

ADAM CONTZEN

TEN BOOKS OF POLITICS

BOOK THREE

On the Virtues Necessary to the Commonwealth

CONTENTS

Chapter I. All the Moral Virtues Are Required in a Well-Constituted Commonwealth	3
Chapter II. Prudence Is Necessary to the Commonwealth, and Its Office and Function	6
Chapter III. Those Who Prefer Prudent Princes and Magistrates but Imprudent, Foolish, and, as They Say, Simple Citizens Are in Great Error	11
Chapter IV. Cunning, the Imitator of Prudence, Is Harmful to the Commonwealth	14
Chapter V. Diligence Must Be Joined to Prudence	23
Chapter VI. Justice Is Especially Commended to the Prince	30
Chapter VII. The Commonwealth Ought to Keep Faith with All	38
Chapter VIII. The Commonwealth Ought to Be Grateful Toward Those Who Have Deserved Well	44
Chapter IX. The Prince and the Commonwealth Ought to Be Liberal	50
Chapter X. Parsimony Is Necessary to the Commonwealth, and Prodigality Pernicious	58
Chapter XI. Affability Is a Distinguished Ornament of Citizens and Princes	62
Chapter XII. Chastity Ought to Be a Matter of Great Care in the Commonwealth	68
Chapter XIII. Spectacles Harm Good and Chaste Morals, and Therefore Must Be Abolished, or Only Those Which Excite to Virtue Retained	82
Chapter XIV. Sobriety Is the Firmament of the Commonwealth	88
Chapter XV. Anger Is Equally Harmful to Rulers and Subjects	106
Chapter XVI. Clemency Must Be Cultivated in Every Commonwealth	122
Chapter XVII. All Persons in the Commonwealth Must Be Trained in Fortitude	143
Chapter XVIII. Fortitude Is Not Acquired by Bloody Spectacles	151
Chapter XIX. A Commonwealth, However Powerful and Rich, Ought to Hold Most Tenaciously to Modesty	158
Chapter XX. Magnanimity Ought to Be Commended to the Commonwealth, and Especially to Magistrates	168
Chapter XXI. Charity, the Queen of All the Virtues, Ought to Be Esteemed Most Highly in the Commonwealth	174

CHAPTER I

All the Moral Virtues Are Required in a Well-Constituted Commonwealth

ON THE VIRTUES NECESSARY TO THE COMMONWEALTH

§ 1. I have already explained in the preceding book that virtue is necessary to the commonwealth; I have demonstrated this concerning faith and religion. It now remains for me to treat of the other virtues that are necessary to the prince, senators, and citizens. I treat of civil life, and of that life for which nature itself has fashioned and advances us. For although virtue itself has very great force in household management, in private dealings, and in private life, nevertheless every virtue without exception is necessary in the commonwealth. Wherever its protection has withdrawn, there the enemy is admitted. Silence overthrew silent Amyclae; lust, Colchis and Crete; avarice assailed the Roman city in bracelets; credulity received Zopyrus as a traitor; through ambition almost all kingdoms have perished. Wherever there is even a small departure from what is right, the commonwealth lies open to blows; nor is any vice so small that it does not suffice to overthrow great kingdoms, if you despise it. It is an oracle of Pythagoras:

Ἀρετὴ τὸ ἰσχύον μόνον, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα λήρος.

For virtue alone is powerful; all other things are trifles: riches, the strength of walls, a fleet, an army, auxiliaries--if they are apart from virtue, they accomplish nothing other than that the ruins may terrify with a greater crash as they fall. While morals had not yet declined, not even Manlius could drive the people into servitude; but when the commonwealth had been corrupted, even princes flatter Claudius and enroll Nero among the gods. The commonwealth desires examples of all the virtues, just as it desires those devoted to and skilled in all the arts. For if examples of any virtue are lacking, the enemy is invited through a breach in the rampart.

These were the last words of a bad but shrewd emperor, who found it easier to think and speak rightly than to act rightly: "Everywhere I received a commonwealth in disorder; I leave it pacified even as far as the Britons. An old man, infirm in my feet, I shall leave a strong empire to my Antonines if they are good, a feeble one if they are bad." It was an oracle. They were bad; swiftly they destroyed both the empire and themselves.

But it is too little for one member in so great a body to be sound. For a state which the virtue of one or a few raises up will not be able to stand if the impulse of the multitude drives and snatches it into vices. The influence of the ruler toward virtue is indeed supreme; yet frequently the vices of the multitude outweigh it. "We are pliant and are led in whatever direction by the prince, and, so to speak, we are followers; we also desire to be dear to him and approved by him. Those unlike him have hoped for this in vain; and by a continuance of compliance we arrive at the point that almost all human beings live by the morals of one man" (Pliny, *Panegyric*). And so the ancients thought no gift of the gods more excellent or more beautiful than a chaste and holy prince, one most like the gods. For if a prince prefers pleasures and riches to virtue, the people must necessarily become vicious by a swift contagion.

[Printed page 110]

§ 2. There is need, moreover, of all the virtues as though they formed one indivisible body; for they are all fitted and joined together among themselves and, as the Stoics were accustomed to say, ἀχώριστοι, "inseparable." I do not agree with those who think that one virtue is diversified by its duties. This is a Stoic doctrine. For Chrysippus speaks thus in Laertius:

Τὰς ἀρετὰς ἀκολουθεῖν ἀλλήλαις, οὐ μόνον τῷ τὴν μίαν ἔχοντα τὰς πάσας ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ τὸν κατὰ μίαν ὁτιοῦν ἐνεργοῦντα κατὰ πάσας ἐνεργεῖν, οὔτε ἄνδρα τέλειον εἶναι, τὸν μὴ πάσας ἔχοντα τὰς ἀρετάς, οὔτε πρᾶξιν τελείαν, ἥτις οὐ κατὰ πάσας πράττεται τὰς ἀρετάς.

The virtues accompany one another, not only because he who has one has them all, but because he who acts according to one acts according to them all. Nor is the man perfect who does not have all the virtues, nor is the action perfect which is not done according to all the virtues.

There is not so great a conjunction of the virtues as they devise, such that none can exist without another; nevertheless, no virtue in its own condition is altogether perfect without the fellowship and companionship of the others. For one is an aid to another, so that it may perform perfect actions consistently; one protects another and makes it invulnerable. And this is what Cicero in book 5 of *On Ends*, and afterward Jerome, admonishes: “Since the virtues are so coupled and joined together that they all participate in all, and one cannot be separated from another, nevertheless each has its own proper office, so that fortitude is discerned in labors and battles, temperance in pleasures, prudence in choice.” And Seneca, Epistle 67: “When someone endures torments bravely, perhaps he employs all the virtues, although one--patience--is at hand and appears most of all. Yet fortitude is there, of which patience, endurance, and toleration are branches. Prudence is there, without which no counsel is entered upon, and which advises one to bear as bravely as possible what one cannot escape. Constancy is there, which cannot be cast down from its station and does not relinquish its purpose when any force attempts to wrench it away. There is that indivisible company of virtues. Whatever is done honorably, one virtue does, but upon the judgment of the council. But what is approved by all the virtues, even if it seems to be done by one, is desirable.”

§ 3. All participate in all. And it is necessary that this occur in the commonwealth. Otherwise, what happens to a soldier whom his comrades have abandoned alone in the battle line will befall a solitary virtue: while he fights most bravely, even the most cowardly of the enemy strikes him down from the rear or the flank with a stealthy wound. Samson’s fortitude, stripped of the aid of chastity, fell and lay in bonds and filth. The sacrilegious ambition of King Uzziah removed his great virtues from the commonwealth; intemperance overthrew John Maccabaeus. If we also consider our own men, we shall find that sometimes all the virtues have yielded to one vice. What drove Tertullian, with so great learning, gravity, and holiness, out of the Church and into the Montanists, if not a proud obstinacy excessively tenacious of its own judgment? What turned Hosius, renowned throughout the whole world and already in extreme old age, aside from his course, if not fear of torments? For so many virtues and labors, deserted by fortitude, fell at a single blow, as it were. Haste in judging, and a certain indulgence toward his own talent, destroyed Origen.

But since it is rare for a man in the commonwealth to be fortified by the company of all the virtues, and since even the most fortified things are fragile in some part of themselves, it is nevertheless necessary that all these virtues exist in the commonwealth. The fierceness of some must be tempered by the counsels of the prudent; the levity of others must be restrained by gravity; pleasures must be chastised; ambition must be suppressed, so that there is no virtue which is not taught by morals and words. Since, therefore, these goods rarely come together in any one person, let the commonwealth act so that it may at least have them dispersed. It is most difficult for someone to be both vigorous in battle and good in counsel. An equal talent for both camp and gown is not frequently found. Therefore let the legislator so govern his citizens that one supplies the mind, another the hand; and let the warlike right hand strike and avoid the enemy by the counsel of the prudent man, so that it may be unconquered.

§ 4. The conjunction and harmony of the virtues is also discerned in a certain moderation, which consists in a mean. In all of them there is a certain firmness, which is the greater the more virtues are present, just as that battle line is strongest which has both the greatest number and the best soldiers. All are also ruled by a certain equality that directs actions. All are bound together in one prudence; for there is no action of virtue unless prudence has directed it. What is done rashly is impulse, not virtue; and although it has been done with a good outcome, it nevertheless has not been well done.

§ 5. A discourse concerning the political virtues must therefore be undertaken, but concerning true virtues, for I rejected hypocrisy and dissimulation already in the preceding book. Now I also give this warning: vices must not be honored with the names of virtues. This is the most ancient evil of states and will be the last, unless I am mistaken. They call license liberty; they think audacity fortitude; they impose avarice under the name of frugality, prodigality

under the name of magnificence, and pride under the name of magnanimity, as though under a covering, upon inexperienced minds. In the schools, when young men have entangled their equals by an ambiguous word or a twisted argument, they rejoice as victors and grieve as defeated men. But in the state, it is not words but the things themselves that entangle many and lead them into fraud. Dissimulation itself is more ingenious in devising things than truth is. Pliny, *Panegyric*. Horace also gives that warning:

As those hired to mourn at a funeral say

And do almost more than those who grieve from the heart.

Vices creep in under the name of virtues. Flattery surpasses friendship in blandishments, and the flatterer often drives out the friend, pleasing by the very thing by which he harms. If rashness is successful, it is praised as fortitude. Fawning enemies call the timid man cautious, the coward moderate. For evils have often presented the appearance of what is honorable.

§ 6. Finally, I wish these things to be understood in such a way that they know there is need of virtue, not of impulse. In virtue there are order, decorum, and constancy; it has harmony among all its actions; it itself distributes duties; it itself moderates all things. It is exceedingly harmful that those who read histories at once admire the sudden desire for action which they call *ὄρμηξ* and number it among the virtues. Many have done something with a noble, liberal, or temperate mind, but once or perhaps twice; their whole life is discordant with the one deed. Such men are most dangerously employed in public affairs, for they have the reputation of a good man and the vices of the ruined. He did something that was right, or in which there was the likeness of what is right, but that was an accident, not an exercise of character. In a state, however, there is need of a brave and constant virtue, one that rests upon judgment and prudence.

Moreover, the virtues I require in the commonwealth are prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance, and friendship with true charity, which contains all those virtues. Just as these embrace various parts within themselves and are pressed on the opposite side by various vices, so they supply abundant matter for discussion. But now let us speak of prudence.

CHAPTER II

Prudence Is Necessary to the Commonwealth, and Its Office and Function

§ 1. Prudence is a habit of acting with true reason concerning those things which are good or evil for a human being (Aristotle, book 6 of the *Ethics*, chapter 1, and St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II--II, question 47).

[Printed page 111]

He calls it right reason concerning things to be done, **τῶν πρακτέων**. Clearer is the definition of others derived from Cicero: knowledge of things to be done and to be omitted. For this definition comes to the same thing: knowledge of things to be sought and to be avoided; or: knowledge of things good, evil, and neutral. Prudence therefore extends most widely and is occupied in the actions of all the virtues; like a blameless mistress, it sets for all of them certain boundaries and a measure,

Beyond or short of which what is right cannot stand.

It is therefore the eye, cynosure, and leader of all the virtues; for neither temperance, nor justice, nor fortitude exists unless prudence moderates it. **Οὐκ οἶόν τε ἀγαθὸν εἶναι κυρίως ἄνευ φρονήσεως**; nothing can properly be good without prudence, Aristotle teaches in book 6 of the *Ethics*, chapter 5. For since every virtue consists in a mean, in choice, and in measure, without that ruler and dispenser the mean cannot be chosen nor the measure found; without this plumb line nothing but a ruin is built up. That magnet directs the course of navigation, unmoved, toward the goal of happiness and carries a torch before it; when this is extinguished, all things are in darkness. Hence let the commonwealth pursue a ray of divine light through so great a darkness with unclosed eyes. "For where there is no prudent governor, the people will fall; but safety is where there are many counsels" (Proverbs 5).

§ 2. Perfect prudence must hold first place in all affairs: **ἅπαντα δὲ διὰ τὸ φρονεῖν καθίσταται**; all things obey prudence.

Its functions are to investigate a matter by counsel and in that counsel to understand and select what is right and to reject what is harmful; to determine what, above all, must be done out of many things, and whether anything must be done at all. The most ingenious of poets expressed this:

You have a right hand useful in war;

Yours is a talent that needs our direction.

You bear strength without mind; mine is the care of the future.

You can fight; with me Atreides chooses

The times for fighting. You avail only in body,

We in mind; and by as much as he who steers the ship surpasses

The oarsman's office, by as much as a leader is greater than a soldier,

By so much do I surpass you.

If, therefore, the commonwealth, senate, or prince is without this, what else shall we say it is than an eyeless Cyclops, which pours out its mighty strength upon the wind, dashes it against the rocks, and at last overwhelms itself with its own mass?

§ 3. The parts of prudence are innumerable--namely, as many as there are kinds of virtues and of things to be done. Nevertheless, for the sake of order and discipline, it is customarily divided into certain species. One is discerned in

individual and private actions and extends most widely, for it embraces all duties that pertain to the ordering and adornment of the mind. The office of another is to administer the family property and the household, which they call economic prudence. But that which is most excellent is called political prudence, which presides over peace and war, kingship, aristocracy, polity, and laws. He who governs that most difficult animal, the human being, needs to know, take up, and arrange as many affairs--so great and so dissimilar--as political prudence moderates and brings to their ends. The human being's nature is greedy for liberty, and command is so troublesome to it that it obeys grudgingly even when useful and just things are commanded benignly: *οἱ ἄρχοντες μισοῦνται· φιλελεύθερον γὰρ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον*, says the scholiast on Thucydides. Rulers are hated because the human race loves liberty.

§ 4. Eight parts constitute complete prudence: memory, docility, reason, understanding, quick-wittedness, foresight, circumspection, and caution. Consideration of these has great force in all actions, for they generally concur in giving counsel. First, certainly, for pronouncing an opinion in public affairs or giving counsel, I require memory of many things, and a vivid recollection--acquired either by learning or experience--of outcomes and causes. He who is ignorant of the things done before him is always a child. So many and such varied things have been written that they could instruct even a blockhead; but such is the weakness of human talent that, when people read adverse and prosperous events, they take good omens for themselves and believe the flattering things. Although I admire the memory of Caesar or Mithridates, I do not demand it in a prince. I nevertheless judge that prudence must consider the outcomes of notable affairs, not only ancient but also recent. Memory is not indeed worthy of the name of prudence; nevertheless, we read of certain exceedingly prudent men who were distinguished by memory. Mithridates of Pontus addressed twenty-two nations, each in its own language; Cyrus could repeat the names of his soldiers, and Lucius Scipio those of the Roman people; on the day after he had come to Rome, Cineas addressed the senate and the equestrian order by name. Hadrian, Seneca, Porcius Latro, and others were strong in an excellent memory. But those marvels have scarcely appeared once in individual ages; I set before my prince those things which can come into use.

Let prudence and reflection upon useful things be in him. When food retains its own nature and floats undigested upon the stomach, it is a burden and irritates and oppresses health; when it has passed into the blood, it supplies strength and fills the veins. In the same way, knowledge of affairs ought not merely to reside in the memory but to pass into the understanding, and with its wholesome juice to strengthen and support the firmness and constancy of counsels. Nothing harms prudence more than the unconsidered rashness of inexperienced men, who either possess no part of human affairs or have lightly touched history without meditation; yet I have observed that these men most frequently display themselves in citations. I judge them like Calvisius Sabinus, and altogether his twins. In him, amid the greatest poverty of a poor little memory and utter thoughtlessness, there was a most greedy desire for glory, Seneca relates in Epistle 27:

"In our memory Calvisius Sabinus was a rich man: he had both the estate of a freedman and the character of a freeborn man. I have never seen a man more indecently happy. His memory was so bad that now the name of Ulysses escaped him, now that of Achilles, now that of Priam--men whom he knew as well as we know our schoolmasters. No aged nomenclator, who does not return names but imposes them, ever saluted the tribes as wrongly as he did the Trojans and Achaeans. Nevertheless he wished to appear learned. And so he devised this shortcut: for a great sum he bought slaves, one who should possess Homer, another Hesiod; in addition, he assigned one slave to each of the nine lyric poets. There is no reason for you to marvel that he bought them at a great price: he had not found them ready-made, so he contracted for them to be made. After this household had been procured for him, he began to harass his dinner guests. He had these men at his feet, and, when from time to time he requested verses from them to repeat, he often failed in the middle of a verse.

"Satellius Quadratus--a gnawer at foolish rich men and, what follows from that, a grinner at them, and, what is joined to both of these, a mocker--advised him to keep grammarians as excerpt-readers. When Sabinus had said that each slave cost him one hundred thousand sesterces, he replied: 'You could have bought as many book chests for less.' He nevertheless was of the opinion that he himself knew whatever anyone in his household knew. The same Satellius

began to urge him to wrestle, though he was a sickly, pale, thin man. When Sabinus answered, ‘And how can I? I scarcely live,’ he said: ‘Please, do not say that; do you not see how many very strong slaves you have?’”

[Printed page 112]

Far more troublesome than Calvisius are those who have scraped together varied stories from commonplace collections and recite them without order, without regard to time, and without decorum or prudence.

§ 5. Memory is not always, but nevertheless frequently, accompanied by a second aid to the actions of prudence, *εὐμάρθεια*, or docility, which in this place I restrict to the actions of prudence. It is the mark of a great mind, since it does not possess all things from itself, to learn without shame--not only from books, which arrogance does more readily, because it is conscious of its own ignorance, but also from colleagues in the senate chamber and in the prince’s council: to hear and judge their opinions, even those of younger men, and to exchange the opinion you have pronounced for a better one. In this part prudent men often err most seriously, while they stubbornly urge not what is best to be done, but what they themselves have judged best.

§ 6. More excellent than docility, but rarer, is quick-wittedness, *ἄγγίνοια*, by which, through a swift movement of the mind, the rationale and means of resolving a difficulty is found. For it settles arduous affairs suddenly and in a short time, and procures reputation and authority. By such fortunate quick-wittedness Solomon adjudicated the most intricate affair of all, in which neither witnesses nor other proofs were present; without threats and tortures he elicited the litigants’ secrets. For when he had ordered the disputed infant to be divided by the sword and a part to be given to each woman, true affection immediately revealed the mother, and cruelty the stranger.

§ 7. The fourth part is reason or intelligence, which is a habit--the faculty of knowing and judging other things from things known and thoroughly perceived. For it is necessary that he who has learned very many things bring them into use, when there is need, by a discursive movement and activity of mind, and bring them toward the public advantage. The Crotoniats were at war against the Sybarites. The horses of the latter, as men utterly ruined by luxury, had been trained so that at certain measures of the trumpet they would leap and turn to dances. Since the Crotoniats had learned their disposition and this training, they turned it to their own advantage. For, having imitated the melody of the Sybarite dance, they easily crushed the dancing and disordered cavalry: the beasts of burden, upon hearing the accustomed song, were so impelled toward their usual sport that neither the ranks could be preserved nor the battle line governed.

§ 8. That reason chiefly looks to three things: first, that it act with foresight; second, with circumspection; third, with caution.

Foresight, therefore, is the part of prudence which looks ahead to future things and orders present things toward them. For when it foresees future things, it disposes present things so that the former may readily be met; when it looks upon present things, it easily conjectures what is to come and, by its care and solicitude, acts either so that evils may be averted or may fall most gently, or so that good things may be most opportune. *Πρόνοια*, foresight concerning future things before they occur, has never been sufficiently praised and ought to be the sole care in the commonwealth. For although our acts of foresight are timid and uncertain, nevertheless the wisest of all human beings truly admonishes us: “The cunning man sees evil and hides himself; the little ones pass on and sustain losses” (Proverbs 22); and: “The shrewd man sees danger and is hidden; the simple break through and suffer harm.” It was the utterance of a wicked but nevertheless provident king when he declared Rome to be for sale if it should find a buyer: from present conditions he foresaw the outcome, and the buyers were already threatening. After Greece and Carthage had been conquered, Scipio foresaw the destruction of Rome, and therefore judged that luxury must be resisted; but morals conquered care, and the conqueror of nations fell through her own delights and left the spoils of the world to the fiercest of barbarians. Thus Hannibal the enemy judged better concerning Fabius the Delayer than did his friends at Rome. For when all interpreted his delay as a reproach, Hannibal alone feared him and foretold that the cloud hanging upon the mountain would someday bring forth storms.

In this comparison and ordering of present and future affairs, judgment and action must be circumspect and cautious.

§ 9. Prudence has as its proposed end a good end, and as proposed means those things that lead to the end and are good or indifferent. But it is too little to have these rightly unless all the adjuncts and the things that surround the affair are also surveyed. This part of prudence is called circumspection. Images of emperors were formerly honored with civil reverence; this could seem a duty, but because images of the gods were joined to those statues, the crime of idolatry was connected with the veneration of lawful magistracy. It therefore belonged to prudence to look around, lest, while they honored the emperor, they should worship a demon. Macrinus, raised to the imperial office, recognized that military discipline had fallen and resolved to repair and restore it by crosses and unaccustomed punishments. He had a right end proposed, but neglected a circumstance; for he ought to have considered what was the principal circumstance--namely, the long-established and strengthened license of the camps, which must never be torn out by a single assault, but little by little. The deed was one of great constancy, but nevertheless it increased the calamities.

When Julian was reigning, an idol-serving temple attendant sprinkled Valentinian, then a tribune and afterward made emperor, with lustral water. Valentinian both gave him a slap and cut off the part of his garment upon which a drop had fallen, and so incited the tyrant to persecution. I praise the zeal; I require circumspection. I praise more highly the Christians of Antioch, who at first, during that time, prudently abstained from things sacrificed to idols according to the custom of the Church; but when Julian abused that law for their disgrace and deprivation and polluted all the food in the marketplace with sacrifices, they freely ate the food and mocked the idols while eating. For the tyrant's malice and the insults of the Gentiles brought it about that Christ was worshiped with ingenuous liberty rather than with anxiety.

§ 10. In pursuing goods, caution against evils also has great importance. For many advantages in the commonwealth, even those received in practice and even those long blameless, must be abandoned so that the evils customarily following them may be avoided. What obstructs virtue must always be considered, lest the whole labor perish by a single accident. Written bonds and contracts are full of precautions; our life is almost empty of them. With how many formulas do buyers protect themselves, and what little word dearer than gold is inserted in the records? Is the commonwealth, exposed to so many evils, treated negligently? First the strength of the enemy and all obstacles are brought into counsel. When Antiochus looks upon his resources and golden arms, he anticipates victory in his mind; Hannibal, who knew the military practice of the Romans, judges that all those things will pass into plunder. This part of virtue rarely accompanies even the most perfect men. Cassius and Brutus endeavor to free their fatherland from tyranny; because the disposition of Antony and of others who rejoiced in civil blood had not been sufficiently perceived, they imposed three most cruel tyrants upon their fatherland in place of one moderate one.

§ 11. The final thing that pertains to true prudence is understanding, or a true estimation of moral principles, from which the rules and actions of prudence are deduced. For just as all sciences have certain principles of their own, from which they derive conclusions by certain and true reasoning, so also prudence rests upon certain general principles which all judge true when they have apprehended them at first sight. They are these: God is to be worshiped, one must act justly, magistracy must be obeyed,

[Printed page 113]

and the other things which all by consensus judge true. Therefore those in whose minds so great a darkness of vices has settled that they tremble and are blinded at so clear a light lack not only the virtue itself but the principles of prudence. This is exceedingly rare even in the worst people, for almost all seek honorable pretexts even while they contrive crimes.

§ 12. And these things I establish generally concerning prudence in this manner. I commend it to the prince and senate and generally hand down its laws.

The first: Let them esteem as small nothing in the commonwealth which can be the decisive point of a greater advantage or danger. “The unforeseen force of death has seized, and will seize, nations”--indeed, a force that has been despised. The Romans fear the Parthian, and a poorly girded boy will rule over those who fear foreign things. Ishbosheth fears David, but is killed by brigands. Philip is armed against the Persians and is slaughtered by Pausanias.

The second: Just as good physicians skillfully forestall the causes of disease, let all who administer the commonwealth prudently, not by impulse, anticipate all dangers. It is easy to support a tottering column; to raise one that lies fallen is laborious. And so let them always look upon the corpses of other commonwealths--such as the Athenian, Corinthian, Spartan, Tyrian, and Carthaginian--the scars of others, and *ἰάματα*, “remedies,” so that they may guard against living wounds.

The third: It must be established with certainty by all kings, commonwealths, and peoples that all kingdoms which have hitherto perished have perished through imprudence in wars and seditions. For although accumulated iniquities drew down deserved punishment, nevertheless all counsels were corrupted so that the enemy could not be resisted. I freely appeal to all histories: among so many changes of kingdoms, overthrows of states, destructions and migrations of peoples, I seek one *ἐνστάσις*, “counter-instance,” and find none; nor, reader, will you find one. Let us look at the Western Empire. The emperors were unwarlike and inconsiderate; the commanders of the army were barbarians--Stilicho, Arbogast, Aetius. For what shadows of emperors were Maximus, Avitus, Majorian, Severus, Anthemius, Olybrius, Glycerius, Nepos, and Augustulus? All were subject to the barbarians. And lest any assistance should be present, Aetius was killed, and indeed by the hand of Emperor Valentinian. Eudocia summoned Genseric to Rome. Theodoric killed the Suevi in Aquitania. Ricimer conspired against his master; Basiliscus, having set out for Africa, surrendered the fleet of the Constantinopolitan emperor to Genseric in order to win the favor of Aspar and Ardaburius. Orestes and Odoacer were summoned for vengeance. But those times were such that all, as though by agreement, made and killed emperors in sport; and administration under the tyranny of the prefects was so intolerable that, according to the testimony of Salvian in book 4, the inhabitants of the Roman Empire fled from its cities to the barbarians and preferred hard servitude to a wretched liberty.

The fourth: The supreme law of prudence is not to trust oneself, but gladly to hear others.

The fifth: No commonwealth has ever been governed with so great a wisdom that wise men and the people have not found much wanting in it. Let the rulers of peoples certainly persuade themselves of this: that they rule amid great complaints from their subjects. For they rule over many wicked people, and over very many desiring contrary things; and they themselves also often stray.

The sixth: Let no one among the subjects complain against the magistracy unless he is one who has administered his house without the complaint of his household, inhabited a city without offense to his neighbors, and entered upon an inheritance without disputes with his kinsmen. For if those men raise so great storms in a little lake, what wonder is it if tempests arise upon a vast ocean, where the winds are free to fight?

CHAPTER III

Those Who Prefer Prudent Princes and Magistrates but Imprudent, Foolish, and, as They Say, Simple Citizens Are in Great Error

§ 1. No discussion is more difficult than a discussion concerning prudence. For many fear lest there be too many prudent people and lest wisdom, if made common, become cheap; they would wish to arrogate so great an honor to themselves alone. Let wisdom, they say, belong to the prince, from whom counsel is derived, and let it belong to those few who are around the prince, while all effort is expended, as it were, in obeying and executing commands. Let no one be more learned, no one more prudent, than the prince. They praise the custom of the Muscovites, among whom all must be less wise than the Grand Duke, and to be excessively devoted to prudence is a crime of majesty. They therefore approve the counsels of tyrants, who remove vivid and ready talents from their midst, lest there be anyone who censures or exposes things not well done. They praise the ancient stupidity of the Arcadians, the Lesbian and Cumaeen asses, the minds of the Abderite common people, and the childishness of the Thracians, who could not proceed in counting beyond four and who, when their leader threatened that he would climb to Juno by the ladders which he had caused to be made and accuse them, were terrified and granted everything that was demanded. They judge that Brazilians, Americans, Guineans--in one word, golden slaves, wethers, and blocks--are proper subjects.

But I affirm entirely the contrary: it is altogether expedient for the commonwealth that all should be strong in wisdom, judgment, and talent, so that they can judge concerning public and private affairs. The greatest and truest simplicity does not injure true wisdom, since the Lord commands that dovelike simplicity be joined with serpentine sagacity. I banish crafty, cunning, and deceitful citizens from the commonwealth; wise, cautious, circumspect, and intelligent citizens I judge not only useful, but also people to be instructed in these things with the greatest care.

§ 2. The reasoning of the pseudo-politicians is that through inexperience, imprudence, and want of consideration citizens may be prompt and pliant toward commands; that they may not examine the princes' orders, and that they may repose trust in the speeches and persuasions of counselors, courtiers, and senators. But they will attain these things better by teaching them prudence than by casting them into stupidity and keeping them in it. I shall not employ the argument of the Stoics and say that all who have not attained the highest summit of wisdom are foolish and consequently insane, and that therefore the prudence of the pseudo-politicians is insane, since they devise a commonwealth in which they alone seem wise and wish the rest of the crowd to be stupider than a terebinth. Those things belong to the Porch of Chrysippus, as does the equality of virtues and sins. I do not believe it, if only for this reason: since the whole Stoa confesses that it has hitherto produced no wise man, Cleanthes, Zeno, Chrysippus, and the others of that sect must be insane; but it is fitting that the insane possess no public authority, since, when they ought to be commended to the custody of their kinsmen, they have by a domestic judgment lost the right to pronounce an opinion and give a vote.

I omit these things. For if I followed them, no king, no consul, and no praetor would be sane; all would be insane, for no one would be wise. I speak in a civil and human manner. It is expedient neither for kingship, nor for aristocracy, much less for polity, that the citizens be foolish, dull, and stupid, such as the Ethiopians around Cape Verde, the Brazilians, the Mexicans, and formerly the Thracians,

[Printed page 114]

Phrygians, Arcadians, and others whose rudeness was mocked in the proverbs of more cultivated nations.

§ 3. The first reason is valid and, from the nature of the thing, refutes their erring wisdom. For the dunces with whom they wish the state to be filled do not sufficiently weigh either the dignity of magistracy or the obligation of obeying, and therefore obey neither readily nor constantly. They define the prince's duty by a triumphal robe, scepter, diadem,

procession of attendants, hunts, and courses at the table. They cannot even suspect what cares oppress and what torments vex that shadowy happiness.

§ 4. Hence another reason follows: namely, that magistracy is not loved by such men, since they do not recognize the causes for loving it; and from this it is customary for the worst thing to occur--that they perform their duty through fear alone. "A similarity of morals joins friendships," Quintilian says; "somehow the lights of minds see and recognize one another, and no one can love in another anything except what he silently approves." For they cannot have a fellowship of affairs and persons so as to live in common, much less, as friends, will they expose or devote themselves to death for the prince's sake. Friendship will never flourish in those mushrooms, with which and for which they might die. For such men do nothing by judgment, prudence, or regard for the public good.

§ 5. The third reason is this: that crowd is the most inconstant of all, and therefore a government hanging upon mobility so slippery is fragile. For a foolish multitude is led by the lightest impulse and is credulous toward specious words. And so they represent the Gallic Hercules as leading foolish nations by their ears with a golden chain hanging from his mouth; and when the Thracians saw ladders being made by which their accuser would ascend to Juno, they became afraid. We see stupidity exposed to every imposture. Histories teach that peoples were alienated from kings by one speech. At Athens the foolish people was led by orators; at Rome the men beneath the Rostra were the slaves of the tribunes. Everything barbarous is ἡλιθιον--foolish, simple, and therefore easily deceived, but, on the contrary, faithless.

Trajan's letters recount so many conquered nations that it was difficult to retain their names; but because they were barbarous, they rebelled with the same levity with which they had acceded. In the year of Christ 116, the Cyrenian Jews, ignorant of all things except wickedness, revolted upon a slight occasion under their leader Andrew, and two hundred thousand were killed. The ignorance of those whom Artemion seduced was no less, and the disaster even greater, for with an army sent against them, as many were slaughtered more cruelly. What aroused the sedition of Münzer and Campanus except the uncultivated malice of a people ignorant of its duty and zealous for new things? For when religion had been abjured, it was also easy to alter the commonwealth.

§ 6. The fourth reason: a stupid people cannot resist enemies, for war is an affair of prudence, skill, and stratagems. How easily did Cyrus seize the whole world, and the Spaniards the Indies, though they were comparable neither in bodily mass, strength, nor multitude? One part of Belgium resists for so many years in an almost equal contest, while such extensive dominions come beneath the yoke and desert their kings, because they know neither how to protect them nor to defend their own things. Therefore these men advise the prince just as if a commander should select foolish soldiers who can only hear the trumpet and strike. You would not require prudence in battle, in camp, or in a garrison.

In this year the Portuguese fought a battle against barbarians; letters from India relate the history in this manner. Another enormous fleet of two hundred ships was approaching from the Acehnese--people of the island of Sumatra and perpetual enemies of the Portuguese. Of these, sixty were triremes, and quadriremes larger than those of our countrymen, whose cannon vomited stone balls of thirty and forty pounds. The king of the Acehnese himself sailed in that fleet, together with sixty thousand fighting men. Four Portuguese squadrons unexpectedly encountered that fleet--which it can be believed had conspired together with the Dutch for the destruction of Malacca--and attacked it, with a daring or a fortune the greater of which you might doubt; and after a most bitter battle they routed it, two whole days having been spent in fighting. As many as forty triremes or quadriremes of the enemy were sunk; thirty thousand human beings are written to have fallen. Indeed, in that very confused multitude the cannon fought among themselves against one another; a multitude of other vessels perished; one Portuguese ship of more than a hundred tons, having caught fire, was entirely burned--whether by accident or by enemy force.

Behold what prudence and dexterity bestowed upon the Portuguese, and how the barbarians perished through their own stupidity.

§ 7. Finally, who would prefer a stupid slave to a prudent one? What besides the mill could you safely entrust to a slave who does nothing by reason but is driven by impulse wherever he is moved? Do you therefore wish citizens to be those who cannot go but must be carried? Whom, when your wise mind has deserted them, the enemy may overwhelm as they stand stupefied in the midst of the whirlwind of affairs? “The life of a fool is thankless, it is fearful, it is borne wholly toward the future.” Seneca speaks not only of the life of Baba and Ixion, whom stupidity ennobled, but of the life of those whom pseudo-political prudence calls simple. For disgust with present things, security concerning future evils, and the ostentation of frivolous people cast them headlong into things that will harm them. Do you seek such citizens, subjects, and defenders of the fatherland, whose folly will sell itself to the enemy sooner than it will conquer him?

But since we are treating of the commonwealth, ancient examples can also teach us. More experienced and wiser men have commanded barbarians and stupid men. The Trojan War exercised the victors and the conquered for ten years; in one siege they served half a lifetime of campaigns. Those who as recruits pitched the first tents of the camp, as veterans, aided by hand and stratagems, undermined the walls. Afterward Antenor, Diomedes, Aeneas, Acestes, and the others, scattered through the lands, established kingdoms, prudent and skilled in ruling. The more cultivated Greeks obtained Ionia and the best part of Italy and Africa. Seneca says truly in his *Consolation to Helvia*: “What do Greek cities intend for themselves in the midst of barbarian regions? What does the Macedonian language intend among Indians and Persians? Scythia, and that whole tract of wild and unconquered nations, displays cities of Achaea planted upon the shores of Pontus. Neither the savagery of perpetual winter nor the dispositions of human beings, bristling in the likeness of their climate, obstructed those transferring their homes. There is an Athenian crowd in Asia; Miletus poured out the population of seventy-five cities in diverse directions. The entire side of Italy which is washed by the lower sea was Greater Greece. Asia claims the Etruscans as its own; Tyrians inhabit Africa, Carthaginians Spain; Greeks thrust themselves into Gaul, Gauls into Greece. The Pyrenees did not prevent the passage of the Germans. Through trackless and unknown places human restlessness has tossed itself.”

If you examine all things, history, which is the teacher of prudence, will demonstrate that a few prudent people who employed laws and discipline held government over many savage and strong peoples. The Germans and Gauls indeed formerly changed their abodes, but occupied kingdoms only after they had been taught civilization. But the Greeks, more civilized than others, and the Tyrians, more civilized than the Greeks, founded long and enduring empires.

The prince must therefore do this: see that all, so far as can be done, are exercised in every respect, but especially in prudence. For thus he will easily rule by good reason and good law those who have learned to follow reason as their leader; and he will correct those who err with a gentler command.

[Printed page 115]

For correction accomplishes more with a prudent man than a hundred lashes with a fool. For stupidity is the mother of all evils: it is always beginning to live, has the slightest occasions for treachery, and is, like a golden flock, a source of profit to the more cunning.

CHAPTER IV

Cunning, the Imitator of Prudence, Is Harmful to the Commonwealth

§ 1. Cunning, craftiness, and like words are customarily taken in either sense. Augustine, Epistle 29: “For, as you know, certain vices are contrary to virtues by an evident distinction, as imprudence is to prudence. But there are certain things which, because they are merely vices, are therefore contrary, yet are similar by a certain deceptive appearance, as not imprudence but cunning is to that same prudence. For now I call that cunning which is more commonly understood and named among the malicious, not as our Scripture is accustomed to speak, which often places cunning in a good sense. Hence: ‘Be cunning as serpents’; and this: ‘That he may give cunning also to the innocent.’ Although among them too the most eloquent man of the Roman tongue said, ‘Yet neither deceit nor cunning for taking precautions was lacking to him,’ placing cunning in a good sense. But among them this is exceedingly rare; among us it is exceedingly frequent.”

