenever a servant thinks more of his own interests than of his master's, he will never make a good servant.

XIII. He who believes that new benefits will cause great personages to forget old injuries is deceived. One never

seeks to avoid one trouble without running into another. Prudence consists in knowing how to distinguish the character of the troubles, and for choice to take the lesser evil. Above all avoid weakness and indecision. Either be a firm friend or an open foe.

XIV. To summarize briefly, he who considers it necessary to secure himself in his new principality must -

1. Win friends - make himself beloved and feared by the people.
2. Overcome either by force or fraud.
3. Make himself to be followed and revered by the soldiers.
4. Exterminate those who have power or reason to hurt him.
5. Be gracious and severe, magnanimous and liberal.
6. Destroy a disloyal soldiery and create a new.
7. Indulge in some vices but avoid those which will cost him the throne.
8. Maintain friendship with kings and princes in such a way that they must help with zeal and offend with caution.

The preceding observations pertain to rulers; the following refer to men generally:

I. It is to be asserted in general of men that they are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly, covetous; and as long as you succeed they are yours entirely. They will offer you their blood, property, life and children, when the need is far distant; but when it approaches they turn

against you:

II. Those who have done great things have held good faith of little account, and have known how to circumvent the intellect of men by craft. It is necessary to be a fox to discover the snares and a lion to terrify the wolves. Since men will not keep faith with you, you too are not bound to observe it with them. A prudent man cannot and ought not to keep his word except when he can do it without injury to himself. It is always easy to justify a breach of faith. The generality of mankind are wicked. It is not necessary to have all the good qualities, but it is indispensable that one should appear to have them. Be a great pretender and dissembler. Men are so simple that he who seeks to deceive will always find some one who will allow himself to be deceived. Everyone sees what you appear to be, few really know what you are. In the actions of all men, one judges by the result. Self preservation will often compel one to violate the laws of religion, charity and humanity.

III. To slay fellow citizens, to deceive friends, to be without mercy, without faith, without religion - this cannot be called talent. Such methods may gain empire, but not glory. Still, if the courage in entering into and extricating oneself from dangers be considered, it cannot be seen why such a one should be esteemed less than the

most notable captain.

IV. How one lives is so far distant from how one ought to live, that he who neglects what is done for what ought to be done, sooner effects his ruin than his preservation. For, a man who wishes to act entirely up to his professions of virtue soon meets with what destroys him among so much that is evil. Hence it is necessary for a man wishing to hold his own to know how to do wrong, and to make use of it or not according to necessity.

V. Fortune is the arbiter of one half of our actions, but she still leaves us to direct the other half. Fortune shows her power where valor has not prepared to resist her. God is not willing to do everything, and thus take away our free will and that share of glory which belongs to us.

If we briefly summarize Machiavelli's general observations of human nature we find,

1. That men are dupes of simplicity and greed.
2. The cloak of religion conceals vices.
3. Men look at things not as they are but as they wish them to be.
4. There are no perfectly safe courses in politics - prudence consists in choosing the least dangerous.
5. To be successful, men must show their judgment to be irrevocable.

SHAKESPEARE'S MACHIAVELLIAN PRINCES
AND POLITIC KNAVES

Shakespeare's Machiavellian Princes.

According to Dr. Praz, "the most perfect incarnations of the Machiavellian Prince were to be found among foreign rulers".¹ He thinks that King John, Henry IV, and Richard III, were much more cunning foxes than that desperate petty weasel Cesare Borgia, who, by the way, was no Italian, but a Spaniard". Evidently then, for one to have been looked upon as a Machiavellian Prince, he must have been a "cunning fox", and a desperate ruler. Wm. J. Rolfe says that the one dominant subject of Shakespeare's histories is, "how a man may fail or how a man may succeed in attaining political mastery of the world".³ History tells us that from the time that Bolingbroke took the crown from Richard II until the end of the Elizabethan reign, but two English kings, Henry VIII and Edward VI held the crown with the consent of their people. The others had to fight against royal claimants and their followers. They had to outwit their enemies in their cunning; they resorted to assassinations on every hand.

Let us then consider King John, Henry IV, and Richard III to see if, and in what respect they were Machiavellian princes, and why, according to Machiavellian principles, they failed or succeeded. These kings, of course, lived before the time of Machiavelli and were not following his philosophy. On the other hand, it is possible that

1. Praz, M., "Machiavelli and the Elizabethans", London, 1928.

2. Ibid.

3. Rolfe, W. J. Notes. The Rolfe Edition of Shakespeare, Chicago, 1903.

Machiavelli had studied their reigns before writing his "Prince".

King John

The reign of King John is characterized by weakness and duplicity. Historians are nearly unanimous in painting him as a "mean-souled tyrant" possessed of the "vulture ambition". Mathew of Paris says, "he was a tyrant rather than a king, a destroyer rather than a ruler, an oppressor of his own and a favorer of strangers, a lion to his subjects, a lamb to his enemies and foreigners".¹ Cross, in his English History speaks of him as extravagant, self indulgent, a heavy gambler, one who was possessed of a certain low cunning, not unskilled in arms, but one whose lack of foresight, neglect of opportunity, and rashness, led him to situations, political, diplomatic, and military, which almost invariably ended in defeat".²

Cheyney tells us that he is looked upon as one of the worst kings in English history.³ Meyers calls him a despot; a man who went beyond the limits of his kingly power; a ruler who surpassed the worst of his predecessors in tyranny and wickedness.⁴

His reign is marked by three events: First, a long contest with the Pope which made the church more independent than before; second, the loss of English dominions on the continent; third, his course led to an open rebellion of the

1. Praz, M., "Machiavelli And The Elizabethans", London, 1928.

2. Cross, A. L., A History Of England, New York, 1914.

3. Cheyney, E. P., A Short History Of England, Gunn & Co., Boston, 1904.

4. Meyers, P.V.N., General History, Boston, 1889, 1906.

barons of the realm as a result of which, the king was forced to accept certain restrictions on his freedom of action.