Augustine is altogether right. For Cicero, in book 5 of *On Duties*, calls cunning those whom the Greeks call *πανούργους*, and places them plainly among vice: “Not open,” he says, “not simple, not ingenuous, not a good man, but crafty, obscure, cunning, deceitful, malicious, sly, practiced in deception, artful.” In the first book he himself explains what cunning he understands: “Injuries also frequently arise through a certain chicanery and an excessively cunning and malicious interpretation of the law. From this, ‘the highest law, the highest injury,’ has now become a proverb worn by speech.” In this kind many sins are also committed in the commonwealth, as by the man who, when a truce for thirty days had been made with the enemy, laid waste the fields at night, because a truce of days, not of nights, had been made.

Nor is our own man indeed to be approved, if it is true that Quintus Fabius Labeo--or whoever else it was, for I possess nothing beyond hearsay--was given by the senate as arbiter to the Nolans and Neapolitans concerning the boundaries of their territory. When he had come to the place, he spoke to each party separately, urging them not to act or seek anything greedily and to prefer retreating to advancing. When both had done this, some land was left in the middle. And so he fixed their boundaries as they themselves had said; what was left in the middle he adjudged to the Roman people. This is indeed to deceive, not to judge. Therefore such cleverness must be avoided in every affair.

§ 2. I therefore define malicious and deceitfully practiced cunning as a habit of mind for deceiving and harming others. The end of prudence is always good; but the ways and means which it chooses for reaching its purpose must also be right, for the wise person does not strive toward his undertaking through crimes. But the cunning or crafty man, whose mind turns and rolls swiftly in conducting affairs, either chooses an evil end, or evil or counterfeit ways to a good end. If he uses a fallacy of words, it is evil deceit; if malice in actions, it is called fraud, although usage in speaking has long since abolished those distinctions. God detests that deceptive cunning: “The Lord will abominate the bloody and deceitful man” (Psalm 5:7); and, “The Lord will destroy all deceitful lips” (Psalm 11:4). But deceitful men are hated not only by God but also by human beings beyond what can be said.

Cicero, book 2 of *On Duties*: “Of these two, therefore, justice possesses more power for creating confidence, since it has sufficient authority without prudence, while prudence without justice has no power at all to create confidence. For the craftier and more cunning anyone is, the more hated and suspected he is when the reputation for probity has been removed. Therefore intelligence joined to justice will have as much strength as it wishes for creating confidence. Justice without prudence will have much power; prudence without justice will have none.” Who has not detested Cleomenes, a leader notorious for fraud, who perished in prison, killed by the captives with a deserved wound? Lysander, the leader of a magnanimous state, was endowed more with Spartan power than with spirit; he accomplished almost everything by his foxlike devices. Aristomenes the Messenian was the object of the greatest hatred while alive; after his death his heart is said to have been found bristling with hairs. I scarcely believe that those who believe this

have a heart, Pliny relates in book 11, chapter 37. After frequently deceiving the Spartans, he was at last killed by them.

The cause of hatred is that no one wishes to be deceived: people prefer that a thing be openly denied them rather than that hope be deferred and mocked by fraud and flattering words. But a greater evil is that malice of nature, once exposed, utterly abolishes all confidence thereafter, as I taught in book 2. But princes and magistrates in whom no confidence is placed are without protection, although they possess kingdoms, resources, and armies.

Pericles acted shrewdly but maliciously. For when he had sworn that he would spare his enemies if they put down their iron, he killed those who had iron clasps upon their military cloaks. The cunning of the Calvinist Church setting out for Florida was no different--indeed, it was more cruel; their history relates the affair. In the year 1556 a French fleet was going to Brazil. It carried thirteen ministers who were to serve the Brazilians; all were inflamed to transport the Reformed Church. They drove off much plunder. On the voyage they took a Portuguese light vessel through surrender, yet promised the Portuguese that, if he quickly found and brought another light vessel, the one they had seized would be returned. The Portuguese, released with an armed force, came upon another Liburnian vessel, captured it, and brought it to that holy Church. The matter greatly pleased our centurions, says the historian, for the vessel was excellent and full of white salt; as they had decreed, they brought it to Villegagnon in Brazil. But in keeping faith with the Portuguese concerning the restoration of the light vessel, they showed themselves so cruel that, after Spaniards and Portuguese had been thrown together into one and the same vessel, not even a morsel of sailors' bread was left to them; the sails were deliberately torn, and even the skiff, without which they could not reach land, was taken away. They would have seemed to have adopted a gentler counsel if they had sunk the wretched men than if they released them thus; for unless a skiff from somewhere else came to the aid of those in distress, it is certain that they perished at last either by shipwreck or by hunger.

§ 3. The Romans indeed believed that the gods delighted in deceit. Valerius, book 7, chapter 3: "When Servius Tullius was reigning, a cow of exceptional size and extraordinary form was born to a certain head of a household in Sabine territory. The most trustworthy interpreters of oracles answered that it had been produced by the immortal gods for this purpose: that the fatherland of whoever sacrificed it to Diana on the Aventine would obtain command of the entire world. Its master, joyful at this, drove the ox to Rome with the greatest haste and placed it before Diana's altar on the Aventine, intending by the sacrifice to give the Sabines dominion over the human race. When the priest of the temple had been made more certain concerning the matter, he instilled a religious scruple into the stranger, so that he should not slaughter the victim before he had washed himself in the water of the nearest river. And while he sought the channel of the Tiber, the priest himself sacrificed the cow and, by a pious theft of the sacrifice, rendered our city the mistress of so many states and so many nations."

This too was foul malice amid error, and he sacrificed fraud to the demon no less than the ox. But when I censure cunning, I do not mean that which has a good and right end proposed and does not employ evil means in pursuing it;

[Printed page 116]

for I relegate that honorable cunning to stratagems. David feigns madness in danger of death; Solomon in judgment at first sight displays cruelty; Marcus Volusius, a proscribed aedile, deceived the triumvirs in the garb of a beggar and arrived safely in the camp of Brutus. "Somewhat more splendid," says Valerius, "was the aid of last resort in the same kind of case employed by Sentius Saturninus Vetulio. When he heard that his name had been posted among those proscribed by the triumvirs, he immediately assumed the insignia of the praetorship. With men suborned to precede him in the manner of lictors, attendants, and public slaves, he commandeered vehicles, occupied lodgings, removed those in his path, and by so audacious an assumption of command poured the thickest darkness upon enemy eyes in the greatest daylight. Likewise, when he came to Puteoli, just as though he were conducting public business, he seized ships with the greatest license and made his way to Sicily, then the surest refuge of the proscribed."

Anaximenes freed his fatherland Lampsacus by an ingenious and praiseworthy craftiness. For when Alexander was advancing with the greatest zeal toward its destruction and saw Anaximenes, his tutor, coming out beyond the walls, because it was evident that he would oppose his own entreaties to the king's anger, Alexander swore that he would not do what he requested. Anaximenes then said, "I ask that you destroy Lampsacus." This swiftness of sagacity snatched the town, renowned for its ancient nobility, away from the destruction for which it had been destined.

Such things must often be employed in counsels of peace and war. Others are things that cause harm unjustly or consist in lies, perjuries, and wicked dissimulation; these I wish to be removed utterly from the commonwealth. For no path except the right path leads to the end; to turn reason given by God toward frauds and malice is an outrage.

§ 4. Many nevertheless admit frauds; indeed, they substitute cunning for prudence. We live among evil people, they say; princes themselves

Keep a cunning fox beneath a stale breast.

Kingdoms are overthrown through fraud; why should you not preserve them by the same means? He always performs his duty who takes counsel for the advantage of human beings.

Machiavelli indeed thinks these things openly and wickedly. Others do so more gently, for they make cunning and fraud threefold: light, intermediate, and grave. They counsel the light, tolerate the intermediate, and condemn the grave. Thus Justus Lipsius in book 4 of the *Politics*.

He calls distrust and dissimulation light fraud; but he describes it in such a way that it seems to contain caution and taciturnity rather than any vice. He forbids princes to believe readily, because they lie open to injury; because offenses against them are committed with less fear and for a greater reward; because confidence is rare in a court--indeed, among so many peoples there is scarcely one faithful person. These, I say, are precepts of virtue, not indulgence toward vices. For nothing is more useful than a wise distrust. Nor is the dissimulation by which one covers one's mind always vicious. A matter which he can believe only rashly and foolishly is proposed to the senate or to the prince, but he nevertheless has no need to say that he believes none of it. He suppresses his judgment; for why should he carry his mind on his forehead or tongue? Silence is a faithful reward. Yet I do not wish dissimulation to advance farther, to ambiguous and fraudulent utterances, when injury to God and human beings lies there; for then he will be guilty of a graver fraud.

Justus tolerates, but does not counsel, intermediate fraud. In it are conciliation, corruption, and frustration through letters and embassies. But these things too must be distinguished. You shall never draw the subject of another into friendship with you or with your commonwealth by a lie and wicked dissimulation, for God forbids it: "Do not wish to use any lie, for the repeated use of it is never profitable" (Ecclesiasticus 1); and, "Elaborate words do not become a fool, nor a lying lip a prince" (Proverbs 17). He says these things rightly, for he confesses that they are sins, albeit small ones. But if that is so, not only must they not be counseled; they must be dissuaded by every means.

§ 5. What, therefore? Will it not be permissible to preserve a state by one little lie? Do not daily perjuries so often resound without causes, or for ridiculous and often even evil causes? Surely one guilt, and not a great one, will forestall and avert so many crimes that would occur in its destruction. Permit a lighter evil by which you may exclude a graver; tolerate smoke lest you fall into flames.

But the oracle of uncreated wisdom, of creative wisdom, thunders against these fearful voices of human wisdom. The vessel of election, the teacher of the nations, cries aloud that evils must not be done so that goods may come (Romans 3:6): "For if the truth of God has abounded in my lie unto his glory, why am I still judged as a sinner? And why not--just as we are blasphemed and as some say that we say--let us do evils that goods may come? Their condemnation is just." Therefore no lie belongs to prudence; no prudence lies; every lie belongs to folly, because carnal prudence and malicious cunning are folly before God, before the angels, in the infallible tribunal, according to the eternal sentence.

§ 6. Against all the pseudo-politicians let Augustine alone come forward for me. He too had been nobly engaged in political life and among the dignities of the powerful, and, in accordance with the custom of his own and our time, had told many lies in unbelief; for sins belong not to times but to human beings. He wrote one book *On Lying* and another *Against Lying*, from which whoever wishes to read him rather than the teachers of lies will draw the true judgment. For in the book *On Lying* he proves that none of the eight kinds of lies is lawful, even if it brings about no one's harm and the advantage of many. Next, a lie must never be told, even to escape any evil whatsoever, since it is written: "The mouth that lies kills the soul." Third, vain is the excuse of those who lie so that what ought to be detested still more may be avoided.

"But in this," he says, "human beings err because they subordinate precious things to cheaper ones. For once it has been granted that some evil must be admitted lest another more grave be admitted, each person measures the evil not by the rule of truth but by his own desire and custom; and he thinks that graver which he himself abhors more, not that which truly must be avoided more. This entire vice is begotten from a perversity of love. For since there are two lives of ours--one eternal, which is divinely promised, and the other temporal, in which we now are--when anyone has begun to love this temporal life more than that eternal one, on account of the life which he loves he thinks that all things must be done. Nor does he esteem any sins graver than those which injure this life and either unjustly and unlawfully remove from it something of advantage or, by an inflicted death, take it away entirely. And so they hate thieves, robbers, the insulting, torturers, and killers more than the lascivious, drunken, and luxurious, if these trouble no one. For they do not understand, or do not care at all, that the latter do injury to God--not indeed to any disadvantage of his, but to their own great destruction--when they corrupt his gifts in themselves, even temporal gifts, and through those very corruptions are turned away from eternal gifts."

[Printed page 117]

He had said a little earlier that one must not lie even for the praise of God. Afterward he adds: "One must not lie with the sixth kind either, for the truth of testimony is not rightly corrupted even for anyone's temporal advantage and safety. But no one must be led to eternal salvation by the aid of a lie." And he adds the reason: "For no one must be converted to good morals by the evil morals of those converting him."

But what of this--is not a little lie praiseworthy for the good of the commonwealth? Augustine answers: "For neither anyone's temporal advantage nor safety is to be preferred to perfecting faith. And so, although someone offended by right deeds should retreat from virtue, right deeds must not on that account be abandoned." In the other book, which is written *Against Lying*, he labors to show that a lie must not be abused either for the peace of the Church or for the conversion of those who err. The Priscillianists thought that their heresy must be concealed not only by denying and lying but even by perjuring themselves; but it seemed to certain Catholics that they ought to pretend to be Priscillianists so that they might penetrate their hiding places. He says that their design is contrary to Paul's judgment, which forbids doing evils so that goods may come.

Since snares and hunts altogether similar to these entangle the unwary throughout the whole world by means of lies, let us compare their deeds with one another. The end of the Catholics was most honorable: to remove the danger of an obscene heresy from the Church and to draw the heretics out of their hiding places so that they might be converted. Augustine teaches that this must be done piously and truly, not by lying, and proves it by the sacred writings; but he also adduces reasons from the very midst of the nature of things.

§ 7. First, there are many kinds of lies; there is none that is not contrary to truth. Every lie, therefore, is in evil, and injury inflicted upon God is graver than human disadvantages. But since that injury touches few people, let us look at the human disadvantages.

§ 8. Second, while human and foolish wisdom opens a crack for fallacy, from small beginnings it builds for itself a broad and open gate. Moreover, so great a blindness has occupied the minds of human beings that it is too little for them if we say that certain lies are not sins, unless in certain cases they also say that it is a sin if we refuse a lie. And in

defending lying they have been brought to the point of saying that the Apostle Paul used even that first kind, which is the most criminal of all. He says that the first kind of lie occurs when someone lies in the doctrine of piety.

§ 9. Third, and what is more pitiable, that prudence, as customary as it is harmful, brings it about that confidence is abolished. For what envoy, what orator now trusts--not to say another envoy or orator; not to say the prince to whom or against whom he is sent--but even his own prince, by whom he is sent? For the envoys themselves are often deceived. "And what is more pitiable," Augustine says, "even those who have now been made, as it were, our own cannot discover how they may trust us. For if they suspect that we speak even the Catholic dogmas themselves deceitfully so that we may conceal some other thing--I know not what--which we think true, you will certainly say to one suspecting such things, 'I did that then for this reason: that I might capture you.' But what will you answer when he says: 'How, then, do I know whether you are doing it even now, lest you be captured by me?' Or can anyone truly be persuaded that the man who lies in order to capture does not lie in order not to be captured? Do you see where this evil tends: namely, that not only do we rightly seem suspect to them, and they to us, but every brother to every brother? And thus, while the endeavor through lying is that faith may be taught, what is accomplished instead is that no one should be trusted. For if we also speak against God when we lie, what evil so great will be able to be found in any lie that we ought by every means to avoid it as most criminal?"

Look upon obscure words, covered faces, the gentle torments of cups, and trials made through the most intimate friends: you will affirm under oath that through this doctrine confidence has now perished from the world, or certainly lies hidden among a few.

§ 10. Fourth, this excuse does not suffice: I lie not only for the advantage of my own commonwealth but even for the good of my adversaries, so that they may become friends and, by inflicting injury upon us, may not sin more gravely. "This opinion," St. Augustine says, "dishonors the martyrs; indeed, it abolishes holy martyrdoms altogether. For according to these men the martyrs would act more justly and wisely if they did not confess to their persecutors that they were Christians and did not make them murderers by their confession, but rather, by lying and denying what they were, both preserved for themselves the advantage of the flesh and the purpose of the heart, and did not permit their persecutors to fulfill the crime conceived in their minds. For those men were not their neighbors in the Christian faith, so that they should have been obliged to speak to them with their mouth the truth which they spoke in their heart; rather, they were moreover enemies of truth itself.

"For if Jehu, whom among others they seem prudently to regard as an example of lying, lied that he was a servant of Baal so that he might kill his servants, how much more justly, according to their perversity, would Christ's servants in time of persecution have lied that they were servants of demons, lest the servants of demons kill the servants of Christ; and would they have sacrificed to idols lest human beings be killed, if Jehu sacrificed to Baal so that he might kill human beings? For according to the excellent doctrine of the lie-speakers, what would harm them if they pretended to worship the devil in the body when the worship of God was preserved in the heart? But the true martyrs, the holy martyrs, did not so understand the Apostle. For they saw and held what is written: 'With the heart belief is made unto justice; with the mouth confession is made unto salvation'; and, 'In their mouth no lie has been found.' And thus they went blameless to the place where they will not guard against being tempted further by liars, because in their heavenly assemblies they will no longer have liars either as strangers or as neighbors."

The reasoning is weighty: so many thousands could have freed themselves from the gravest torments and death, and others from crimes, by one little lie; and nevertheless they preferred to hold to truth through so many torments. What reasoning, therefore, compels you to lie in little temporal affairs, and indeed to those who will not believe?

§ 11. Fifth, if one must lie so that we may lead human beings to praise God, we teach not only the speaking of true things but also lying. If, therefore, we refer this to the commonwealth and profess the art of lying as honorable, I think we shall state no reason why we should not be attacked with our own arts, and accomplish this: that, by our own desert, all others who can do so lead us into fraud. But if lies are lawful and without harm because they are opportune

for the advantages of the commonwealth, in that manner adulteries too will be chaste, thefts just, homicides blameless, and poisons permitted. Histories disclose human crimes to us. There have been those who slaughtered flocks of illustrious men as though they were victims for their own security. There have been those who pursued adulteries with matrons--not so much from lust, although they were most impure, as from a zeal for prying into the secrets of their husbands.

For he who has once admitted into government sins as though either necessary or useful, because small guilt is well counterbalanced by enormous advantages to public affairs, is not far from refusing no crime which he judges conducive to what they call reason of state. They make use of the offense of a small fraud:

[Printed page 118]

“What if you utter a little word for the public safety otherwise than you think--have you sinned?” Will not that man also say: “What if I also add an oath to a useful and salutary lie? What difference does it make that I lie with God as witness, if I lie in his sight? How great a sin is there in one little soul, if for the common good it is dismissed from its little body? How great an evil is there in one embrace, that it should not be permissible to preserve life and the state even through pleasures?” Tiberius killed many because he knew that they had perceived his mind. Others did many things by which they showed this: that they fled no crime which offered advantage and pleasure. For this opinion not only presents small offenses as almost nothing but also, in comparison with public safety, preserving a kingdom, or conquering an enemy, defends great crimes as though pardonable and prudently admitted.

Zopyrus, the servant of Darius and an example of wicked compliance, when he saw that Babylon was being besieged in vain, fled into the enemy city after his body had been torn with lashes and mutilated--an injury which he himself had inflicted upon himself--and complained that his king had treated him with that cruelty. His wounds created confidence, for no one suspected so effective and so cruel a deceit. No prudent man would have endured those things even if a kingdom were the reward for himself, much less for an impious king. He counted lying praiseworthy and built confidence in the lie by means of torments. But this had been too little, for the Babylonians were not ready to believe; and so by a greater crime the lives of many were expended upon his frauds. For he had agreed with the king that, if he were placed in command of the army by the Babylonians, the king should expose soldiers to them when they sallied out, whom by that disorder and fraud he could easily cut down. And thus, by perjury, mutilation of his body, and successful parricides, he most criminally betrayed to a most savage enemy those by whom he had been elected to the highest dignity, and carried about forever the marks of shameful compliance and perfidy.

I use a familiar example which is customarily brought forward to commend fidelity; but here all things are full of perfidy, both in the king and in Zopyrus. It is of more value, indeed, that fidelity be preserved than that Babylon be captured. I shall conclude this argument with a judgment of St. Augustine: “It indeed matters very greatly from what cause, for what end, and with what intention anything is done. But things which are established to be sins must be done under no pretext of a good cause, with no supposedly good end, and with no seemingly good intention.” Augustine, the same man who ought to possess great authority in this important case, proceeds:

“But when the deeds themselves are already sins, such as thefts, debaucheries, blasphemies, or other such things, who is there who says that they are to be done for good causes, so that either they are not sins or, what is more absurd, they are just sins? Who is there who says: ‘So that we may have something to give to the poor, let us commit thefts against the rich; or let us sell false testimonies, especially if innocent men are not thereby injured, but rather guilty men are rescued from judges who would condemn them’? For two goods are accomplished by this sale of a lie: money is obtained from which the needy person may be fed, and the judge is deceived lest a human being be punished.

“If we can, why do we not also suppress true wills and substitute false ones, so that unworthy people who accomplish no good from them may not possess inheritances or legacies, but rather those by whom the hungry are fed, the naked clothed, strangers received, captives redeemed, and churches built? For why should those evils not be done for the sake of these goods, if for the sake of these goods even those things are not evil? Again, if certain impure and wealthy

women appear likely to enrich their lovers and debauchers besides, why should a merciful man not undertake those parts and arts and use them for so good a cause, so that he may have something from which to bestow upon the needy? And why should he not listen to the Apostle saying: ‘He who was stealing, let him now steal no more; rather, let him labor, working with his hands what is good, so that he may have something from which to give to one who has need?’”

§ 12. Evil, therefore, will not be good, even if it is perpetrated for the cause that there may be something from which good is done. Who would say such things except one who strives to overthrow human affairs and all morals and laws? He sins less who sets a good end before evils--who steals from a rich man so that he may give to a poor man, who sins not from avarice but from pity; but prudence does not rule that corrupt pity--error possesses it.

Will prudence, then, never counsel lying? Not even so that grave sins of others may be avoided? Let them hear the great and holy dictator of politics: “If we open this road to sins, so that we commit lesser ones lest others commit greater, all things will enter and reign over an infinite space, with a broad boundary--indeed, with no boundary, but with all limits torn out and removed. For when it has been determined that one human being must sin less lest another sin more, then surely by our thefts the debaucheries of others will be guarded against, and by debaucheries, incest; and if some impiety is seen that is even worse than incest, it will be said that incest too must be committed by us, if it can be contrived in this manner that the impiety is not committed by others.

“And in each individual kind of sin, thefts for thefts, debaucheries for debaucheries, incests for incests, and sacrileges for sacrileges will be thought necessary--our sins for the sins of others--not only lesser for greater, but even, if the very greatest and worst are reached, fewer for more, if the course of affairs should so turn itself that others will not otherwise abstain from sins unless we sin somewhat less, but nevertheless sin. Thus, whenever an enemy who has power of this kind says, ‘Unless you are criminal, I shall be more criminal,’ or, ‘Unless you commit this crime, I shall do more such things,’ we would seem to ourselves to admit a crime if we wished to abstain from crime. What else is it to judge this wise than to be unwise, or rather to be insane? For I must guard against damnation arising from my own iniquity, not from another’s, whether perpetrated against me or against others. For the soul that has sinned shall itself die.”

§ 13. But human weakness still rises up, brave only in the defense of vices. Augustine himself confesses that he is not yet in the number of those whom compensatory sins do not disturb. Behold, a sick man is in danger from a grave disease, whose strength could no longer bear it if the death of his only and dearest son were announced to him. If he asks you whether the son lives, when you know that he has ended his life, what will you answer? For whatever else you say besides one of three things--“he is dead,” “he lives,” or “I do not know”--he believes nothing other than that the son is dead, because he understands that you are afraid to say it and unwilling to lie. It has the same force even if you remain silent in every way. But of those three, two are false--“he lives” and “I do not know”--and cannot be said by you except by lying. But if you say that one true thing, namely, that he is dead, and the death of the distressed man follows, it will be cried out that he was killed by you. And who could endure human beings exaggerating how great an evil it is for a salutary lie to be avoided and for truth, the murderess, to be loved?

“I am moved vehemently by these objections, but it would be a wonder if wisely too. For when I shall have set before whatever eyes my heart possesses the intelligible beauty of him from whose mouth nothing false proceeds, although where truth grows more and more clear as it radiates, there my palpitating weakness is beaten back, I nevertheless am so inflamed by love of so great a beauty that I despise all human things which call me back from it. But it is much that this affection should persevere to such a degree that the effect may not fail in temptation. Nor, while I contemplate the luminous good in which there are no shadows of lying, am I moved by the fact that, when we are unwilling to lie and human beings die upon hearing the truth, truth is called a murderess. For if an immodest woman demands debauchery and, when you do not consent, dies disturbed by savage love, will chastity too be a murderess?”

[Printed page 119]

What if it should be permissible to preserve a soul by a lie? An infant is held captive. Can I deceive the guards by a lie so that there may be access to him for baptizing him? Augustine denies it, for if they can be deceived by a lie, why can they not also be enticed by debauchery? The conclusion, therefore, is: "Either lies must be guarded against by acting rightly, or they must be confessed by repenting; but, since they abound, they must not be increased by living unhappily and by teaching them."

These things are Augustine's, from whom we also learn this: the rationale of those who frequently use lies without harm to another and repent of those committed is far different from that of those who increase lies without measure by teaching them.

I wished to teach most of these things in the words of so great a doctor. For if any theologian, especially a religious, gives these warnings, those deceitful and obscure schemers, compliant with their princes in frauds, immediately object: "Be unconcerned about what those young men from the school or shade say; we do not judge them suitable arbiters of civil discipline. A man not ignorant of the things that occur in this life is required, and the Italian Maculonus must not be condemned so strictly." For thus they wrest words of a good man, spoken without complete caution, into the worst sense. But let them acknowledge that Augustine neither lacks talent nor is inexperienced in human affairs, and that he is a constant censor of vices.

§ 14. But what is it in which that prudence vaunts itself while the crowds favor it? By my cunning I preserved the city; I resolved intricate affairs; I removed the commonwealth's fear--how great the utility of one lie! But God did not will it; he prohibited even a useful lie. Will you take better counsel for the commonwealth than God? It is the Lord who, unless he guards the city, the man who guards it lies in vain. But I ascend the tower and proclaim with the voice of God and the voice of nature: the fellowship of the human race is not preserved by sins, but dissipated.

All things depend upon God, upon supreme truth, supreme power, and supreme goodness. Do you judge your little subtleties and little lies necessary for so great a mass of affairs? Unless you teach that one must lie, will human affairs slide backward? O pure deity, O most limpid truth, disperse the wretched clouds of vanity with a ray of true light! In your hand are all the ends of the earth and the hearts of kings; yet these men trust that by their fallacies and frauds they can regulate and administer all things. It is great imprudence to wish, without God and against God, to secure happiness not for one human being alone but for the commonwealth. Do you please yourself so greatly that you think a prince will be happy through your lie?

What, then, shall I do when I must either lie or incur danger? You indeed will do what is not lawful and what I dissuade: you will lie. But you ought rather to incur danger than to lie, because he who forbade you to flee danger by a lie can free you from it; or, if you undergo it, can turn it into greater goods. But if you persist in the purpose of lying, he will cast you into other evils from which you will emerge neither by lying nor by telling the truth. Commit the affair and the waves of your thoughts to omnipotent wisdom, certain that human affairs--even the wills of wicked men, the artifices of courts, and the sly counsels of cities--are so ordered by infinite wisdom that the most provident goodness of God suffices for the common safety, and a cunning in lying within you, contrary to the laws of God, is not required.

§ 15. But to me, considering the affair in human terms, a great part of calamities seems to arise from that deceitful art. First, they conduct the affair not with simplicity, prayer, modesty, contempt of self, hope, and confidence in heavenly aid; rather, they summon troops of fallacies into their breast and, as the more cunning little slaves are accustomed to boast in comedy, place every protection in crafty deceits. And so the outcome of such counsels is generally unhappy: "They enter upon counsel, and not from God"; therefore it is dissipated.

Next, those cunning counsels contend with equal fallacies of the adversaries, wherefore greater distrust, dissimulation, and fraud arise on both sides, as does knowledge of the mutual fraud. "Rome too has its Hannibal," the Carthaginian used to say, when Fabius recovered Tarentum by the same art by which Hannibal himself had seized it. Third, those who have practiced the art of deceiving for so many years are not faithful counselors to princes or senators to states. By a severe but just vengeance of God, those inventors of frauds have generally paid the penalty to their own prince or

fatherland: Themistocles, Pericles, Theramenes, Lysander, Cleomenes, Aristomenes--I omit others, for politicians cannot read here all the deeds or ends of these men. Let them recall what is easiest for them: namely, within these last twenty years, the lamentable falls, disgraces, dishonorable removals from office, poverty, disasters of family, and sometimes prisons and death of men swollen with prudence and of cunning men ruling in courts, assemblies, and public affairs.

CHAPTER V

Diligence Must Be Joined to Prudence

§ 1. I would wish that what always sounds in the Church in the Apostle's voice were inscribed upon the citadels of all princes and the senate houses of all cities (Romans 12:8): **ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ**. "He who presides, with solicitude, zeal, diligence." Prudence cannot be idle. I take diligence and solicitude as the same, as do the ancient translator of Scripture and St. Thomas. For although among non-Christian writers *solicitude* signifies a vicious and anxious restlessness and agitation of mind, it nevertheless has a better signification among our writers. St. Thomas says: "One is called solicitous as though *sollers citus*, 'skilfully swift,' insofar as someone, from a certain skilfulness of mind, is swift in pursuing the things that are to be done." Diligence, therefore, is an alacrity and faculty of mind by which swiftness, with right reason, is prescribed for those things which have been prudently resolved.

The enemies of this virtue are **ἀμέλεια**, negligence, when, with care and solicitude set aside, good counsels perish through not acting--a frequent but deadly evil in the commonwealth; next, sloth, or **ὀκνηρότης**, when the times for action are postponed until affairs come into danger; third, torpor, or **νωχρεία**, which so dissolves the mind that it interrupts things well considered and rightly begun. O prince, O consul, O commander:

Ἔργοις φιλόπονος ἵσθι, μὴ λόγοις μόνον.

>

Love labor in deed, not only in words.

The saying is brief, but it embraces all the things of prudence: **νόει καὶ πράττε**--think and act. For diligence is truly the mother in every good thing. A little earlier I praised the verse concerning wisdom:

Ἄπαντα δὲ διὰ τὸ φρονεῖν καθίσταται.

>

All things serve wisdom.

But a similar saying demonstrates that this must be understood of efficacious, laborious, and operative wisdom:

[Printed page 120]

Τῆς ἐπιμελείας πάντα δοῦλα γίγνεται.

>

All things serve diligence.

§ 2. I indeed judge every care, solicitude, diligence, and vigilance of the magistrate honorable and almost royal. For whatever things, having been prudently resolved, are executed with princely authority and swift vigor are great because they pertain to many. Every virtue requires **ἀκρίβειαν**, exactness, and that the result answer the art precisely; but under government, diligence even in small things is of the highest importance and is a certain and stable proof of a mind not degenerate. To many it is accustomed to seem beneath majesty to take an interest in the accounts of quaestors and to exercise care over expenditures. But in truth this especially procures and strengthens majesty; otherwise, through that negligence the treasury is exhausted and the rapacity of officials and ministers is increased without measure. And when war threatens, all flee; for both those who have plundered wish to preserve their possessions, and those who have no hope from a poor prince transfer themselves to the rich.

Then indeed they feel the penalties of negligence, when citadels, revenues, and towns must be pledged--not to friends and faithful men, but to thieves who buy the prince for themselves with the princes' money. I shall discuss this matter in book 8. For now I admonish that the lively eyes of princes and senators must be cast upon the smallest things. All those smallest things are decisive points of the greatest things. The sum is this: either let the prince or senate do all things itself, or let it demand accounts of all things done; if it can do neither, let it act so that all believe that accounts of all things must be rendered daily.

Not only is this useful to the commonwealth and an antidote to embezzlement; it also conduces to the safety of administrators, of whom there is not one in a thousand who is not compelled to disgorge things badly acquired and restore them with disgrace, since no one lacks an enemy and, in truth, an accuser. Princes sharpen the industry of others by example: the prince carries a palisade, raises an earthwork, sights the cannon, polishes the sword, exercises the horse, demands accounts, and learns small things. Majesty is not reduced to the ranks; rather, distinction from majesty is added to common works. The majesty of God is infinite, and nevertheless he always looks upon all lowly things: he disposes limbs and members for flies and fleas, and executes these small things without diminution of majesty just as he governs the world. Therefore in Amos 7:1 God himself is named "the Maker of the locust." For the same wisdom of his shines in great and small things.

§ 3. Finally, who does not daily experience what the disadvantages of negligence are? I do not treat of private matters; public ones lie open to everyone's eyes. Nothing is so rightly constituted that idleness does not overthrow it. The opportunities of affairs never wait for the idleness of rulers. I condemn precipitation in counsels, which nevertheless is sometimes successful not by its own merit but by the indulgence of the divine power; but I condemn still more delay and languor, which corrupt all things. For just as diligence corrects the depravity of nature, so negligence in a great body nourishes and increases the plagues of all diseases. There is nothing that persistent labor and intent and diligent care do not conquer; and, on the contrary, there is nothing that does not waste away through idleness and fall through relaxation and torpor.

Why do you look upon distant things? The surest protection is from what is nearest--indeed, from yourself. The magistrate, therefore, will imitate farmers, whose rustic axiom is this: wherever the eyes of the present master have frequently approached, in that part the fruits abound to a greater degree; for the master's eye feeds the horse. Therefore let no one, like the Chinese king or the later Persians, think that the fruit of kingship is leisure with dignity; rather, let him judge that it is royal to act well and to hear ill. The gait of the Egyptian king was a matter of ridicule to Scipio and the Roman envoys: it displayed ἀργίαν, idleness, and ἀδυναμίαν, weakness.

The constancy of Alexander Severus in laboring is to be praised. Lampridius describes it thus: "Indeed, if necessity compelled, he gave his attention to business before daybreak and prolonged it to a late hour; nor did he ever become weary or withdraw morose or angry, but always with an even countenance and cheerful toward all things. For he was of enormous prudence, a man upon whom no one could impose, and one whom, if anyone wished cleverly to attempt to deceive him, he understood, and the man paid the penalty."

And Herodian: "He himself made the journey without interruption, greatly regarding neither feast days nor any labors, equally enduring cold and heat. Often he also went through the highest mountains in a savage winter, with snow falling heavily from the sky, his head uncovered, so that in deed he might exhort the soldiers to alacrity and endurance of labors. Therefore they were incited to endure all things not by a certain fear and law, but rather by emulation and the prince's example. He also sent men to occupy the narrows of the Alps and beset the approaches to Italy."

Nor did he wish others to act differently, for he gave the watchword "Let us labor," just as Pertinax had given "Let us serve as soldiers." Hadrian was energetic and laborious, if any emperor was; for he frequently traversed the provinces, administered justice, and punished the greed of governors. The poet Florus mocked his august labors: "I do not wish to be Caesar--to walk among the Britons and endure Scythian frosts." To him Hadrian wittily replied: "I do not wish to be Florus--to walk through taverns, hide in eating houses, and endure round mosquitoes." Vespasian indeed died amid

imperial cares while he was attending to embassies; his maxim was this: “An emperor ought to die standing.” What would he have thought concerning those whom soft inactivity buries alive? In the morning, after he had awakened from sleep, he read letters, conducted public business, inspected petitions, and heard parties. Domitian too, among his greatest vices, retained this through a certain emulation. Trajan, however, sat upon the tribunal and heard cases without weariness.

§ 4. But as in other affairs, so especially in military affairs, in which it is not permissible to err twice, there is need of most cautious speed. For it strikes great terror into enemies and does not grant those terrified an interval for recovering themselves. But how will a prince suffice for so many and such minute cares? I answer: not only lesser kings and commanders, but even monarchs and lords of very many kingdoms, can have ordered times for arranging affairs.

§ 5. First, therefore, let the prince arrange his times in order; for things out of order hinder not only themselves but also those things which are well ordered. If he distinguishes these times, affairs will present themselves in their order, and times will not be lacking for them; yet neither will times--which the prince will count as profit--remain over for vices. The time expended upon business is sacred; that expended upon other things is profane, unless it is expended so that health may be equal to the business.

Second, if there are several provinces, he will assign their own counsels to each, just as to individual affairs, and thus he himself will also be able to be present with them by turns.

Third, if seven hours are allotted to sleep, two to food, and the same number to recreation and honorable relaxation of the mind, thirteen will remain for business. If he so arranges these that all can say:

The day itself is distinguished by a beautiful order of affairs,

[Printed page 121]

he himself will dispatch many affairs. For fixed hours he will assign to fixed consultations, and other hours which he wishes to be free for extraordinary matters and for hearing the wretched, widows, and wards. For pity is due first to them, and the prince ought especially to be a father to those deprived of other protection.

It pleases me here to append what the most prudent man Antonio de Guevara rightly and wisely wrote concerning Marcus Aurelius, in imitation of Xenophon’s *Education of Cyrus*. “By these intervals,” he says, “the excellent emperor Marcus Aurelius divided his times, so that he might have sufficient time both for caring for his own affairs and for public business. For a man released from cares and solicitude--not idle--accomplishes many things even in a short time; one distracted by solicitude scarcely accomplishes a few in a long time. He ordered his time so that he slept seven hours at night, rested at noon for one, and allotted two to lunch and dinner--not because he lunched or dined for so long, but because the banquet was prolonged by the disputations of philosophers. For during all seventeen years he was never seen to take food without hearing either a reader or a philosopher.

“Although he commanded many kingdoms and provinces, he gave individual hours to the affairs of Asia, Africa, and Europe; but for two hours on each day he associated familiarly with his children, wife, and friends. He likewise allotted one hour to extraordinary business--for example, hearing the complaints of the oppressed, the grievances of the poor, the burdens of widows, and the spoliations of wards. For poor people, who have little power, must be heard by princes who love the praise of clemency just as much as rich people, who possess very much.

“Whatever remained of either daytime or nighttime was distributed to the reading of books, the writing of works, the composition of poems, the investigation of antiquities, the conversations of learned people, and the disputations of philosophers; for nothing was more pleasant to him than learned conversations.

“Unless he was hindered by difficult wars or called away by arduous business, ordinarily in wintertime he always went to bed at the ninth hour and arose from bed at the fourth; and lest he be idle, he always had a book placed beneath his pillow, by reading which he passed the time until it grew light. For it was solemn custom for fire to be carried before

the Roman emperors--glowing coals by day, but lamps to be lit in their chambers at night--so that candles might burn while they watched and lamps while they slept. It was instituted by the Romans that oil born from the olive tree and wax prepared by the industry of bees should be burned before princes, so that they might remember that they ought to be as placid and mild as oil born from the olive, and as useful to the commonwealth as the bee in the hive.

"When he had risen at about the sixth hour, he dressed publicly, not in a common manner but rather with the greatest pleasantness, by asking those standing around how they had passed the whole night and by explaining either what he had dreamed, what he had meditated upon, or what he had read. Once dressed, he washed his face and hands with scented waters, since he especially delighted in pleasant odors and was endowed with so acute a sense of smell that he was sometimes not a little offended when passing foul and fetid places. First thing in the morning he ate one or two morsels of the electuary *diastoechados* and drank three cups of Cretan wine or a little distilled liquor, because his stomach and breast were weaker from excessive exertion in studies. For those devoted to studies are exposed to various diseases, as experience teaches, since, enticed by the sweetness of studies, they do not perceive the harm to life.

"In summertime, first thing in the morning, he walked on foot along the bank of the Tiber for about two hours and heard while standing those who addressed him; and this was certainly wise. For a prince who is sitting always makes him who speaks brief. As the day gradually advanced and the heat grew stronger, he ascended to the Capitol, where he was awaited by the senate. When it had been dismissed, he went to the amphitheater of Titus, where the envoys and procurators of the provinces assembled, and remained there for a good part of the day. When he had eaten lunch and withdrawn for a little while, he went to the temple of the Vestals and heard the individual nations in the order assigned to them by him. He ate only once in the day, and that sometimes rather late, but pleasantly and abundantly, rejoicing in few dishes, but the best; for foreign and varied feasts always produce foreign diseases and infirmities.

"Not rashly did he go out to walk through the city more than once in each week, without any retinue either of his own people or of strangers--attended by only ten or twelve servants--so that all needy people and orphans might have free power to speak to him and, if they wished, to complain concerning his officials. For it can in no way happen that anyone heals the commonwealth unless he whose duty this is thoroughly knows its diseases."

§ 6. Experience teaches that a prince can perform these things and embrace the care of all. Unseasonable and seasonable banquets, journeys, hunts, fowling, games, and other pleasures take away much time. If they cut off a part from these, so much time will be supplied for ordering serious affairs very well that all subjects will enjoy the prince's vigilance, all faithful administrators will rejoice that their works are inspected, and the wicked will be in continual fear.

The province of magistrates is certainly hard and laborious. Since through their negligence justice is oppressed, religion despised, enemies gain strength, and satraps exercise tyranny, their negligence is very often a mortal sin--indeed, among mortal sins the most detestable. By one word, one subscription of a name, one cast of the eye, how many scandals can they remove, how many good men can they raise up, how many efforts of the wicked can they repel? Nor can they be excused. They tolerate no negligence in their own affairs; people fly to execute the commands of the court. How, amid so many acts of obedience, do they not understand that the most exquisite diligence is required from them?

Distinguished counsel was given to Augustus by Maecenas: "It belongs to the best and excellent prince not only that he himself perform all things according to duty, but that he also take care by what means all the others may become as excellent as possible." Let him try to learn all things; this belongs to diligence. I know that many things must be forgiven to one who knows all things; but if he is blind to many, most things will be done in such a way that they ought not to be forgiven. People fear and dread to offend again one who forgives; they mock one who is ignorant. He who sits at the helm never dozes without danger; yet a shipmaster is in one part of the great sea, which is often at rest, while all the storms of the whole kingdom beat upon a prince wherever he sits. Unless he watches perpetually, they will

shake him out. Yet he ought to fear not for himself but for his people, so that the people too may fear for the prince, upon whom they know their safety depends.

§ 7. There is one distinguished abridgment of diligence by which things well constituted are faithfully completed with swift execution and without great labor. I have observed the Reverend Father General employ it in our Society, and provincials also employ it sometimes; it will be applied with great advantage in the governance of the commonwealth. When commands and constitutions are sent by the prince to distant places, let this clause be added to the diploma: that the inferior magistrate write concerning the execution performed--whether it has been performed, whether it cannot be performed, or whether he judges that it will be performed--and order the cause to be written if anything obstructs it.

[Printed page 122]

For that precaution instills great solicitude for obeying; otherwise, those through whom it occurred that the prince's command was not obeyed are themselves compelled to write letters bearing witness to their own negligence. But if, from the circumstances of the place, there should appear a just cause why it was not obeyed, when the inferior magistrate is ordered to write this very thing, full knowledge of the affairs will be gathered from those letters. With the same efficacy, good laws--even ancient ones which have yielded somewhat to customs--will be restored to force and practice without trouble to the prince. For if viceroys, governors, and satraps are ordered at a fixed time to make the prince more certain concerning them, they will strive to prove their work to the prince and to show that by their care and labor his will has been satisfied.

The mutual fear of ministers among themselves is also a great bridle, since without the knowledge of the other one cannot sin, and with his knowledge does not dare. The prince will instill this fear in all with easy care if at fixed times he demands a sincere report, confirmed even under oath, concerning the condition of the province, the administration of justice, the morals of governors, the treasury, and the complaints of subjects--not only from viceroys, governors, and satraps, but also from their counselors, assessors, quaestors, and praetors. I shall say more concerning this matter when I treat of magistracy. For now my purpose was only to show how a prince can most rightly direct very many things with the least trouble to himself. For if those letters arrive at a fixed time and errors are corrected, he will correct more by a word than by a laborious and costly journey, which, although I sometimes counsel it, I do not approve when frequent.

Therefore, although I praise Hadrian's diligence in greatly disturbed affairs, I nevertheless prefer that, when the commonwealth is at peace, the prince ordinarily remain in one place or another. Since, therefore, the prince himself cannot be present at all business, while there are many duties and many places which never enjoy the sight of their lord, this is the most convenient means by which he can preside over all, even though he is not present among all. Although it is necessary that he forget many things and fail to notice many things, nevertheless, because all things come beneath his gaze, security is taken away from malicious ministers.

§ 8. I summon my prince to labors and solicitude; I shake delights and pleasures, sleep and inactivity from him. He follows willingly if he has weighed that, when he ascended the throne as lord of all, he placed the care of all upon himself together with the diadem, and that he cannot be negligent without both the destruction of many and condemnation to the gravest eternal punishment. In a private person:

Ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν ὄνειδος, ἀεργίη δέ τ' ὄνειδος.

To work and labor is not a disgrace, but sloth and cessation are a disgrace. In a king, prince, or senate it is not only a disgrace; it is a crime, it is perfidy, it is often robbery, often tyranny, when through their idleness the injuries of the wicked rise up against their subjects.

Human weakness desires a quiet and unencumbered life; flatterers inculcate it; harpies, for whom wealth grows from the prince's lack of diligence, drive him toward idleness. But he will hold to the right path:

Τὴν μὲν γὰρ κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλέσθαι,

ρήϊδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει.

Τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεὸς προπάροιθεν ἔθηκε

ἀθάνατος· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐπ' αὐτὴν

καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,

ρήϊδίη τε ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ εὐῶσα.

It is easy to embrace idleness; the road is level and very near. But God placed the sweat of virtue before our eyes; long, steep, and rough is the road to it. But after you have gained the summit, it then becomes easy, although it had been difficult.

Let the prince have men by whose liberty he may be admonished and incited to labors. Under the morning twilight, someone from the company of honored men cried aloud to the Persian kings: “Arise, king; care for the commonwealth,” as Plutarch writes in the book *On the Education of a Prince*; and: “Care for those things, O king, for which Oromasdes wished you to labor.” Sometimes scarcely a year repairs the negligence of one moment; sometimes even successors are compelled to lament it. Therefore a true prince and lover of his fatherland will foster royal care beneath his breast even when the rest are released into games. The great commander Epaminondas, while the citizens celebrated festivals, alone made the circuit of the walls. When his friends asked about his untimely solicitude, he replied that he was solicitous so that the citizens’ joy could be secure. And indeed, at his death Theban dignity and liberty fell, because the labor and care of princes had been turned into delights.

§ 9. Do you therefore set all hard things before the prince? All things hard, anxious, and solicitous; for I ought not to be a flatterer, but an admonisher. To me he is truly a prince whom cares possess to such a degree that he would prefer private leisure, if this would be for the commonwealth’s good. Those from whom the splendor of majesty, foolish flattery, senseless joy, and fawning acts of obedience have taken away the sense of this solicitude perform their duty least of all; rather, they criminally do not know the grievous things which they especially ought to know. Those who thought they would render an account to no one wished to strip themselves of public cares. What will the prince do whose zeal, vigilance, diligence, solicitude, and idle word--not merely his leisure and idleness--will be judged destructive to peoples?

You will see utterances fall from the most powerful human beings raised on high by which they wish for leisure, praise it, and prefer it to all their goods. Meanwhile they desire to descend from that summit of theirs, if it can be done safely; for even if nothing external assails or shakes it, fortune collapses upon itself. The divine Augustus, to whom the gods granted more than to anyone, did not cease to pray for rest for himself and to seek release from public affairs. All his conversation always returned to this, that he should hope for leisure for himself. With this sweet consolation, though false, he comforted his labors: that someday he would live for himself. In a certain letter sent to the senate, after he had promised that his rest would not be empty of dignity or discordant with his former glory, I find these words: “But these things can be done more splendidly than they can be promised. Yet desire for a time most greatly wished for by me has carried me so far that, since the joy of the reality still delays, I might take beforehand some pleasure from the sweetness of words.” Leisure seemed so great a thing that, because he could not possess it in use, he took it beforehand in thought.

He who saw all things depending upon himself alone, who gave fortune to human beings and nations, thought that day most joyful on which he would strip off his greatness. He had experienced how much sweat those goods shining through all lands pressed out, how much hidden solicitude they covered. Compelled to decide by arms first with citizens, then with colleagues, last with relatives, he shed blood by sea and land. Driven about by war through Macedonia, Sicily, Egypt, Syria, Asia, and almost every coast, he turned armies wearied by Roman slaughter toward foreign wars. While he pacified the Alps and subdued enemies mingled into the midst of peace and government, while he advanced the boundaries beyond the Rhine, Euphrates, and Danube,

[Printed page 123]

in the city itself the swords of Murena, Caepio, Lepidus, and the Egnatii were sharpened against him. He had not yet escaped their plots when his daughter and so many noble young men, bound together by adultery as though by a sacrament, terrified his already broken age; afterward a woman together with Antony was again to be feared.

Amid so many evils and cares a prince cannot interpret his summit as a place of rest. Labor, and great labor, dwells upon it; if he flees this labor, he betrays at once both the commonwealth and his own salvation.

CHAPTER VI

Justice Is Especially Commended to the Prince

§ 1. Justice is the bond of the commonwealth; the prince's labor and prudence must serve it. For this is the cause for which princes are constituted, and when they have overthrown it, they are cast out. The Greeks say that it is more beautiful than the morning star. Justice is twofold: universal justice, which is also called perfect, concerning which there is an ancient saying:

Ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἔστιν.

In justice, in sum, is every virtue. This justice ought to shine in the prince as in the jewel of the whole province, and in the senate as in a girdle that encircles the world and measures seasons and labors in a fixed succession. For the whole world confirms by its testimony the saying of Bias: "Magistracy reveals the man." This justice is not a part of virtue, but the whole of virtue; and injustice is not a part of viciousness, but the whole of viciousness. This injustice is *ἀνομία*, or iniquity. There is another justice, which they call particular and which is properly *ἰσότης*, or equality. It is defined as that which renders to each his own right. More suitably for my purpose, the jurists say: "Justice is the constant and perpetual will to render to each his own right." For it signifies a habit and inclination of the mind.

There are two kinds of this justice. It is occupied either in distributing public advantages and burdens, or in contracts, such as purchases, sales, exchanges, and agreements. In the former kind it does not maintain the equality that exists in the latter, but employs analogy or proportion, which they call geometrical, by which equal things are apportioned to equals and unequal things to unequals from the goods and burdens of the commonwealth. It apportions a greater stipend to the tribune than to the centurion, and to the centurion than to the decarch or soldier; for as dignity is compared with dignity, so stipend is compared with stipend. There is a similar distribution in civil affairs; for the measure of tribute or the necessity of military service is greater for the rich and noble, but that must be counterbalanced by prerogatives of honor and advantage. But because desire violates equality in all these things, it must be restored by laws and judgments, and, when their force is broken, by sword, punishments, and wars.

§ 2. The prince sits as arbiter of so great a good, bringing all unequal things down to a level by his nod and equating all things according to their proportions. Nor is there another origin of principate; for when the weaker saw that they were oppressed, they transferred all their right and strength to one more powerful man by whom they might be defended.

Therefore let the prince, the optimates, and whoever has been raised on high by whatever hand or fortune render to each his own, not claim what belongs to another, neglect private advantage, and guard common equity. For thus the Milanese Doctor, who presided not as a judge but as a bishop, admonishes.

You are a priest of right, whoever you are who govern the commonwealth in any part. I exhort you to exhibit in yourself what the panegyric praises in Theodosius: "You are the same man you were, and only as much is lawful to you through yourself as was lawful before through the laws. You experience supreme right in the faculty and abundant opportunity of benefiting, not in security for sinning."

§ 3. God is the beginning of justice so salutary and so necessary. Its beauty is infinite, because it contains the whole order of the commonwealth, since it is a virtue, as Aristotle says, toward another. For the oppressed flee to the prince's justice as to a most sacred altar, as Archytas used to say, so that the sanctity of justice may protect those whom neither common nature, nor strength, nor prayers defend from injury. It was honored formerly, for it is the mistress and queen of the virtues, the empress even of kings. They say that it was the custom among the Egyptians that, when diplomas had been given throughout the kingdoms, they commanded the governors of cities to resist without hesitation if the kings commanded anything unjust. For they judged that no one was harmed when justice was observed.

Ambrose, both in the tribunal and at the altar a wise and distinguished priest of justice, says in book 1 of *On Duties*: “Great is the splendor of justice, which, born for others rather than itself, assists our community and society and holds an exalted place, so that it has all things subjected to its judgment.” And the disciple of Ambrose, greater than his master, says on Psalm 64: “Your temple is holy, wonderful in justice. These are the goods of his house. He did not say, ‘Your holy temple is wonderful in columns, wonderful in marbles, wonderful in gilded ceilings,’ but ‘wonderful in justice.’ You have eyes outwardly with which to see marble and gold; inwardly is the eye with which the beauty of justice may be seen. Inwardly, I say, will be the eye with which the beauty of justice may be seen.

“If there is no beauty of justice, whence is a just old man loved? What does he bear in his body that delights the eyes? Bent limbs, a wrinkled brow, a head made white with gray hairs, and weakness on every side full of complaints. But perhaps because this decrepit old man does not delight your eyes, he delights your ears. With what utterances? With what song? Even if perhaps he sang well as a young man, all things have failed with age. Or perhaps the sound of his words delights your ears, though with fallen teeth he scarcely fully pronounces words? Yet if he is just, if he does not covet what belongs to another, if from what he possesses he gives to the needy, if he admonishes well and thinks rightly, if he believes with integrity, if he is prepared to expend even his broken limbs for the faith of truth—for many martyrs were also old—from what source do we love him? What good do we see in him with the eyes of flesh? Nothing.

“There is, therefore, a certain beauty of justice which we see with the eyes of the heart, and love, and for which we burn. How greatly human beings loved it in the martyrs themselves while beasts tore apart their limbs! When blood befouled all things and their entrails were poured out by the bites of beasts, did their eyes not possess only what they might shudder at? What was there to be loved, except that in that foulness of mutilated limbs there was the unimpaired beauty of justice?”

Plato speaks in the same sense—indeed, those holy Fathers speak from Plato’s meaning. He says that nothing is better than justice, which holds first place among the virtues and is their first ornament. O holy and praiseworthy justice,

[Printed page 124]

beneath you, and through you, chastity reigns, peace triumphs, security and dignity flourish, and fruit is brought forth in patience. Justice makes kings greater than their kingdoms—indeed, sons of God. It draws even strangers and posterity to love it. Frederick, ruler of the Roman Empire, was educating the boy Ladislaus, king of Hungary and Bohemia. Those to whom utility was more powerful than honorableness urged him to join two most flourishing kingdoms to himself through the fall of one little body, without envy or infamy. But to Frederick, truly great, justice was of greater value than a heap of kingdoms; indeed, with a salutary admonition he suppressed the criminal counsels. “What, then?” he said. “Do you wish a rich king rather than a just one?” By this answer he struck them, since they saw that he would employ against themselves the same right which they had prescribed to him against another. Imitate this, prince; you have no greater gift from God.

§ 4. How different from him was Valentino, the tyrant of Italy, who retained by slaughters what he had seized by force and at last was compelled by death to restore it. And nevertheless he found a praiser; for Machiavelli, in chapter 7 of his *Prince*, after he had recounted Valentino’s crimes, says: “Therefore, when all the reasons for these deeds of Prince Valentino have been brought together in sum, I do not see in what matter I should censure him. Rather, I judge that he should be proposed for imitation by all those, as he was by me, who have been advanced to governments with fortune as leader and by the arms of others. For otherwise, since he bore a great and exalted spirit, and the purposes of his mind impelled him toward higher things, he could not administer his affair.”

But he both swiftly perished, and it is certain that kingdoms are preserved only by justice. If what is stronger is judged more equitable, first the weak, and then the strong when oppressed by stronger men, perish. For right and equity are the bonds of states; without them, what are kingdoms except great robberies? Kings are therefore *δικασφόροι*, “ministers of justice,” for there is no commonwealth where there is no justice. And so Scipio argues splendidly in

Cicero, as St. Augustine reports: “Therefore,” he says, “where there is no true justice, an assembly of human beings associated by a consensus of right cannot exist, and therefore neither can a people. And if it is not a people, neither is it the affair of a people, but of some multitude unworthy of the name of a people.”

There has never been another cause why peoples and provinces acquired by labor and blood revolted except injustice; for this reason governments are transferred from nation to nation. This affair drew the cities of Liguria and Lombardy away from the German Empire and dispersed them among various dominions. For when they had complained before the emperor and had shown that in two years alone they had suffered more harm from the German prefects than from tyrants during all the rest of the time, and nevertheless were held in contempt, they revolted. Having made a conspiracy and obtained security, they turned injuries against one another. For human beings first customarily act so that they cannot be oppressed; when they believe that they have obtained this, they also seek the power by which they can oppress others.

And so they bring it about that what Augustine inculcates to us in book 2 of *The City of God*, chapter 4, is true: “With justice removed, what are kingdoms except great robberies? For what are robberies themselves except little kingdoms? The band itself of human beings is ruled by the command of a leader, is bound by a compact of association, and divides booty by an agreed law. If this evil grows so greatly by the accessions of abandoned men that it also possesses places, establishes settlements, occupies cities, and subjugates peoples, it assumes the name of a kingdom all the more openly--a name conferred upon it not by desire taken away but by impunity added. For a certain captured pirate answered that famous Alexander the Great elegantly and truly. When the king asked the man what it seemed to him that he kept the sea hostile, he answered with free insolence: ‘The same that it seems to you that you keep the world hostile. But because I do it with a little vessel, I am called a robber; because you do it with a great fleet, you are called an emperor.’”

§ 5. I see that most kingdoms of this kind existed formerly. What else was Nebuchadnezzar than a great robber? He killed whom he wished and kept alive whom he wished. And what sort of robberies were the kingdoms of the Medes, who did not seek gold and silver but killed little children with arrows? The administration of the Persians was no better: their injustice was equal toward strangers and members of the household; for the fault of one, all his kindred were punished although innocent. Because the empires of the Greeks and Romans have more writers, they also supplied more examples of injustice punished. Therefore no riches and no power is stronger than justice; but there is no firmness of a kingdom so great that injustice does not dissolve and break it.

The reason for this is that the beginning of justice proceeded from nature; then certain things came into custom from a consideration of utility; afterward fear of the laws and religion sanctioned both things proceeding from nature and things approved by custom. When injustice removes these, it overthrows nature and again scatters the association of human beings which came together into an assembly to repel injuries.

§ 6. Therefore cultivate justice, prince, and be diligent in cultivating it. Against the crowd of courtiers be active and inquisitive, trust few, and scrutinize the smallest things; you will find no small deceits in the smallest ministries. Esteem nothing small. For where the affair even of abject human beings is conducted, where the eternal destruction of your magistrates--judging beneath you and at your peril--is to be feared, we call all things great. This extends so far that not even among monetary affairs, whether to be acquired or lost, should the things which the ecclesiastical Doctor discusses appear small, whether the money is great or small. For justice is not small, and we certainly ought to preserve it even in a small sum of money, as the Lord says: “He who is faithful in the least is faithful also in much.” What is least, therefore, is least; but to be faithful in the least is great.

For just as the principle of circularity is that all lines are drawn equal from the central point to the circumference, and this is the same in a large disk as in a little coin, so, where small things are conducted justly, the greatness of justice is not diminished. Finally, when the Apostle was speaking concerning secular judgments--which surely concern nothing but monetary affairs--he says: “Does any one of you, having a matter against another, dare to be judged before the

unjust and not before the saints?" Why is it that the Apostle is so indignant, so corrects, so reproaches, so rebukes, so threatens? Why is it that he testifies to the disposition of his mind by so frequent and so harsh a change of voice? Finally, why does he speak so grandly concerning the smallest things? Did secular business concerning that affair merit so much? Far from it. Rather, he does this on account of justice, charity, and piety, which--even in affairs however small--are great, as no sober mind doubts. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, book 4, chapter 18.

§ 7. Nor can justice be defended by words or kindness alone; there is need of the sword and instruments of torture. Otherwise, in its own sanctuary, in its own tribunal, justice will be oppressed. The sanctity of all laws and the integrity of all judges rest upon the vigilant, severe, constant, inexorable justice of the prince. Its primary function is to appoint suitable judges and to punish prevaricators without hope of pardon. I praise the clemency of princes; but in the case of governors and judges who take gifts, who have delivered an inequitable sentence, and who have dissembled the injuries of the wretched, let severity alone have a place.

[Printed page 125]

Louis XII, king of France, thought that the prince who does not punish a crime when he can is no less guilty than the man who perpetrated it. I judge this to be most true, therefore, in this most grave and difficult censuring of inferior magistrates. For through dissimulation not only does the audacity of the inequitable and rapacious increase, and the weakness of the innocent become their prey, but the prince's good faith is also accused, as though he were an associate of honored and purple-clad thieves. For if the prince is said to be ignorant, the excuse is judged insulting, if it is not even his care to have knowledge of others' calamities, when it belongs to him to bring the remedy.

In other matters an excuse has a place: if there has been a faltering in war; if battle was begun with too little courage or too little prudence; if a garrison surrendered through fear; if an error was made in an embassy; if the prince's grain supply was preserved negligently. To exact, severely and constantly, penalties for justice violated by its own judge is not cruelty, but a most beautiful virtue among the parts of justice. He who is fierce against wolves is merciful toward sheep. The security of the unjust is the destruction of the best men.

No city, no household, not even one single human being can be governed without justice; and nevertheless rebellion against justice arises everywhere. O wretched human race! O dreadful spectacles, and yet daily ones! Scourges resound; full prisons are squalid; cords tear; claws shriek; rivers swallow; wheels are burdened; flames devour; quadrupeds drag men apart--and justice is not sufficiently sanctioned by so many punishments. The crimes that are avenged are always perpetrated by new authors. Amid so many deaths of the wretched, the thefts and robberies of judges, governors, and purple-clad men ought not to be unpunished. For how will men who sin more gravely avenge those crimes?

Who will give me holy kings, severe avengers of their own tyrannical men who range through their subjects' fortunes and make a mockery of them, and guardians of kingdoms? Germany and Gaul once had Clovis and Charlemagne; Gaul had Sigebert and Louis; Spain, Alfonso the Chaste and Ferdinand III; England, two Edwards, two Ethelberts, William, Oswald, and Edmund; Hungary, Stephen and Ladislaus; Poland, Casimir and Boleslaus the Chaste; Germany, Rudolf and Henry; Denmark, Canute; Bohemia, two Wenceslauses; Norway, Olaf; Sweden, Henry; Austria, Leopold; Burgundy, Sigismund. Other kingdoms have had just, holy, severe, laborious kings who judged that no license capable of doing harm was to be permitted to their men, and who kept the good in their duty by their own sanctity and the wicked by the vigorous justice of vengeance.

I am not ignorant that clemency is expected of me, that human life is sacred, and that a magistracy occupied with the lives of guilty men is most difficult. But so many calumnies and oppressions of the innocent, and the so intolerable insolence of certain magistrates who crush the heads of the poor together with the dust of the earth, compel princes to be severe. Let him be gentle in spirit, let him be mild, let him be slow to punishment and swift to rewards. Yet let him condemn--even with tears, after the example of Bias--the wicked and rapacious judge, the client or intimate who has abused confidence in the king's love for crimes and the calamities of the needy; but let him condemn him nevertheless.

Let him expend guilty blood, although it be that of a friend, upon justice and the public peace, not upon the sweetness of vengeance.

Themistocles used to say that he preferred to go to a tomb rather than to a tribunal. This is a remarkable example of mildness--if he said what Aelian recounts concerning him, or felt what he is reported to have said. Here the prince must be brave and cautious. Brave, because powerful men must be dragged to punishment; the condemnation of cheap blood is easy, because there is no difficulty in its execution. Brave, because the laws often act against friends, kinsmen, and brothers. Cautious, because powerful men have many patrons, and many arts, if they do not defend a bad case, at least prolong it; and, if all else fails, guilty men purchase perjuries.

Walk upon the royal road, you who rule the multitude. Think all men yours; consider all to be your sons. He is more closely joined to you whose cause merits your patronage. This is your condition: when judging between friends, you will have one of the two as an enemy. Do not fear; God is present to justice. Even men not particularly just will furnish examples for you. Publius Rutilius refused a friend's inequitable requests. The friend, raging, said: "What need have I of your friendship if I do not obtain what I ask?" Publius replied: "Rather, what need have I of yours, if I am to do something dishonorable for your sake?" The friend of Rutilius acted most wickedly, for he wished friendship to be the procuress and broker of injustice; Rutilius acted excellently, for he renounced false friendship in order to patronize true justice.

Agis likewise resisted the desire of his parents. Although they pressed him importunately, lest he fail their cause, and urged him by their paternal right, he remained unmoved: he had already surrendered himself to his country and its laws and could not act against those laws whose obedience and veneration he had learned from his parents.

Antigonus showed the same affection for his brother Marsyas and the same constant will for a reputation of justice. For when Marsyas, on account of their brotherly intimacy, requested that his case be heard at home within the walls, Antigonus answered nothing except: "If we are doing nothing besides what is right, it will be done better in the forum, with everyone listening." This equality in judging is altogether necessary for a kingdom. For if people see the prince yield to affections in certain cases, they cry out that justice has been taken away universally. Of those who have lost a case, few acknowledge that they were defeated by right; instead, they become angry either at the judge or at their advocates. They assert that even their most inequitable suits were condemned not by right and laws but by hatred and money, count themselves, according to the customary manner of human beings, among those whom it is agreed were unjustly oppressed, and seek consolation for their loss from slander and insults against their rulers.

§ 8. But if it pleases us to recount examples of those who gravely avenged the crimes and robberies of their judges, I fear that too many will occur. And this is by the fault of the supreme magistrate, who entrusts the web and guardianship of right, laws, sanctity, and equity to depraved and perverse violators of the laws, just as one entrusts a sword to madmen. Yet they themselves are not free of fault, because it is manifest madness to undertake burdens which you cannot carry. For burdens greater than the bearer must necessarily crush him. Therefore let there be the greatest solicitude in appointing good judges; thus there will be fewer punishments of those who have failed in their duty. Yet even thus there will be many punishments of those whom either the opportunity for sinning has made wicked or the license of power has exposed.

What Cambyses, king of the Persians, did belongs to a crude antiquity and is not praiseworthy in every respect; nevertheless, by this one splendid deed amid infinite crimes he is celebrated. Sisamnes had sold judgments for a price. Cambyses ordered him killed, his skin stripped off, and the tribunal covered--or, as others say, fitted together--with it; and, to show that he was angry at injustice and not at the man, he wished Sisamnes' son to pronounce law from the same

seat, admonished that, terrified by his father's punishment, he should pronounce law according to the prescription of the laws, not from love of gifts. This latter act was harsh and, in keeping with the king's disposition, plainly barbarous; but nevertheless it is something that inculcates zeal for justice in a prince.

Aurelian pursued provincial thieves--men guilty of extortion and embezzlement--beyond measure in a military fashion, so that he punished them with immense penalties and torments. Severus was violently moved against inequitable judges and judged that their eyes should be dug out with a finger. Andronicus punished Theodore, a foremost man, with twelve strokes of clubs because, when he had lodged with farmers, he had paid absolutely nothing. I make an end; the most learned Justus Lipsius and others adduce more examples in their admonitions.

I give this warning: if princes are severe, they will have many Vespasians, who administered a province as governor with a better reputation than he administered the Empire when made Augustus. Tranquillus speaks thus of him: "Thereafter, having obtained Africa by lot, he administered it with the greatest integrity and not without great dignity, except that, in a certain disturbance at Hadrumetum, turnips were thrown at him. He certainly returned no richer, since, his credit now almost ruined, he mortgaged all his estates to his brother and was compelled, in order to sustain his dignity, to descend to the profits of mule-dealing; on account of this he was commonly called the Muleteer."

A muleteer of this kind should certainly be preferred to all knights and masters of knights, if the other things corresponded. Therefore in your kingdom let those words and precepts be heard which Comnenus repeatedly inculcated upon his prefects: "Leave behind either injuries or life; for that you should act unjustly and live is neither pleasing to God nor tolerable to me, his minister." Agapetus spoke truly:

Δυσθήρατος ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ δικαίου εὐρεσις, ῥαδίως ἐκφεύγουσα τοὺς μὴ λίαν προσέχοντας.

Justice is difficult to capture; it easily slips from the hands of those who do not attend diligently. When you have commanded, subscribed, sealed, and sent a messenger, there will be someone who evades, someone who delays the commands, someone who warns the accused. I certainly approve the saying of St. Cyprian: "The justice of the king is the peace of peoples, the protection of the fatherland, the immunity of the common people, the fortification of the nation, the care of the sick, the joy of human beings, the temperateness of the air, the serenity of the sea, the fertility of the earth, the consolation of the poor, the inheritance of sons, and for himself the hope of future blessedness."

§ 9. Therefore let him inquire into judges. In Spain and Venice commissions of inquiry are most useful and ought to be introduced everywhere. For without justice concord cannot be preserved, nor without concord can a city remain safe. A judge ought to regard justice, not the will of the prince; much less ought the prince to regard the judge, whom he will rightly condemn if he sees that the judge has pronounced not according to justice but according to the prince's affection. Hanno, bishop of Cologne, ordered the eyes of inequitable judges to be torn out; he left one of them one eye so that he might lead the rest home. Philip of Valois provided by testament that an inquiry should be made into the judges even after his death. This ought altogether to be done. If human punishment is evaded, divine vengeance will nevertheless seize both the judges and the prince by whose connivance a judge sins--perhaps late, but gravely. Nor is discretion in determining permitted to a judge; rather, a law is laid down. The supreme prince alone can grant pardon for an offense; this too has been granted to the princes of Germany among the regalian rights. And certainly to bend and mitigate the harshness of the laws by kindness is a royal work.

Nor will the prince easily concede to a judge the diminution or remission of a punishment. Although Charles V made great concessions to the Senate of Milan, he retained this part for himself. The decrees of France do not concede it even to the king's mother. In Spain there is a singular tribunal in which deliberation is held concerning the giving of pardon and the granting of grace. Jerome Casteg, *On the Union of Portugal and Castile*, book 8. Charles ordered a judge hanged who had punished by cutting off the hand of a guilty man worthy of hanging.

§ 10. It has been asked whether a prince can judge in his own case. They answer affirmatively from law 3, *Concerning Those Things Which Are in Testaments*; law 41, *Concerning the Institution of Heirs*; and the final section at the end of

the Institutes, *Concerning Ordinary Substitution*. They add that he cannot be alleged as suspect. I see that many of the heretics think thus, and some Catholics also have sometimes appeared to me to approve the same thing.

Now this matter can be asked in two ways. First, whether, every law set aside, it is inequitable by nature itself to have the same man as judge and adversary. Second, whether in well-constituted commonwealths and kingdoms, where there is an order of laws and judgments, this is lawful. It seems to me contrary to nature and justice that an emperor, king, or prince himself should judge in his own case. A judge, or *δικαστής*, is in the middle between the parties, so that he may protect the equality of right on both sides. Second, in the commonwealth of the Hebrews it was not lawful for Ahab to deliver judgment between himself and Naboth; therefore he took refuge in calumny. Third, a private person defeated by that judgment is never bound to acquiesce. For since princes are changeable, subject also to affections and errors, and for the most part also lovers of themselves and tenacious of majesty, no one is bound to entrust himself to the judgment of a man whom he knows and experiences as an adversary.

The highest reason for this matter is that, when truth and justice are investigated, in order that the investigation and adjudication may be legitimate, the parties ought to be equal in all things, so that only the weight of the case and the reasons may constitute inequality. Let this be an example. The empress Eudoxia entered a widow's vineyard and plucked grapes; therefore both she and the emperor contended that the vineyard had passed into the empress's right. If in her own case either she herself or the emperor is judge, the matter is already concluded, for the matter has been decided in the highest tribunal. But the widow denies that Caesar or his wife can be given to her as judge. Nor is it less unjust for her to be compelled to undergo such a judgment than to yield the estate. For she is in the worse position not by the kind of case but by the desire of the judge, which obstructs the establishment of equality between the litigants. This judgment, therefore, is always contrary to justice by its own nature.

But the prince, even without affection, will pronounce sentence against himself. A heroically just prince will sometimes do this; but no one believes that all will always do so. God alone is judge in his own case, because his will is immutable justice and his judgments are true, justified in themselves. God alone is truthful, but every human being is a liar. Why, then, will a senator be compelled to abide by the sentence of Gaius or Nero when they themselves are present and torture him with their countenance? The prince is sometimes said himself to judge because he pronounces through his judges; but in this case they are sworn not to the prince but to the whole commonwealth and to justice. Therefore the prince may neither inquire into them nor show that their sentence displeased him if he lost the case, for he casts fear into the judge.

§ 11. Hence in all kingdoms governed by law and institutions, the cases of kings and princes against subjects are judged by others. The count palatine judges the emperor's case when he judges in Caesar's court, according to the Golden Bull. The king of France, Spain, or Bohemia can be sued by his subjects. Hence there are so many royal advocates in France. Hence, I think, law *π.*, *Concerning the Right of the Fisc*. Hence the holy

[Printed page 127]

constitution of Philip II, king of the Spains, that the president of the royal council should pronounce against the fisc in a doubtful case. For no commonwealth wished to commit the bodies and fortunes of its subjects to the private affections of princes, but to the public declaration of justice. Therefore the rejection of a suspect judge belongs to natural right, so that it cannot be denied; and the custom of all nations proves this. But if the prince himself is suspect--and in his own case he is always suspect--his judgment is refused much more justly than that of any inferior person, because both appeal is cut off and execution is readier.

Nor can the commonwealth grant this. For just as it cannot determine that Gaius's estate be given to Titius--for that is spoliation--so neither can it determine that Gaius, without fault, come into danger of losing his estate. For to cast an innocent person without cause into danger of life and fortunes is as inequitable as to strip him of life or fortunes: unequal in degree, indeed, but like in injustice. Will you then compel me to entrust myself to my adversary, to whom my losses are profit? Will kinship, affinity, a similar case, or favor toward an enemy--that is, something

extraneous--bring it about that I am not compelled to abide by the sentence of an adversary, but will the person himself, **αὐτότης**, not bring this about?

CHAPTER VII

The Commonwealth Ought to Keep Faith with All

§ 1. I have demonstrated that prudence, diligence, and justice are necessary to the prince. For if he is destitute of wisdom, none of the remaining virtues will attain its purpose. But if diligence is necessary in a private house, lest the whole house perish through a defect of the roof, how great a diligence is at last demanded in that vast body in which some part is always being injured? For the idleness of the prince involves great danger. Agapetus the Deacon seriously admonished Justinian concerning this matter:

“Ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν πλεόντων, ὅταν μὲν ὁ ναύτης σφαλῇ, μικρὰν φέρει τοῖς συμπλέουσι βλάβην, ὅταν δ’ αὐτὸς ὁ κυβερνήτης, παντὸς ἐργάζεται τοῦ πλοίου ἀπώλειαν· οὕτω καὶ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, ἂν μὲν τις τῶν ἀρχομένων ἀμάρτη, οὐ τὸ κοινὸν τοσοῦτον, ὅσον ἑαυτὸν ἀδικεῖ· ἂν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ ἄρχων, πάσης ἐργάζεται τῆς πολιτείας τὴν βλάβην. Ὡς οὖν μεγάλας ὑφέξων εὐθύνας, εἴ τι παρίδοι τῶν δεόντων, μετὰ πολλῆς ἀκριβείας, ἃ λεγέτω πάντα, ἃ πραττέτω.

Just as among those who sail, if one of the sailors has erred, he brings a small loss, but if the helmsman errs, he causes the loss of the whole vessel, so in the commonwealth, if one of the subjects sins, he harms himself more than the commonwealth; if the prince sins, he brings detriment to the whole commonwealth. Therefore, since he will have to render a great account if he has neglected anything among those things which ought to be done, let him both say and do all things with great exactness.

From this prudent diligence follows justice, concerning which I spoke just now; and the inseparable companion of justice is faith, or constancy in words and deeds.