"Of all the kings of England", says Cheney, "none has left the reputation of more complete failure as a ruler and greater unworthiness as a private man".¹

Although "King John" was founded upon an earlier play published in 1591 and is unhistorical in places, nevertheless, Shakespeare follows history pretty closely in the delineation of John's character and in touching on the most striking events of the reign. As Wm. J. Rolfe says, he is pictured "in the tug of selfish power" pulling "hither and thither amid the struggle of kingly greeds and priestly pride, amid the sales of cities, the rumors and confusion of the people".²

The play opens with John usurping the throne of his nephew Arthur who was the legitimate heir of the dominions of his uncle Richard. The Archbishop of Canterbury, John's chief supporter, declared the Crown of England to be elective and John was chosen as fittest candidate of the House of Plantagenet. He was crowned on Ascension day in 1199. By a combination of impolicy and mishaps he was soon plunged into difficulties. Machiavelli tells us that there are fewer difficulties in holding hereditary states than new ones, for men change their rulers willingly hoping to better

1. Cheney, E. P., A Short History of England, Gunn & Co., Boston, 1904.

2. Shakespeare, Wm., "King John", Notes in Wm. J. Rolfe Edition, Chicago, 1903.

themselves. John's mother, with great foresight, realized this, and advised him to rely on "his strong possession" rather than on his right, or else it would go wrong with him and her.¹ He was scarcely seated on the throne when a series of battles began, and the men who led these attacks were selfish in their aims. The leaders were barons and bishops, struggling to safeguard their feudal rights. Furthermore, in the latter twelfth century, the French possessions of the King of England were the cause of strife. These movements might not have been successful, but John's lack of foresight, cruelty and oppression antagonized his subjects. Machiavelli tells us that it is necessary to have the people friendly, otherwise there is no security in adversity; and that neither genius nor fortune is altogether necessary to attain to it, but rather a happy shrewdness, so that the citizens will always, in every sort and kind of circumstance, have need of the state and of the ruler. John's oppression caused his subjects to unite in opposition and their triumph was assured.

Philip of France and Leopold of Austria united for their own selfish purposes in the cause of Arthur, and entered into an agreement with Arthur and his mother; but, John was more than a match for them in cunning statesmanship. Through the compromise with Angier and the marriage of his niece, Lady Blanch, and the Dauphin, John saw a way, by

1. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, I,1.

subtle dealing, to get Arthur into his power, and through Lady Blanch to exert an influence on the French King. The King of France saw a way to gain large possessions for his son. Each looked at his own interests first. This act shows the villainous policy and duplicity of John. To gain possession of Arthur, he was willing to give up Anjou, Touraine, Marne, Poictiers, and the Rouen Province. Philip and Leopold, in order to safeguard their interests, were willing to sacrifice Arthur, and break their agreement with his mother, knowing that after Arthur's death John would be overthrown. Of this double dealing, Richard the Bastard said:

"Mad world: mad kings: mad composition.
 John, to stop Arthur's title in the whole,
 Hath willingly departed with a part;
 And France, whose armour conscience buckled on,
 Whom zeal and charity brought to the field
 As God's own soldier, rounded in the ear
 With that same purpose-changer, that sly devil,
 That broker, that still breaks the pate of faith,
 That smooth-fac'd gentleman, tickling Commodity,
 Commodity, the bias of the world,
 This bawd, this broker, this all-changing word,
 Clapp'd on the outward eye of fickle France,
 Hath drawn him from his own determin'd aid,
 From a resolv'd and honourable war,
 To a most base and vile-concluded peace.
 Since kings break faith upon commodity,
 Gain, be my lord, for I will worship thee".¹

In the midst of this treaty, Pandulph appeared. He was the Cardinal of Milan, sent by Rome to find out why John had refused to acknowledge Langton as the Archbishop of Canterbury. The mighty power of Rome and England's resentment

1. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, II, 1.

of it are shown in the bold words of John's defiance:

"What earthly name to interrogatories
Can task the free breath of a sacred king?
Thou canst not, cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy and ridiculous,
To charge me to an answer, as the pope.
Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England
Add thus much more, that no Italian priest
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions;
But as we, under heaven, are supreme head,
So under Him that great supremacy,
Where we do reign, we will alone uphold,
Without the assistance of a mortal hand".¹

We soon find out, however, the truth of Machiavelli's words, namely, that there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. If the innovators can rely on themselves and use force, they are rarely endangered; but, could John do this? He had lost the respect of all classes. Again, Machiavelli says, he will be successful who directs his actions according to the spirit of the times, and according to this spirit, Rome was authority.

Austria and France were summoned by Pandulph's curse against John to fight for the church, and the English people were still more shaken in their allegiance. John cared little for the sufferings of his people, who by the interdict were deprived of religious rights. He seized the possessions of the Bishops who obeyed the Pope's orders and banished them.

1. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, III, 1.

John was victorious at first. Arthur was captured by Hubert de Burgh who was given strict commands to guard his prisoner securely. "He is "a serpent in my way", said John, "and wheresoe'er this foot of mine doth tread, he lies before me: dost thou understand me? Thou art his keeper". "And I'll keep him so that he shall not offend your majesty",¹ replied Hubert. The treacherous ruler whispered the words "Death, the grave", and Hubert knew that Arthur's life was doomed.

Pandulph aroused the Dauphin's ambition by telling him what would happen should John take Arthur's life, and Lewis was soon at the head of a powerful army, some of whom were English nobles with many retainers - men who had slackened in their allegiance to the English king. Fearing to lose all, John surrendered his crown to Pandulph and received it again as a subject of the pope, under promise that Pandulph would command the Dauphin to retire from England, but the latter refused. Just before the French invasion, Hubert received an order from King John that Arthur's eyes should be put out with red hot irons. Hubert refused to put out his eyes, and history tells us that John had Arthur stabbed and thrown into the Seine. There are other stories of how he met his death. Shakespeare tells us that he was killed in trying to escape over high walls which offered no means of climbing down. He leaped, missed the jutting buttress

1. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, III, 3.

and was hurled down the ledge. John's cowardly duplicity is again seen when he turns upon Hubert and upbraids him for being the cause of Arthur's murder. His duplicity, his cowardice, and his treacherous and cruel nature called forth vengeance. As the sense of his danger rose before him, he said,

"My nobles leave me; and my state is braved,
Even at my gates, with ranks of foreign powers:
Nay, in the body of this fleshly land,
This kingdom, this confine of blood and breath,
Hostility and civil tumult reigns
Between my conscience and my cousin's death".¹

In mourning Arthur's death, Sir Richard said,

"England now is left
To tug and scramble and to part by the teeth
The unowed interest of proud-swelling state.
Now for the bare-pick'd bone of majesty
Doth dogged war bristle his angry crest
And snarleth in the gentle eyes of peace:
Now powers from home and discontents at home
Meet in one line; and vast confusion waits,
As doth a raven on a sick-fallen beast,
The imminent decay of wrested pomp.
Now happy he whose cloak and cincture can
Hold out this tempest".²

Many of the stout men-at-arms refused to serve under the standard of a cruel, perjured king".³In fact the time had come when scarcely anyone but his mercenaries would stand by him. Machiavelli repeatedly warns rulers against the danger of relying upon mercenaries and foreign aid, but John brought them in to overcome any resistance to his actions. To meet the growing needs of the state John constantly demanded more than the customary taxes, and his demands were

1. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, IV, 2.

2. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, IV, 3.