It must therefore be established that the commonwealth ought to preserve faith safe and intact. Faith adorns the prince; perfidy disgraces him. Deceit attacks the fickleness of the people more severely. An upright senate is accustomed to cultivate faith most steadfastly. Faith, moreover, must be kept with the people, and in turn the people are bound to the prince; then it must be kept with private persons; third, with neighboring commonwealths; finally, with enemies. And not only in prosperity, but in every fortune, constancy in all words and deeds must remain. Let the saying of the Roman sage in Epistle 88 adhere to the mind and grow old together with it: “Faith is the most sacred good of the human breast; it is compelled by no necessity to deceive and corrupted by no reward. Burn,” it says, “strike, kill; I shall not betray. But the more deeply pain seeks secrets, the more deeply shall I conceal them.”

Therefore let truth be preserved in deeds, words, and the whole of life. Socrates said that truth and virtue were the same. Plato judged truth to be, not indeed the *τέλειον ἀγαθόν*, the supreme and perfect good, but *ἀγαθοειδές*, good-like; for it always adheres to the highest good and attends it as light attends the sun. “Οὐδέν,” he says, “οἰκειότερον τῇ σοφίᾳ τῆς ἀληθείας.” Nothing is more closely joined and familiar to wisdom than truth. It removes the crowd of evils: “Ἡγουμένης τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἂν ποτε χορὸν αὐτῇ κακῶν ἀκολουθήσαι.” The chorus of vices does not follow when truth leads.

§ 2. And first, the prince ought to preserve altogether whole and uninjured the faith which he gave to his subjects. Whatever princes promised at the beginning of their assumption of power to the estates concerning liberty, privileges, immunities, and donatives must be performed, provided that they are just and honorable. For inequitable or shameful things are never promised without crime and are performed with a greater crime than that with which they were promised. The emperor binds himself in many ways to the Church, the princes, and the subjects; and I think that there is no people in Europe which does not admit a sworn prince and commonwealth.

Therefore shameful is the method of those princes who, after they have placed their powers in safety, seek various pretexts for violating promises. Nor are wicked craftsmen lacking for cloaking perfidy, to whom nothing is so accepted

as to deceive faith. Deceit certainly does not make men just; for faith is the foundation of justice. Although, indeed, where the magnitude of profits is regarded, unbroken faith rarely remains, nevertheless the judgment of the Roman consul remains firm and valid: “Nothing holds a commonwealth together more powerfully than faith.”

§ 3. Certainly perfidy brings the least evil upon those who are deceived and harms its author most. For no perfidy is lasting. What prince who occupied power through force and blood did not give his own blood to his successor? What murderer of his own prince, who succeeded through crime, was not sacrificed by his successor for the safeguarding of power? For it is the custom of princes to give every tyrannicide over to death, both so that they may not appear to have committed the slaughter by their own command and so that they may meet conspiracies beforehand. Why, then, should anyone bind himself with perfidy, which even the man to whom it brought a kingdom will avenge? For they prefer to punish the audacity of conspirators rather than to appear to owe a kingdom to another’s crime. Thus perfidy has no place anywhere, neither among those whom it has ruined nor among those whom it has benefited.

Among all who were notorious for perjury and perfidy, Lysander the Lacedaemonian possessed the greatest name among the ancients. To cruelty, avarice, and lust he finally added shamelessness, so that, when he was to return to Sparta, he asked Pharnabazus for testimony to his continence and equity, by which he might be assisted against the accusations of citizens before the ephors. But Pharnabazus avenged perfidy by deceit. For after he had ordered a commendatory letter for Lysander to be written, and Lysander had approved it, while it was being sealed he substituted another one entirely like it, which explained Lysander’s wickedness and crimes. The ephors ordered Lysander himself to read it in the senate; and so the perfidy by which alone he believed himself safe returned upon his own head.

§ 4. But the reason why punishment soon overwhelms the perfidious, the perjured, the ὑσπόνδους, contemners of treaties, is the vengeance of the divinity itself, which is always provoked by the perfidious. For he who deceives others by false promises and calls God as witness--what else does he do than either mock God or command him to be the minister of his

[Printed page 128]

crimes?

And so when Sennacherib had broken faith, he first fled after his soldiers were slain, and then was butchered by his sons before his own idol. For he who mocked whatever divinity he believed in, and who severed the commerce of the human race, was deprived of life by those whom he brought into the light, by a great crime indeed, yet according to his own desert. Zedekiah likewise violated faith with an impious king, but he nevertheless paid the penalty by the destruction of his nation.

Antiochus the Illustrious, in 1 Maccabees, and his son Eupator are a sorrowful example of violated faith. He and his princes swore to the Jews. “And he entered into the mountain and saw the fortification of the place, and he broke more quickly the oath which he had sworn and commanded the wall round about to be destroyed.” But Alexander and Demetrius soon exacted the penalties of the violated oath. For when the army had seized Antiochus and Lysias in order to offer them to Demetrius, and he had answered, “Do not show me their face,” the army killed them. Alcimus, Bacchides, and Nicanor perished by the same perjury. For Nicanor and Bacchides fell; Alcimus died with great torment. Demetrius also, deserted by the Jews on account of his notorious perfidy and defeated by Alexander, was deprived of kingdom and life.

But neither was perfidy fortunate for Alexander. Led into deceit by his father-in-law Ptolemy through the covenants of marriage, and defeated by a perfidious Arab, he was punished with decapitation. Shortly afterward Ptolemy likewise paid the penalties of perjury and contempt for human right: he died on the third day and paid for three days of joy with immense infamy. But the other Demetrius, for whom Jonathan preserved kingdom and life--how ungrateful, how forgetful of his oath he was! “And he lied in all the things which he said,” says Scripture, “and estranged himself from Jonathan; he did not repay him according to the benefits which he had bestowed upon him.” Avenging justice did not

delay the punishment. Routed in battle by Antiochus through Tryphon and cast down from the kingdom, he was at last stripped of his camp by Arsaces the Mede and cast into chains.

But Tryphon, after he broke the faith given to the Jews and removed the young Antiochus his lord by parricide, paid the penalty, late indeed but within a few years, as a fugitive, and was killed by his own men. Nor indeed did Antiochus Sidetes perform the things promised to Simon Maccabaeus; Tryphon therefore killed him as he occupied his brother's kingdom.

Demetrius, the son of Demetrius, succeeded, together with his father's perfidy and hatred. Alexander Zabinas harassed him with war and perjuries for six years. Demetrius' son was Antiochus Grypus, while Antiochus Cyzicenus was the son of Antiochus Sidetes. For a short time they fought, not more with arms than with perjuries and by soliciting peoples to perfidy, until Antiochus Grypus was butchered by the most perfidious Heracleon, and Antiochus Cyzicenus by Seleucus, the son of Grypus. Their sons likewise waged war, as their fathers had, with perfidy and contempt for every treaty.

What of the two Antiochi, sons of the former men, for eleven years--one the son of Grypus, the other of Cyzicenus; Seleucus, son of Grypus; and Philip and Demetrius, sons of Cyzicenus? Did not the perfidy of all their predecessors reach these men, and Philip, who survived them all by two years? At last, after Tigranes was defeated, the dominion of the Macedonians came into a Roman province; and with the resources of great kingdoms luxury is always their ruin, and thence come perfidy and perjuries, civil wars and ruins, which gave beginnings to the kingdoms of Europe today.

After such clear examples, it is irksome to recall others: Manuel Comnenus, betrayer and likewise poisoner of Emperor Conrad and the German army. I pass over the sole art of the Turks when their affairs are prosperous--perjuries. For since they judge it holy to destroy enemies in whatever way, they hold no treaties valid except when it pleases them. Consult history, especially Bonfini concerning the siege of Famagusta. Although their malice in agreements is so manifest, nevertheless Murad, about to fight Ladislaus, king of Hungary, whom he alleged had first broken the treaties, arraigned him as guilty before the tribunal of God. For before the battle he read aloud the letters that witnessed the treaty and thus concluded his speech in Bonfini: "These, Jesus Christ, are the treaties which your Christians struck with me. By your holy name they swore and violated the faith given under your name; perfidiously they denied their God. Now, Christ, if you are God, as they say, and we are hallucinating, avenge, I pray you, your injuries and mine. Show to these men who have not yet known your holy name the penalties for violated faith."

However the matter was conducted, after these words the uncertain battle inclined and was more favorable to the Turk. In the memory of our grandfathers also, treaties between Louis and Charles the Bold were rather frequently broken and still more shamefully renewed, but by the perfidy of the counselors more than of the king and duke. For often, although they clashed with all their strength, neither king nor duke knew the true cause of the war, as Philippe de Commines recounts.

Philip of Valois likewise had promised Louis the Bavarian by oath that he would act so that Edward, king of Britain, might be reconciled to the Roman Pontiff; and although he seemed outwardly to conduct this matter solicitously, he nevertheless secretly obstructed it. He paid for the perjury so fraudulently covered by a vast slaughter and almost the destruction of the French nobility; and, routed by the Englishman at Crécy, he showed that God is never deceived. Claudian therefore sings falsely:

Now he who breaks treaties is enriched;

he who keeps them is in need.

Rather, because what the better instructor of morals, Theognis, sings is true:

Παῦροι τῶν πολλῶν πίστιν ἔχουσι νόφ.

Few among the many have faith in mind.

For this reason kingdoms are oppressed by so many calamities. I have related the examples of the Seleucids, of whom it can truly be said:

Faith never enters a royal threshold.

Nor was the perfidy of their own people ever absent from a royal threshold; by it they paid the penalties for the perfidy they exercised against others. They thought it prudence to deceive others by an oath until, deceived themselves, they perceived destruction.

§ 5. Deservedly did those Thracians perish who, during a truce agreed for the days, invaded the fields of the Boeotians by night in order to plunder them. Deservedly also did Cleomenes afterward rage against himself. For when he had sworn that he would deliberate all things with the head of Archonides--which Archonides understood according to the Greek custom as though Cleomenes had promised to do all things according to his counsel--Cleomenes turned the matter into a cruel mockery: he carried the head of Archonides around and held his deliberations concerning the things to be done in its presence.

Among the other origins of calamities for Suleiman was the killing of Ibrahim, whom, after he had advanced him to the highest position, he swore that he would never kill. He therefore caused Ibrahim's throat to be cut while he was sleeping. For the Turkish pontiff had interpreted it to be lawful because he denied that sleeping men were counted among the number of the living. But that fraud binds the perjury; it does not release it.

§ 6. The second reason why nothing that is faithless is stable is drawn from the nature of the thing itself: because he who has lost faith can lose nothing further. Therefore, when human beings observe someone acting either by manifest perjury or by criminal sophistries, they not only furnish him no faith but hate him in turn and strive to withdraw from his friendship and to place themselves and their

[Printed page 129]

possessions in safety.

Everyone thinks it madness to entrust oneself to the man who has denied faith. Thus this is the greatest evil of the perfidious man: no one is faithful to him. If no one is faithful, therefore, he cannot be safe. Although friends devote themselves, although armies, with swords placed at their necks, swear to your safety, although they surround you with a multitude of ambitious guards--if you yourself teach them to deceive faith, you will alienate even the most faithful men. And since otherwise,

No fortune ever stands long for mortals

when faith totters,

you will find faith wholly closed to the wretched and doubtful man. You will hold no one bound by love or mutual faith. Payment inflames avarice; it does not bind hearts to the giver if he is perfidious. That whole crowd thinks itself to have an oath to fortune, not to faith.

Sejanus was once faithful to Tiberius. "Sejanus," says Tacitus in book 4, "suspended above Caesar by knee, countenance, and hands, set himself against the falling masses; and in such a posture he was found by the soldiers who had come to their aid. Greater from that event, and although he advised ruinous things, he was heard with confidence as one not anxious for himself." What, therefore, made him from faithful into faithless, an ambusher, and an aspirant to power?

Taught to deceive by Tiberius' perfidy itself, he had determined to occupy the empire. A perfidious man is very like ice; no one but a fool builds upon it. Thus, just as ice is without houses, so the perfidious man is stripped of friends. We see, indeed, that those who cross rivers bound by frost are always in a state of suspense and anxiety and are afraid

if the slightest cracking sound occurs, since they are not ignorant that they stand upon a fragile nature. The friendship of the perfidious, through which very many have perished, is more uncertain.

Cyrus acted prudently when he employed Hyrcanian leaders. When they said that hostages should be awaited so that he might set out under a pledge of faith, he answered: "I think that the pledge for us all is in our minds and in our hands. For we seem to be so disposed in our minds that, if you are truthful, you will have us fit to deserve well of you; if you deceive us, we judge the condition of our affairs will be such that we shall not be in your power, but we believe that you, with the gods helping us, will be in ours." But this was altogether to distrust the barbarians. And since perfidious princes can by no means be in another's power, it is certain that no faith is placed in them. The Parthians have no faith except insofar as it is expedient; and thus, always clashing against themselves, they were worn down until they were reduced to servitude. Just as the Syrians have no faith, so they have never had any liberty.

§ 7. Therefore Francis, king of the Gauls, also spoke rightly in a human manner. For when he had Charles V in his power and was admonished by his men to hold him captive in violation of faith, he said: "If faith were exiled from the whole world, it nevertheless ought to be preserved by kings, who can be constrained by it alone and by no fear."

Our Germany, always an unshaken preserver of faith, held the Empire for a very long time; and, what you may marvel at and not find in another nation, for so many years no king of Germany, no Augustus, was led into captivity by foreigners or fell in battle. Yet they waged very many wars and subdued the Pomeranians, Rani, Livonians, Slavs, Helvetians, and others.

But you may marvel at this also: in almost eight hundred years only six emperors were reduced to order by their own people--Charles the Fat, Ataulf, Wenceslaus, Henry III, Otto IV, and Frederick II. And these too had degenerated from German sincerity. Deservedly, indeed, faith and the religion of the oath were furnished by their own people to emperors tenacious of faith and the oath. You, reader, compare these things which I have said concerning the ancient emperors with these present ones. Meanwhile, while civil perfidy devastated the eastern empire, it polluted itself with the blood of eighty-six or eighty-seven emperors. They had learned to deceive faith and were crushed and cut down by their own deeds.

The perfidious Zeno was buried alive by his wife Ariadne. Anastasius, who obtained power by the crime of the perjured and parricidal Ariadne, paid the penalties of perfidy when struck by lightning. Heracleonas and his wife Martina deprived Constantine, the son of Heraclius, of life; but he, with his nose cut off, and she, with her tongue cut out, perished detestably in exile. Constans killed his brother Theodosius, and in vengeance for his brother's death he was killed by Andrew, almost the only man whom he trusted. From Philippicus, than whom no one was more criminal and who held all faith as a mockery, power was taken away together with his eyes. No one was more wicked than Copronymus, who kept faith with no one; but as he died he cried out that he had been delivered alive to unquenchable fire. Leo IV was killed by his own men; Leo the Armenian, by Michael the Stammerer. Andronicus, Isaac, and Alexius, all perjured, fell by the perfidy of their own men.

Who, therefore, would not say that those who teach perfidy and perjuries overthrow the commonwealth? For how can commerce, wars, peace, cities, or households stand without faith? If the prince can violate faith, who will be bound to preserve it?

§ 8. But must faith be kept with one who violates faith? Indeed, it must be kept even with treaty-breakers and barbarians. Caesar, to be sure, according to Plutarch, judging it madness to keep faith with men so perfidious and barbarous, led an army against them. Nevertheless faith must be kept, nor must another's perfidy be punished by your perfidy. For if Hannibal besieged Saguntum contrary to the treaty, it was not therefore lawful for the Romans to break the peace afterward made with the Carthaginians. Nor, if Roman legates were violated by the Carthaginians, was it therefore right that Hanno likewise be led into chains. Much less, if the Lusitanians attacked the Romans contrary to their oath, did it therefore become Lucullus to entice the Lusitanians by a promise of impunity and butcher them.

Yet when enemies deceive faith within the same agreement, the man whom another's perfidy has afflicted is released from obligation. For if the Messenians plunder Spartan territory during an agreed truce, the Spartans will repay like for like by the best right. For those who exercised hostilities rendered the common peace void. But when, after the first treaties have been violated, a new one is struck, it is not lawful to violate it because the first treaties were violated.

CHAPTER VIII

The Commonwealth Ought to Be Grateful Toward Those Who Have Deserved Well

§ 1. Gratitude is akin to faith, just as not to acknowledge a benefit, or to repay it with evil deeds, is a kind, as it were, of perfidy. It belongs to a great spirit to be grateful.

For--as you say--all foolish men are wicked; but he who has one vice has them all; and all men are foolish and wicked; therefore all men are ungrateful. What, then? Is reproach not directed against the human race from every side? Is it not a public complaint that benefits have perished, and that there are very few who do not in turn deserve most wickedly of those who have deserved well of them? And there is no reason for you to suppose that this is only our murmuring, since we count as most wicked and depraved whatever has fallen short of the rule of right. Behold, I know not what voice is sent forth, not secretly from the house of the philosophers but from the midst of the assembly, to condemn peoples and nations:

No guest is safe from guest;

no father-in-law from son-in-law; even the favor of brothers is rare.

The husband threatens the destruction of his wife, and she of her husband.

[Printed page 130]

This is already something more: benefits have been turned into crime, and the blood of those for whom blood ought to be shed is not spared. We pursue benefits with sword and poisons. To lay hands upon the fatherland itself and to crush it with one's own fasces is power and dignity. Whoever has not stood above the commonwealth thinks that he stands in a humble and abject place. Armies received from it are turned against it, and this is the commander's address: "Fight against your wives; fight against your children; assail altars, hearths, and household gods with arms. You who, not even when about to triumph, ought to enter the city without the Senate's command, and for whom, as you led back a victorious army, a senate-house would be provided outside the walls--now, after citizens have been slain, drenched in kindred blood, enter the city with standards raised. Let liberty grow mute among the military standards; and let that people, conqueror and pacifier of nations, now that wars have been removed far away and every terror suppressed, be besieged within its walls and dread its own eagles."

Coriolanus is ungrateful--dutiful too late and after repentance for his crime. He laid down his arms, but laid them down in the midst of parricide. Catiline is ungrateful. It is too little for him to capture the fatherland unless he overthrows it, unless he sends cohorts of the Allobroges against it, unless an enemy summoned from beyond the Alps satisfies ancient and innate hatreds, and Roman leaders pay to Gallic tombs the funeral rites long owed them.

Gaius Marius is ungrateful: brought from the soldier's boot to the consulship, unless he equals Roman funerals with Cimbrian slaughters, unless he not only gives the signal for civil destruction and butchery but is himself the signal, he will perceive his fortune to have been insufficiently changed and restored to its former place.

Lucius Sulla is ungrateful: he healed the fatherland with remedies harsher than its dangers. After he had walked through human blood from the citadel of Praeneste all the way to the Colline Gate, he produced other battles and other slaughters in the city. He butchered two legions crowded into a corner--cruelly, after victory; impiously, after a pledge of faith--and devised proscription. Great gods! A man who killed a Roman citizen received impunity and money, and almost a civic crown.

Gnaeus Pompey is ungrateful. In return for three consulships, three triumphs, and so many honors, which for the greatest part he had seized prematurely, he returned this gratitude to the commonwealth: he introduced others also into

possession of it, as though he would diminish the odium of his own power if what ought to have been lawful to no one had become lawful to several. While he desired extraordinary commands, while he distributed provinces so that he might choose them, while he so divided the commonwealth among the triumvirs that nevertheless two parts were in his own house, he reduced the Roman people to such a state that it could not be safe except by the benefit of servitude.

Ungrateful was Pompey's own enemy and conqueror, who turned the war from Gaul and Germany round upon the city; and that friend of the plebs, that popular man, placed his camp in the Circus Flaminius, nearer than Porsena's had been. He did indeed moderate the right and cruelty of victory; he fulfilled what he used to say: he killed no one except an armed man. What then? Others wielded arms more bloodily, yet, when at last they were sated, cast them aside. He quickly sheathed the sword but never put it down.

Antony was ungrateful toward his dictator, whom he pronounced to have been killed lawfully, and whose killers he sent away to provinces and commands; but after the fatherland had been torn by proscriptions, incursions, and wars, after so many evils he assigned it not even to Roman kings, so that the city which had restored full right, liberty, and immunity to the Achaeans, Rhodians, and very many renowned cities would itself pay tribute to eunuchs.

The day will fail one who enumerates the ungrateful, even to the final destructions of the fatherland. It will be equally immense if I begin to run through how ungrateful the commonwealth itself has been toward its best and most devoted men, and how it has sinned no less often than sin has been committed against it. It sent Camillus into exile; it dismissed Scipio. After Catiline, Cicero was exiled, his household gods overthrown, his goods plundered; everything was done that Catiline would have done if victorious. Rutilius bore as the price of his innocence that he lay hidden in Asia. The Roman people denied Cato the praetorship and utterly denied him the consulship.

We are publicly ungrateful. Let each man question himself: there is no one who does not complain of someone as ungrateful. Yet it cannot happen that all complain unless complaint must be made concerning all. Therefore all are ungrateful. Only that? All are covetous too, all malicious, and all timid--those especially who appear bold. Add that all are ambitious and all impious. But there is no reason for you to be angry. Pardon them: all are insane.

I do not wish to recall you to uncertainties, so as to say: "See how ungrateful youth is." Who does not desire his father's last day, provided he is innocent; await it, provided he is moderate; think of it, provided he is dutiful? How rare is the man who fears the death of the best wife without also calculating it? For what litigant whom you have defended, I ask, has the memory of so great a benefit lasted beyond the next few matters?

This often applies to princes and commonwealths, among whose errors, among others, it is not the least to return either no gratitude or evil gratitude to those who have deserved well. How much detriment the commonwealth has incurred from this matter is taught both by the nature of the thing and by these examples. Nor is it wonderful that the commonwealth is ungrateful toward citizens who have deserved well of it, and that others in turn are ungrateful toward it, because no one is sufficiently grateful to God for so many goods.

§ 2. The Romans were ungrateful toward those who had deserved well of them: they drove Tarquinius Collatinus into exile solely from hatred of his name; they compelled Valerius to incur danger on account of the house erected on the Velia; they were either cruel or unjust toward Manlius, Camillus, Scipio, and Cicero. The Athenians were no less so. Through the barbarous law of ostracism they were the most ungrateful of all nations; among them great benefits were a matter of certain danger. This arose precisely from the fact that, since they had endured many grave tyrants--men whom before they had regarded as renowned, beneficent, and popular--they thereafter began to distrust everyone equally. The Lacedaemonians were no milder; the Carthaginians were the cruelest of all and the most ungrateful toward their generals.

§ 3. The vice of ingratitude extends widely, so much so that an Italian asks whether princes or the people are customarily more ungrateful. I would prefer their morals to be such that one could instead ask whether the people or princes are customarily more grateful. He concludes that ingratitude arises from avarice and ambition, and then from

suspicion; that the people are never ungrateful from avarice, and much more rarely than princes from suspicion. But I can by no means approve these things as prudently said.

For an avaricious people frequently, through desire for money, deprives brave men who expend themselves for their fatherland of a just honorarium. Amid their very dangers, while Philip carried around the terror of war and deceit, the Athenians not only sat idle in the theater, but also judged that the naval fund should be spent as payment for the theater. The Romans appointed a day for Camillus to stand trial, as though he had distributed the Veientine booty inequitably. Whence came so great an injury against so great a man, unless from avarice? How great were the contests which the Agrarian Laws stirred up at Rome, by which the revenues, the sinews of the commonwealth, were cut? That avarice, moreover, not only took away the donatives of commanders and the rewards of armies, but wore down the commonwealth more than the wars themselves. Thus even the people are ungrateful from avarice.

And they are so all the more because the optimates will not easily consent to great advantages for one citizen who has deserved splendidly; for what is given extraordinarily to one is withdrawn from his colleagues. But ungrateful citizens envy the wealth of their preservers after receiving safety, although they have received life and wealth from those same men.

The people are not customarily ungrateful from ambition, indeed, because they are not customarily a competitor for great deeds and rewards

[Printed page 131]

but, because they are governed and, as it were, animated by a few men, they are led by the ambition of those men. Popular leaders and demagogues, moreover, are accustomed to envy renowned men, detract from their praises, and exercise rivalries and hostilities. Scipio sails to Africa and undergoes dangers; meanwhile the ungrateful Senate and ungrateful people listen to Cato barking against his greatness. Thus by another's ambition,

As wood movable by another's sinews

is led.

In place of ambition, however, the people possess the implanted poison of envy. They are so imbued with it that they cannot bear those who have deserved best, and they grieve more that the faculty of doing good remains to great men than they rejoice in the benefit. Then the people are not only an unfit but also a malevolent assessor of benefits. For since individuals care little for the commonwealth, they value no benefits highly unless private advantages are joined to them; and nevertheless, when they have obtained those advantages, they expect more or complain that greater ones have been given to others. But the highest ingratitude is not to acknowledge a benefit.

Nor is it true that the people do not have many causes for suspicion. Athenian, Corinthian, and Roman history teaches the contrary. The people, who for the most part are ignorant of the sequence of the deed, suspect plots against liberty, embezzlement, judgments, and all matters. But princes, since an account is customarily rendered to them personally for the most part, have knowledge of all things. Nowhere are the people more moderate, more cultivated, and more fitted for magistracies than in the free cities of the Empire. Yet a hundred years ago most cities rose up from suspicions against the senate, and some also shed blood. Today many harbor grave suspicions concerning senators and would demand accounts if they did not remain quiet out of regard for a greater power.

§ 4. Princes, however, have a twofold condition. Some possess a single principality and have neighboring enemies or rivals. If they have a renowned commander in war, fortified by victory and the favor of provincials, they easily suspect and fear him. The reason is that such commanders almost equal the prince and, if they wish, will either betray him to the enemies or themselves succeed him. These princes are customarily ungrateful through suspicion, and often even wish death upon their commanders to their own ruin. This is all the more so if they perceive that their own resources are slender in comparison with so great a name.

Others are very powerful and possess many provinces, governors, and viceroys. Such princes are rarely ungrateful through suspicion, because even the most renowned commanders stand far below the greatness of their lords. Thus envy is not customarily dominant in such men either. Then a probable fear never arises from a commander's perfidy, because he has neither the strength nor the spirit, after occupying the tyranny of one province, to rouse the entire body of the kingdom against himself. Although these things are so, nevertheless both the people and the prince frequently sin in this matter. Gratitude, however, procures friends and preserves the commonwealth.

§ 5. For, first, it is of great importance that gratitude be laid up for those who have deserved well of the commonwealth. An ungrateful prince will scarcely retain good men, and never men of great spirit. If you are ungrateful for the great labors of any citizen whatsoever, you will not only have him as a mortal enemy, but will also blunt the industry of others and bring it about that they look elsewhere and seek where they may bestow their benefits better and with hope of advantage. For in truth:

τὴν εἰς ἀτιμίαν ὀλιγωρίαν οἱ φιλότιμοι, καὶ οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς φέρουσι βαρέως.

Those desirous of honors, and prudent men, bear it heavily when they are neglected through contempt. The deeds of great men when left without honor have brought on immense calamities. Coriolanus pressed his ungrateful fatherland with siege; Carbo attacked it through barbarians; Narses imposed the Lombards upon Justinian. Boniface, count of Africa, brought in the Vandals. For those who, after their illustrious labors, the dangers they have encountered, and the fidelity they have expended together with their blood, experience the dispositions of princes or of the commonwealth as estranged from them--if they are strong in resources and tenacious of their dignity--generally devise something so as to take care (as Octavian used to say) that they cannot be removed. And so they conciliate to themselves the spirits of the soldiers, conspire with neighbors and sometimes with enemies, occupy fortifications, and avenge the contempt shown them. What ambition does in frivolous men, indignation does in others. Accordingly, from the ingratitude of princes and commonwealths many pernicious tyrannies have arisen. And certainly, even if a prince's ingratitude is not a just cause of rebellion, yet among the common people it is a plausible one, and favor is shown to an injured man who pursues his injuries. And this is all the more so because ingratitude is a shameful vice. Herodian says truly:

Καὶ τὰ μὲν δεινὰ τῷ ἔργῳ αἰὲ μνημονεύεται. Τὸ γὰρ λυπῆσαν δυσέξαλειπτον· τὰ δὲ χρηστά, ἅμα τῇ ἀπολαύσει, καὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν μνήμην συναναλίσκει.

The memory of grievous things that have happened always remains; for whatever causes sorrow is erased with difficulty, but the memory of benefits is consumed together with their enjoyment.

They oppress those by whose labor they were freed from fear, and begrudge them the fruit of their labors. For after the daughters of Jerusalem sing, "Saul has slain a thousand, and David ten thousand," the safety of the whole kingdom, when joined to the praise of the bravest man, is now unwelcome. Saul is therefore angry with David, all of whose benefits were burdens to him, whose punishment he counted as gain. He disdains to appear to have been affected by a benefit, as though he were the lesser man, and--as is characteristic of raging men--he does not forgive the benefit. He overturns all the benefits and remembers only that he has been placed second. Nor is it wonderful that men are moved when they behold new tablets drawn up concerning benefits, a thing most pernicious to states; God himself detests forgetfulness of benefactors. After God, the Israelite people owed life and liberty to Moses. "I see," says God, "that this people is stiff-necked. Let me alone, that my wrath may be angry against them and I may destroy them; and I will make you into a great nation." But the mildest of mortals, forgetful of his own dignity, intercedes for the ungrateful. If those stiff necks had obtained another prince, they would have lain crushed in the very desert among thorns and thistles. Joash removed from their midst Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, to whose father he owed his life, his kingdom, and piety more excellent than life and kingdom--so much more powerful was one unjust offense than a kingdom bestowed. Thus nothing grows old more quickly than a benefit. From this, great disasters flowed into that commonwealth.

Augustus often considered returning command to the people, but examples of an ungrateful people frightened him. He had read, in a deserted town, the epitaph of the elder Africanus, who had restored the commonwealth by conquering Carthage: “Ungrateful fatherland, you shall not even have my bones.” He knew that Africanus's brother Scipio Asiaticus, after he had filled his fatherland with the riches of the most opulent part of the world, was ordered to be led to prison as one accused of embezzlement. There came to his mind the unworthy death of the younger Africanus, which found no avenger in the Forum. The speech of Publius Lentulus was in men's hands, in which he reproached the people for ingratitude and prayed to the gods that he might never return to his fatherland; and he died in Sicily. He also knew that Cicero had been driven out, that slight gratitude had been shown to Pompey, and that death had even been inflicted upon Caesar. And so, from fear of ingratitude, he retained the scepter and, under the most savage tyrants,

[Printed page 132]

brought it about that Rome should serve.

The Roman people owed much to those men because they did not think about avenging the old wrongs; for what could those men not have done--supreme commanders of their own times--if they had gone over even to enemies who were not strong? Sertorius taught what they could have done; the tyrants who followed taught it. Greece's greatest men were Solon, Miltiades, Aristides, Themistocles, Alcibiades, and Phocion. All of them were, as Themistocles used to relate, plane trees beneath which the people took refuge when a storm raged, but which they abandoned when the sky was clear. And although no one avenged his injuries, yet if Themistocles had preferred to pour out his fatherland's blood rather than drink bull's blood, he would have destroyed the three foul beasts of Athens: the owl, the dragon, and the disorderly people. Therefore those men perceived that their beneficent deeds perished, and they drew others back from benefits. For he who bestows upon the ungrateful sends benefits into a perforated cask, while there are as many cracks in the commonwealth's cask as there are forgetful, ungrateful, and malicious souls.

When Pythius, the son of Atys, had won Xerxes over by means of an army, money, and obedience, Xerxes overturned all those benefits when Pythius asked that, out of five sons, he might be permitted to retain one as a consolation for his old age--and he lost him. For Xerxes, provoked, immediately commanded that Pythius's eldest son, whom the unhappy love of his father had desired, be cut through the middle. Nor did he wish his cruel ingratitude to be concealed, for he ordered the parts of the corpse to be set out on either side of the road so that the army might pass through their midst. I judge Xerxes to have been conquered on that day on which, by this mournful proof, he displayed an ungrateful spirit to so many peoples whom he could scarcely bind to himself by benefits. For who would take up arms for such a monster? Who would not believe that it would go well with the human race if so malignant a spirit were removed from its midst? Pindar said too little:

Παλαιὰ μὲν εὔδει χάρις, ἀμνήμονες δὲ βροτοί.

Ancient gratitude indeed sleeps, but mortals are forgetful.

He said too little, I say: new, fresh, flourishing, and living gratitude sleeps; and men are not merely unmindful, but do not even feel gratitude. Emperor Frederick complained that men were made faithless by benefits. It is so, because great benefits furnish an opportunity for displaying faithlessness. The ungrateful man therefore turns the poison upon himself while he alienates everyone from himself. “To this ungrateful man,” says Seneca in Book IV *On Benefits*, “who is a defrauder of benefits and whose spirit has fallen wholly in this direction, no one will give a benefit any more than he will entrust money to a bankrupt or commit a deposit to a man who has already denied several deposits.”

§ 6. Therefore let the prince be grateful, and the commonwealth grateful; but let it bestow gifts in such a manner that it makes no one an object of fear to itself. Let it give quickly and honorably, and let its gifts be lasting and splendid. But those who receive should know that they owe not only gratitude, but also a lawful use of the benefit, so that they may turn it toward the safety and liberty of the commonwealth. Meanwhile, let princes consider as addressed to themselves what Seneca admonishes in his book *On Benefits*:

“There is no reason, however, why the multitude of the ungrateful should make us slower to deserve well. For first--as I have said--we increase that multitude ourselves; then, not even sacrilegious men and those who neglect the immortal gods deter the gods from this so lavish benignity. They employ their own nature and assist all things, and among them even the wicked interpreters of their gifts. Let us follow them as guides, so far as human weakness permits: let us give benefits, not put them out at interest. He deserves to be deceived who, when he gave, thought about receiving back. ‘But it turned out badly.’ Both children and spouses have disappointed our hope; nevertheless we both rear children and marry, and we are so persistent against experience that, though conquered, we return to wars, and, though shipwrecked, to the seas. How much more fitting it is to persist in giving benefits! If anyone does not give because he has not received back, he gave in order to receive, and makes a good case for the ungrateful, for whom it is shameful not to repay if they are also permitted to do so. How many are unworthy of the light? And nevertheless the day arises. How many complain that they were born? Nevertheless nature begets new offspring and permits even those who would prefer not to have existed to exist. It is the property of a great and good spirit not to pursue the fruit of benefits but the benefits themselves, and even after wicked men to seek a good man.”

CHAPTER IX

The Prince and the Commonwealth Ought to Be Liberal

§ 1. In Chapter XVI Machiavelli commends to his prince the appearance of liberality, but in reality avarice. First, indeed, he does not deny that it would be best for the prince to be regarded as liberal; but surely it is better that he both be liberal and be regarded as such. For if he is not truly liberal but only hunts after the reputation, he will cast himself and the commonwealth into great evils: either, liberal only in countenance and words, he will deceive men and thus incur hatred, and by delaying his benefits will himself spoil them; or, by failing to observe a measure, he will take away from the worthy what he may bestow upon the unworthy.

§ 2. Next, he rightly reproves the man who, in order to retain the name of beneficence, pours out everything, who must thereafter turn to plunder and rapine, and whom public hatreds will easily overthrow, since he takes from all what he gives to a few. Third, he says that it is better for him to be sparing, for in this way all from whom he has taken nothing will be his friends. Fourth, that a reputation for liberality is necessary to those who are about to seize a principality. Finally, he advises him to be generous with what belongs to another.

And again, if someone were to say that many princes have existed who performed great deeds with their armies and yet excelled in that beneficence, it must be said that a prince makes expenditures either from his own goods or from those of others. If the former, he ought to be sparing; if the latter, it is necessary that he omit no part of liberality. But this liberality is necessary to a prince who leads an army on an expedition--an army that must be maintained by booty, pillaging, and tribute--and who handles the goods of others; otherwise the soldiers would not follow him. What is not yours or your people's can be conferred more liberally, as it is agreed was done by Cyrus, Caesar, and Alexander. For what you spend from another's goods does not diminish your reputation but rather makes it more abundant; but from the consumption of your own resources comes detriment to you. And there is nothing that consumes itself more than liberality, in the use of which you lose the ability to use it and are reduced to want or to contempt of you; or, if you judge poverty to be avoided, you then turn to rapine and to procuring hatred for yourself.

This counsel is wicked, for in order that princes may appear liberal, he commands them to be robbers and plunderers of the whole world. But that course turned out well neither for Cyrus, nor for Alexander, nor for Caesar--wealthy brigands--and it will not turn out well for any prince. Apart from the civil wars, Caesar cut down eleven hundred thousand human beings, and almost always had avarice as the cause of his wars; at last he paid for all those things with his own wounds. Alexander was harassed by a brief enjoyment of goods ill-gotten, and he devoted his whole progeny to the vengeance of the nations he had violated. Cyrus's insatiable greed wasted away in human blood.

[Printed page 133]

Yet I advise this to a prince: if he wages a just and lawful war, let him show himself munificent toward his commanders and soldiers, and let him distribute not only booty, but also villages, castles, cities, and little provinces as fiefs or on an emphyteutic tenure to those who have deserved well, together with a new title of honor. For in this way he will always secure a faithful and ready band of soldiers and commanders, because they will defend their own possessions more steadfastly than the prince's. But those matters pertain not so much to liberality as to military prudence, which I shall discuss in Book X.

§ 3. True liberality, therefore, is fitting for a prince and is especially becoming, because, as a virtue that wins the greatest favor, amid so great an abundance of material it appears altogether divine. It is a measured rule in preserving and expending wealth, holding the middle between the extremes of avarice and prodigality. In the affection it is named benignity; in the effect, beneficence. The Greeks sometimes call it ἐλευθεριότητα, sometimes δαψίλειαν; but εὐδαιμονία especially expresses the force of this virtue, for liberality places all expenditures well. And although they

are received by the ungrateful, another's baseness nevertheless does not contaminate the dignity of liberality, just as it is not contrary to the beauty of the sun that its shining rays fall into caves and sewers.