3. Carter, Thomas, Stories Of The English Kings, New York, n.d.

resisted. He would not abstain from the property of citizens and subject, and if we rely upon Machiavelli's science, this was another cause of his downfall. He commanded the Bastard to "shake the bags of hoarding abbots" and the answer came back,

"Bell, book and candle shall not drive me back,
When gold and silver beck me to come on".¹

In the words of Mathew Paris, "England became a ship in storm without a helm".²

The war between Lewis and John was brought to an issue. In crossing the marshes of the Wash, King John fell into a raging fever, and died within a short time. He had been carried into an Abbey orchard, and it is doubtful whether he died of fever or of a deadly poison administered by a monk. At any rate, he died conscious of the fact that all his possessions in France had been wrested from the English crown and that his kingdom was threatened by an invading, victorious army.

In conclusion, let us ask ourselves the question, why was John a Machiavellian Prince? The answer is, I think, that up to a certain time, in fact up to the time of the signing of the Magna Charta, which Shakespeare does not mention, his reign was one of royal absolutism; because, he was a lion as well as a fox; because he relegated morality to the background in the attainment of his purposes; because he was a usurper and held the crown by force; because he was a cruel tyrant,

1. Shakespeare, Wm., King John, III, 3.

2. Mathew Of Paris, "Historia Anglorum", London, 1866, 1869.

a despot, an untruthful, dishonest and treacherous ruler. Why did he fail? Because his vices and incapacity precipitated his downfall.

Henry IV

The first part of Henry IV shows us again the insecurity of the usurper. He is surrounded on all sides by domestic and foreign foes, and troubled by dissatisfaction with his son and heir. Shakespeare takes many liberties with ages and time. He rearranges and compresses to suit his purposes; but in all this there is no real distortion of history, and Henry seems to have been drawn entirely from historical authority.

When Henry of Bolingbroke, who had been banished by Richard II, suddenly appeared in the northern part of England, declaring that he had come back to claim his estate, his popularity was so great that he soon had an army following him and he reached out for the throne. Although Parliament acknowledged him as king and he was crowned with the title of Henry IV, the change of kings was really the result of Henry's military power. However, the usurpation could not have been accomplished with so little difficulty without its consent.

His reign opened full of promise. He was welcomed by all classes - was in harmony with the church - was a relative of most of the famous nobles of the kingdom - was thought of as a rich man, for he held six earldoms, including the large estates of Lancaster, and he also had possession of the

treasure which Richard II had amassed - and finally, he had able bodied sons to preserve the line of succession. History tells us that he promised to "govern, not by his own voluntary purpose and singular opinion" but, "by common council and consent".¹ In spite of all this his position was insecure. He by a "seeming brow of justice did win the hearts of all that he did angle for",² but from the very beginning he sought to curb the power of the nobles. Richard II was placed in captivity and died within a few weeks. Henry was accused of bringing about his murder. In the last part of the play he confesses.

Henry was shrewd enough to govern for the most part in accordance with the wishes of Parliament, although its complaints and demands were numerous, but he was soon troubled with many conspiracies and rebellions as might have been expected from the way in which he had gained the crown. He had difficulties with Scotland, renewals of the war with France and dissensions in his own family. It was necessary for him to be politically crafty and to keep the people friendly because he knew, as Machiavelli knew, that it was easier to snatch the crown than to keep it. He had obtained his crown from discontented nobles and feared to lose it through their discontent. He, therefore, tried to employ them in war against the enemies outside the realm, and hid his real motive

1. Cross, A. L., A History Of England, New York, 1914.

2. Shakespeare, Wm., Henry The Fourth, III,1, Part 2.

under the cover of religious feeling and interests. He slowly took unto himself more and more power, having determined at all costs to secure his crown.

At the very beginning of Henry's reign, a Welshman named Owen Glendower arose in rebellion against the English nobles. The Welsh had been deprived of their independence since the conquest of Edward I, and castles occupied by English barons were scattered here and there throughout Wales. It was the duty of these barons, among whom was Edmund Mortimer, to hold the country down and to exercise most of the powers of government. A large portion of the native population joined Glendower. Henry fruitlessly attacked Glendower in Wales in the year 1400. Mortimer was taken prisoner by Glendower. Mortimer's nephew had more right to the throne than Henry. He was the nearest descendant of Edward III. Henry had to watch young Mortimer closely, for his succession to the throne had been publicly acknowledged at one time. His uncle, who was also his guardian, was the leader of a powerful band of soldiers. Furthermore, this uncle had married Owen Glendower's daughter and there was great danger of his joining the Welshman. Henry's position was a most difficult one and required the greatest caution and cleverness. The king, however, was a "wise, far-seeing statesman, persevering, shrewd, and very courageous, able to weigh up forces likely to be brought against him and clever enough to balance one against the other".¹

1. Carter, Thomas, Shakespeare's Stories Of The English Kings, New York, n.d.

Henry did not intend to ransom Mortimer. As guardian of young Mortimer, it seemed wise to allow this powerful soldier to remain in the hands of the Welsh. Harry Percy, better known as Hotspur, who had married Mortimer's sister, became infuriated at this refusal and denounced the king as a vile politician, a canker, a subtle schemer who was plotting against the lives of the Percys after having involved them in murderous deeds.

Harry's father, the Earl of Northumberland, together with the Earl of Worcester, ruled in the north with almost kingly power. The French would not recognize Henry IV as the new king of England and wanted to regain the English possessions on their soil. They stirred up the Scots, and the Earls of Northumberland and Worcester had been engaged by Henry to hold back the Scots. They took great care of the Scotch and Welsh borders and executed their duties well. They inflicted a crushing defeat on the Scots in 1402, the result of which was a heated quarrel with Henry over the payment of expenses and the disposal of prisoners. Henry demanded all prisoners for himself and thereby increased the profound suspicion of his policy. This, together with his refusal to ransom Mortimer caused these powerful and discontented nobles to renounce their allegiance to King Henry and to enter into conspiracy with his opponents in Scotland and in Wales. Along with Worcester and Northumberland came Hotspur and another.

famous soldier, the Earl of Douglas. They who had helped to place Henry on the throne were now bent on taking the crown from him. Glendower proclaimed himself Prince of Wales. Henry became the prey of factions. It was a powerful conspiracy, but the wealth, power and organization of the English, together with the perseverance of their king won for them the battle of Shrewsbury in 1403. Hotspur was killed. England has been described as a land which bled and gasped for life under the rule of Bolingbroke. After having attained the object of his ambition, his ambition then was to hold it firmly. He won through craft, and held through strength. There was a purpose in everything he did.

In a later uprising in 1405, Scrope, the Archbishop of York, aroused Yorkshire against the king. Deceived by promises of the royal leaders, he surrendered, was tried, and sentenced to death. Henry did not scruple to use base means to accomplish his ends. When goaded by resistance and rebellion he was cruel in retaliation.