There are, moreover, two kinds of liberality: one of giving a benefit, the other of repaying one. I dealt with repaying in the preceding discussion, for it pertains to gratitude. I now deal with giving, of which the manner is likewise twofold, for it is accomplished either by service or by money. It is always a great virtue, whether it is brought forth from the treasury or from labor. "He who gives benefits," says Seneca, "imitates the gods; he who demands them back, moneylenders." Nothing is more adapted to the nature of man than liberality. For by nature we are inclined toward liberality. Nature commands human beings to benefit human beings. But it placed the prince on high so that he might demonstrate his greatness by doing good.

The beneficence which is in a prince also has this feature, that it is most properly called liberality. For it is so called not because it is given to free men, but because it proceeds from a free spirit—one not coerced, not bound, and not demanding repayment. The prince is supremely free in giving; neither fear extorts his liberality nor hope bids for it. Nature commends beneficence to all; the prince, because he is a father, and the commonwealth, because it is a mother, and both, because each is rich, ought to exercise it. For a prince to be conquered in arms is human; to be conquered in liberality is disgraceful. Anaxilaus was capable of a great monarchy, for he judged the happiest thing in a kingdom to be not to be conquered in benefits. I consider it a great thing among human affairs to be incapable of being conquered in this way; yet I consider that kings can be conquered. For it is a matter of great virtue to be the friend and intimate of a prince who can easily be offended and, when offended, can do much harm. To be the prince's friend, I say—not the friend of his purple, nor of one's own hope.

Nor did Alexander define the best king badly: he is the one who binds both friends and enemies by benefits. By benefits, not words; for liberality in words together with a restriction of benefits scarcely becomes even a private person, and that pretence cannot be concealed for even one year. For when many petitioners understand that words have been given them, they think themselves mocked by a flattering prince, not assisted by a beneficent one. Only by a favorable interpretation might a prince approve the softened form of this:

Let him be munificent in praise, but not prodigal of gold.

For that great flatterer retains an image of liberality, and in words shows what is becoming, while avarice forbids deeds akin to the words. Yet I do not say these things in order to maintain that the affections ought not to be shown. For, as Seneca rightly admonishes in *On Benefits*, neither gold nor silver nor anything of those things which are received from one's neighbors is a benefit; rather, it is the very will of the giver. Care must be taken that the man who receives the gifts recognize this will.

Therefore let the prince determine that what Ptolemy, the richest of kings, said is true and has been set before him for imitation: "It is more kingly to enrich than to grow rich." And what Artaxerxes said with the same meaning: "It is more kingly to add than to take away."

§ 4. Therefore let the prince be generous. But in beneficence let him follow measure and reason, not impulse.

First, indeed, let him make a selection of those to whom he gives, for benefits are not to be poured out rashly upon the multitude.

When you have undertaken to bestow benefits upon the multitude,
many must be lost in order that you may place one well.

You will not understand this as though the prince ought not to show himself beneficent toward the wretched common people, for those in misery must especially be succored. But judgment ought to accompany that liberality; otherwise, if by inept largesse he fosters the vices of the people, under the appearance of liberality he deceives both himself and the peoples. The grain-distribution and the meat-distribution were a foul corruption of the Roman plebs; luxurious

ambition fattened the crowd beneath the Rostra and in the theater, which was fit for being driven to riots in every vice. Augustus condemned this, but did not dare remove it. Thus Suetonius: “He writes that he conceived an impulse to abolish the public grain-distributions forever, because through reliance upon them the cultivation of the fields had ceased; and yet he did not persevere, because he held it certain that at some time they could be restored through ambition. And so thereafter he moderated this matter in such a way that he took no less account of farmers and merchants than of the people.”

No less criminal is a false liberality of another kind, which was also prohibited. Caesar decreed, as Tacitus says in Book XIII, that no magistrate or procurator who governed a province should present a spectacle of gladiators or wild beasts or any other public entertainment. For previously they afflicted their subjects no less by such largesse than by seizing their money, while through canvassing they defended what they had committed through lust. I would not even approve the custom of the Persians, among whom it was customary for a king to deny nothing to the first petitioner. For, such is human malice, something joined with disgrace or injury could be sought, and the new king would be compelled either to dishonor the beginnings of his reign by a crime or, contrary to the received custom, to deny the requests with the reproach of avarice.

§ 5. Second, it belongs to liberality to give things that will not cause harm. I am not speaking of cruel gifts, of δῶρα ἄδωρα, of gifts that are no gifts, such as those of Heliogabalus, who scattered presents so that those running together for them would crush one another and perish transfixed upon the soldiers' shields. Rather, I speak of those gifts which do harm more secretly, such as those of Vespasian, who appointed the most avaricious men as provincial governors and afterward slaughtered them when they were full of plunder, so that he was said to use them as sponges. Why does he entrust jurisdiction to an irascible man, the treasury to an avaricious man, an army to an insolent man? He will not give even money to a prodigal any more than he will give a sword to a madman. Now it is so common that a great part of princes' gifts is lost and that a man is struck by the very adornments bestowed upon him.

Seneca says in Book IV of *On Benefits*, Chapter X: “To return a deposit is a thing desirable in itself; nevertheless, I shall not always return it, nor in any place whatsoever, nor at any time whatsoever. Sometimes it makes no difference whether I deny it or return it openly. I shall consider the advantage of the man to whom I am about to return it, and I shall refuse him the deposit if it will harm him. I shall do the same in the case of a benefit. I shall see when I give, to whom I give, in what manner, and why. For nothing must be done without reason; and it is not a benefit unless it is given according to reason, since

[Printed page 134]

reason is the companion of everything honorable. How often have we heard this utterance from men reproaching their own ill-considered gift: ‘I would rather have lost it than given it to that man’? An ill-considered gift is the most shameful kind, and it is much more grievous to have given a benefit badly than not to have received one in return. For it is another's fault that we do not receive back; that we did not choose the man to whom we would give is ours. In making my selection, I shall regard nothing less than what you suppose I will regard: from whom I am going to receive back. For I choose one who will be grateful, not one who will repay. Often a man who will not repay is grateful, and a man who has repaid is ungrateful. My assessment is directed toward the spirit. Therefore I shall pass by a rich but unworthy man; I shall give to a poor good man. For he will be grateful in the utmost want, and when he lacks everything, his spirit will remain. I do not seek profit from a benefit, nor pleasure, nor glory. Content to please one man, I shall give for this purpose, that I may do what I ought; but what I ought to do is not without selection. You ask what sort that selection will be? I shall choose a man of integrity, sincere, mindful, grateful, abstaining from another's goods, not avariciously tenacious of his own, and benevolent.”

And in Book II, Chapter XIV: “There are certain things which will harm those who command them to be given; not to give but to deny these is a benefit. Therefore we shall assess the advantage rather than the will of the petitioners. For often we desire harmful things and are not permitted to discern how pernicious they are, because affection interrupts

judgment. But when desire has subsided, when that impulse of the blazing spirit which puts counsel to flight has fallen, we detest the authors of pernicious, evil gifts. As we deny cold water to the sick, and a sword to those who mourn and are angry with themselves, or to lovers whatever their ardor seeks to use against themselves, so shall we persevere in not giving things which will cause harm, even when they ask earnestly and submissively, and sometimes even pitifully. It is proper to regard both the beginnings of one's benefits and also their ends, and to give things which delight not only when they are received but also after they have been received. There are many who say: 'I know this will not profit him, but what am I to do? He asks; I cannot resist his entreaties. Let him see to it: he will complain about himself, not about me.'"

§ 6. Third, it is neither becoming for a prince, I add, nor safe, to give without reason. Seneca says in Book II of *On Benefits*, Chapter XVI: "The frenzied Alexander, who conceived nothing in his spirit that was not grand, was giving a city to someone. When the man to whom it was being given had measured himself and shrank from the ill will belonging to so great a gift, saying that it did not suit his fortune, Alexander said, 'I do not ask what it is fitting for you to receive, but what it is fitting for me to give.' This utterance appears high-spirited and kingly, although it is most foolish. For nothing is fitting for anyone in itself; it matters what is given, to whom, when, why, where, and the other circumstances without which an account of the deed will not stand. Most swollen creature! If it is not fitting for him to receive this, neither is it fitting for you to give it. Let there be a proportion of persons and dignities; and since there is everywhere a measure of virtue, what exceeds sins equally with what falls short. Let this indeed be lawful for you, and let fortune have raised you so high that your distributions are cities: how much greater a spirit did it take not to accept them than to scatter them? Yet there is someone too small for a city to be founded in his lap. Who would think that he was going to receive, or had received, anything great when he sees an uncultivated and unworthy man made the master of a state? What will be bestowed upon veteran commanders, comrades-in-arms, and the flower of the Macedonian nobility? Each man grieves more that he has been placed after one unworthy man than that he has been made equal to many. If a city is to be given because you are king, give it to your own men and to the veterans of your father. Prince, give to the faithful; give to prudent counselors; be sparing toward lyre-players, fowlers, and entertainers--this is praiseworthy. Those men soothe the senses for a brief time; the others relieve a great part of your labors and die for you."

§ 7. Fourth, this rule must be observed: let liberality be proportionate to one's means; thus you will give without yourself being in want. Yet I forbid it to be sordid. Dio writes of Galba: "He was insatiable in heaping up money, as though he lacked many things, and he expended so little of it that he bestowed upon some men not drachmas but obols." Antigonus mocked Diogenes more in jest than from avarice. For when Diogenes asked for a talent, he refused and added that it was more than a Cynic ought to ask; but when, after being refused, Diogenes asked for a denarius, he replied that it was less than it was fitting for a king to give. Let liberality, therefore, be proportionate to one's means. In whatever way you can, be merciful: if you have much, bestow abundantly; if you have little, strive gladly to impart even a little. Aristotle says that it pertains to liberality not to bestow in such a way as to leave fewer things for oneself. For great liberality can exist even amid small resources.

Seneca says excellently in Book I of *On Benefits*, Chapter VI: "It is the spirit which exalts small things, makes sordid things illustrious, and dishonors things great and held in esteem. The things themselves which are sought have neither nature, neither of good nor of evil; it matters where the directing spirit impels them, by which a form is given to things. Therefore the benefit itself is not what is counted out or handed over. Just as even in victims, though they be the finest and shine with gold, the honor of the gods does not consist in them, but in the pious and upright will of the worshipers. And so the good are religious even with meal and a little sacrificial cake; the wicked, in turn, do not escape impiety, although they have stained the altars with much blood. If benefits consisted in things and not in the very will of doing good, they would be greater in proportion as the things which we receive are greater. But that is false. For sometimes he who gave small things magnificently binds us more: he who in his spirit equaled the riches of kings; who bestowed a little, but gladly; who forgot his own poverty while he regarded mine; who had not only the will to assist but an eager

desire; who thought that he was receiving a benefit when he gave; who gave as though he would not receive, received as though he had not given; who both seized and sought an opportunity that might profit. On the contrary, thankless are those benefits--as I have said--which, although they appear great in substance and appearance, are either extorted from the giver or fall from him; and what is given with a ready hand comes much more agreeably than what is given with a full one. 'What he conferred upon me is little, but he could do no more. But what this man gave is great; yet he hesitated, yet he delayed, yet he groaned when he gave, yet he gave haughtily, yet he paraded it about, and wished to please not the man upon whom he bestowed it. He gave to ambition, not to me.'"

§ 8. Fifth, let him also give quickly. He who was willing late was unwilling for a long time. Delayed gratitude makes a benefit unwelcome. Every benignity hastens; it is characteristic of one who acts willingly to act quickly. But in a prince inequality must especially be guarded against in this matter. He has an aged minister, a veteran commander; that man sees others enriched in a short time for slight services that involved no danger, while he himself is abandoned--and it is not so bitter to be abandoned as not even to be admitted into the crowd. Whatever they see given to men less worthy, they think has been taken from themselves. Therefore, in this matter a most honorable promptness must be established. For they cease to love a prince by whom they think themselves passed over. A stage-player or flatterer in one hour snatches away what a senator awaits for ten years, what a faithful soldier has earned with much blood. And sometimes a new lyre-player receives the rewards of a veteran commander.

But if they observe that order is preserved and that honors and riches are distributed with regard to merits, they will attempt to prove their service for the opportune time, and will judge not that they themselves have been deferred, but that others have been sent ahead.

§ 9. Sixth, a prince must often moderate his liberality not according to his own judgment but according to the good of the commonwealth, for gifts must often be conferred upon the unworthy so that they may do no harm. It pertains to the stability of rule to bind the spirits of wicked men by benefits, so that they may do harm less or later, or may abandon an altogether depraved will. At the beginning of his reign Nero bound every very powerful man to himself by largesses, as Tacitus relates.

[Printed page 135]

After a drinking-party, liberality and affability were Alexander's salvation, for one of the conspirators disclosed the devices undertaken for his murder. The wicked whom you have bought in this way will not be faithful, nor will traitors to whom you have given a price; rather, after receiving the bait, they will withdraw, lest they seem to owe obedience. Nevertheless, they will hope again.

§ 10. Seventh, to give willingly, to give quickly, and to give before you are asked are the adornments and, as it were, the seasonings of benefits. But to give even secretly and without causing shame to the recipient is greater than the gifts themselves. It is a rare virtue to be unwilling that one's liberality be known to men, and to wish it to be hidden even from the recipient. Rare, I say, and so praised in Saint Nicholas, bishop of Myra, and celebrated throughout the Christian world by the pleasantness of little gifts received with gratitude: many have given more; few have escaped the recipient's awareness. Those who give with the best spirit and do not reckon up their benefits so that they may pass into the form of a debt nevertheless desire those to whom they give to be grateful. That holy bishop wished the benefit to be pure; he permitted nothing to be deducted from it and therefore concealed it. But God, who had seen in secret, made it public in the sight of this sun, and seeks imitators.

§ 11. A liberality that supports ancient and noble families and raises up afflicted cities is welcome and suitable for strengthening a kingdom. Suetonius relates thus of Vespasian: "He was most liberal toward every class of human beings. He made up the senatorial census; he sustained impoverished men of consular rank with five hundred thousand sesterces annually; he restored to a better condition very many cities throughout the whole world which had been afflicted by earthquake or fire."

Tiberius incurred great hatred because of certain noblemen who were poor not through their own fault but through the injustice of fortune and whom he haughtily rejected. The reason is that nothing appears so wretched to everyone as nobility cast down; all favor such men, all pity them, and sometimes even their enemies do. Therefore the glorious liberality of a prince affects the spirits of all, especially those of noble and powerful men. Many examples show how much pity a noble house and disposition arouses for itself when it has undergone an unworthy fortune.

Valerius, Book VIII, Chapter I: “Aulus Gabinius, in the greatest heat of his infamy, was subjected to the votes of the people, with Gaius Memmius as his accuser, and seemed to be a man whose hope was cut off, because both the prosecution was plainly discharging its part and the supports of the defense rested upon feeble trust, while those who were judging, with headlong anger, eagerly sought the man's punishment. The lictor and prison therefore stood before his eyes. Meanwhile, all these things were dispelled by the intervention of favorable fortune. For Gabinius's son Sisenna, driven by consternation, prostrated himself as a suppliant at the feet of Memmius, seeking some alleviation of the storm from the place whence the whole violence of the tempest had burst. The insolent victor repelled him from himself with a savage countenance, struck the ring from his hand, and allowed him to lie upon the ground for some time. This spectacle caused Laelius, with all the tribes of the plebs approving, to order Gabinius released, and furnished a lesson that neither ought one insolently to abuse the outcome of prosperous affairs, nor ought anyone hastily to be broken by adverse ones.

“Likewise, Lucius Piso, accused by Publius Claudius Pulcher because he had inflicted grievous and intolerable injuries upon the allies, escaped the fear of an undoubted ruin by a chance assistance. For at the very time when grim votes were being cast concerning him, a sudden violent rainstorm broke out. And as he lay prostrate on the ground kissing the feet of the judges, he filled his face with mud. When this was seen, it transferred the whole court from severity to clemency and gentleness, because they judged that he had paid the allies sufficiently grievous penalties when he had been brought to this point of necessity: that he was compelled either to cast himself down so abjectly or to raise himself so hideously.

“Quintus Flavius the augur was prosecuted before the people by Gaius Valerius the aedile. When he had been condemned by the votes of fourteen tribes, he cried out that he, though innocent, was being crushed. Valerius replied in an equally clear voice that it made no difference to him whether he perished guilty or innocent, provided that he perished. The violence of this statement gave the remaining tribes to his adversary. He had cast down his enemy; when he believed that same man certainly ruined, he raised him up and lost the victory in the midst of victory itself.

“Marcus Aemilius Scaurus also, when accused of extortion, brought a defense so ruined and given up for lost into court that the accuser said that the law permitted him to summon one hundred and twenty men to give testimony, and that he would not object to Scaurus's acquittal if he named just as many from whom he had taken nothing in the province. Although he could not make use of so favorable a condition, nevertheless he was acquitted because of the extreme antiquity of his nobility and the recent memory of his father.”

If the people so favor the wicked--indeed, if even the sworn judges themselves do so--how much love will the commonwealth or the prince gather for itself if it makes innocent and good men, whom impoverished nobility burdens more than it adorns, equal to the honor of their birth? Lactantius spoke truly of all liberality in his book *On the Anger of God*: “Justice and beneficence are as immortal as the mind and soul, which by good works attains the likeness of God.”

§ 12. Ninth, I would also admonish the prince to exercise liberality toward his own family and agnates. But because, out of many, few sin in that direction, while the churches frequently complain that the riches of provinces are heaped upon little nephews and little kinsmen, the hand which is munificent toward its own family alone and not toward the fatherland seems instead to need restraining. I shall speak opportunely of this matter when I have treated magistrates.

§ 13. Tenth, let a prince never pour out everything from a full granary, or, as the Greeks say, from a βαθὺν σάκκον, “deep sack.” Let him give frequently and in portions. The reason is that in this way recipients will remember both the

present gift and past gifts, and benefits are heaped upon benefits; then, if they receive the whole at once, they easily run away, whereas an eager hope for the future detains those who otherwise would depart. Hence princes frequently have it in their mouth that this is given not as a gift but as an indication of favor; that it will not be the last, but will be the beginning of a more ample beneficence.

Finally, no one has received so much from a prince that he has not wished for more and does not hope for more. Seneca described this disposition in one man, but it exists in almost all, in Book II, Chapter XXVII of *On Benefits*: “Gnaeus Lentulus the augur, the greatest example of riches before his freedmen made him poor--he saw four hundred million sesterces belonging to him; I spoke precisely, for he did nothing more than see them--was of a disposition as barren as it was petty. For although he was most avaricious, he let coins escape more quickly than words, so great was his poverty of speech. Although he owed all his advancements to the deified Augustus, to whom he had brought poverty laboring beneath the honor of nobility, and though he was now the first man of the state in money and favor, he was accustomed from time to time to complain to Augustus, saying that he had been drawn away from his studies; that nothing had been heaped upon him equal to what he had lost by abandoning eloquence. But among other things the deified Augustus had also conferred this upon him: he had freed him from ridicule and useless labor. Greed permits no one to be grateful, for what is given is never enough for a depraved hope. The greater the things that have come to us, the greater the things we desire; and avarice placed amid a heap of great wealth is much more aroused, just as the force of an immense flame is fiercer the greater the conflagration from which it has flashed forth.”

Therefore a prince can enrich many, but satisfy few.

§ 14. Eleventh, care must also be taken that liberality not appear compelled. Daniel, long neglected by Belshazzar and already almost unknown, is summoned in the utmost necessity; honors and the third place in the kingdom are offered to him. But he did not want the gifts of a kingdom about to perish, which would have made his cause worse before the conqueror, and so he freely rejects them: “Let your gifts,” he says, “be yours, and give the gifts of your house to another.”

[Printed page 136]

When Antiochus and other kings of Syria were in fear and danger, their promises toward the Jews were abundant but unwelcome, because they were extorted by fear. Therefore the prince will promptly preoccupy the spirits of the nobility and the plebs by gifts and advantages. For what is given in danger they think has been thrown away because it cannot be retained, and they think it will be recalled when the fear has been removed. When the kings had been expelled and the Roman Senate saw a great mass of war approaching from Etruria, it prudently granted much to the people--indeed, it courted the people: the consul lowered the fasces; it permitted appeal to the people; it was liberal toward those bound by debt and debtors; it lived on equal terms of law with the plebs; and, what is of the highest importance for conciliating the spirits of the common people, it remitted taxes, took care for the grain supply, and gave salt without charge.

If these things are given in such a way that they appear to be gifts of necessity, besides being harmful they alienate the people still more. For from the prince's great fear and distrust of his own affairs they judge him prodigal and no longer liberal, though until now he has devoted himself to avarice. Just as, when they see merchandise thrown into the sea from a ship breaking apart, those standing on the shore, although they do not see the cause of such great losses, nevertheless infer that the passengers are in great danger, so also, when the plebs suspects hidden dangers from an avaricious prince's sudden largesse, it transfers its hopes and affections elsewhere.

§ 15. Twelfth, give to the powerful. In Tacitus, Book III, Nero binds each of the most powerful men by largesses. In a good cause, for the safety of the people, the prince will carry owls to Athens, wood into a forest, and water into the ocean. For because the greed of the rich is more aroused, and the costly life of the powerful needs many things, to conciliate them by gifts belongs to liberality; but to alienate them by neglect belongs to avarice. The prince will not

fear to imitate the example of a prudent supplanter, who said, Genesis 32:20: "I shall appease him with the gifts which go before me, and afterward I shall see him; perhaps he will be propitious to me."

§ 16. Thirteenth, since princes are in great danger of avarice and tenacity--for patrons of the treasury and of rapine are always present, and besides this human nature is greedy for riches, while with an increase in money the madness of greed is increased--he will ensure this one thing before all else: that he not be ready to receive. And so he will moderate all tolls and tributes. He will appoint just and upright collectors.

Therefore he will certainly persuade himself that such abundance as exists in bodies when a quantity of vicious humor distends them is not the support of a kingdom but its pestilence: when treasuries swell with unjust exactions, but the subjects have neither property nor any hope except in a change of affairs. Such is the prince who is never wearied τῷ κερδαίνειν--"in making gain," as Epictetus said to Hadrian. Such is the prince who heaps the riches of the world into one house, as Severus, the most avaricious of all emperors, had undertaken to do. Such was Justinian, whom Zonaras records to have been always avaricious, always needy, and often prodigal. Yet there is no need of ancient examples: the emperor of the Turks exceeds the rapacity of all, for he judges everyone's resources to be his own.

§ 17. Let a magnanimous prince weigh in his own mind that it is greater, and certainly more welcome, to benefit all than to possess great riches. For to what purpose are great treasures unjustly collected and heaped up over many years, which one Julius will break open and one Gaius will dissipate? The labor of avarice belongs to the avaricious man; the advantage belongs to his successor, and often to an enemy.

An example for us is Haolonus, mentioned in the history of Hayton the Armenian, Chapter XXVI, "Armenia." He, the brother of Mango Khan, the fourth emperor of the Tartars, baptized in the year 1258, captured Baghdad, or Babylon, and ordered the caliph to be brought to him and all his treasure to be carried to him. Haolonus then said to him, "Why did you not summon your neighbors and mercenaries to you with so great a treasure, to defend you and your country from the incursions of the Tartars?" He replied, "I seemed to myself to have enough strength if I fought with my own men alone." Haolonus answered, "You are the master of all who believe in Mohammed the false prophet; therefore so great a master ought to be nourished by no food other than this treasure. Let this be your food." Thus he shut him inside a chamber filled with gold and gems, without any food, and compelled him to die of starvation.

Midas's fate in this respect was milder, for by his touch he turned everything into gold; for at least he delighted his eyes by variety and transformations of things.

Deadly money adheres to an avaricious prince no less than to private persons, and it is not torn away without feeling. Avarice may even appear to be proof of a great spirit: it lies upon heaps of gold and silver, cultivates fields under the names of provinces, and under each individual steward possesses territories wider than those which consuls used to receive by lot. This vice is fatal among the powerful. For they draw not merely estates and houses, but kingdoms and nations into their patrimonies. They join not only house to house and couple field to field, but join kingdoms to kingdoms and seas to seas, and expend the deaths of nations upon a single title.

CHAPTER X

Parsimony Is Necessary to the Commonwealth, and Prodigality Pernicious

§ 1. Parsimony, which the Greeks call φειδωλ, remains joined to liberality by a perpetual bond; indeed, it is the fountain and sinew of liberality. It is a rich and present revenue, a short road to wealth for private persons, and a most honorable road to supreme power for a prince and a commonwealth. I do not define it by the sordidness of certain men, which disgraces even private persons. I detest the Phasaelites and the Sidetans, the extremes among the Pamphylians, because they gave occasion to a proverb. Nor do I judge that Fabricius, cooking a turnip more for a display of glorious sordidness than from political moderation, acted rightly. Blessed are those who have held the mean. Let the commander's table be furnished with liberal and manly parsimony; let tribunes, centurions, and every very brave man be invited as testimony to fidelity and valor. Let no prince imitate those things which the Romans themselves preferred to admire rather than follow. Nor are these precepts of the times but of nature, which placed majesty in a prince together with liberality. Pyrrhus, a commander of such great prudence and of such great armies, at the same period treated his own men with liberal magnificence and was a match for the Romans.

Parsimony, therefore, is the virtue by which men acquire property, preserve what has been acquired, increase it, and restore it, by a lawful and honorable measure and toward a good end. In this no less does the splendor of liberality shine forth than in conferring gifts. Nor, among the people, is the esteem of parsimony which retains less than that of liberality which expends. Its end is not only that the treasury may be equal to expenditures and that the province may have a reserve fund laid up against the uncertainties of the times, but also that it may not be necessary to oppress any of the subjects with tributes. This benefit extends widely, for it is conferred upon all from whom nothing is taken away. Then, a prince will never be poor if he is sparing. It is agreed that in our own time many ecclesiastical and secular princes have gathered great riches from provinces of moderate size not only without vexing their people, but have also restored many towns, villages,

[Printed page 137]

monasteries, and churches. Certainly the Most Reverend Julius, Bishop of Würzburg, after endowing the academy, furnishing a distinguished and wealthy poorhouse, and building and restoring citadels, monasteries, and churches, left the commonwealth in the best condition; and yet he did not manage its economy unbecomingly and displayed magnificence in many things.

§ 2. Therefore let the first consideration make the prince sparing, not avaricious. Long experience has taught that nothing illustrious has been accomplished except by sparing men. For although Caesar and Alexander were prodigal at the beginning, they nevertheless acted thus, especially in civil wars, from necessity, not from liberality or prodigality. It is more difficult to retain command than to acquire it: it is seized by force, but retained by justice, industry, parsimony, and a treasure stored away for uses. Alexander was avaricious, not sparing, and sometimes prodigal; nevertheless he attempted to establish his kingdom by riches and parsimony. Certainly he retained much from the spoils of the East: his noble but unfortunate defendant objected to him that thirty thousand mules carried captive gold for him. Caesar, now victorious, demanded money back from Antony; and when Antony indignantly said, "Money from me, Caesar? Did he conquer without me? Why do I not rather demand it from him?" Caesar compelled him to pay. Nero, after pouring out his resources, turned to rapine. And he taught that what Timotheus once reproached Aristophon with was most true: "For him to whom nothing is enough, nothing is shameful." He must take from another who cannot borrow from himself--that is, from parsimony. For this counsel from Socrates was also given to kings, although it was spoken to Aeschines as a private man: παρ' ἑαυτοῦ δανείζεσθαι, "to borrow at interest from oneself." Poverty will halt at whatever place frugality has taken its stand.

§ 3. The second rule of parsimony is that they not give where they ought not, but give where giving is required. How many errors are committed in this matter I shall say elsewhere, when I teach my prince to gather riches. Now I admonish that much is often given to the devil, little to Christ. Let us listen instead to the discourse of the bishop and martyr of Carthage, in his book *On Works and Alms*:

“Let each man place before his eyes the devil springing forth into the midst with his servants--that is, with the people of perdition and death--and, with Christ himself present and judging, challenging the people of Christ to an examination of comparison and saying: ‘For those whom you see with me, I neither received blows nor endured scourges, nor bore the cross, nor poured out blood, nor redeemed my household at the price of suffering and gore; but neither do I promise them the heavenly kingdom nor call them back anew to paradise with immortality restored. And what precious gifts, what great gifts, sought by what excessive and long labor, they procure for me with the most costly preparations, either pledging or selling their property to procure the gift! And unless the presentation turns out honorably, they are cast out with abuse and hissing and are sometimes almost stoned by popular fury.

“‘Show your gift-givers to be such men, O Christ: admonished by your precepts and about to receive heavenly things in return for earthly ones, those rich men, those men overflowing with abundant resources. In the Church, with you presiding and looking on, do they present a gift of this kind, their property pledged or sold--indeed, transferred to the heavenly treasures by a change of possession for the better? In these fleeting and earthly gifts of mine, no one is fed, no one clothed, no one sustained by the solace of any food or drink. All things perish amid the fury of the one presenting them and the error of the spectator, through the prodigal and foolish vanity of pleasures which frustrate. There, in your poor, you are clothed and fed; you promise eternal life to those who work, and scarcely are your men, who are honored by you with divine recompenses and heavenly rewards, made equal to mine, who are perishing.”

§ 4. Amid such great preparations, how often is hunger imposed upon the poor? Indeed, the poor are bought so that they may be torn apart, as the cruelty of the amphitheater commanded to be done. But since both parsimony and prodigality are discerned in various things, profusion must be avoided by a prince in absolutely all of them. For if, by the law of the Twelve Tables, the administration of a patrimony is taken away from a prodigal no less than from a madman, who would bear a king prodigal of his own peoples? Who would wonder at sedition amid such contempt of the subjects? Antiochus was prodigal of riches and contemptuous toward his own people. “It happened,” 2 Maccabees 4:30, “that the Tarsians and Mallotians raised a sedition because they had been given as a gift to the concubine of King Antiochus.”

The frugality of others consists in their table, as did that of Severus, of whom Lampridius says: “This was his daily provision for a banquet: thirty sextarii of wine for the whole day; thirty pounds of fine bread; fifty pounds of the bread which followed, for distribution. For from his own hand he always gave the attendants at the banquet both bread and portions either of vegetables, meat, or legumes, behaving with altogether elderly maturity as the father of a household. Thirty pounds of different meats were also prescribed, and there were chickens and eggs; a goose was also employed on feast days. On the Kalends of January, however, and on the festivals of the Mother of the Gods, the Apollinarian Games, the banquet of Jupiter, the Saturnalia, and feast days of this sort, a pheasant was served, and sometimes even two were set out, with two chickens added. He had a hare daily and game frequently, but divided it with his friends, and especially with those whom he knew not to have it of themselves. Nor did he send any of such gifts to rich men, but always received them from those men. He had daily four sextarii of millet without pepper, and two with pepper.”

§ 5. The prodigality of others was immense, as the same author relates monstrous things of Antoninus Heliogabalus. “He had couches made of solid silver, both dining-couches and bedroom-couches. He quite often ate, in imitation of Apicius, the heels of camels, combs cut from living chickens, and tongues of peacocks and nightingales, because whoever ate these was said to be safe from epilepsy. He also presented to the courtiers immense feasts filled with the entrails of mullets, the brains of flamingos, eggs of partridges, brains of thrushes, and heads of parrots, pheasants, and peacocks. Indeed, he ordered so many beards of mullets to be presented that he served them in place of cress, parsley, bean-plants, and fenugreek in full bean-dishes and platters--a thing especially astonishing. He fed dogs with the livers

of geese.” What will you do with this monster, to whom so many things that would cause harm--indeed, so many evils--were pleasing?

§ 6. Some have exhausted themselves by the prices of clothing, something frequent among private persons. Gaius Caligula, the heir of the most avaricious Tiberius, poured out everything in every manner. “He put on no garment twice,” says Suetonius, Chapter III. “He gambled at dice for four hundred thousand sesterces on a single throw. He fished with a gilded net, with cords woven of purple and scarlet. He is said never to have made a journey with fewer than one thousand carriages, with silver shoes for his mules, muleteers clothed in Canusian cloth, and a band of litter-bearers and runners adorned with bracelets and trappings.” What ornament must we believe to have been absent, if not the necks but the hooves of asses were shod underneath with silver?

The prince will take the greatest care that citizens not burden themselves by the expense of dinners or clothing. From this come many destructions of souls. Thus Propertius once sang:

The matron walks forth clothed in the wealth of her descendants,
and draws the spoils of our reproach across our faces.

The luxury of clothing is very often derived from the wages of a prostitute. Spartan matrons dressed modestly; harlots splendidly.

Caligula used to boast, repeatedly saying, “A man ought to be either frugal or Caesar.” Indeed, for several days he scattered coins of no moderate sum from the roof of the Basilica Julia among the plebs. He also built Liburnian ships of cedar, with jeweled sterns, many-colored sails, great spaciousness for baths,

[Printed page 138]

porticoes, and dining rooms, and also with a great variety of vines and fruit-bearing trees, in which, reclining at table by day amid choruses and symphonies, he might traverse the shores of Campania. I judge that not even infinite worlds could suffice for this man, for there is no bottom to infinite greed.

What wonder is it that, after such great luxury, Galba's frugality in diet and his parsimony in making expenditures, as Plutarch relates, were imputed to him as sordid vices when he obtained command? For empty opinion accompanied his moderation and temperance.

Many in former times poured out everything upon mimes, human monstrosities, and parasites. Aurelian is no less to be blamed than the gullet of the man whom he fed deserves to be consigned to Orcus. These are the words of Victor: “But in a wondrous manner he delighted in mimes; and he was delighted most vehemently by Phagon, who ate so much that in one day before his table he ate an entire boar, one hundred loaves, a ram, and a little pig; and, with a funnel applied, drank more than a large jar.”

§ 7. Some men's structures have exhausted all their wealth. What wonder?

Rome will become a house; migrate to Veii, Quirites.

Rome when burned gave the greedy and needy monster an opportunity to plunder the provinces, while money was sought for the imperial city.

The prince will attend diligently to what must be given and when his hand must be drawn in. Witty and urbane was Alfonso's reply to a prodigal knight who asked for gifts inopportunely and repeatedly: “I shall sooner make myself poor than make you rich.” But sumptuary laws, economy, and the other matters must be treated minutely and individually when I discuss wealth.

§ 8. At this point I admonish that whatever is conferred upon the wretched and needy contains a promise not only of eternal life but also of temporal life. “Therefore,” says Daniel 4:24, “O king, let my counsel be pleasing to you, and

redeem your sins with alms and your iniquities with mercies toward the poor; perhaps he will forgive your offenses.” And the liberal king: “Blessed,” says Psalm 40:1, “is he who understands concerning the needy and the poor; on the evil day the Lord will deliver him. May the Lord preserve him and give him life, and make him blessed upon the earth, and not deliver him into the soul of his enemies. The Lord will bring him aid upon the bed of his sorrow; you have turned all his couch in his infirmity.”

Tiberius replied excellently to Sophia, an avaricious and scheming woman, that he in no way obstructed the advantages of the treasury who assisted the poor and redeemed captives. Divine liberality showed this also by a distinguished miracle, when the treasure of Narses the eunuch was disclosed. This happened in the year of Christ 582, by which God adorned liberality toward the poor with so illustrious a testimony.

Radegund, the captive Thuringian and wife of Chlothar, experienced no lesser beneficence: when from a vessel of eight modii, as the history calls it, she drew forth wine for the poor, the cup was always full. It pleased God to give to the most holy queen material equal to her spirit. When Gualbertus had distributed grain from the third hour all the way to the ninth, supplements were given by a hidden power so that abundant produce filled the granary. Greatest in this virtue, as always, was Flavius Constantine, who by a law promulgated in the year 322 commanded that the poor be fed from the public granaries. O God, how far did that soul then differ from the ancient executioners, who bought the poor for the sword, the mines, naval combats, and wild beasts? The same liberality was in his son Constans, who sent Paul and Macarius through Africa with alms; and by that liberality he raised up the Church, oppressed by the Donatists, something that until then had been attempted in vain by so many laws.

He who is God, rich toward all, is never conquered by human liberality; and I judge that there is no one to whom what he has expended toward his neighbors with a benign spirit has not been repaid with much interest. Saint Germanus, as Constantius the priest relates in his life, had ordered three gold pieces to be given to beggars. The deacon--as the spirits of ministers are solicitous--had expended two; but a little afterward two hundred were returned to the holy bishop. It was signified by an oracle that there would have been three hundred, so that a hundredfold might be returned even in this life, if the deacon's avarice, by retaining one, had not lost one hundred.

Therefore, care of the poor is a support of the kingdom; but the care is twofold: first, that they not be the prey of the rich; second, that they be enriched by the commonwealth and the prince. Euphemianus, the parent of Saint Alexius, was of a noble and truly Roman spirit. If ever he had been less benign toward the poor, as a severe exactor of liberality he thought that the accounts stood against himself, and, prostrate upon the ground, cried out with voice and tears: “I am not worthy to walk upon the earth of my God.”

§ 9. Prostrate your heart before your God, O prince, from whose single, brief, and slight pleasure--better omitted--a thousand poor persons could have been refreshed. See also whether your delights have been collected from the sweat of a thousand poor persons. Weigh in your spirit not what great men do, but what ought to be done.

CHAPTER XI

Affability Is a Distinguished Ornament of Citizens and Princes

§ 1. Saint Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, Question 114, Article 1, refers affability, which the Greeks name εὐπροσηγορίαν, to the virtue of justice. Under this I also place courtesy, humanity, εὐτραπελίαν, and φιланθρωπίαν, which are nearly the same virtues, or certainly very closely neighboring ones. Affability holds the mean between contentious quarrels and flatteries. For it so moderates fellowship and friendship by words and deeds that, through its humanity, it delights others becomingly and for a good end. Courtesy, or urbanity, which the Greeks call εὐτραπελίαν, moderates severity or moroseness, and excessive relaxation, which they are accustomed to call buffoonery, and which the Apostle also condemns by the name εὐτραπελίαν. For nothing is more difficult than to hold the measure in courtesy and urbanity.

Humanity, according to the custom of speech, is accustomed to embrace all those things. In Sermon VIII *On the Words of the Apostle*, Saint Augustine calls him humane who shows himself a human being, and especially one who receives a human being as a guest. Φιλανθρωπία, or humanity, is a certain benevolence common toward all human beings, implanted by nature and the force of society. Those who have put it off, like that Timon μισάνθρωπος, “the misanthrope,” must be regarded as beasts--and all the more so, the more they extend deadly hatreds to the whole race. But we are now treating the humanity which is displayed by signs, words, and deeds, in which a prince ought to excel. For humane men cherish every class of human beings and repel injury from all, even from the lowly and from slaves. This also, as Aristotle admonishes, causes our spirit to be moved by the suffering of guilty men when they are tortured and torn, although you do not pity them. If this virtue has driven firm roots in the spirit, it will easily disclose itself toward others. I called it a virtue because Aristotle so teaches in his little book *On Virtues*, referring the pretence of humanity to injustice.

[Printed page 139]

But it is enough for me that my prince should φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι, “practice humanity,” showing himself benign, courteous, and affable toward everyone--as an ornament of virtue. “Humanity,” says Seneca, Epistle LXXXVIII, “forbids one to be haughty toward one's associates; it forbids one to be avaricious. In words, deeds, and affections it shows itself courteous and accessible to all. It considers no evil another's. But it especially loves its own good when that good is going to become a good for someone else.” Such a man will in no way be ἄμουσος, ἄγροδιαίτος, ἀπρόσιτος; he will appear unskilled, rustic, and difficult of access neither to his own people nor to strangers.

§ 2. Among these morose men I place those whom Seneca judges to foster a delicate kind of irascibility. They are δυσάρεστοι, “hard to please”; and therefore, since many things are done by many persons before them, while very many displease them, they must turn out bitter, harsh, irritable, rabid, clamorous, and rough. Let no senator of this kind in the senate-house, nor any prince in his court, when he is inhuman and, as the Greeks say, ἀπάνθρωπος, persuade himself that he has any human being as a friend. All services are unwelcome if courtesy is absent; all gifts are poisoned by the inhumanity of the giver. At the summit of command harshness of words is atrocious. Even when kings command arduous things, let their words be gentle.

§ 3. One objection is customarily made: authority and majesty, which those who think it beautiful to form Timons, Stoics, and Scythians out of princes suppose are brought into contempt by affability and courtesy. Authority does not lie in roughness and moroseness, but hatred does. Since everyone hates this in a prince, and concerning it they speak with one another against the prince, I do not see what authority it procures for him. Do you suppose that man possesses authority against whom this is cast:

σοὶ δέ τις ἐν στήθεσσι ἀκλήητος νόος ἐστίν;

Odyssey κ.

But in your breast there is an implacable mind.

That majesty belongs to the Cyclops, who was:

Accessible to none in countenance, nor affable to any in speech.

I would never wish the man who presides over human beings to put off humanity. Let the prince be sparing in words, stern in countenance, a strict exactor of duties. Thus he will be revered. This is well done, but let all those things in their proper place be seasoned with much sweetness; let men know that benignity is natural to the prince, and severity extorted by the vices of others. Those who make use of an inhuman prince do what mountebanks do, who lead lions, bears, or similar wild beasts about for gain at public spectacles. First, they never do anything except for their own advantage, nothing for the prince's good, for they do not love him. Next, they never entrust themselves and their own possessions to him, for they rightly hold his savage disposition in suspicion. It follows from this that they place greater trust in another prince.

The first and principal fruit of humanity is that men procure friends for themselves. There are those who prefer a prince who speaks courteously to one who gives haughtily. Caelius preferred to be consulted by Caesar rather than gilded by him.

Indulgence especially captures minds with its right hand;

harshness bears hatred and savage wars.

We hate the hawk because it always lives in arms,

and wolves accustomed to go against the fearful flock.

But the swallow is free from plots against human beings because it is gentle,

and the bird of Chaonia has towers which it may inhabit.

The man who joined the highest courtesy to the highest eloquence, Cicero, did not fail to know this; he would never have attained the consulship except through courteous and flattering eloquence. "It is difficult to say," he writes in Book II of *On Duties*, "how greatly courtesy and affability of speech conciliate the spirits of human beings." There also survive letters of Philip to Alexander, of Antipater to Cassander, and of Antigonos to Philip--three most prudent kings--in which they command them to attract the spirits of the multitude to benevolence by benign speech and to soothe soldiers by flattering discourse. This is more powerful even than lavish largesse. "What companions more fitting for liberality," says Valerius, Book V, Chapter I, "could I give than humanity and clemency? For they seek the same kind of praise: the first of these is displayed in want, the next amid occupation, the third in doubtful fortune. And although you do not know which one you should approve most, nevertheless the commendation of that one whose name was sought from the human being himself seems to run ahead."

He then proceeds to relate examples of humanity, or rather of humane liberality. Among the rest, distinguished is the deed which Alexander, mindful of his father Philip's precepts, accomplished. While Alexander traversed all nations in his tireless course, in a certain place, when oppressed by a winter storm, he noticed a Macedonian soldier, already exhausted by old age, stupefied by excessive cold, while he himself sat in a raised seat near the fire. Having made an assessment not of fortune but of the age of each, he descended, and with those hands by which he had crushed the power of Darius he placed the body doubled up by cold in his own seat, saying that what among the Persians would have been capital--occupying the royal throne--would be salutary for him.

§ 4. If that king's other deeds had been similar, neither would so many plots have surrounded him, nor would Babylonian poison have taken away from him the fruit of so many victories. What of Quintus Aelius Tubero? Did he not draw upon himself rejection and disgrace by the inhumanity of his deed? Valerius, Book VII, Chapter V: "Quintus

Aelius Tubero, when asked by Quintus Fabius Maximus--who was giving a banquet to the people in the name of his uncle Publius Africanus--to furnish the dining room, covered Punic couches with kidskins and set out Samian ware in place of silver vessels. By the ugliness of this affair he so offended everyone that, although he was otherwise regarded as an outstanding man and had descended into the Campus as a candidate in the praetorian elections, supported by Lucius Paulus his grandfather and Publius Africanus his maternal uncle, he departed from it marked by rejection. For just as they always approved continence in private, so in public the greatest care was taken for splendor. Therefore the state, believing that not merely the number present at one banquet but the whole state had lain upon those little skins, avenged the shame of the feast by its votes."

§ 5. Store also in your spirit what happened to Scipio Nasica. The affair is related thus by Valerius: "Publius Scipio Nasica, the most illustrious light of power in the toga, he who as consul declared war upon Jugurtha, who received with most holy hands the Idaean Mother as she migrated from her Phrygian seat to our altars and hearths, who suppressed many pestilential seditions by the strength of his authority, under whose leadership the Senate gloried for several years--when as a young man he sought the curule aedileship and, in the manner of candidates, grasped rather firmly the hand of a certain man hardened by rustic labor, he asked him by way of a joke whether he was accustomed to walk upon his hands. This saying, taken up by those standing around, flowed out to the people and brought about Scipio's rejection. For all the rural tribes, judging that their poverty had been reproached by him, unsheathed their anger against his insulting urbanity."

Therefore golden is the precept of that most prudent governor and bishop, Ambrose, in Book II of *Duties*, Chapter VII: "Goodness," he says, "is popular and welcome to all, and nothing so easily glides into human senses. If it is aided by gentleness of manners, accessibility of spirit, moderation of command, affability of speech, honor in words, a patient interchange of discourse, and the grace of modesty, it is incredible how greatly it advances toward the accumulation of affection. For we read not only in private persons, but even in kings themselves, how greatly

[Printed page 140]

the ease of flattering affability has profited, or how greatly pride and swelling of words have harmed, so that they shook kingdoms themselves and dissolved power."

He then adds two illustrious examples. The first is of Moses. "How great were the insults," he says, "inflicted by the people of God which Moses swallowed; and although the Lord wished to punish the insolent, he nevertheless frequently offered himself for the people, so that he might withdraw the plebs from divine indignation. With what gentle discourse after their injuries did he address the people; he consoled them in their labors, soothed them by oracles, cherished them by works; and although he spoke steadfastly with God, nevertheless he was accustomed to address human beings with a humble and pleasing appellation."

The second is of King David. "What of his imitator, holy David, chosen out of all to govern the plebs? How gentle and flattering, humble in spirit, diligent in heart, accessible in speech. Before his reign he offered himself for all; as king he placed his own military service on an equality with all and shared the labor: brave in battle, gentle in command, patient under abuse, more ready to bear injuries than to repay them. Therefore he was so dear to all that, when a young man, he was sought for the kingship even against his will and, though resisting, was compelled; when an old man, he was asked by his people not to take part in battle, because all preferred to be endangered for him rather than that he be endangered for all. Thus by gratuitous services he had bound the plebs to himself."

Humane men, therefore, attend others with benevolence, assistance, and dangers themselves; against rough men they cast this:

Ἀλλ' ἤτοι κείνον μὲν εἰσομεν, ἢ κεν ἦσιν,

ἢ κε μένη.

But let us leave that morose man alone, whether he goes or remains.

For the punishment of inhumanity is ready at hand: solitude, and the mockery of all who do not need their aid. The morose man is hated by his own people, but by strangers he is both hated and mocked. The authority of Scripture is also at hand for us here. “A sweet word,” says Scripture, Ecclesiasticus 6:5, “multiplies friends and mollifies enemies. And a gracious tongue abounds in a good man.”

Cato, with immense haughtiness, refused to hear Eumenes. Nicomedes, unmindful of royal dignity, put on the cap and professed himself a freedman of the Roman people.

§ 6. The second good of humanity, therefore, is the reconciliation of enemies. It was said to Rehoboam with good counsel, 3 Kings 12:7: “If today you obey this people, and serve them, and yield to their petition, and speak gentle words to them, they will be your servants all their days.” But he alienated them from himself by roughness. Much more prudently, when a Roman commander could restrain his mutinous soldiery neither by force nor by authority, he called them “Quirites”; by this humanity he made them obedient.

Alexander the Great dispelled, by humanity alone, the supreme danger in which he was placed. The conspirators had assembled; that night had been appointed for the crime. But when he went out and addressed the conspirators rather flatteringly--men whom he supposed had increased their watches for his protection and honor--by that courtesy he moved one of them to make a disclosure. Courtesy shining forth from serenity of countenance also brought safety to Augustus. Thus Suetonius: “Whether in conversation or silent, his countenance was so tranquil and serene that one of the leading men of the Gauls confessed among his own people that he had been restrained and softened by it, so that he did not, as he had intended, when admitted nearer under the pretence of conversation during the passage of the Alps, thrust Augustus over a precipice.”

§ 7. Am I mistaken, or is it from that unvarying humanity that today the title “Serenity” is bestowed upon the greatest kings? For humanity is in the countenance as much as in words. Serenity of countenance therefore furnished authority to a man for whom savageness and a centaur-like gloom would have been ruinous.

Let gentle words be joined to benignity of spirit and serenity of brow; for, as a queen used to say with manly prudence, silken words ought to be employed by kings. The wisest of kings instructs us excellently, Ecclesiasticus 18:15: “Son, in good things do not give a complaint, and in every gift do not give the sadness of an evil word. Will not dew cool heat? So too a word is better than a gift.”

§ 8. Lest anyone wonder, let him look at those who attempt to seize a tyranny, for they accomplish more by flatteries than by gifts. Look at Absalom, courteously saluting all, hearing their cases, embracing them, and thus enticing their spirits by an appearance of humanity, so that they preferred a parricidal son to David, their liberator and most just and brave king. Prince, I admonish you: boldly emulate Absalom for the good of the commonwealth. By a pretence of humanity he was preparing to destroy his parent and brothers and to oppress the people by tyranny; do you, by true humanity, keep spirits so bound and constrained that another's pretence does not cast you into danger.

By what did William of Nassau draw the Belgians, a most cultivated nation whose principal gift is courtesy, away from Spanish rule more than by the affability and humanity which he opposed, to its discredit, to Spanish gravity? Imitate him, whoever rules peoples, and especially you senators of cities and men of patrician blood. The greatest kings have gone before with a great example. Caesar had learned to address nearly every one of his soldiers by name. Nor was any commander loved by his soldiers for so long and so steadfastly. Antoninus the Philosopher calmly gave his right hand to those who approached and barred no one from access. Hadrian dealt most pleasantly and civilly even with the humblest citizens. Let a Christian prince do this more sincerely, to whom it is said, “Make yourself affable to the congregation of the poor,” Ecclesiasticus 4:7. For those whom he addresses, and those whom he despises, are members of Christ; Christ does not disdain to call them brothers. He ought to please those whom he commands if he desires them to be ready and brave for commands. Above all, as Antalcidas replied when asked, he pleases human beings who speaks the most pleasant things.

§ 9. How greatly this virtue of which I treat avails either for preserving or for overthrowing the commonwealth the voice of nature teaches. For all men, even kings and great men, when they are in danger, turn to humanity and courtesy. When the outcome of battles is doubtful, when spirits waver, they employ humanity alone. Therefore, if in the greatest dangers affability can sustain a tottering commonwealth and can even raise one that has fallen, who denies that it can thus be preserved? What was more abject than Pompey's party after the battle of Pharsalus, after Pompey's murder commanded by a boy king? Yet Cato raised it up, not by gifts--for he had been conquered and was an exile--but by soothing the spirits of the soldiers through humanity and binding them to himself, while he goes before, while he shows how to endure labors rather than teaches it. He stands while the camp-follower drinks. Nor throughout that whole journey could it be discerned whether he was commander or soldier, except that he was the first to undertake the greatest share of labors and dangers.

§ 10. Three things in particular must be guarded against in the courtesy of governors. First, let him not furnish easy access to the wicked, for that accessibility is not the accessibility of a modest prince but the prostitution of supreme power. Andronicus always furnished access to flute-players and harlots. The kings of the Chinese associate only with eunuchs and concubines. By that relaxation or flattery the life of the subjects is dissolved. I therefore seek a prince such as Paul the Deacon describes Valentinian in Book XI. He says that Valentinian was of an acute disposition, becoming in countenance, grave in spirit, most cultivated in speech,

[Printed page 141]

although sparing in speaking; severe and vehement in punishing crimes; industrious in business; patient in adversities; most hostile to criminals; temperate in food and drink; most friendly to those excelling in virtue and to religious men; so that by everyone's judgment he was said to be most similar in character to Emperor Aurelian. For what honor will a noble man judge to have been furnished him by the prince's accessibility if he observes that the same access always lies open to infamous persons and Jews?

Therefore let the prince's virtue profit all, but not the wicked except for their correction. For it is necessary that a prince be held in hatred by the good if they understand him to be the friend of the wicked. Alexander Severus carefully guarded against both, as Lampridius is the authority in his life: "When Septimius Arabianus, notorious for the crime of thefts and already set free under Heliogabalus, had come among the senators to salute the prince, he exclaimed: 'O divine powers, O Jupiter, O immortal gods! Arabianus not only lives but even comes into the Senate. Perhaps he also hopes for something from me; he judges me to be so foolish, so stupid.' He was saluted by name, that is, 'Hail, Alexander.' If anyone bowed his head or said anything too flatteringly, he was either cast aside as a flatterer, if the quality of his station permitted, or was mocked with immense laughter if his dignity could not be subjected to a graver injury. When saluted, he offered a seat to all senators; and indeed he admitted to the salutation none but honorable men and men of good reputation."

§ 11. The second is that by excessive accessibility he not come too near to flattery and blunt the force of command. Excessive familiarity is not to be borne even in a father. Gravity must be retained, self-seeking must be removed. "Gravity shines forth pleasantly when haughtiness has been removed," said a good poet and the best senator. Nor is the proverb empty, but taken from experience:

Καλὸν φύει καρπὸν οἱ σεμνοὶ τρόποι.

Splendor and gravity of character bear the most beautiful fruits. Through mere familiarity with excessively flattering masters, fear grows obsolete among slaves. It is as harmful for them not to fear as it is hard to obey a cruel master. Flattering men grow cheap through association.

§ 12. The third is that by accessibility and courtesy he not prostitute his fidelity: let him not promise things which he does not intend to discharge. Vespasian gave counsel altogether most badly for his reputation and, if he had lived longer, for his safety. For when many petitioned, he himself, rich in promises, promised everything; when asked the

cause, he replied, "It is not becoming that anyone depart sorrowful from Caesar." The utterance is more splendid than prudent, and therefore neither true nor useful to the prince. Neither frugality nor the treasury suffices for so many expenditures and disbursements as are demanded by the desires of many thousands. Therefore he cannot satisfy all; for this reason he must not promise to all.

For when something has been promised by the princely voice, they think it is owed. When they perceive that they have been mocked by a joyful countenance, or held in suspense, they conceive the gravest indignation and judge themselves to have been affected by an injury if the benefit has been denied. And although what was wickedly sought is deservedly denied, nevertheless, after it has been promised, if it is not given, they accuse the prince's fidelity. For it belonged to prudence to examine the justice of the requests before the promises. Otherwise the prince is judged to have promised either rashly or fraudulently. Thus no one will depart joyful from him; for however much he promises mountains of gold, nevertheless, since he has so often deceived, he will not create trust. There is no need to explain how shameful it is, after flattering indications of a beneficent will and after fidelity has been bound by a promise, still to doubt the prince's intention, since even private and slender men count this dishonorable for themselves. And so Vespasian was hated, and after he had deceived a few no one thereafter trusted him.

§ 13. What certain princes possess is not courtesy but pusillanimity, so that they think it kingly to promise many things but to prevent them from being granted through administrators. He promises abundantly to the petitioner, takes care that letters be written, and entrusts execution to the satrap or quaestor; meanwhile, either the form of the letters or the manner of the mandate is such that the ministers understand that the man is being led on by an empty hope and has received words. In this matter, indeed, there are many offenses: the prince's fidelity is prostituted; the immense hatred of the man who is exposed to mockery is contracted without cause; authority grows cheap among the officials. For they never trust his countenance, never his words, by which they have experienced so many men led into deceit. At last they are also indignant that they are ministers of most mendacious courtesy; and they rightly foretell that they themselves will be remunerated not with wealth or dignities but with the benevolence of words. This is to be mocked by one's own prince.

Therefore let the prince's courtesy be honorable, grave, and faithful. By this he will lead where he wishes--not wild beasts, like Orpheus, nor stones, like Amphion, but human beings following of their own accord. And with the easiest labor he will gather the most abundant fruits.

It belongs especially to humanity to hear everyone. Law 6, π ; law *Adducis*, title *On Appeals*. Antonius Perezius says well: "If a prince denies an audience to the people, neither do the people furnish him their spirit." Demetrius wickedly cast the petitions of suppliants into the river in their presence.

CHAPTER XII

Chastity Ought to Be a Matter of Great Care in the Commonwealth

§ 1. The prudence of the prince and of the whole commonwealth, justice, and the virtues connected with them have been discussed; it follows that I deliver precepts concerning temperance, which is especially concerned with moderating pleasures by reason. Its principal parts are chastity and sobriety; gentleness and clemency are annexed to it. These must be discussed in order.

I join chastity and modesty, although the former restrains lust, while the latter removes the signs of wantonness through shame. The thing itself altogether teaches that lust and every incitement to lust must be removed from the commonwealth. Distinguished is Agapetus's precept and his serious admonition to his prince:

Βασιλέα σε κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὀρίζομαι, ὥς βασιλεύειν, καὶ κρατεῖν, τῶν ἡδονῶν δυνάμενον, καὶ τὸν στέφανον τῆς σωφροσύνης ἀναδήσαμενον.

I define you as an emperor in truth, since you are able to rule and hold pleasures under your power, and are bound with the diadem of temperance.

§ 2. Reader, I beg you--whether concern for the court and princely counsels occupies you, or you deliver your opinion among fellow senators--I beg you not to pass over this part of the discussion as though it pertained only to churches and monasteries. It is of principal concern to the commonwealth that both princes and private persons live chastely and modestly. The causes and origins of wars and tumults, and the manifold occasions for overturned kingdoms, have very frequently been lust. Seditions arise from injustice, fear, and contempt. Aristotle says in Book V of the *Politics*, Chapter X:

Τῆς δὲ ἀδικίας μάλιστα δι' ὕβριν.

But out of every kind of injury, they arise especially on account of insult. Of the attacks that are made upon kings or tyrants, some are made upon the body and head of the princes themselves,

[Printed page 142]

and others upon the principality. Those which are made on account of insult pertain to the body. Since insults have many kinds and many parts, each of them arouses anger. Indeed, of those who become angry, almost all invade another for the sake of avenging an injury received, not for the sake of preeminence.

For example, the attack upon the Pisistratids was made because they had affected Harmodius's sister with disgrace and dishonor and had attempted to inflict sexual violation upon Harmodius. For Harmodius attacked them because of his sister, Aristogiton because of Harmodius. Men also plotted against Periander, tyrant of Ambracia, because, while they were drinking together, he asked a boy who was with him and whom he kept among his delights whether he was already pregnant by him. Violence was inflicted upon Philip by Pausanias because Philip had permitted him to be affected with insult and dishonor by Attalus without punishment; upon Amyntas, surnamed the Little, by Derdas, because Amyntas had boasted that he had enjoyed his youthful age; and upon the eunuch by Evagoras the Cyprian. For because that man's wife had been taken from him by the eunuch's son, he killed him as though he had received an insult.

Many attacks were also made upon certain monarchs because they had taken chastity from someone by violating his body--for example, Crateus's attack upon Archelaus. For Crateus always bore it gravely and painfully that Archelaus had intercourse with him for the sake of violation. And so, although the following pretext was far slighter and this cause less weighty, it was nevertheless sufficiently suitable and just: that Archelaus had given him in marriage none of

the daughters whom he had promised to give him. Rather, he betrothed the elder to the king of Elimea while entangled in the war which he waged with Sirras and Arrhabaeus, but the younger to Amyntas's son, thinking that by this arrangement the latter, especially since he had been born from Cleopatra, would by no means dissent from him. But the origin of the estrangement from the prince was that Crateus had borne it grievously that he had submitted to his lust in sexual matters.

Hellanocrates of Larissa attacked him together with Crateus and for the same cause. For when he saw that he was not recalled from exile by the man to whom he had given the flower of his age to be used and enjoyed, especially since Archelaus had promised that he would do this, he judged that the intimacy with him had been instituted not because of amorous desire but for the sake of insult. Parrhon and Heraclides of Aenus killed Cotys, avenging an injury to their father. Adamas abandoned Cotys and revolted from him because he judged himself affected with insult in having been castrated by him when he was a boy.

It is indeed so. A foreign woman overturned Troy. Lavinia in turn delivered Italy, and in turn incestuous marriage-beds, to the descendants of Troy. A stranger's love crushed the newness of the Punic kingdom and its rising citadels, and delivered them into the hands of the barbarian Hiarbas.

That virtue was rare among the nations. Therefore, when Valerius invokes it, he scarcely finds where it may have a place: "Whence," he says in Book VI, Chapter I, "shall I invoke you, Chastity, the principal support equally of men and women? For you inhabit the hearths of Vesta consecrated by ancient religion. You lie upon the couches of Capitoline Juno. By constant station you frequent the summit of the palace, the august household gods, and the most sacred marriage-bed of the Julian clan. By your protection the insignia of boyhood are defended. Out of regard for your divinity, the uncorrupted flower of youth remains. With you as guardian, the matron's robe is esteemed. Be present, therefore, and acknowledge what you yourself wished to be done." But chastity wanders far from these things.

The cause of so great an evil is that God delivered them into passions of dishonor. For such grave vices followed idolatry. Tertullian explained this in his book *On Modesty*, Chapter V, where he places fornication midway between idolatry and murder: "There is also a dignity of evil in that it is placed at the summit or in the midst of the worst things. I behold a certain pomp and raised platform of adultery: on this side a procession led by the idolatry which precedes it; on that side an escort furnished by the murder which follows it. Without doubt, it has taken its seat worthily between the two most eminent pinnacles of crimes, and through their midst it has filled, as though vacant, a place of equal authority in guilt. Who will tear it, enclosed by such sides and supported by such ribs, from the body of the things adhering to it--from the bond of neighboring crimes, from the embrace of kindred wicked deeds--so as to separate it alone for the fruit of repentance? Will not idolatry on this side and murder on that side detain it? And if they have any voice, they will cry out: 'This wedge is ours; this joining is ours. We are marked off by idolatry; with it distinguishing us, we are joined. We attend upon it as it shines forth from our midst. Divine Scripture has embodied us together; the letters themselves are our glues; now it cannot exist without us. I indeed, idolatry, very frequently supply occasion for adultery. My groves know, and my mountains, and living waters, and the very temples in cities, how much we procure for the overthrow of chastity.'" Thus idolatry was the common bawd of the world, the procuress of lusts, and the violator of marriages.

§ 3. But Seneca is the best witness to the morals of his own time, in Book III of *On Benefits*, Chapter VI: "Then he does not desire it to become known to all how many are ungrateful, for the multitude of sinners will take away shame from the thing, and a common curse will cease to be regarded as a disgrace. Does any woman now blush at divorce, after certain illustrious and noble women reckon their years not by the number of consuls but by the number of husbands, and depart for the sake of marriage and marry for the sake of divorce? That was feared so long as it was rare; but because no public records were without divorce, by often hearing of it they learned to do it. Is there now any shame in adultery, after matters have reached such a point that no woman has a husband except to provoke her adulterer? Chastity is a proof of ugliness. What woman will you find so wretched, so sordid, that a single pair of adulterers is enough for her, unless she has divided the hours among individual men and the day is not sufficient for

all; unless she has been carried to one and remained with another? She is uncultivated and old-fashioned who does not know that the adultery of one man is called marriage. Just as shame for these offenses has now vanished after the practice wandered more widely, so you will make the ungrateful more numerous and more daring if they begin to count themselves.” Histories teach that what Seneca says is truth, not hyperbole.

Thus, under such morals, the mass of so great an empire could not stand. And although, through the zeal of brave and sometimes prudent emperors--Vespasian, Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines--it moved its arms, at last it grew languid and served barbarians.

Therefore, let those who deny that chastity is necessary to rulers, and who do not disapprove the Babylonians, Corinthians, and Sybarites, look upon the transformations not of one commonwealth but of the whole world. After all flesh of the primeval world had corrupted its way, the cataclysm destroyed it by inundation. The sorrowful monuments of the Sodomites and Gomorrheans remain to the present day. The destructions of the Midianites and Benjaminites are recalled daily. A son rebelled against David the adulterer. At Rome kingship ended through adultery, and the decemvirate was abolished through lust. Every age has had lusts and punishments for lusts. The immodesty of the Sybarites was punished with such severity by the Crotoniats that “Sybaritic evils” passed from it into a proverb. Lacedaemon paid grievous penalties for impious lust when its strength was worn down in the battle of Leuctra. The Volsinians were thus reduced to servitude. Philip of Macedon was killed because he did not avenge the obscene injury inflicted by Attalus. Bryas was stripped of command because of violence inflicted upon another's betrothed. Antiochus, king of Syria, called θεός, “God,” was killed by Laodice because he had married Berenice. Ptolemy Philopator perished after being attacked by plots even from his wife. Antoninus

[Printed page 143]

Verus, poured out into wandering lusts, was killed with poison by his wife Lucilla. Fredegund, his mistress, killed Chilperic, king of France and infamous for adulteries, through Landeric. Julian, a nobleman, attacked Roderic, king of the Goths in Spain and the violator of his daughter, with a most grievous war; for after the Saracens and Moors had been brought into alliance, the Goths conquered, and seven hundred thousand human beings slain, the Spains were oppressed by the harshest and most enduring servitude, into which one man's lust cast them. Why should I recall the Sicilian Vespers, in which the Gauls were slain as though in a single hour, and the right to the kingdom was transferred to Constance, Frederick's wife? A great disaster was inflicted upon a most noble kingdom when it was deprived of the strength of that island. The cause was the wantonness of governors and soldiers.

Therefore divine justice, always vigilant as the avenger of luxury, rises vehemently against lusts even in this life. “Adultery and fornication are a fire consuming even to destruction and rooting out all offspring,” Job 31. “He who is an adulterer, through want of heart, will destroy his own soul, and he gathers dishonor to himself, and his reproach will not be blotted out,” Proverbs 6. And Wisdom 3: “The children of adulterers will come to destruction, and the seed of an unlawful bed will be exterminated.” Certainly Scripture most frequently recalls this also among the causes of perishing Israel. For this vice is foul, and because nature is prone to it, it is always punished by God with great examples. But because my business is not only with pious governors of the commonwealth and their counsels, but also with atheists and those whom advantage alone, or reason of state, moderates in delivering an opinion and making laws, let us explain the cause itself why lust is so harmful.

§ 4. The stimulus toward pleasures is sharp, and it belongs to a brave and prudent man to be an enemy to the sweet evil. Love and desire are vehement; they never lay down hope; whatever is preserved they desire more. That flame at first warms with a slight fire, but presently burns out the whole of virtue and the spirit. It never stops at what is lawful, never at what is small; it purchases unlawful things with money, life, and reputation. And if any other vice does so, this one certainly passes most quickly into a monster. Shame forbids the recollection of the deeds of the ancients and their monstrous lusts.

During Julian's reign, the inhabitants of Arethusa and Heliopolis showed themselves most cruel toward virgins because the virgins had been taught chastity by Christian governors. The cause of such great cruelty among the Heliopolitans was that the virgins were forbidden to prostitute themselves to those they met before they were given in marriage, for they had formerly employed that law. They were therefore borne against chastity with a rage so great as was not fitting even for punishing lusts. And so what Cicero admonishes in Book IV of the *Tusculan Disputations* is especially forceful here: "He who has hurled himself headlong cannot hold himself back when he wishes." Bodies given to a precipice have no command of themselves. If lust has hurled the spirit headlong, the choice of crime indeed remains in the falling man's liberty, but it is a wretched choice, which by its impulse urges on the ruin rather than struggles against it.

Therefore, since this evil is violent and, if it falls upon powerful men, most insulting, great harms must necessarily arise from it. For the good which is taken away--namely, chastity--is regarded as the greatest. Mortals can bear two things with the greatest difficulty: losses and contempt.

Lost money is mourned with true tears.

In the deaths of parents, spouses, brothers, and relatives, rehearsed and often feigned tears flow; no one has mourned shipwrecks, the destruction of villas, or the confiscation of a patrimony with a hired mourner going before. True grief has sufficient strength for tears. And so, on account of adverse things which they see others enjoy, human beings retain anger either perpetually or for a very long time, and, though it has been effaced, sometimes renew it by sight and hearing.

They receive contempt of themselves, and especially insult joined with loss, much more harshly. They interpret the supreme insult to have been done to themselves in the chastity of themselves or their people being taken away, because they value it highly--or at least wish to be seen to value it highly--and because it is infamous to be negligent concerning the chastity of one's own people. Virginius killed his daughter, whom Appius Claudius sought for violation after judgment had been given against her liberty and for her enslavement, and judged it better to be the killer of a chaste daughter than the father of a corrupted one. With the same spirit, Pontius Aufidianus killed his daughter, corrupted by her tutor, after he had taken punishment from the corrupter. Publius Maenius punished a freedman who had given his daughter a kiss. Nor was Roman severity so great only toward chastity itself. Publius Atilius Philiscus, who had himself made shameful gain, nevertheless killed his daughter when she was discovered in violation: thus, once a victim of lusts himself, he nevertheless exacted chastity from his daughter. Quintus Fabius Maximus, accusing his son of doubtful chastity, brought it about that by voluntary withdrawal he avoided his father's sight. Scantinius, tribune of the plebs, because he solicited the son of Marcus Claudius Marcellus for violation, was condemned by the Roman people upon one witness. Gnaeus Sergius also paid the penalties for a lustful intention, for he was condemned by the Quirites because of money promised to a matron. The master of Titus Veturius, by then made a slave from the son of a commander, was led to prison by a decree of the Senate. Gaius Pescennius, a man illustrious through many offices, was compelled to die in prison because of an unspeakable violation. Laetorius Mergus, a military tribune accused upon a solicitation to violation, withdrew himself from judicial inquiry and punished the attempted crime by voluntary death.

Nor were these things done only in a better commonwealth and under a stricter discipline. Even when morals had already been corrupted, Marius pronounced that Gaius Luscius, his sister's son, who had been killed by the soldier Plotius on account of an attempted violation--and indeed a tribune killed by his own soldier--had been slain lawfully. Certainly he was worthy of seven consulships, if only for this judgment. Sempronius Musca caught Gaius Gallus in adultery and cut him down with scourges. Gaius Memmius beat Lucius Octavius with cords. Carbo Accienus, caught by Vibienus, and likewise Pontius, caught by Publius Cernius, were castrated.

These are examples of Roman chastity, in which commonwealth public honor long flourished beyond that of other nations. Afterward all things were overturned: after Curio, son of a most grave father, incurred sixty million sesterces

of another's debt through injury to noble young men; after Clodius, having bought the court and committed violation, escaped the penalties of adultery; after Gemellus, a court attendant, invited the consul and tribunes and established a brothel in his house, in which he prostituted Rome's freeborn but degenerate blood; after Catiline killed his only son so that he might obtain marriage with Aurelia Orestilla.

§ 5. Nor was chastity of less value among foreign nations. After their husbands had been slain in battle, the wives of the Teutons asked Marius that they too be given to the Vestal virgins to cultivate virginity; when this was denied, they killed themselves, for they regarded chastity as preferable to life. This is less marvelous in Hippo, a Greek woman, who cast herself into the sea lest she be made a mockery. Democles, fleeing the lust of Demetrius Poliorcetes, plunged himself into a boiling cauldron. The Athenian daughters of Phaedo, after their father had been killed, embraced one another and cast themselves into a well, lest

[Printed page 144]

they be compelled to live unchastely. Timoclea did better: she cast her violator into a well. Brasilla of Dyrrachium, by a chaste deception, lured a soldier to his own death, lest she suffer violence. Sophronia, a Roman woman, forestalled the injury of Maxentius with a sword. Fifty Spartan virgins preferred to die rather than endure the insulting lust of the Messenians. Digna, a woman of Aquileia, when Attila occupied the city, leapt from a window into the river flowing past. Pelagia, together with her mother and sister, underwent the same fate for chastity. I omit Camma, Panthea, the wife of Orgiagon the Gallograecian, Cyane, Valetia the Tuscan, Chiomara, and others concerning whom Plutarch and others write--especially since Christian virgins and matrons surpass them, for whom the cry "Christians to the lion!" was welcome, but "the virgin to the procurer!" was horrifying. I do not bring forward so many armies of virgins fighting more bravely for chastity than any legions, lest political writers judge that I wish to construct a Parthenon, not a city.

I wished to establish only this: violated chastity has customarily been avenged with a grave penalty. For every family is inflamed to avenge a sexual violation, and anger scarcely ever comes to rest unless blood has been shed. And there is scarcely any father or brother who would not bear more patiently that his sister be led to the funeral pyre than to dishonor. From this cause, therefore, great disasters and conspiracies must arise. This is so not only if the powerful sin in this matter, but also if private or very lowly persons do so, should either no penalty or a light one be inflicted for the fault, and much more if it is passed over in silence.

§ 6. The second cause is that by that vice men's prudence, sagacity, and care for the future are blunted. This one thing is most pernicious to the commonwealth. Nothing is so deadly to minds as lust. "The lust of luxury," says Augustine, "claims the whole body, inward and outward, for itself, and moves the whole man, with affection of the mind and appetite of the flesh joined together, so that pleasure follows, greater than all pleasures of the body; yet its extremity is reached in such a manner that almost all the sharpness and vigilance of thought is obstructed." And so, in a commonwealth in which shame is oppressed and luxury exults freely with the reins given to it, there is a great number of the blind, the ecstatic, and the stupid. Good and brave counsels are rare.

For not even Solomon himself, after he gave himself to lusts, reigned wisely and politically; and for that reason he was greatly hated by everyone. "Your father," says the people, "placed a most harsh yoke upon us." And the foolish young man admits: "And now my father placed a heavy yoke upon you"; and: "My father cut you with whips, but I shall beat you with scorpions." Behold what lust did--how it struck the art of ruling out of the wisest man, so that he did not even instruct his son rightly. A blind love inheres in all vices, as Claudian truly says in *Against Eutropius*:

But because a blind love inheres in vices, every future thing

Is despised, and present things commend their brief fruit.

And lust, heedless of loss, rushes into what is forbidden.

§ 7. Minerva is fashioned chaste, and the Muses virgins, because chastity is not only the companion of wisdom but also its cause and preserver. Nor is this so only by divine ordinance, which did not will to send the pure light of wisdom into souls contaminated by luxury; nature too teaches it. For those whose minds are occupied by the enticements of shameful acts cannot conceive serious thoughts concerning studies. So many comedies, both ancient and modern, teach men to love, yet they present to us no young lover who is prudent; or, if they attribute prudence to him, they also make him a conqueror of love and a hater of the brothel.

§ 8. The third cause is that there is not, in a ruined city, that vigor and strength of bodies which exists in one well regulated in its morals. Brave and rustic Persians conquered the Babylonians--men, to say it in a word, fit for prostitutes. The rustic hardness of the Macedonians conquered the Persians when they had now been enervated; the Romans, while lusts had not yet become common, conquered those enfeebled Macedonians; the Heruli, Goths, Huns, and others of the barbarians conquered the Romans, until they too succumbed to men stronger than themselves. Diogenes sharply and cynically objected to the Greeks that, while they lived, they caused their bodies to putrefy by baths and lust, but when the same bodies were dead, they seasoned them with spices and ointments against putrefaction. It is an altogether inverted concern: to putrefy the living, and at great expense to dry the dead.

§ 9. Finally, where there is little regard for shame and chastity, the whole commonwealth must necessarily be badly administered. For marriages are uncertain; every offspring either is spurious or is held to be so. For if a daughter will never be able to name her mother's adulterers without drawing breath thirteen times, as it is in the *Satire*, who will believe that she was born of a lawful marriage-bed? From this it also happens that very many flee marriages, not from love of chastity but from the liberty of whoring, and then truly because they fear men lying in wait to take their own place in marriage.