The last revolt of Northumberland was crushed in 1408. Heavy cares were fast bringing on a collapse that was to end the king's days of ambitious strivings. He lived, in an "eager, striving, pushing age" - in that "stirring age during which every man was led into activity by his desire for honor or by his vain-glory",¹ and he was feeling in very truth that,

1. Cross, A. L., A History Of England, New York, 1914.

"Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown".¹

At his death in 1413, he told Prince Hal that by indirect and crooked ways he had marched in order to snatch the crown, and how difficult it had been to maintain that which he had seized. He advised Harry, as Machiavelli advised all rulers, to study and imitate the glorious exploits of those kings whose flags of victory had waved over many a battlefield in foreign lands. Knowing also that there are fewer difficulties in holding hereditary states than new ones, Henry said,

"-----though thou stand'st more sure than I could do,
Thou art not firm enough, since griefs are green".
Therefore, my Harry,
Be it thy course to busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels, that action, hence borne out,
May waste the memory of the former days".²

Machiavelli said of Borgia, that he did everything which a longheaded and capable man could do in order to strike root. The same might be said of Henry IV. His success might be summed up in these words which Prince Hal said in referring to the crown,

"You won it, wore it, kept it, gave it me".³

Although he succeeded to the full measure of his powers and never lost an opportunity by laxness, yet ye was not all he longed to be, and he cried out against fortune that "never comes with both hands full". He possessed "every element of power except those which are spontaneous and unconscious".⁴

1. Shakespeare, Wm., Henry The Fourth, III, 1, Part 2.

2. Shakespeare, Wm. Henry The Fourth, IV, 5, Part II.

3. Ibid, IV, 5, Part 2.

4. Rolfe, Wm., J. Shakespeare's King Henry The Fourth, Notes, Chicago, 1903.

He was dauntless, but his courage was under the control of his judgment. He was ambitious, but his ambition aimed at definite ends and could be held in reserve until these ends were attainable. He knew when to augment his power by clemency and when by severity. He pardoned Aumerle, but Bushy, Green and others of their kind Henry swore to "weed and pluck away". He was a careful administrator and a wise statesman, knowing when to stand firm and when to yield. His bitter experiences made him suspicious, calculating and politic. He was studious to obtain the good graces of the nobles as far as was profitable for him, and also to obtain the confidence of the people at large, and finally, he succeeded because, "wedded to his end, he did not become impatient of the means".¹

In "Henry The Fourth" there is a passage which bears a close resemblance to a passage in Chapter III of "The Prince". Worcester in suggesting rebellion says,

"And 'tis no little reason bids us speed,
To save our heads by raising of a head;
For, bear ourselves as even as we can,
The king will always think him in our debt,
And think we think ourselves unsatisfied,
Till he hath found a time to pay us home.
And see already how he doth begin
To make us strangers to his looks of love".²

Compare the passage just quoted with Machiavelli's words:

"Every new prince is compelled, in some degree, to displease his new subjects and thus he is sure to render all those persons inimical to him whom he has injured by seizing the

-
1. Shakespeare, Wm., "Henry The Fourth", Rolfe Edition - Notes, Chicago, 1903.
 2. Shakespeare, Wm., Henry The Fourth, I, 3, Part 1.

principality, and is unable to preserve the friendship of others who assisted him in his enterprise, because he can neither reward them as they expect, nor coerce them with rigour, as they have laid him under such weighty obligations. For, however great the military resources of a prince may be, he will find that to obtain firm footing in a province he must engage the favour and interest of the inhabitants. Hence in order to preserve a newly acquired state, particular attention should be paid to two points. In the first place, care must be taken to extinguish entirely the family of the ancient sovereign; and, in the next, the laws should not be altered nor the taxes increased".¹

Dr. Praz in his lecture "Machiavelli and the Elizabethans" mentions this resemblance, but he seems to think that Shakespeare borrowed his ideas, not from Machiavelli, but from Leycester's "Commonwealth".

Richard III

Richard III is the last of Shakespeare's English Princes who obtained and held the crown by nefarious means. He was the very pinnacle of craft, fiendish hypocrisy, boundless ambition and violence. He was a Machiavellian Prince in the sense that, as Dr. Praz said, he was a type of the self confident, super-human hero, whose aspiring mind concentrated upon the attainment of a mundane end.

1. Bohn, Standard Library Edition of "The Prince" Chap., III. London, 1871.

"Conscience is but a word that cowards use
 Devis'd at first to keep the strong in awe;
 Our strong arms be our conscience, swords our law.
 March on, join bravely, let us to 't pell mell;
 If not to heaven, then hand in hand to hell". 1

He swept aside every obstacle that lay in his path to the throne. He showed absolutely no trace of moral principle.

He,

"-----set the notorious Machiavel to school". 2

Writers contend that the Richard of Shakespeare is not the Richard of history; that the dramatist exhibits him in a much darker light. However, I have found in studying the historical records that the sinister side of Richard is no blacker in Shakespeare than in history, the only difference being that Shakespeare painted this side only, while history records his parliamentary skill, his benevolence to friends and followers, his vigilance in defending England against foes and his intellectual brilliancy.

During his brother Edward's reign, Richard had shown that he possessed the qualities that fit a man to hold a high position, and having grown up in an unscrupulous age, he had no hesitancy in clearing his way by ruthless slaughter. It is commonly believed that he took part in the killing of Prince Edward after the battle of Tewkesbury; that he carried out his brother's order in bringing about the murder of Henry VI; and Shakespeare has him set about to procure the

1. Shakespeare, Wm., Richard The Third, V, 3.

2. Shakespeare, Wm., Henry The Sixth, III, 2, Part III.

death of his brother Clarence by setting him and the king in deadly hatred of each other. History questions this however. Gardiner's History states that in those hard days every man of high position had to be either hammer or anvil and Richard was resolved that he would not be the anvil.

Edward IV left two little sons. The oldest was thirteen years of age. At his father's death he became king in name, but his reign, which lasted for just a few weeks, was merely a scramble for supremacy between his mother's uncle Lord Rivers, his half brother Sir Richard Grey, and his paternal uncle Richard of Gloucester. Gloucester seized young Edward as he was being conducted from Ludlow to London to be crowned and imprisoned in Pontefract Castle those who were bringing him to London, namely, Rivers and Grey. He was then made Protector of the realm by the Council. Pretending to secure his position, for he certainly knew how to circumvent the intellect of men by craft, he began to reach out for the crown. He played one person against the other. He saw the chance to become king and he stopped at no fraud or bloodshed to attain his end. History tells us that he bribed all the supporters he could, and tried to dispose of all influential persons whom he could not win over.

By his dissembling he won the consent of Lady Ann to a second marriage with himself, although she was the widow of that Prince Edward whom he and his brothers had stabbed at Tewkesbury. This was a clever piece of Machiavellian policy,

for it placed his power on a firm foundation.

This villainous dissembler then accused the Queen Mother and her party of working spells upon him. He had been afflicted all of his life, but he made use of his withered left arm as a means of proving the power which these spells had had on him. It was the beginning of a plot against the little king. Lord Hastings hesitated to believe this accusation of witchcraft and was beheaded without trial. Richard frightened the queen into sending the other little son of Edward IV to join his brother in the Tower, where Edward V after his coronation had been lodged. He spread the news that Edward the Fourth's marriage had been illegal and therefore his sons had no right to rule. The aspiring villain went so far as to accuse his mother of adultery in order to declare himself the only legitimate heir to the throne. His powerful intellect devised scheme after scheme in rapid succession in order to deceive the "simple gulls".