Seneca relates that in his time the corruption at Rome had been so great that no woman married except in order to provoke her adulterer. "Messalina," says Dio, "a lustful and intemperate woman, also compelled the other women to live luxuriously and wantonly; and she brought it about that many women in the palace, in the presence and sight of their husbands, had intercourse with adulterers. She herself esteemed their husbands and increased them in honors and dignities; but she hated the others who did not permit it, and destroyed them by every means." Who, under such an emperor and such an Augusta, mistress of the emperor, would have wished to take a wife? Therefore let the commonwealth defend chastity publicly and privately, and repress and restrain luxury and lust. Many things avail for this purpose, but especially those which I shall set forth.

§ 10. Let that care, I say, be public; for it is of greater importance that a city be cleansed of evil morals than of infected bodies. Yet no contagion is more ready to spread than in this part. The loss of shame is the most certain parent of every crime. And license permitted by laws brings not satiety but incitement. Morals are easily changed for the worse; the severity of laws scarcely ever turns vices toward the good. When shame has perished, it does not know how to return. Therefore, unless public authority, seriously armed by laws and penalties, opposes lusts and makes ready the fasces and axes, every disgrace and horror will overflow, and the city will be a great brothel.

When Stratonicus had departed from Heraclea, he kept looking back as though anxious, and did all the things done by those who do not wish to be seen. When his companions wondered, he replied that he feared lest someone see him departing from a brothel. For those who leave a brothel are ashamed of the crime committed.

§ 11. Therefore let the insolence of lusts be restrained by severity of laws. Examples are not lacking. Jovianus enacted by a capital law that anyone who looked upon a sacred virgin with an unchaste gaze should be punished. And Title 11, §1, *On Extraordinary Crimes*: "Solicitors of others' marriages, likewise disturbers of marriages, even if they cannot obtain the effect of their crime, are punished on account of the intention of pernicious lust." And §2: "He who, after a boy has been led away or his companion corrupted, has persuaded him to sexual violation, or has importuned a woman or girl, or has done anything for the sake of unchastity, furnished a house--or, according to others, a gift--and given a price by which he might persuade him, is punished, when the crime has been completed,

[Printed page 145]

with death; when it has not been completed, he is deported to an island. Corrupted companions are visited with the supreme punishment.”

The humanity of the Theodosian and Valentinian laws also comes to the aid of those whom another's wickedness compelled to be unchaste: “If fathers and masters acting as procurers impose upon their daughters or maidservants the necessity of sinning, let the daughters and maidservants, after imploring the help of bishops, be released from every necessity of their miseries.” Let the prince follow the prescriptions of the divine laws in his city.

I see that adulteries were once checked by severe laws. In our Germany, after her hair had been cut off, an adulteress was beaten with whips, naked, through the entire village; and, execrable and hateful to everyone, she was consumed by grief and want of food. The ancient Romans strove to remove the seedbeds of every lust in the very blade of grass; for it was a capital offense for a woman to have drunk wine. They thought that shame would be cheap to her who, although she was otherwise weak in judgment, had by drunkenness--or certainly by the danger of drunkenness--made a path for unchastity. The Pisidians were more lenient: after placing the adulteress together with the adulterer upon an ass, they led them about for some days for everyone to ridicule. The Arabs punished adultery with death, and the Egyptians with a thousand blows; but they cut off the adulteress's nose, so that she who had been an enticement to another's crime by her beauty, and had prostituted her own chastity, would displease by deformity.

Formerly many nations had no laws concerning chastity. They say that Hyettus the Argive was the first to carry a law against adulterers, after he had killed Molurus, whom he had discovered in adultery with his wife, and had received a part of Orchomenus in Attica. They say that Draco the Athenian imitated him; he was said, on account of his severity, to have written his laws in blood. Zaleucus, lawgiver of the Locrians, deprived adulterers of their eyes. Deservedly, for the eyes are leaders in love and impose upon the mind. And so, when his son had offended against his father's law, the indulgent father divided the penalty and, as Aelian relates:

ὅπερ τὸ ἕτερον τῶν τοῦ παιδὸς ὀφθαλμῶν, ἀντιδιδόναι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ὁ νεανίσκος τυφλωθῇ τελείως.

In place of one of his son's eyes, he gave his own in exchange, so that the young man might not be blinded completely.

Plato advises that the inflamed impulse of lust must be moderated by reason and restrained by fear of the laws. In Book IX of *The Laws*, he condemns with death not only inverted lust and adultery, but every resort to prostitutes. He concedes to a husband the right of life over an adulterer--a deed which our laws also do not punish, for they remit penalties to righteous grief. The same is also permitted to a father against the corrupter of his daughter, yet in such a manner that he does not spare his daughter either. The Gortynians led an adulterer crowned with wool to the magistrate, and thereafter held him forever incapable of bearing witness. The people of Lepreum led adulterers into the forum, led them about for three days, and rendered them contemptible for their whole lives. The Romans ordered adulteresses to go about wearing the toga.

The Athenians' punishment of persons guilty of adultery was foul and not well ordained according to the gravity of a well-ordered commonwealth. The rich redeemed themselves with money; the punishment of the poor was

παρατιλμός, καὶ ἀπορράφανιδωσις,

plucking out the hair and *rhaphanidosis*--the insertion of a radish--which contained more disgrace and foulness than befitted a grave people. Among the Parthians, adulteries were punished most gravely; they generally shut their wives and other women inside the house.

§ 12. Therefore let public power restrain lusts by laws in all citizens. Let it not imitate the Spartans, who at first lacked those laws. Plutarch tells the matter thus in his *Laconic Sayings*: In Lycurgus's times such great chastity of wives existed among everyone, and they were so far removed from that shameful conduct which afterward became prevalent, that formerly it was incredible that the crime of adultery could be found among the Spartans. A saying is reported of

Geradas, a man of the greatest antiquity at Sparta. When a certain guest asked him what penalties adulterers paid among the Spartans--for he saw nothing concerning this enacted by Lycurgus--he replied, "There is no adulterer among us, my friend." When the other rejoined, "What, then, if one should arise?" "He will give," he said, "a bull so great that, with its neck stretched beyond Taygetus, it may drink from the Eurotas." And when the other said with a laugh that it was impossible for so great a bull to be found, Geradas replied, "And by what means could an adulterer arise at Sparta, where riches, delights, and artificial adornment of the body are held to be a disgrace; but modesty, moderation, and the observance of obedience owed to the magistrates are, on the contrary, accounted an honor and a praise?"

But that praise was brief. For Aristotle is the authority, in Book II of the *Politics*, Chapter IX, that they were ruled by their wives and that the license of the women from that city was extreme:

Διὸ παρὰ τοῖς Λάκωσι τοῦθ' ὑπῆρχε, καὶ πολλὰ διωκεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν. καίτοι τί διαφέρει γυναικὸς ἄρχειν ἢ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἄρχεσθαι; ταῦτό γὰρ συμβαίνει.

The wives of the Spartans administered many things; but it is all the same whether wives govern the commonwealth or command those who govern it. For the same outcome occurs in either case.

But, in general, the chastity of the Spartans is rendered suspect to me. Certainly Helen was twice abducted in heroic times. She was led away by Alexander the Phrygian only with her own consent. Then Euripides deservedly reproaches them that a virgin cannot be chaste at Sparta, since virgins are accustomed to wrestle with young men beside the Eurotas. But there is greater testimony in Aristotle, Book II, Chapter IX of the *Politics*:

Ἔτι δὲ ἡ περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἄνεσις, καὶ πρὸς τὴν προαίρεσιν τῆς πολιτείας βλαβερὰ, καὶ πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν πόλεως· ὥσπερ γὰρ οἰκίας μέρος ἀνὴρ καὶ γυνή, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐγγὺς τοῦ δίχα διηρῆσθαι δεῖ νομίζειν, εἷς τε τὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν πλῆθος καὶ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν, ὥστε ἐν ὅσαις πολιτείαις φαύλως ἔχει τὸ περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, τὸ ἡμισυ τῆς πόλεως εἶναι δεῖ νομίζειν ἀνομοθέτητον· ὅπερ ἐκεῖ συμβέβηκεν. ὅλην γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ὁ νομοθέτης εἶναι βουλόμενος καρτερικὴν, κατὰ μὲν τοὺς ἀνδρας φανερός ἐστι τοιοῦτος ὢν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐξημέληκεν. ζῶσι γὰρ ἀκολάστως πρὸς ἅπασαν ἀκολασίαν, καὶ τρυφεροῶς.

Moreover, indulgence and leniency toward women is useless and harmful both to the design which they formed concerning the administration of their commonwealth and to the happiness of the city. For just as the parts of a house are man and woman, so plainly one ought also to judge that a city is divided into two equal parts, into the multitude of men and of women. Therefore, in whatever forms of administering a commonwealth that which pertains to women is badly ordered, in them one must judge that half the city is not regulated by laws, as happened there. For although the lawgiver wished the whole city to be strong and robust for enduring and bearing labors, in the men he plainly attained what he wished; but toward the women he showed himself negligent. For they live intemperately and luxuriously, let loose and poured forth, plainly, toward every kind of intemperance.

At first many things were permitted to the women because the men were living far from home on account of the Arcadian and Messenian war. Lycurgus wished to subject them to laws, but they protested; and so he was compelled to desist from his undertaking, as Aristotle relates in the same place. From this fountain innumerable evils arose: for both the Helots frequently rebelled, and the citizens were reduced to a great paucity, and the very land also came together into the vast estates of very few men. This ἀνομία, "lawlessness," therefore brought destruction upon the Spartans. For I would not judge the men good in that city where the wickedness of the women is free. From this there also arose greater crimes τῶν παιδεραστῶν, "of the pederasts."

Therefore that city perished through a scarcity of laws. In the Roman commonwealth the laws, conquered by vices, yielded. The emperor Alexander did not dare to prohibit male prostitutes; Philip, however, abolished them in the year of the Lord 249. So great

was the departure even from the ancient morals of the gentiles.

§ 13. But enactments of laws profit little unless they are guarded by the vigilance of magistrates. The proverb of the Greeks is true:

Ἰσχυρόν ὁ νόμος ἐστίν, ἂν ἄρχοντ' ἔχῃ.

A law is a strong thing if it has a ruler to assist it. For if Neronian luxury reigns, if Gaius erects a brothel in the palace, if Messalina compels, what will wretched laws be able to do? Who will condemn what the emperor does? Who will flee what the wife of Augustus commands? The laws are holy, but Maxentius compels matrons to death through fear of disgrace. What will laws avail while that man reigns who pardoned only those who confessed unchastity, because he thought that no one could live chastely? Therefore let there be an example in the prince and in the leading men, through which the laws may acquire authority and force. Let not even prostitutes now proclaim:

Happy are the ages which oppose you

With morals; let Rome now possess shame.

This is a danger to everyone; but when so favored an evil, drawing authority from the foremost men, has driven out shame, it cannot be excluded by any force. Now, indeed, as formerly too, punishment rages more against the weaker sex. But the law and obligation are equal on both sides. Pope Innocent truly says, as it stands in Cause 32, Question 5: “The Christian religion condemns adultery by an equal rule in either sex. But women do not easily accuse their husbands of adultery, and hidden sins do not have vengeance. Men, however, have been accustomed more freely to denounce adulterous wives before priests. And therefore, when their crime has been disclosed, communion is denied to women. But while the deed of men remains hidden, no one easily abstains on the basis of suspicions; yet he will certainly be removed if his crime is uncovered. For since the cause is equal, the principle of vengeance sometimes comes to rest when proof is lacking.”

§ 14. There is also great weight in public morals and practices. If you wish minds to be chaste, take care that things whose poisons reach the mind do not meet their eyes or ears. The habit of hearing and seeing also takes to itself license for doing. There is no need to educate people for wickedness: without an evil example they are teachable, and contrariwise they are teachable through good examples. What does it profit to prescribe right things privately if the public discipline is such as could soften even Lyncurgus? Private evils can be corrected; public evils wish to be cultivated. From this come the destructions of cities.

From this look broadly upon the flourishing cities

Which luxury once overturned. Surely neither the anger of the gods,

Nor weapons, nor enemies harm as much as pleasure alone,

Gliding into souls.

Therefore, when luxury, the public dissuader from what is honorable, has grown strong, all things yield and the commonwealth perishes.

For luxury overturns other kingdoms through vices,

And pride through hatreds. Thus the Spartan, wickedly raised aloft,

Overturned Athens, and he himself fell in the same way before Thebes; thus the Mede

Took the reins from the Assyrian, and the Persian took them from the Mede;

The Macedonian subjected the Persian, himself destined to yield

To the Romans: these things were confirmed by the Sibyl's auguries.

First delights, soon satiety, then violence, and finally destruction broke out in cities. Certainly, when Diogenes was returning from Lacedaemon to Athens and was asked where he was going and whence, he replied, "From men to women."

It therefore falls to the commonwealth to remove from its midst every incitement to luxury, such as unchaste spectacles, dangerous dances, lascivious public displays of women, and much more houses of prostitution and brothels. The reasoning of those who judge that worse things are prevented by those public pleasures is most wicked. Wherever those things have grown strong, every most shameful act is perpetrated. Flight consults best for chastity. But flight cannot exist if the incitements of lust are public; if one must be blind in order not to see evil; if in porticoes, in the forum, and in the streets everything abounds in shameful things; if, as Pliny says in Book XXXI, Chapter I, it pleases men to conceal lusts in drinking vessels; if enticing images are placed with impunity in the sight of the young. Poison is not publicly sold; toxins of souls are sold in the marketplaces of Christians, while the magistrate does not prohibit it.

That magistrate who passes over unspeakable things in silence will pay the penalties. If you learned that your daughter had bought those shameful images, to be instilled into her thought through the pigment of colors, you would blaze up with deserved indignation. If anyone related those things in the presence of your children, you would appoint a day for his trial as a corrupter of youth. Is it a greater thing to disclose them by words, or to place them before faithful eyes so that they may adhere more tenaciously? Everyone sees this; your own people see it; those who will relate it to your people see it.

§ 15. Nor should enticements alone be removed; impediments and reins should also be placed upon luxury. Let everyone be occupied with serious thought, works, and labors; let idleness be banished. Love reigns in an empty breast. Movement and activity do not admit so biting a rust. Leisure always gives a changeable mind, rarely a good one. Love is idle; it occupies the lazy. This vice is dispersed by business; true care disperses so vain an anxiety. Certainly Theophrastus defines love thus:

Ἔρως πάθος ἐστὶ ψυχῆς σχολαζούσης.

Love is a passion, or disease, of a soul living idly. The cause, therefore, of so many evils--and the first cause--is the neglect of the nobility, while they neither educate nor harden their sons for honorable labors, but lead them to dishonorable amusements. Hence

from the tender nail they contemplate wickedness

and incestuous loves.

And so, although these desires belong to all human beings and are conquered with difficulty--"Every evil," says Cyprian in *On the Good of Chastity*, "is conquered more easily than pleasures, because whatever the former is, it is horrible; but the latter is enticing"--nevertheless they belong especially to the rich, because idleness and kindling are present. Then, after the rich, they belong to able-bodied beggars who live for the day. For since they act without any care, are often filled by the benevolence of men, are wicked through habit and association, and strike against shameful things with their eyes and ears, they must necessarily be exercised very frequently in playful and never serious thoughts, whose image is readier to hand and whose pleasure is more titillating. Such men must be driven to labors not only for other causes but also on account of their morals. Nor will the magistrate regard this as a small thing. The same vices exist in rags and purple; the same lust exists in a jewel and in filth.

Augustine rightly says in *On the Honesty of Women*, Chapter II: "Among all the contests of Christians, only the battles of chastity are hard, where the fight is daily and the victory rare. For chastity has been allotted a grave enemy, whom it resists daily and always fears."

§ 16. Let the commonwealth also lay up with deep attention what the holy fathers prescribe to individuals: namely, that the first titillations of the devil must be opposed. Cyprian says this in *On Fasting*. “Lest the tares of wickedness grow, they must be crushed in the seed,” says Jerome on Ecclesiastes, Chapter IX. Therefore, from a high watchtower,

[Printed page 147]

let the helmsman look ahead to the coming storm, draw in the sails, and draw up the ship. If new actors are being prepared, if new theaters, if foreign luxury of clothing, if new contrivances of foods are breaking in, let him resist seriously while these things have not yet occupied the houses of the powerful. If the prince desires to be chaste, let him be sober and withdraw from the body the material of so grave a conflagration. This is Ambrose's counsel in Book I, Chapter XIV of *On Penance*: “Lust is a grave fire, and therefore let us not give it the nourishment of luxury. Lust is fed by banquets, nourished by delights, kindled by wine, and set aflame by drunkenness. For wine and youth are a double conflagration of pleasure.” Why do we add oil to the flame? Thus Saint Benedict, Bernard, Francis, Martinian the Hermit, and innumerable others fled wine as poison and satiety as a plague.

Boldly, O prince, cut down the growing forest of luxury; take away occasions, remove the instruments of lusts and the allurements of delights, although the city may appear less cultivated and less opulent, although something may be lost to the treasury. Frugal moderation is preferable to lavish and luxurious riches. Conquered Greece weakened its conquerors; Asia, reduced to a province, laid them prostrate.

§ 17. But nothing assists chastity as much as care for religion. It raises minds to God daily; it considers eternal goods and punishments. He who in prison is condemned to an evil lodging already looks upon the cross or pyre before his eyes; he whose doubtful life shipwrecks batter; he who grows pale in battle--fear strikes every lustful thought from him. In the same way, faith in and dread of eternal punishment extinguish the ardor of pleasures as it creeps upon him with an alluring agitation.

Antonius of Siena tells of a distinguished man of his own order, that is, of the order of Saint Dominic, against whose chastity a wicked she-wolf laid snares. He constructed two blazing pyres and cast himself upon one of them; if that little bed pleased her, he said that he invited the woman to the shameful deed. For that crime which the punishment of eternal fire would follow deserved to be perpetrated in fire. Other things are sometimes too small to be able to withstand the impulse of the most vehement delight; love sends many into dangers. The Daunian youth fixes his gaze upon the virgin and burns more keenly for arms. He too despised death who, swimming across the Hellespont, more frenzied than the very waves, prayed:

Spare me while I come; drown me while I return.

Hence the Church numbers so many thousands of chaste persons, so many armies of virgins. Deservedly the Christian religion glories in chastity as a distinguished token of truth. For how many thousands of virgins could have escaped torments and death on condition of marriage, and nevertheless preferred chastity? No torments could compel those weak in sex and age, and placed in the midst of enticements, to admit enticing pleasures. How, then, are you a participant in the grace of God if you are so conquered by the sweetness of lusts that you pursue delight even through dangers?

And nevertheless there are men who, on account of the incontinence of the wicked, do not hesitate to pollute cities with brothels, as though graver harms were avoided by a smaller loss. They permit fornication among Christians lest men blaze up into adulteries, incests, and other disgraceful deeds. It is an error, and indeed a grave one; for in that license the wicked receive their first lessons, so that they dare greater things. In no vaulted chamber is there fornication alone. Marriages are violated there too. Nowhere are there greater dangers for matrons than where prostitutes instruct the young.

Around the year of Christ 437, under the Augusti Theodosius and Valentinian, Florentinus, a most illustrious man and most worthy of command, greatly desired procurers to be expelled. When losses to the treasury were raised as an

objection--for the procurers paid a tax--he repaired the loss by a substitute payment from his own estate, so that as much as was lost to the empire through those plagues having been driven away might be supplied from private revenue. It was a great praise to have consulted for public chastity by losses of his own. But by how much greater was the shame of having accepted the tax of procurers from a most holy man? Let us not marvel at our own times: the men are new, the vices old. Gold is given to the empire so that there may be no procurers; gold is accepted so that victims of public lusts may not be exposed for sale.

Would that kings constantly follow either the sanctity of married life or celibate purity. There are many examples among Christians: Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, concerning whom Dubravius writes; Casimir, son of Casimir III, king of Poland; Emeric, son of Stephen V, king of the Hungarians; Edward, king of England; Henry I, head of our commonwealth. Wonder comes upon one at so many royal virgins of such admirable holiness; from them there is an easy conjecture concerning the others. I shall report the catalogue from Book XXII, Chapter II, *On the Signs of the Church*, by Bozio, whose words are these:

“Perpetual virginity of mind and body, dedicated to God, is a divine gift; but it is by far the most divine if there is joined to it, in addition, not some middling but a most excellent preeminence of the remaining virtues. The North produced very many such women, from which region it followed the Roman pontiff. Of this kind were Milburga, Mildreda, and Miluida, daughters of Merualdus, concerning whom Polydore writes in Book IV. There was Fara, abbess of the monastery of Hibrigensis, who flourished in the year 640; Francongota in 660; Edilberga, daughter of Anna, king of the East Angles; Itta, together with her daughter Gertrude, foundress of the monastery of Nivelles, in 650; Edilburga, abbess of the monastery of Beretingensis; Edeldrudis, daughter of Ana, king of the Angles, in 680; Hilda, daughter of the nephew of Edwin, king of the Angles, in 630; Irminda, daughter of King Dagobert, foundress of the monastery which is called Horreum, or commonly Oeren, at Trier, in the year 710; Modesta of Trier in 680; Severa, abbess of Saint Symphorian at Trier; Athela, daughter of King Dagobert and abbess of a certain monastery at Trier; Thecla the Englishwoman, abbess of the monastery which her brother Boniface, archbishop of Mainz, built in Germany near the Main at Eizingen; Lioba the Englishwoman, who presided over the monastery which the same prelate founded at Bischofsheim in the year 730; Amalberga, whom King Charles frequently and ardently sought as a wife, in 772; Anastasia and Basilissa, abbesses of Horreum at Trier in 760 and 780; Mathilda, sister of Emperor Henry I and Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, abbess of Saint Servatius in Saxony, in 990; Wiborada, a nun of Saint Gall, in 920; Walburga the Englishwoman, abbess at Heidenheim in Eichstätt and sister of Saint Willibald, in 750; Benedicta, abbess in the convent of Suvestris; Notburgis, nun of the Capitol at Cologne; Hadeloga, abbess of the monastery of Rinchingensis; Landrada of Liège; Waldrudis of Mons; Gladesindis of Metz; Lutrudis of Corvey; Cecilia, abbess in Suvestris; the empress Richardis, who, after the death of Charles the Fat, her husband, devoted herself to Christ and presided over sacred virgins; Jutta, sister of Count Meginhart of Sponheim, in 1136; Hildegard, admirable disciple of Jutta, in 1160; Elisabeth, abbess in the monastery of Schönau, in 1165.

[Printed page 148]

“Adelaide, abbess of Vilich in the time of Heribert, archbishop of Cologne; Surius reports her life, Volume VII, February 5.

“Brigid the Scot, in the year 518 or 522; Surius, Volume I, February 1.

“Catherine the Swede, daughter of Saint Bridget, in the year 1381; Surius, Volume II, March 22.

“Elisabeth, daughter of the king of Hungary; Volume VI, November 19. Ermelende, virgin; Volume V, October 29. Hedwig, duchess of Poland; Volume V, October 15. Hunegundis; Volume IV, August 25. Landrada; Volume IV, July 8. Margaret, daughter of the king of Hungary; January 28, Volume I. Margaret, queen of Scotland; Volume III, June 10. Mary of Oignies; Volume III, June 23. Maxellendis, virgin and martyr; Volume IV, July 30. Monegundis; Volume IV, July 2. Noilburgis; Volume V, October 31. Liduvina; Volume II, April 14. Ludmilla, duchess of Bohemia and martyr; Volume VII, September 16. Lutgardis; Volume III, June 16. Lutrudis; Volume V, September 22. Opportuna,

virgin; Volume II, April 22. Ositha, virgin and martyr; Volume V, October 7. Richardis Martianensis; Volume III, May 12. Walburga; Volume III, May. Bridget the Swede.”

The East and Greece formerly possessed some such women; but now whom can they name? Whom could Africa produce as her own? Whom Muscovy?

Virgins excelling at once in sanctity, learning, and published writings: those virgins or women who brought to light, in published writings, most illustrious monuments of a manly and not effeminate genius were at once admirable and most highly praised in every memory of mortals. But those women, for the most part--if assemblies alien from us produced any--were given over to lust or some vice. For that poet did not sing foolishly in the third *Satire* that a woman did not please him

who, with speech whirled around, twists

a clipped enthymeme.

But Germany and the North brought to light not only certain learned women, but also most incorrupt guardians of inviolate virginity, and, beyond this, women most preeminent in divine virtues and most illustrious in sanctity. For such were those five whom we mentioned in Sign 37, *On the Spirit of Prayers*, Book IX, Chapter XII: Hrotsvitha, Elisabeth, Hildegard, Gertrude, Mechthild, and Bridget the Swede, although the last was a widow.

Therefore it is especially to be wondered at that, after so many thousands of years have now elapsed, not even one woman similar to these virgins can be produced from the whole North before the northern peoples obeyed the pontiff. Indeed, from the whole world not even one virgin can be named of whom there exist books of such great piety and learning for every method of rightly ordering life and forming morals as exist from these virgins. Was it not, therefore, an excellent thing to have obeyed the popes? Is anything similar found among any heretics who have ever existed? Let all Greece, mistress and parent of the best disciplines, be summoned, and let her bring forth, if indeed she can, a woman of her own whose writings of such great piety exist, sealed by most illustrious and divine examples of morals and an innocent life. Will Germany, Saxony, Scotland, and Sweden therefore surpass the nurse and mother of the good arts? Certainly so. Go now, and call the northern peoples barbarians. Are those barbarians among whom there are such virgins and women? Call them barbarians as much as you wish: those barbarians will surpass the wisest of all mortals. Of so great importance, plainly, is obedience to the Roman pontiff.

When the Christian commonwealth has considered these things, let it exhort itself with Saint Augustine's argument: “Will you not be able to do what these men and these women did?” But I am pleased to transcribe the whole passage from *Confessions* VIII, Chapter XIII: “There appeared from that direction toward which I had turned my face and into which I trembled to pass the chaste dignity of continence, serene and not dissolute in her cheerfulness, honorably enticing me to come and not to doubt, and extending toward me, to receive and embrace me, pious hands filled with flocks of good examples. There were so many boys and girls, there much youth and every age, and grave widows and aged virgins; and in them all continence herself was by no means barren. And she laughed at me with an exhortatory ridicule, as if she said, ‘Will you not be able to do what these men and these women did? Or indeed are these men and these women able in themselves, and not in the Lord their God? The Lord their God gave me to them. Why do you stand in yourself, and do not stand? Cast yourself upon him; do not fear. He will not withdraw himself so that you fall. Cast yourself securely; he will receive you and save you.’”

And if not everyone can do what these men and these women did, because the struggle of perpetual virginity is great, its glory distinguished, and the prerogative of its crown exceptional, will they not at least be able to confine and moderate their desires by the laws of sacred marriage?

I shall close with the judgment of Saint Jerome in Book III *Against Jovinian*: it is the voice of a most learned man that chastity must above all be retained, since when it has been lost every virtue collapses. In this lies the sovereignty of womanly virtues. It commends a poor woman, exalts a rich one, redeems one who is deformed, adorns one who is

beautiful. It deserves well of ancestors, whose blood it does not corrupt by a furtive offspring; well of children, who need neither blush concerning their mother nor doubt concerning their father; well, above all, of herself, whom it vindicates from the dishonor of an alien body. There is no greater calamity of captivity than to be dragged to another's lust. Act bravely, O prince; act through laws. Christians can live chastely, so many thousands of whom have met death for chastity.

Let chastity be preserved with great zeal, lest there be not a city but a conflux of bastards and degenerates.

CHAPTER XIII

Spectacles Harm Good and Chaste Morals, and Therefore Must Be Abolished, or Only Those Which Excite to Virtue Retained

§ 1. Tertullian divides spectacles into four kinds: the madness of the circus, the unchastity of the theater, the atrocity of the arena, and the vanity of the xystus. The Greeks celebrated the Nemean, Pythian, Isthmian, and Olympic games; they contended in racing, singing, wrestling, boxing, and the speed of horses. Various games were combined with these principal ones. Today some of these remain; of certain others only traces survive.

Tertullian deservedly calls the circus a madness on account of the expense and the frenzy of those favoring different colors, and the tumults arising from it. I shall treat the atrocity of the arena and the vanity of the xystus when the discussion has reached fortitude. Now it is necessary to discuss the unchastity of theaters, which is opposed to temperance. Chastity was attacked in all the contests, not in the theater alone. For Tertullian says in *On Spectacles*, Chapter XXI: “Thus it happens that the man who scarcely lifts his tunic in public from necessity of the bladder exults in the circus only by casting all shame in the face of everyone.” In the xystus also they exhibited the unchaste wrestling contests of prostitutes and effeminate men; in the arena they cast naked human beings before beasts; and, lest any evil be lacking,

[Printed page 149]

the one cause of everything was the flame of impiety and impurity. Nor was chastity to be sought in cruelty, because every luxurious man is cruel and all cruelty is luxurious. For those to whom the torments and deaths of innocent persons are a delight, and who bend over bodies squalid with their own blood with the most patient eyes--it is not marvelous that they are enslaved to other pleasures.

Gladiatorial spectacles were abolished early by Christian emperors. Circensian, theatrical, and xystic spectacles remained longer. Arcadius and Honorius abolished the foul games of Maiuma: the final law, π , *On Maiuma*, in the Theodosian Code. Chariot races and the running of horses could otherwise be tolerated by their own nature. But the contests of factions stirred up tumults. Nevertheless the bishops opposed themselves to them all. See Arnobius, Book II, *On the Amphitheater*; and, before everyone, Tertullian, *On Spectacles*, and the booklet on the same matter attributed to Saint Cyprian; Lactantius, Book VI, Chapter XX; Augustine; Jerome; and others in various books. Constantine abolished the gladiatorial games--Eusebius, Book IV of his life, Chapter XXVIII, and Sozomen, Book I of his *History*--but they revived. Attend to the things said in Book II of the Code, *On Gladiators*. Indeed, when Augustine treats of Alypius, he recalls the combat and the conspicuous wound.

As the authority of the bishops increased, theaters and stages were abolished on Sundays and on the feasts of the Nativity, Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost. Thus the law *Dominico*, *On Spectacles*, in the Theodosian Code. See also Canon 66 of the synod celebrated in Trullo.

§ 2. The wise men of old will indicate to us how great a stain and plague spectacles brought upon morals. “Nothing,” says Seneca, “is so harmful to good morals as to sit idly at some spectacle.” Saint Cyprian sets forth the causes in the first epistle *To Donatus*: “Turn your gaze from here to the no less lamentable contagions of another spectacle. In the theaters too you will behold what is both a grief and a shame to you. The tragic buskin is a verse recital of ancient crimes: the ancient horror concerning parricides and incests is repeated by an action expressed after the likeness of truth, lest that which was once committed grow obsolete as the ages pass. Every age is admonished by hearing that what has been done can be done. Crimes never die through the old age of time; offense is never buried by the times; wickedness is never interred by oblivion. Those things become examples which had ceased to be crimes.

“Then it delights a man, in mimes, through instruction in shameful deeds, either to recognize what he has done at home or to hear what he can do. Adultery is learned while it is seen; and with the evil of public authority acting as procurer for vices, the matron who had perhaps proceeded chaste to the spectacle returns unchaste from the spectacle. Beyond this, how great a stain upon morals, what kindling of disgraceful deeds, what nourishment of vices, to be polluted by actors' gestures! To see, contrary to the covenant and law of birth, an elaborate performance of men enduring incestuous obscenity! Men are unmanned; every honor and vigor of their sex is softened by the dishonor of an enervated body. The more anyone has broken a man into a woman, the more he gives pleasure there. He grows in praise from his crime, and the fouler he is, the more skillful he is judged. He is watched--O abomination!--and watched willingly.

“What could one who is such not persuade men to do? He moves the senses, soothes the affections, and storms the stronger conscience of a good breast. Nor is the authority of an enticing disgrace absent, so that destruction may creep upon human beings through the softer hearing. They represent an unchaste Venus, an adulterous Mars, and that Jupiter of theirs, a prince no more in kingship than in vices, burning toward earthly loves with his very thunderbolts--now growing white in the feathers of a swan, now flowing down in a golden shower, now springing onto the stage toward the puberty of boys, carried off with birds as his servants. Ask now whether one who watches can be uncorrupted or chaste. They imitate the gods whom they venerate; for the wretched, offenses become religious acts.

“O, if only, stationed in that lofty watchtower, you could introduce your eyes into secret places, unclothe the covered doors of bedchambers, and open hidden inner rooms to the consciousness of the eyes. You would see things done by the unchaste which a chaste brow could not even behold. You would see what it is itself a crime to see. You would see what men maddened by the fury of vices deny that they have done and hasten to do. Men rush upon men with insane lusts. Things are done which cannot please even the very men who do them. I lie if one who is such does not rebuke others; a shameful man defames shameful men and believes that he has escaped the one who knows, as though it were not sufficient that he cannot escape his own conscience. The same men are accusers in public and defendants in secret, at once censors of and guilty before themselves. They condemn outside what they perform within; they willingly admit what, when they have admitted it, they accuse--an audacity agreeing altogether with vices, and a shamelessness corresponding to the unchaste. I do not wish you to marvel at what men of this kind speak with that polluted mouth: whatever sin is now committed by the voice is less.”

He exaggerates nothing. He keeps silent about those things which modesty prohibited him from saying. Heliogabalus ordered to be exhibited in reality the things which the mimes imitated. No one can be excused on the ground that the Athenians did those things long ago. Aristophanes, the most wicked of all, reproaches the wickedness of the whole city because by a public decree they removed from his place an aged poet who abstained from obscene taunts. Believe steadfastly that minds so fit for prostitutes deserved whatever evils they afterward suffered.

§ 3. “The theater,” says Tertullian in Chapter X of *On Spectacles*, “is properly the shrine of Venus. In this manner, finally, that kind of work arose in the world. For the censors often destroyed theaters just when they were springing up again, consulting for morals, whose immense danger from wantonness they plainly foresaw. Thus already from this point the heathens' own judgment, which makes with us, may yield as testimony against them, and the prerogative even of human discipline may serve us for an amplification of the charge. And so Pompey the Great, lesser only than his own theater, when he had built that citadel of every shameful deed, sometimes fearing a censorial censure of his memory, placed a temple of Venus above it. Summoning the people to its dedication by edict, he called it not a theater but a temple of Venus, ‘beneath which,’ he said, ‘we have placed the tiers of spectacles.’ Thus he covered a condemned and condemnable work with the title of a temple and mocked discipline by superstition.

“But Venus and Liber agree with one another. Those two demons of drunkenness and lust have conspired and sworn together among themselves. Therefore the theater of Venus is also the house of Liber. For they also called other theatrical games *Liberalia* in their proper designation, not only because they were devoted to Liber--as the Dionysia are among the Greeks--but also because they were instituted by Liber. And plainly the patronage of Liber and Venus

exists even in the theatrical arts, in those things which are private and proper to the stage, concerning gesture and looseness of body. For, dissolute, they sacrifice softness to Venus and Liber--to the one through sex, to the other through looseness."

And in Chapter XVII: "In like manner, we are ordered to remove all unchastity. Therefore in this way we are also separated from the theater, which is the private consistory of unchastity, where nothing is approved except what is disapproved elsewhere. Thus the whole of its favor is in the greatest degree fashioned from filthiness, which the Atellan gesticulator and which the mime also represent through women, banishing the shame of their sex so that they blush more easily at home than on the stage; which, finally, the pantomime suffers in his body from boyhood so that he can be an artist. Even the prostitutes themselves, victims of public lust, are brought forward on the stage, more wretched in the presence of women, from whom alone they were hidden; and they are paraded before the faces of every age and every dignity. Their place, their fee, and their encomium are proclaimed, even to those who have no need of it. I keep silent about the rest, which ought to lie hidden in darkness and in its own caves, lest it contaminate the day. Let

[Printed page 150]

the Senate blush; let all the orders blush. Those very destroyers of their own shame, growing afraid to bring their gestures into the light and before the people, blush once a year. But if unchastity must be execrated by us, why should it be lawful to hear what it is not lawful to speak? Since we also know that scurrilities and every idle word are judged by God, why should it equally be lawful to hear things which it is a crime to do? Why should those things which, uttered by the mouth, defile a man not be thought to defile a man when admitted through eyes and ears, since ears and eyes are attendants of the spirit, and he whose attendants are polluted cannot be presented as clean?" Therefore the prohibition of unchastity also contains the prohibition of the theater. Cyprian agrees in his book *On Spectacles*; Lactantius, Book VI, Chapter XX; Augustine, Book XX of *The City of God*, Chapters IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, X, and XIII.

You will perhaps say that lascivious comedies are prohibited, not grave ones, not tragedies. But tragedy too represents ancient crimes, so that it may be established that what has been done can be done; and tragedies should be exhibited only with great discrimination. This, therefore, is the sum, and the rule which must be observed in these games.

§ 4. First, neither the commonwealth nor the prince is permitted to introduce such spectacles; neither can permit them. An actor is infamous and is not admitted to the communion of the Church. There is an example in Saint Cyprian, Epistle 61: "Because of your affection and our mutual modesty you judged that I should be consulted, most illustrious brother, concerning what I think of a certain actor who, established among you, still perseveres in the dishonor of that same art of his; and, as a master and teacher not of boys who are to be educated but of boys who are to be destroyed, also instills into others what he learned wickedly--whether such a man ought to communicate with you.

"I think it agrees neither with the divine Majesty nor with evangelical discipline that the modesty and honor of the Church should be defiled by so shameful and infamous a contagion. For since men are prohibited in the Law from putting on a woman's garment and those of this kind are judged accursed, how much greater a crime is it not only to receive women's clothing, but also to represent shameful, soft, and womanly gestures through instruction in an unchaste art? Nor should anyone excuse himself if he himself has ceased from the theater while he nevertheless teaches this to others. For he cannot be seen to have ceased who appoints substitutes and supplies many successors in place of himself alone--educating and teaching, contrary to God's institution, how a male may be broken into a woman and sex altered by art, and how the Devil, who stains the divine creation, may be pleased through the offenses of a corrupted and enervated body.