Accordingly, in 1483, an assembly of representatives offered him the crown. He pretended to accept with reluctance but was crowned soon after. History tells us that he really tried by various ways to make himself popular and beloved by the people, but he undid every good by his ruthless bloodshed. On Richard's coronation day, Lord Rivers and Sir Richard Grey were executed after a slight pretense of a trial. A little later Sir James Tyrrell, guard of the Tower, received orders to kill the two little princes. They were smothered while

they slept, and Tyrrel said,

"The tyrannous and bloody deed is done
The most arch act of piteous massacre
The ever yet this land was guilty of".¹

The king had now removed all immediate obstacles that stood in his way, but men began to turn from him with loathing. This bloody deed gave them a handle to turn against him when the time came. Every nobleman knew that his life was insecure if he crossed Richard's path. Henry Stafford, the Duke of Buckingham, a steadfast friend and chief adviser, if one could speak of Richard as having had an adviser, was the first to revolt, because Richard did not give him as a reward the Earldom of Hereford, vast estates which would almost have made Buckingham master of England. He began to negotiate with Henry Tudor, the Earl of Richmond, a Lancastrian who had taken refuge in France until the time was ripe for him to assert his power. Buckingham commissioned Richmond to lead a great conspiracy to overthrow the usurper. Buckingham himself raised an army against the king, but his plans miscarried. He was betrayed to Richard, captured and put to death. Henry was destined to hurl Richard from his thorne.

The king's last bit of cunning policy is shown in his eagerness to marry his niece Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV, in order to give to his crown new and much needed strength, and in order to curtail Henry's power, for Henry sought Elizabeth's hand in marriage. Accordingly, it was given out

1. Shakespeare, Wm., Richard The Third, IV, 3.

that his wife, Ann, was dangerously ill and about to die. Richard was soon rid of her.

The king began to force large loans in order to carry out his military preparations. The people did not resist him but he could not trust anyone. His chief enemies, however, were among the nobility. Henry Tudor secured men and money in France and then called for English supporters to assist him in the fight against their tyrant ruler. In 1485, two years after Buckingham's death, Tudor crossed the Channel and continued to call for supporters. Many joined him in his march. Richard had a strong army at first but his forces served him through fear and not from love. Richard chose his battleground with exceptional skill. One wing was protected by a marsh and the position was such that the enemy's archers would have had to fight with the sun in their faces, had there been any sun. The Bosworth fight lasted but two hours. Lord Stanley deserted Richard and the Earl of Northumberland stood aloof. The desertion of Lord Stanley and the men of Lancashire was the main cause of the king's overthrow. The people were not friendly and there was no security for him in adversity. He struggled fiercely in the combat, determined at any cost to die, King of England.

He was a bloody usurper, calculating and distrustful, and during his rule England awoke to the fact that she had outgrown the age of submission to violence and despotism.

"Machiavelli stood for achievement of supremacy on earth; all scruples had to be disregarded".¹ His famous maxim was "One asks about what and not about how. If one has might, one has right".² Surely, Richard was the very incarnation of this policy; a true disciple of that bloodthirsty Spaniard, Borgia, whose force was the masterkey to his policy.

-
1. Praz, Mario, *Machiavelli And The Elizabethans*, London, 1928.
 2. Morley, J., *Miscellanies*, "Nicola Machiavelli", London and New York, 1886, 1908.

Shakespeare's Machiavellian Knaves.

Shakespeare writes of an age of corruption, particularly in his history plays, but in other dramas also he portrays a corrupt society, a corrupted state, and many loathsome characters. In many of his dramas, the desire for fame seems to be the one end sought by his heroes and heroines, and, therefore, this desire for fame became an important factor in the working out of many of his plots. Nefarious means were used to obtain it.

There are five of these characters who, moving in an atmosphere of craft, suspicion, fraud and violence, stoop to any means in order to accomplish the end sought. The first three, Claudius in "Hamlet", Edmund in "Lear", and Macbeth are true Machiavellian knaves. They relegate morality to the background in seeking political power. The other two, Iago in "Othello", and Aaron in "Titus Andronicus", are Machiavellian knaves only in the sense that they are super-human monsters, and in the Shakespearean age, Machiavelli became "the common denominator for all sins".¹

Cassius in "Julius Caesar" was the follower of Machiavelli's philosophy, namely, that the end justifies the means, in the framing of his conspiracy. Therefore, he too might be included in the number of Machiavellian knaves.

Since Cassius "had as lief not be, as live to be
In awe of such a thing as (he himself)",²

he tried to explain his reason for wanting Caesar out of the

1. Praz, M., Machiavelli And The Elizabethans, London, 1928.
2. Shakespeare, Wm., Julius Caesar, I,2.

way, on the moral basis of justice. He misunderstood Caesar, hated monarchy, and feared absolutism, but his conspiracy was not free from personal resentment, jealousy and treachery.

"Such men as he be never at heart's ease,
Whiles they behold a greater than themselves".¹

The fact was, he could not endure Caesar's power. To give moral force to his deed was the surest and quickest way to the end he had fixed upon, and he was not scrupulous about using this means. He played upon the people's patriotism by telling them that he stood for Roman freedom, while Caesar was ambitious for the crown and absolute monarchy.

"Cassius has no qualms of conscience in the matter of removing Antony as well as Caesar; he will not cavil at the measures taken by his lieutenants for raising money. Intellectually he stands out from the rest of the conspirators as incomparably the shrewdest; the man who can take the initiative; who sees the course that policy requires; who understands other men and knows their true value and danger, unless he is blinded by personal prejudice".²

Claudius sought to overcome by fraud rather than by force. He could "smile, and smile, and still be a villain".³ Hamlet called him,

"A murderer and a villain; a vice of kings;
A cutpurse of the empire and the rule,
That from a shelf the precious diadem stole,
And put it in his pocket."⁴

-
1. Shakespeare, Wm., Julius Caesar, I,2.
 2. Rolfe, Wm. J., Notes on Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Chicago, 1903.
 3. Shakespeare, Wm., Hamlet, I,5.
 4. Ibid, I,4.

He murdered the king, married the queen, took the crown, plotted to do away with Hamlet, but in all guarded himself from blame. Treachery for the sake of carnal desire and ambition was native to him.

Edmund, a traitor without any qualms of conscience, sacrificed both father and brother to his greed for power. In his aim for the crown he preferred that woman who would remove every living impediment to her desire. He was the sort of cunning, crafty and intellectual villain who would have fit in well with the Borgias of Italy. Stopford Brooke says that Edmund's actions "breathe of the reckless life of that Italy which Shakespeare knew from the stories of the novellisti".¹ His maxim was,

"Let me, if not by birth, have lands by wit.
All with me's meet that I can fashion fit".²

The coolness and clear sightedness with which he used his hypocrisy and treachery, with which he regarded men and women, virtues and vices, as mere tools for his advancement were characteristics of the Machiavellian idols. He considered everything and everybody only in relation to this end.

"Macbeth" gives us a political setting of treason, leading to the convulsion of the kingdom. We are told in the "Chronicles" that Macbeth had as much right to the throne as Duncan, his first cousin, but the elective council chose Duncan. He, therefore, had "no spur

1. Brooke, Stopford, Ten More Plays Of Shakespeare, New York, 1913.

2. Shakespeare, Wm., King Lear, 1,2.

To prick the sides of (his) intent, but only
 Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself
 And falls on th' other".1

Therefore, he used bloody means to an immediate end. Like the Italian despots his life became one of prolonged terror for he gratified his ambition at the expense of every principle of justice. The deeper he waded in crime, the easier it became for him to pass from murder to murder until,

"Not in the legions
 Of horrid hell can come a devil more damn'd
 In evils to top Macbeth".2

Having murdered the king and his attendants, he proceeded to make away with all of whom he was suspicious or who had power to hurt him. His crimes, however, were crimes of necessity and expediency in the attainment of political power and in the furthering of that power.

Iago took devilish pleasure in plotting and carrying out his low cunning in order to bring pain and death upon those whom he hated. He had the brain to plan and the hand to strike. He was incensed by the report that Othello had made a cuckold of him and, therefore, his cruelty and cunning were a means of satisfying his envy and not a cruelty in statesmanship. Since his knavery was retaliation, he becomes less a Machiavellian knave, although he is generally looked upon as such. Borgia once said that it is well to cheat those who have been masters in treachery. Shakespeare does

1. Shakespeare, Wm., Macbeth, I,7.

2. Ibid, IV,3.

not make Othello a master in treachery, yet Iago thought he was, and he carried out Borgia's advice. Iago delighted in the strength of his power more than in the accomplishment of the ends for which the means were undertaken, but he did possess the characteristics of the Machiavellian knave. He had the power to make his diabolical vices pass for virtues; he was a perfect dissembler, a shrewd and remorseless monster of evil. Dr. Praz says that the cant use of the word Machiavellism suggested two things to the Elizabethans: A treacherous way of killing, and atheism.¹ From this standpoint, we find in Iago a perfect Machiavel.

The words Satan and Machiavel were used interchangeably in Shakespeare's day, and it is only in the sense of his being "an incarnate devil" that Aaron becomes a Machiavellian knave. His heinous deeds were plotted for revenge and personal gratification only. However, he followed Machiavelli's advice in one respect, for he left no long-tongued babbling gossip to betray his guilt.

1. Praz, M., "Machiavelli And The Elizabethans", London, 1928.

ALLUSIONS TO MACHIABELLIAN PHILOSOPHY

There are a few allusions to Machiavellian philosophy to be found in Shakespeare, and there are in his works certain conceptions of life and character which are consistent with the fundamental conceptions of Machiavelli. I have endeavored to separate this body of Shakespearean quotations into groups, each of which emphasizes some particular phase of the Florentine's philosophy.

Machiavelli says:

1. Men are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly, and covetous. As long as you succeed they are yours entirely. They will offer you their blood, property, life and children, when the need is distant, but when it approaches they turn against you. This point is frequently emphasized in Shakespeare. King Richard II looking into a mirror said,

"O flattering glass,
Like to my followers in prosperity
Thou dost beguile me".¹

and again,

"Dogs easily won to fawn on any man.
Snakes, in my heart blood warm'd that sting my heart".²

In "Henry The Eighth", after Buckingham has been tried and found guilty of treason, he gives this advice,

"This from a dying man receive as certain,
-----those you make your friends,
And give your hearts to, when they once perceive
The least rub in your fortunes, fall away

-
1. Richard The Second, IV,1.
 2. Richard The Second, IV,1.
 3. Henry The Sixth, IV,4, Part 2.

'Like water from ye, never found again
But when they mean to sink ye".1

In "Henry The Fifth", Pistol says,

"Trust none;
For oaths are straws, men's faith are wafer cakes,
And hold-fast is the only dog, my duck".2

In "The Winter's Tale" Camillo says to Florizel,

"Prosperity's the very bond of love,
Whose fresh complexion and whose heart together
Affliction alters".3

Timon of Athens emphasizes throughout the entire play
of that title, this same philosophy.

"When fortune in her shift and change of mood
Spurns down her late belov'd, all his dependants
Which labour'd after him to the mountain's top
Even on their knees and hands, let him slip down,
Not one accompanying his declining foot". 4

"-----when the means are gone that buy this praise,
The breath is gone whereof this praise is made".5

"Has friendship such a faint and milky heart,
It turns in less than two nights? 6

"Were your godheads to borrow of men, men would
forsake the goods." 7

"Timon will to the woods, where he shall find
The unkindest beast more kinder than mankind,
There's nothing level in our cursed natures
But direct villainy". 8

"As we do turn our backs
From our companion thrown into his grave,
So his familiars to his buried fortunes
Slink all away, leave their false vows with him
Like empty purses pick'd; and his poor self,
A dedicated beggar to the air,
With his disease of all-shunn'd poverty,
Walks, like contempt, alone".9

-
1. Henry The Eighth, II,1
 2. Henry The Fifth, II,3.
 3. The Winter's Tale, IV,4.
 4. Timon Of Athens, I,1
 5. Timon of Athens, II,2
 6. Timon Of Athens, III,1
 7. Timon Of Athens, III,6.
 8. Timon Of Athens, IV,1
 9. Timon Of Athens, IV,1.

II. Be a great pretender and dissembler. Everyone sees what you appear to be, few really know what you are. It is not necessary to have all the good qualities, but it is necessary to seem to have them. The cloak of religion conceals vices.

Richard The Third says,

"I clothe my naked villainy
With old odd ends stolen forth of holy writ
And seem a saint when most I play the devil". 1

and his mother says of him,

"Oh, that deceit should steal such gentle shapes,
And with a virtuous visor hide deep vice". 2

Gloster's words to his nephew are,

"Sweet prince, the untainted virtue of your years
Hath not yet div'd into the world's deceit;
No more can you distinguish of a man,
Than of his outward show, which, God he knows,
Seldom, or never, jumpeth with the heart". 3

Volumnia in "Coriolanus" realizes that strategy must be used in governing as well as in fighting. She says,

"If it be honour in your wars to seem
The same you are not, which, for your best ends
You adopt your policy, how is it less or worse
That it shall hold companionship in peace
With honour, as in war, since that to both
It stands in like request?" 4

In "Troilus And Cressida", Troilus says,

"What is aught, but as 't is valued? 5

Iago makes his diabolical vices pass for virtues.

"When devils will the blackest sins put on,
They do suggest at first with heavenly shows,
As I do now". 6

-
1. Richard The Third, I,3.
 2. Richard The Third, II,2.
 3. Henry The Sixth, III,1
 4. Coriolanus, III,2.
 5. Troilus And Cressida, II,2.
 6. Othello, II,3.

"Though I do hate him as I do hell-pains,
Yet, for necessity of present life,
I must show out a flag and sign of love,
Which is indeed but sign". 1

Iago says to Cassio,

"Reputation is an idle and most false imposition;
oft got without merit, and lost without deserving. You
have lost no reputation at all, unless you repute yourself
such a loser". 2

Claudius in "Hamlet" says,

"One may smile and smile and be a villain". 3

Polonius warns Ophelia against Hamlet,

"Tis too much prov'd - that with devotion's visage
And pious action we do sugar o'er
The devil himself". 4

Hamlet to Rosencrantz:

"-----to be honest, as this world goes
is to be one man pick'd out of ten thousand". 5

Hamlet to his mother:

"Assume a virtue if you have it not". 6

Quotations from Macbeth:

"There is no art
To find the mind's construction in the face". 7

"-----thou wouldst be great;
Art not without ambition, but without
The illness should attend it". 8

-
1. Othello, I, 1.
 2. Othello, II, 3.
 3. Hamlet, I, 5.
 4. Hamlet, III, 1.
 5. Hamlet, II, 2.
 6. Hamlet, III, 4.
 7. Macbeth, I, 4.
 8. Macbeth, I, 5.

"To beguile the time,
Look like the time; bear welcome in your eye,
Your hand, your tongue; look like the innocent flower,
But be the serpent under 't". 1

"False face must hide, what the false heart doth know". 2

"There's daggers in men's smiles". 3

But I remember now
I am in this earthly world; where to do harm
Is often laudable, to do good sometime
Accounted dangerous folly". 4

When Edward IV was crowned, his brother Richard kissed him
and murmured,

"So Judas kiss'd his master
And cried - all hail, when he meant - all harm". 5

The following quotations are from "Pericles, Prince of
Tyre":

"How courtesy would seem to cover sin,
When what is done is like an hypocrite,
The which is good in nothing but in sight". 6

"Who makes the fairest show means most deceit". 7

"Opinion's but a fool, that makes us scan
The outward habit by the inward man". 8

"No visor does become black villainy
So well as soft and tender flattery". 9

"Virtue and cunning are endowments greater
Than nobleness and riches; careless heirs
May the two latter darken and expend,
But immortality attends the former,
Making a man a god". 10

-
1. Macbeth, I, 5.
 2. Macbeth, I, 7.
 3. Macbeth, II, 4.
 4. Macbeth, IV, 3.
 5. Henry The Sixth, V, 7, Part 3.
 6. Pericles, III, 2.
 7. Pericles, I, 4.
 8. Pericles, II, 2.
 9. Pericles, I, 4.
 10. Pericles, III, 2.

In "Measure For Measure" we find,

"O 't is the cunning livery of hell,
The damned'st body to invest and cover
In priestly guards". 1

"O, what may man within him hide,
Though angel on the outward side". 2

In "The Merchant Of Venice",

"O, what a godly outside falsehood hath". 3

"In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt,
But, being season'd with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil?
In religion, what damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it, and approve it with a text
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?
There is no vice so simple, but assum's
Some mark of virtue on his outward parts". 4

In "The Comedy Of Errors",

"Muffle your false love with some show of blindness.
Look sweet, speak fair, become disloyalty:
Apparel vice like virtue's harbinger;
Bear a fair presence though your heart be tainted;
Teach sin the carriage of a holy saint". 5

When Romeo is about to kill Tybalt, the nurse exclaims,

"There's no trust
No faith, no honesty in men; all perjured
All foresworn, all naught, all dissemblers". 6

III. One should be a constant inquirer and a patient
listener concerning the things of which one inquired, and
afterwards form one's own conclusions.

Polonius' advice to Laertes was,

"Give every man thine ear, but few thy voice;
Take each man's censure, but reserve thy judgment". 7

-
1. Measure For Measure, III,1.
 2. Measure For Measure, III,2.
 3. The Merchant Of Venice, I,3.
 4. The Merchant Of Venice, III,2.
 5. The Comedy Of Errors, III,2.
 6. Romeo And Juliet, III,2.
 7. Hamlet, I,3.

IV. It is best for a new prince to get rid of those who helped him to the crown and of those who have power to hurt him, for he will be unable to preserve their friendship.

"Either make a man your friend or put it out of his power to be your enemy".

The gardener in "Richard II" compares the pruning of his trees with the ruling of a country.

"Superfluous branches,
We lop away, that bearing boughs may live;
Had he (Richard) done so, himself had borne the crown,
Which waste and idle hours hath quite thrown down".¹

V. In the actions of all men, one judges by the result. Shakespeare voices the same sentiment in "All's Well That Ends Well".

"All's well that ends well. Still the fine's the crown;
Whate'er the course, the end is the renown".²

Prince Hal says to Poins:

"Let the end try the man".³

VI. Fortune is the arbiter of one half of our actions, but she still leaves us to direct the other half. God is not willing to do everything, and thus take away our free will and that share of glory which belongs to us.

in "All's Well That Ends Well" we find,

"Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie,
Which we ascribe to heaven. The fated sky
Gives us free scope, only doth backward pull
Our slow designs when we ourselves are dull".⁴

-
1. Richard The Second, III, 4.
 2. All's Well That Ends Well, IV, 4.
 3. Henry The Fourth, II, 2, Part 2.
 4. All's Well That Ends Well, I, 2.

VII. A wise prince should never in peaceful times stand idle, but increase his resources with industry in such a way that they may be available to him in adversity. Nothing is so common as a thirst for conquest. It is by conquering difficulties that princes raise themselves to power.

"Plenty and peace breeds cowards; hardness ever
Of hardness is mother".¹

"Peace itself should not so dull a kingdom,
Though war, nor no known quarrel were in question,
But that defences, musters, preparations,
Should be maintain'd, assembled and collected
As were a man in expectation".²

VIII. There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. If the innovators can rely on themselves and use force, they are rarely endangered. The injury done to a man ought to be of such kind that the new ruler does not stand in fear of revenge.

"A scepter, snatch'd with an unruly hand,
Must be as boisterously maintain'd as gained,
And he, that stands upon a slippery place,
Makes nice of no vile hold to stay him up".³

IX. Men change their rulers willingly hoping to better themselves.

In "Coriolanus" we find,

"With every minute (they) do change a mind,
And call him noble that was now (their) hate,
Him vile, that was (their) garland".⁴

-
1. Cymbeline, III, 6.
 2. Henry The Fifth, II, 4.
 3. King John, III, 4.
 4. Coriolanus, I, 1.

"This common body,
Like to a vagabond flag upon the stream,
Goes to and back lackeying the varying tide,
To rot itself in motion".¹

X. Men are dupes of simplicity and greed. This is emphasized in "Lear",

"Through tatter'd clothes great vices do appear,
Robes and furr'd gowns hide all. Plate sins with gold,
And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;
Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw does pierce it".²

The term "Machiavel" is found twice in "Henry VI
and once in "Merry Wives Of Windsor".

York speaks of Alencon as.

"-----that notorious Machiavel".³

Gloster says,

"-----Why I can smile, and murder while I smile
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,
I can-----
Set the murd'rous Machiavel to school".⁴

In "Merry Wives of Windsor" when "mine host of the Garter"
has directed Sir Hugh Evans and Doctor Caius to wrong places
in order to avoid their silly duel and his joke is discovered,
he cries out,

"Am I politic? am I subtle? am I a Machiavel?" ⁵

-
1. Antony And Cleopatra, I,4.
 2. Lear, IV,6.
 3. Henry The Sixth, V,4, Part 1.
 4. Henry The Sixth, III,2, Part 3.
 5. Merry Wives Of Windsor, III,1.

SUMMARY

Summary

Macaulay in his characterization of Machiavelli tells us that "two characters altogether dissimilar are united in him".¹ He was a "faithful public servant of the State, a student of books and of human nature, and the inaugurator of a political philosophy for modern Europe".² On the other hand, his letters tell of his stooping "to low pleasures" and his correspondence is soiled "with gossip which breathes the tainted atmosphere of Florentine vice".³ It is the first of these Machiavellis and the moral bluntness expressed in his theories of human conduct as found in "The Prince, which I have been considering in this essay. It is not my intention to compare the man Shakespeare with the man Machiavelli for it is a well known fact that Shakespeare was interested in the integrity of moral standards, and although Machiavelli "ascribed the weakness of the Italians to their loss of morality, he was not logical enough to insist that their regeneration must begin with a religious revolution".⁴

It is impossible to tell what thoughts arose in Shakespeare's mind as he contemplated his creations. "Of what he thought about the art of living - and this includes the art of judging - we have no direct and little indirect evidence".⁵ However, Shakespeare was one of the most gifted

-
1. Warner, C. D., Library Of The World's Best Literature, Vol., 24, New York, 1896.
 2. Symonds, J. A., Renaissance In Italy, "Italian Literature" Part II, New York, 1882.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Sharp, F. C., Shakespeare's Portrayal of the Moral Life, New York, 1902.

students of human nature the world has known. "His master hand swept with unerring accuracy over the entire scale of human life and passion".¹ In this essay, therefore, I have attempted:

1. To show that Shakespeare as a thinker and student of human nature could not have escaped the influence of Machiavelli, for - he was a man who, in accordance with his age, held in mind the Elizabethan picture of a bloodthirsty and deceitful Italy; he knew the wild extravagances of Marlowe, the dramatist who is recognized as one of the first to introduce the Machiavellian hero into English drama; he was aware of the Machiavellian statecraft of Cromwell; he was acquainted with the reckless life painted by the novellisti; and finally, he realized that the Machiavel had become an important character in Elizabethan drama and Machiavellism an important factor. The very fact that Shakespeare, reflecting English thought, uses the name Machiavel "as the superlative for craft and murderous treachery"² shows an indirect influence. It is impossible to point out Machiavelli as a direct source from which he gained his experience or knowledge, but Machiavellism left its stamp upon him and guided him in his problems of relationship between nations and rulers, between men and their neighbors.

1. Creighton, M., *The Age Of Elizabeth*, New York, 1912.

2. Warner, C. D. *Library of the World's Best Literature*, Vol., 24, New York, 1896.

2. To select from among Shakespeare's characters the Machiavellian princes and knaves, and to show why they may be looked upon as such.

3. To discover in the cynical moralizings of some of his characters a Machiavellian flavor, and to discover certain points of perception which voice Machiavelli's philosophy as set forth in "The Prince". It is not my intention, however, to identify Shakespeare with any of these characters.

---*---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

1. Symonds, J. A., Renaissance In Italy, "The Age Of The Despots", New York, 1881.
2. Horridge, F., Lives Of Great Italians, Boston, 1900.
3. Vincent, Geo. E., Some Italian Authors, Boston, 1887.
4. Morley, John, Miscellanies, "Nicola Machiavelli", London and New York, 1886, 1908.
5. Villari, Pasquale, The Life And Times of Nicola Machiavelli, London, 1898.
6. Machiavelli, Nicola, History Of Florence and Other Works, together with "The Prince", Bohn's Standard Library Edition, London, 1871.
7. Brooke, S. A., Ten More Plays Of Shakespeare, New York, 1913.
8. Carter, Thomas, Shakespeare's Stories Of The English Kings, New York, n.d.
9. Thorndike, Lynn, History Of Medieval Europe, New York, 1917.
10. Gardiner, S. R., A Student's History Of England, New York, 1929.
11. Green, J. R., Short History Of The English People, New York, 1916.
12. Cross, A. L., A History Of England And Greater Britain, New York, 1914.
13. Warner, Beverley, E., English History In Shakespeare's Plays, New York and London, 1906.
14. Mac-Callum, M. W., Shakespeare's Roman Plays, London, 1910.
15. Meyers, P. V. N., General History (Revised) Boston, 1906.
16. Shakespeare, W., New Hudson Edition with Notes, Boston, 1908.
17. Robinson, J. H., History Of Western Europe, Boston, 1902, 1903.
18. Cheyney, Ed. P., A Short History Of England, Boston, 1904.
19. Shakespeare, Wm., The Arden Edition, Boston, 1916.

20. Mabie, H. W., Shakespeare - Poet, Dramatist And Man, New York and London, 1901.
21. Hudson, H. N., Shakespeare - His Life, Art And Characters, Boston, 1882.
22. Sharp, F. C., Shakespeare's Portrayal Of The Moral Life, New York, 1902.
23. Harris, F., Man Shakespeare, New York, 1909.
24. Bradley, A. C., Shakespearean Tragedy, London and New York, 1905.
25. Shakespeare, Wm., The Rolfe Edition With Notes, Chicago, 1903.
26. Shakespeare, Wm., The Tudor Edition With Notes, Macmillan Company, Canada, 1911.
27. Marriott, W. K., "The Prince" by Nicola Machiavelli, A translation, New York, 1908.
28. Praz, Mario, "Machiavelli And The Elizabethans", London, 1928. Italian Lecture Of The British Academy, From the Proceedings Of The British Academy, Vol., XIII.
29. Warner, C. D., A Library Of The World's Best Literature, Vol., XXIV, New York, 1896.
30. Symonds, J. A., Renaissance In Italy, "Italian Literature", Part II, New York, 1882.
31. Creighton, M., The Age Of Elizabeth, New York, 1912.