"But if such a man pleads his want and the necessity of poverty, his necessity too can be assisted among the others who are sustained by the Church's provisions, provided that he is content with more frugal but innocent food. Nor let

him think that he must be bought off with a salary so that he ceases from sins, since he renders this not to you but to himself. For the rest, let him seek as much as he wishes from that source.”

§ 5. By the example of the Roman Empire, they say that they are able to permit--indeed, to seek--pleasures for the people. But among the Romans there was at first a moderation of stage players; then stages and theaters were often abolished and actors driven into exile. For they were becoming accustomed to idleness and vices, since, as Varro reproaches them in Book II of *On Agriculture*, “They preferred to move their hands in the theater and circus rather than among crops and vineyards.” They learned by experience that virtue could not stand in the kingdom of pleasure, and that innocence could not remain among so many incitements to vices. Therefore they often condemned these things, and most wickedly resumed what they had rightly renounced. The matter departed into such great madness that performers received the pay of generals and armies. At so great a price were purchased the kindling of disgraceful acts and the stain of morals. So great was the reward for violators of morals. Thus Tertullian speaks: “Theaters arose for violating morals. So many unclean spirits sit there as there are human beings whom the theater holds.”

§ 6. So great, so pernicious an evil can be abolished by the prince with one word, with one sheet of paper; and because he can oppose it so easily, if he does not do so, he himself cannot be saved. For what Christian will stir up a tumult? Then too, very many subjects, and indeed soldiers, are offended by these delights of princes and cities. Now the defenders of the fatherland in garrisons and camps are in want, while those who render service of no worth, pernicious service, live in gold and purple and insult those who pursue honorable things. But how can a commonwealth stand in which actors are equated with generals? We read with wonder of the wealth of Roscius and others, and from them we learn the madness of public vanity.

The Spartans did better in removing actors altogether than those who resolved to regulate them by laws. For although actors were sometimes compelled by the commands of princes to abstain in public, many seditious things were nevertheless attempted by them in public and many foul things within houses. Augustus was indeed just and severe toward Stephanio and lenient toward Pylades, but at last steadfastly brave; yet in the rest of his life he was indulgent and a corrupter of morals, for he himself lived most shamefully, and his wife and daughters were a public disgrace. Therefore stage players and performers must altogether be removed from our midst--much more foreign ones, such as Britons and others who wander everywhere through Germany; for they are infamous on account of their theatrical art and introduce great corruptions.

I would not, however, abolish every apparatus of the theater and every study of comedies; but I would readily concede it when bound by definite laws.

§ 7. First, let it excite to virtue both those who declaim and those who see and hear either a fable or a true history. We possess one play of Plautus more modest than the others, the *Captivi*:

Certainly, he says, it will be expedient to give attention to this play.

Its subject has not been handled before, nor is it like the others;

Nor are there filthy and unmentionable verses in it.

Here there is neither a perjured procurer nor an evil prostitute,

Nor a vainglorious soldier.

Therefore let the plays be holy and implant virtue. Let them teach civil prudence. Let nothing be spoken in a theater of Christians which could not also be spoken in a church. For your hearer is a temple of the Holy Spirit, to whom it is impious to commend trifles, much less obscenities. For the chief of all political writers and instructor of a great king rightly says in Book VII, Chapter XVII:

Οἶον, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὥσπερ ἄλλο τι τῶν φαύλων, ἐξορίζειν.

Foul speech, like other evils, must be utterly banished from the city.

Second, let there be such moderation of gestures as not only pleases, by its gravity, men who are civilly and elegantly mannered, but which the actor can retain through the whole remainder of his life, so that the stage may contribute to living courteously and agreeably in human society, and so that even the roughness and sluggishness of rustic young men may be formed.

Third, when the affections of vicious men--for example, of the proud, avaricious, and angry--are represented by voice and gesture, let the character of the verse and action be such that hatred and detestation of the vices is produced. And let the cause of evil never be acted so skillfully that the cause of good appears to have fallen. Thus there will not occur what sometimes happens: that actors carry into private conversation the gait, expression, and tossings

[Printed page 151]

of the arms which they displayed properly in theaters; and those who seemed to simulate pride in the theater exhibit it as reality in life.

Fourth, let them never represent the affection of a lover by words or gestures--not even for the purpose of showing the disastrous end of unchastity. Therefore the actor will not bring forward Hemor, son of Sichem, wounded by love, in order that, through the destruction of all the citizens and the sexual outrage avenged, he may strike greater fear. Nor will he present Delilah's flatteries in order that Samson's fates may be sung. There is a great difference among these matters. To think and speak about pride, avarice, or drunkenness, and to simulate its affections, does not lead the mind away from virtue. But the disease of lust is contagious; it is transmitted by the slightest breeze. This vice, too, when rebuked somewhat inconsiderately or immodestly, often rages more vehemently. Men behold the angry and the drunken without anger or drunkenness of their own, and by the very sight have learned to condemn those vices. Improvident minds do not safely hear the lusts of others, except incidentally and in passing. If you dwell upon representing loves, the mind is infected with vice before it hears the catastrophe to the end.

Fifth, I do not condemn charms and witticisms, provided they are pointed, honorable, and pertain to contempt for vices. For nothing can be said wittily except against a vice. If you jest against an innocent person, it is an insult. In the very jest, let something of a good disposition shine forth; let foulness never insinuate itself. Nazianzen says excellently:

Εἰπεῖν, ἀκοῦσαι, ἢ δοῦναι, μικρὸν μέσον.

Speaking, hearing, and doing stand at a short interval. Therefore let the jest be noble, not malevolent, not foul, because one ought not even to hear such a jest.

What Antonius of Siena relates in the history of the Dominican Fathers is marvelous. A young man had disclosed his love to Lucia, a chaste and holy virgin, and among his flatteries had written that he was wounded and captivated by the beauty of her eyes. But she, unaccustomed to a procurer's flattery and at the same time concerned for the lover's salvation, sent her eyes, torn out, to the young man, with an inscription added: that he now possessed the very cheap thing which she had valued less than her God. How chaste was that spirit, which tore out eyes violated by an impure letter because they had pleased her lover! How would that virgin have detested theatrical obscenities when she avenged a letter in this manner?

Sixth, let no woman enter the stage, nor any man in a woman's costume. Let even the clothing of that sex, whom modesty and laws confine at home, be absent from the theater. I have never approved a young man, in feminine dress, simulating a woman--even one holy, modest, and chaste--or having his hair arranged and being adorned by women, so that he may be seen in public as though a woman. I rejoiced that this judgment of mine was approved by our Society; for it prohibited our pupils from coming forth upon the stage in women's clothing in the future. And in general I dislike the cause of chastity being pleaded in the theater. Chastity is modest and tender, safer by fleeing and hiding; it does not

desire to appear in public even for its own praise. Let faith, fortitude, prudence, and sobriety have their parts. Let chastity enjoy its own conscience alone at home. If it is praised in public, let this be done sparingly and modestly.

Seventh, let no one proceed onto the stage for the sake of gain--no one who does not sustain his life by another art or support himself and his family from domestic resources. Therefore I have already utterly proscribed from my commonwealth stage players and mountebanks who prepare a living by jesting, speaking obscenely, and deceiving; whose praise grows from crime; and who are considered more skillful the fouler they are. Men of this kind are generally most wicked. For since they are oppressed by poverty, they labor to gather crowds and please the people; hence they say and do those things by which every most foolish man is delighted. Hence they do not care what they say, provided they extort money. Therefore it was badly provided for the commonwealth when that dregs was supported at public expense, and laughter and instruction in foulness were purchased with so great a concern. Roscius received a daily wage of one thousand denarii, as Macrobius testifies in Book III of the *Saturnalia*. But surely, is it lawful, contrary to right, that those things which the provinces contributed be spent on the amusements of the worst men? It also disturbs the peace of the commonwealth.

Eighth, just as obscene license ought not wander about the prince's table, but instead a benign invitation, nobility of jest, and love of studies, so let sacred, honorable, political, and learned comedy--an indication of a liberal disposition and a pledge of future hope--delight the eyes of the Christian people with grave courtesy and easy dignity. And let it be brought about that every most honorable and most noble person comes to practice in this matter. Rule 13 of the prescribed plan of studies for the rectors of the Society has encompassed all these things in brief words:

“13. The subject of tragedies and comedies--which ought to be only in Latin and very rare--shall be sacred and pious. Nothing shall be inserted between the acts which is not Latin and decorous; nor shall any female character or clothing be introduced.

“14. But let him take great care to prevent the pupils, while preparing themselves for things of this kind, from suffering a loss of morals or studies.”

CHAPTER XIV

Sobriety Is the Firmament of the Commonwealth

§ 1. Many things have been said by the wise, and many by the temperate, in favor of sobriety against intemperance. But drunkenness, though rebuked in gatherings and even at banquets, rules; and it is much easier to praise virtue than to follow it. Therefore I shall speak about temperance to those who seek dishes and wine. I shall also speak to the Germans, that is, to my own fatherland. Although this vice reigns most widely among them, one must nevertheless not despair of a remedy, since many princes and magnates have brought their courts back to moderation and continence.

They say that certain men asked Charles V to prohibit revels and drinking bouts, but that he replied with a laugh that this would be just as if he prohibited thefts among the Spaniards. One must not judge that the emperor spoke in this way out of despair of reformation, but in order to remind men who sharply censured the vices of another nation of their domestic evils. And so I too shall admonish them concerning these things; for the time will come when so great an evil will either be removed by the diligence of princes or oppressed by barbarian servitude.

Germany has always acknowledged this evil as its own, and therefore has carried very many laws against it, even in public diets and assemblies. I shall review the more recent ones.

In the year 1500, at the Diet of Augsburg under Emperor Maximilian, the following was decreed concerning compulsory drinking: “And although, by the consent of the electors, princes, and other estates, it was established and enacted at the last diet concerning compulsory drinking and drinking bouts that the magistrates of all provinces and places where that custom of drinking was not so ancient should apply themselves to the matter, so that it might be abolished, prevented, and gravely

[Printed page 152]

punished, we have nevertheless understood that this constitution of ours and of the Empire has thus far been little observed, but that the said abuse and intemperance is growing stronger and increasing everywhere in all the provinces from day to day. Therefore, since it is so much more necessary that this evil be met with greater care and vehemence than has formerly been done, we prescribe and command each and every elector, prince, and other estate, of whatever dignity, condition, or province they may be, unless they wish to incur the righteous indignation of Our Majesty and fall from favor, that they severely prohibit drinking bouts of this kind everywhere in their electorates, principalities, provinces, dominions, and territories, punish them with a grave penalty, and execute this command with every zeal.”

§ 2. But in the year 1512, at Cologne, an even graver penalty was decreed.

§ 3. “Likewise, although drinking bouts have very gravely been prohibited rather often at previous diets, this has nevertheless thus far been little observed and put into execution--indeed, it has been neglected by those who ought to have maintained and enforced the command--and because, above all, from this imitation in drinking a larger draught of wine arises drunkenness, and from drunkenness frequent blasphemies, homicides, and innumerable other evils, so that those drinkers cast themselves into a present danger to honor, reputation, the salvation of the soul, reason, life, and fortunes, let each of the magistrates of all the provinces, highest and lowest, ecclesiastical and secular, reform that vice first in themselves and then in their subjects, and prohibit everyone from that lust for drinking under the gravest penalties.

“And if any of the nobility are unwilling to restrain themselves from it, let us, the electors also, the princes both ecclesiastical and secular, and every magistrate avoid them, dismiss them from courts, and remove them from offices and duties; and let none either of the princes or of the other lords admit those dismissed for this cause into his service. But let men of lower condition and lot be subjected to corporal penalties for the same fault. But if any magistrate has

been negligent toward his subjects in watching over, enforcing, and executing this command of ours, then let the fiscal officer of Our Imperial Majesty summon those subjects who have transgressed before our Imperial Chamber, so that the deserved penalties may be exacted from them. But wherever that depraved custom of drinking, handed down from ancestors, has already taken root, let the magistrates give diligent effort to its abolition.”

O happy fatherland, if those amphorae and Maximins are exterminated from courts, churches, and cities, and punished.

In the year 1548, at Augsburg, the following was decreed by Charles V with the consent of the Empire:

“Since, as daily experience teaches, God is most gravely offended by drunkenness--for various vices, evils, and injuries spring from it--and at previous diets it was established concerning drinking bouts and contests of cups and wine that, in order to remove and abolish drinking bouts, the magistrate should punish severely those guilty of that crime; nevertheless constitutions of this kind have thus far been little observed and put into execution. Rather, that depraved custom of drinking has grown and spread more broadly everywhere from day to day, having driven deeper roots. From it have followed blasphemies, robberies, homicides, adulteries, and gravest offenses of that kind.

“It is added that, through drunkenness, secrets which deservedly ought to be concealed are repeatedly revealed. These vices render the Germans--whose valor was known long ago and greatly praised--exceedingly contemptible among foreign nations. It has likewise often happened in war that, on this occasion, grave dissensions, seditions, and rebellions have arisen among the soldiers themselves, and disobedience toward commanders and military magistrates has sprung up. From this the dearness of provisions is also increased; honorable banquets and social gatherings, for which the Germans were formerly especially commended, are abolished, diminished, and avoided. This is to say nothing of the fact that the vice of drinking is the fountain of every evil and exceedingly pernicious to the eternal salvation, honor, favor, reason, longer life, and bodily strength of human beings.

“Therefore, having considered these things, we command each and every elector and prince, both ecclesiastical and secular, and the other estates of whatever dignity, condition, or province they may be, that they themselves abstain altogether from drinking bouts, both so that they may shine before their subjects by example and so that they may have so much greater power to exact due penalties from transgressors. In their courts let them command courtiers, and in princely dominions, provinces, territories, and domains their subjects, under grave penalty, to abstain from every drinking bout, by whatever manner, words, or form it is instituted or may be devised for institution; and let them diligently enforce this command. Especially, let them also command heads of households diligently to admonish their whole household--children, male servants, and maidservants--to abstain altogether from oaths, blasphemies against God, his most holy mother, and the other saints, and from drinking, as we too prescribe severely here and will to have diligently observed.

“We also will that magistrates give this business to their parish priests and preachers, so that on every Sunday they may set it before the people and command them to abstain from drinking, enumerating for this purpose the vices which are generated from it. For this it will be necessary that a catalogue of them be furnished to the priests by the magistrates.”

In the year 1570, at Speyer, Maximilian established the following concerning the military order, §48:

“Since, to our sorrow, the matter has come to such a point that among the Germans, especially those in military service, the detestable and bestial custom of drinking is the principal exercise--from which grave disgrace, dishonor, infamy, danger, and contempt threaten the whole nation, and above all because victories are consequently rarer and the outcomes of war often more unfortunate--let it be severely commanded to the master of cavalry, military magistrates, as also to lords, nobles, and knights, by force of this military constitution, that they restrain themselves from continual and perpetual drunkenness, but especially that they do not permit it to their attendants and servants.” And §49 admonishes thus:

“But if any one or more military magistrates, having been accused, shall have been discovered to be so given to the bestial and detestable vice of gorging himself that he by no means performs his duty according to necessity, let him be removed from office by the military prefect or his commander, and let it be entrusted to men more sober. Nor is it lawful for anyone, whoever he may be, to oppose himself, aid that man, or defend him, by force of the present constitution and the obedience owed to it.” And §50:

“Likewise, by the military prefect, the commanders, and the equestrian court, in all offenses which were committed in drunkenness by lords, nobles, or soldiers, of whatever condition or lot they may be, and which come to be punished, let drunkenness in no way be accepted or admitted as an excuse or a mitigation of penalties. Indeed, let offenses of this kind be fined and punished the more severely and gravely, even with twice as much.” And §51:

“He who, through drunkenness, has neglected a hostile danger, being stupefied by sleep or in some other manner, shall pay for the negligence with his head.” And §52:

“Each and every soldier, foot soldier, and other man occupied in the service of the cavalry who shall have been discovered to have drunk in the manner of beasts and to be so drunk that he is without power over himself and his reason shall be led directly to prison and bound with iron, nor shall he be released without the will of the commanders or master of cavalry. In addition, it shall be lawful and right to punish such men according to the gravity and confession of the offense, and to summon and drag before the equestrian court those who have opposed themselves to this proceeding.” Finally, §78:

[Printed page 153]

“Therefore, anyone who has been discovered in the watches after drinking, or drunk, so that according to the necessity of the matter he cannot keep watch and give the true and proper password, shall be punished according to the judgment and sentence of the military prefect, the commanders, or the equestrian court.”

I therefore bring these laws forward at the beginning so that I may meet the objection of those who judge that one must despair of Germany and deny that sobriety can be restored. Emperors and princes have good hope; I add that they are also able to apply a remedy, if they will.

§ 4. The Africans, according to Augustine's testimony, were prone to drunkenness, but in his church there was nevertheless so great a care for sobriety that Augustine deservedly says in Sermon 231 *On Time*: “Although, with Christ's favor, dearest brothers, I believe that you dread the evil of drunkenness as a pit of hell, and that not only do you yourselves not wish to drink beyond measure, but do not adjure or compel others to take more than is fitting, nevertheless it cannot happen that there are not some negligent persons who are unwilling to be sober. You who always offer sober banquets, do not take it as an injury to us that it is necessary for us to rebuke certain drunkards.

“For since, dearest brothers, the evil of drunkenness is a grave vice and hateful to God, it has been admitted into custom by many throughout the whole world to such an extent that by those who are unwilling to know God's precepts it is now neither thought nor believed to be a sin. This goes so far that at their banquets they ridicule those who are able to drink less, and through inimical friendship are not ashamed to adjure men to take more drink than is fitting. For to the man who compels another to make himself drunk by drinking more than is necessary, it would be a lesser evil if he wounded the other's flesh with a sword than if he killed his soul through drunkenness.

“And because our bodies are earthly, just as, if rain is excessively heavy and prolonged, the earth is flooded and dissolved into mud, so that no cultivation can take place in it, so too our flesh, when it has been made drunk by more abundant drink, will be able neither to receive spiritual cultivation nor to bring forth the necessary fruits of the soul. And therefore, just as all men desire their fields to receive sufficient rain so that they may both be able to exercise cultivation and rejoice in an abundance of fruits, so too in the field of the body they ought to drink only as much as is fitting, lest through excessive drunkenness the earth of the body itself, as though turned into a marsh, be able to generate worms and serpents of vices rather than bring forth fruits of good works.

“For all drunkards are such as marshes appear to be. Your Charity is not ignorant of what is born in marshes: all that is born there is recognized as having no fruit. Serpents and bloodsuckers are born there; frogs and diverse kinds of worms are born there, which can generate horror rather than supply anything profitable for sustenance. Those plants or trees which are accustomed to be born either in the marshes themselves or around their banks appear to have no usefulness, to such a degree that every year they are consumed by fire. See: what is born from drunkenness is prepared for fire.”

Why do we either write books or preach in churches or debate in academies concerning these things? The belly has no ears; but the ears of drunkards also lack hearing, and their head lacks a brain. Nevertheless one must not yield to vices but go against them. Thus the wise men and prophets acted formerly. Nor must the anger of drunkards be feared, because very soon they will rot away.

They cry, “Be ashamed, and let there be shame upon you! Why are you unable to drink as much as we?” For they say that those men are not men. And see the misery of drunkards: those who lie in the sewer of drunkenness say that they are men, and they say that those who stand honorably and soberly are not men. They lie prostrate and are men; the others stand upright and are not men?

Therefore, since the drunk are outside their own power and, because they lack reason, are incapable of admonition, let us admonish the sober to restrain them.

§ 5. First, the law of the great king upon whom every kingdom depends was given to everyone. You see the foundations of the German laws in the decrees of God and the oracles of the Most High, and you see that Germany's princes and leading men are not ignorant of their own evils, but either love them or are too weak to remove them. But let us look upon the divine laws, and measure our commonwealth and morals by them.

Leviticus 10:8: “And the Lord said to Aaron: You and your sons shall not drink wine or anything capable of making drunk when you enter the tabernacle of the testimony, lest you die; because it is an everlasting command throughout your generations.” Let drunkenness not approach ceremonies destined to perish; to have tasted wine at all is held to be an offense requiring expiation. How shall Christians drink the cup of the Lord while still belching from drunkenness?

Proverbs 20:1: “Wine is a luxurious thing and drunkenness tumultuous; whoever delights in these will not be wise.” And 21:17: “He who loves feasts will be in poverty; he who loves wine and rich foods will not be enriched.” And 23:1: “When you sit to eat with a prince, attend diligently to the things which have been placed before your face, and set a knife at your throat, if nevertheless you have your soul in your power. Do not desire his foods, in which is the bread of falsehood.”

And 31:4: “Do not give wine to kings, O Lemuel, do not give wine to kings, because there is no secret where drunkenness reigns, lest perhaps they drink and forget judgments and alter the cause of the children of the poor.”

Ecclesiasticus 19:1: “A drunken workman will not become rich, and he who despises small things will fall little by little. Wine and women cause the wise to apostatize and will reprove the prudent.” And 31:12: “You have sat at a great table; do not open your jaws over it first.” And verse 17: “Do not be compressed at a banquet.” Chapter 37:32: “Do not be greedy at every feast.”

Isaiah 5:11: “Woe to you who rise in the morning to pursue drunkenness and to drink until evening, so that you may grow hot with wine. The cithara and lyre and timbrel and pipe and wine are in your banquets, and you do not look upon the work of the Lord or consider the works of his hands.” And verse 22: “Woe to you who are powerful at drinking wine and strong men at mixing drunkenness.” And 22:12: “And the Lord God of hosts shall call on that day to weeping and lamentation, to baldness and the girdle of sackcloth; and behold joy and gladness, killing calves and slaughtering rams, eating flesh and drinking wine: Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die,” and so forth. And 28:7: “But these also did not know because of wine, and wandered because of drunkenness. Priest and prophet did not know because of drunkenness; they were swallowed by wine, wandered in drunkenness, did not know the seer, and

were ignorant of judgment.” And 56:12: “Come, let us take wine and be filled with drunkenness; and as it is today, so shall it be tomorrow and much more.”

Ezekiel 16:49: “Behold, this was the iniquity of Sodom your sister: pride, fullness of bread, abundance, and the idleness of her and her daughters; and they did not extend a hand to the needy and poor.”

Daniel 5:2: “Therefore, being now drunken, he commanded that the vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar his father had carried away from the temple which was in Jerusalem be brought, so that the king, his nobles, his wives, and his concubines might drink from them.”

Hosea 4:11: “Fornication and wine and drunkenness take away the heart.”

[Printed page 154]

Joel 1:5: “Awake, drunkards, and weep and howl, all you who drink wine in sweetness, because it has perished from your mouth.”

Micah 2:11: “Would that I were not a man having the spirit, and that I spoke falsehood instead: I shall drip down wine and drunkenness for you, and this shall be the people upon whom it is dripped.”

Romans 13:13: “As in the day, let us walk honorably, not in revels and drunkenness, not in beds and unchastities, not in contention and rivalry.”

1 Corinthians 10:6: “But these things were done as a figure for us, so that we should not be desirous of evil things as they also desired.” And 15:32: “If according to man I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what does it profit me if the dead do not rise? Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die.”

Galatians 5:19: “But the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness,” and so forth; “drunkennesses and things similar to these, which I foretell to you, as I have foretold, that those who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.”

Ephesians 5:18: “And do not be drunk with wine, in which is luxury.”

1 Thessalonians 5:6: “Let us keep watch and be sober; for those who sleep, sleep by night, and those who are drunk are drunk by night. But we who belong to the day, let us be sober.” 1 Timothy 3:2: “Therefore a bishop ought to be irreproachable, the husband of one wife,” and so forth; “not given to wine, not a striker,” and so forth.

1 Peter 4:3: “For the past time is sufficient for accomplishing the will of the gentiles, for those who walked in luxuries, desires, drunkennesses, revels, drinking bouts, and unlawful worships of idols.” Hebrews 12:16: “Lest there be any fornicator or profane person, like Esau, who for one meal sold his birthright.”

§ 6. I have long remembered that my business is with those men who measure everything by their own advantages, not by the integrity of the commonwealth but by reason of state, as they themselves are accustomed to speak. And so I must also say this: a commonwealth in which drunkenness rules cannot stand for long. For drunkenness is both hostile to God and contrary to the order by which alone the commonwealth stands.

For what region was there which, although it embraced drunkenness, did not condemn it? What region did not perish through it unless it corrected it early? Lacedaemon, that harsh but brief guardian of virtues, ruled while sober and served while drunk. When Leotychidas was asked why they avoided drunkenness by a severe law, he replied, “Lest others deliberate for us.” For a drunkard, like a ward, is in another's hand. Solon punished an offense of drunkenness with death. Pittacus visited one who offended while drunk with a double penalty. The laws of Germany in a certain manner imitate this, for they establish a graver penalty for the offenses of drunkards. In Spain, if anyone is a drunkard, he is deprived of the honor of giving testimony; in Italy he is held up to mockery and regarded as in a certain manner infamous. Therefore we possess the testimony of the Creator, the holy fathers, and human laws, together with the

consensus of all nations. If anyone resists it, assuredly he must be cast out of every commonwealth as insane and as one contemplating madness.

§ 7. A commonwealth which takes no account of temperance, and which either passes over in silence or incites the drunkenness of its citizens, is cruel. It raises a people weak, diseased, useless for conducting affairs, contemptible to neighbors, and exposed to enemies. For the vinousness of fathers and grandfathers transmits into sons and grandsons arthritis, dropsy, coma, inflammation of the eyes, tremor, epilepsy, and apoplexy, and frequently together with them poverty and want. Sobriety is the cause of health; intemperance brings in a cohort of diseases. Golden are the words of Hippocrates:

Ἀσκησις ὑγείης, ἀκορίη τροφῆς, ἀοκνίη πόνων.

The exercise of health is slenderness of diet and unwearied endurance of labor. Socrates lived healthy for a very long time at Athens--that is, in the fatherland of luxury and diseases--because he lived soberly. Fortune sets out an ostentatious table; virtue a sparing one. Indeed, even great fortune sets out a sparing one, provided that it is not luxurious. Health requires a sparing table; fever and dropsy are never satiated. Nature is content with few things. As everyone admits, one lives well and healthfully on water. "You have the Nile, and you seek wine?" Pescennius Niger said to a soldier rioting from desire for delicacies.

The old age of Augustus flourished through abstinence and would have been longer if his wicked wife had not hastened it with a poisoned fig. He furnished a dinner of three courses, or most abundantly six, with no excessive expense but the greatest courtesy. Thus Suetonius testifies. What do you hear? Three or six courses on the table of Augustus, the lord of affairs, to whom the Parthians returned the standards and the Indians submitted their kingdoms? What satrap, what citizen furnishes a dinner to a friend in this manner? Constantius too was long-lived; the history of his life teaches the cause. At Caesar's banquet he forbade a pheasant, a sow's womb, and an udder to be demanded and brought in, content with the chance food of a munificent soldier.

But the cause why wine and excessive food bring diseases upon the body--so that they rightly call *ἰόν*, "poison," *τὴν κακίστην τροφήν*, "the worst nourishment"--is easily explained by natural philosophers.

§ 8. Whatever is supplied to nature beyond its appetite and powers weighs it down, oppresses it, and weakens it to such a degree that it is turned into poison. It excites an immense struggle and is cast out with convulsion of the breast, nausea, shaking of the head, injury to memory, and the functions of the entrails turned to the contrary.

Wine taken copiously, especially wine that is sweet and spirituous, evaporates upward in great abundance, fills every passage and cavity of the brain, puts reason to sleep, and soon that cloud congeals through cold. With both the passages of breathing and the nerves which administer sensation oppressed, it sometimes threatens immediate death. Thus Alexander the Macedonian died; thus Andebundus, king of England, was carried out from a banquet. Alexander's drunkenness was always a spectacle; but the funeral rites of Calanus the Indian were set before the entire army as a terror. For a drinking contest was instituted. A talent was promised to the first man, thirty minae to the second, and ten to the third; but it was a bloody contest. Thirty-five men, seized on the very field by sudden cold, shivering, and syncope, breathed out their lives. Six who were carried back to the tents died shortly afterward. Promachus the Macedonian, who merited the talent, died within three days after receiving it. Thus Chares of Mytilene writes concerning Alexander.

But if death does not follow, nevertheless the falling sickness, which is customarily called Herculean, is at hand; for Alcides was subject to it, and not undeservedly, since he bore away the palm among drinkers. They relate that his cup could scarcely be carried by two men. Therefore they called immense mixing bowls Heracleian. All the senses, especially the eyes, are rendered duller; the voice is blunted by drunkenness; color dies away; the breath is corrupted. Ears, lungs, stomach, joints, and intestines have their own vices from a debauch; frenzy also frequently breaks out from it.

What is more miserable than Zeno, who, as a mockery to the peoples, was buried alive first in wine and then in earth? His mind was altogether alienated through drunkenness, with the plebs reproaching him:

[Printed page 155]

“Zeno, rise up; have you drunk again?” When this happened frequently, Ariadne, through hatred of so many vices, ordered him, half alive, to be cast into an imperial tomb and it to be closed with an immense stone. When he returned to himself there and, with immense lamentation and bellowing, wailed, he was neglected through fear of Ariadne and compelled to die. Zonaras, Annal III.

Nor is the end of Michael dissimilar in the same Zonaras. While he was overwhelmed by undiluted wine and oppressed by the deepest sleep, his hands were then cut off so that he could not flee because of drunkenness; a soldier of Basil pierced him through, and by drawing out his entrails with a sword ended his drunkenness and life.

Aristotle briefly explains whence those things arise, Section III, Problem III. He says that drinkers are *δυσρίγους*, “prone to chills,” and that they are most quickly seized by pain of the sides and other conditions of this kind. For wine brings much moisture and much cold and overcomes natural heat. But wine induces old age and tremor:

Ὡν γὰρ θερμὸς ὁ οἶνος μετὰ τῆς φυσικῆς ὑπαρχούσης θερμότητος, μᾶλλον ἀναλίσκει τὰ ἐν σώματι ὑπάρχοντα ἐφόδια τῷ οἰκείῳ θερμῷ.

For since wine is hot, when joined to the body's natural heat it more effectively consumes the nourishment in the body belonging to its natural and innate moisture. Hence it happens that among these men some are oppressed inwardly by water, others by a flux, others by another discharge, and very many other disorders of the same belly exercise them. For both the remaining humors remain sharp and unfit, and those liquids which have come from without cannot be thickened because of the weakness of their proper heat. But the heat itself remains weak for this reason: because the matter by which it can still be maintained is weak. So it is with a fire which a reed produces, for because of the weakness of its material it is weaker than a fire furnished by wood.

But Aristotle plainly teaches in Problem XXIII that one's age is diminished by wine: “Why does one who was previously emaciated and then drank much undiluted wine fall down dead? And why are very many drinkers, although they have in no way emaciated themselves, nevertheless made dry by a large and universal draught of undiluted wine? For this must be investigated, since wine is hot by its own nature, and just as life plainly is maintained by heat, so death occurs by cooling. Is it the case that, as from hemlock, so one must die from undiluted wine, although one's own heat is thereby gradually extinguished, but by a different manner? For hemlock wastes natural heat by cold. And just as a small fire is extinguished by excessive fire or by the sun, so the body's inward heat is overcome and extinguished by the heat of wine, if it is excessive.”

Or, if another similitude pleases: just as heated wine, when it is cooled, loses its natural heat and subtlety, because its fiery, airy, and more delicate parts vanish and the baser matter remains, so too the natural moisture, which philosophers call radical moisture, is dissipated and dissolved by excessive adventitious heat. From this tremor and cold of bodies grow strong. Hence drunkards rejoice in the sun.

This having therefore been established, a rightly ordered commonwealth and a political prince ought to remove drunkenness as poisons and hemlock are removed, and to punish offenders by laws. For it makes no difference whether by the cold of hemlock or by the heat of undiluted wine you exhaust the heat implanted in nature and induce a deadly cold. Drunkenness, I believe, kills more slowly but more cruelly, wrenching the unhappy soul away amid a great concurrence of diseases and symptoms. Indeed, Caelius Rhodiginus relates in Book XXVIII, Chapter XXXI, that certain men became mute from drunkenness and, suffering convulsion or spasm, immediately fell down; others, when fever supervened, sought a remedy from the lesser evil.

Thus, therefore, I maintain that the life of many nobles and rich men in Germany could be twice as long if they cultivated sobriety--indeed, healthier and more pleasant. I say of the rich, for drunkenness is more frequent among

them, rarer among the poor, and less harmful to bodies hardened and dried by labor. For just as individual bouts of drunkenness diminish vital heat and the vegetative moisture of nature, so too they tear away a part of life and accelerate death. And so the unjust inviter drives men toward death while he serves delightful poisons; and when men “drink health,” as they speak, they subtract years from themselves. You will find many old men nowhere except in the harsher places of Germany, where poverty and lack of wine have taught sobriety. Nor shall I deny that many leading and wealthy men, obedient to the laws of temperance, live moderately amid splendid fortune. But the paucity of these yields to the multitude of the others. From this another evil follows: very many men, their fathers removed by an immature death, are wards; both their estates are dissipated and, with greater harm, their education is neglected.

§ 9. Beginning again from higher principles, I undertake to explain how great a corruption there is in wine and how great a plague to life comes from it. Aristotle says in Book VII, Chapter XVII of the *Politics*:

Φαίνεται δὴ διὰ τε τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἐπισκοποῦσι, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν οἷς ἐπιμελές ἐστιν εἰσάγειν τὴν πολεμικὴν ἔξιν, ἢ τοῦ γάλακτος πλήθουσα τροφὴ ἀσυνωτέρα δὲ, διὰ τὰ νοσήματα.

It is plain, if anyone considers other living creatures and the nations which take care to induce a bodily habit fit for war, that an abundant supply of milk is most suited to bodies, yet without wine because of diseases. Therefore Aristotle also prohibits dark wine to nurses, lest vinous and hot milk infect the tender limbs and humors of infants; for as the flavor of the fodder is, so too are the force and property in the milk.

I do not think that wine must be prohibited to women in Germany, although this was provided by laws at Rome and although Egnatius killed his wine-drinking wife with a club and was acquitted of the killing by Romulus. For the region is cold, and its wine is for the most part more diluted than Greek, Italian, and Spanish wine. And so that law of Romulus--“If she shall have drunk wine at home, let them punish her as an adulteress”--was abrogated even at Rome. Nor does that consequence of vices which the ancients connected always exist: that adulteries and poisonings follow the use of wine. For physicians frequently prescribe wine in Germany and the northern regions; and Guevara, a man prudent as well as severe, concedes a little wine to women in his very hot Spain for thickening milk, although it is so diluted that the rawness of the water is corrected rather than any flavor perceived by the tongue.

But let each person judge these matters as he wishes, provided that what I have resolved to conclude from them is introduced into morals, and everyone acknowledges how much harm to bodies exists in the abuse of wine. For if wine drunk by a mother or nurse, subdued by the stomach, tempered with other nourishment, thickened into blood, and then by the most perfect digestion converted into milk exercises such power upon nurslings that it kindles them with an alien heat and renders them epileptic, ecstatic, stupefied, stupid, and diseased, what must be judged if both parents and the grandparents received those vices by inheritance, increased them by intemperance, and transcribed them into their offspring?

§ 10. For the same cause the custom of many who frequently drip wine into infants is also foul--*πῦρ ἐπὶ πῦρ ἐπάγοντες*, as the Greeks say, adding fire to fire.

Plato prohibits wine from being given to children before their eighteenth year. The Suebi, formerly imitating Plato, according to Caesar in Book IV, did not even permit wine to be imported, lest they become soft. The Bohemians, by contrast, in the age of their great-grandfathers poured noble wines into infants so that they might learn to drain immense cups at court. Roman youths wearing the *toga praetexta*

[Printed page 156]

abstained from wine. Avicenna altogether denies it to children, for it is just as if one adds fire to fire, and this in weak matter. He concedes it temperately to young men and as much as they can endure to old men. Children's bodies are porous, loose, and hot; therefore they are most easily inflamed by wine. Their nerves are weak and their brain infirm. Thus Galen too says in his *Regimen of Health*: “Wine is most hostile to children, because they are excessively

inflamed by it and because their nerves and brain cannot resist its violence. It dries vehemently and overturns the state of the mind not only for the present but disturbs it for the whole of life.”

If you bend violently strong wood or a bronze bow, it possesses powers by which it may spring back and restore itself to its straightness. If you bend wax, lead, and tender shoots, they easily follow the hand, but they cannot return whence they were drawn. Thus voluntary madness from drunkenness indeed disturbs robust bodies, hardened arteries, strengthened nerves, a compact and thickened brain, and its strong little membranes in men, and renders them weaker--for wood once bent is never restored altogether to its former integrity, and a bow long bent loses its strength. But if the ardor of Liber falls upon the tender entrails of children, it so dilates, twists, contracts, and dries them that by no art can they recover their natural constitution.

Memorable is the example of a boy of Pergamum who, when thirsty, drank somewhat undiluted wine. He remained awake for a long time; fever followed the wakefulness, frenzy followed the fever, and finally death. “But we do not always see those things.” It is true: wine does not produce the same evils in everyone, but contrary ones--dropsy in one, burning fevers in another, wasting and sleep in some, shouts and songs in others. Chaeremon says in Aristotle's *Problems* that wine operates according to the characters of those to whom it applies itself. And so it harms gradually and little by little until it uses up the whole man.

I have heard young men complaining of sleeplessness; I have seen men otherwise strong from whom wine had taken away, if not their mind, certainly their health and vigor of mind. Sleep denied to nature in youth is a certain sign of a short life. Dryness drives away sleep, but wine dries young men especially; that humor, overwhelming tender nature, takes away its sweet and life-giving juice. Just as dry wood is moistened by water yet lacks native and vital sap, and that moisture effects nothing except that it rots more easily, so too are bodies which are washed in wine rather than drink it.

Thus Diotimus the Athenian, whom they jestingly called a *chous*, because, with a funnel applied, he drank without breathing. There are some so inexperienced in affairs that they judge the natural heat to be restored and increased by the heat of wine with which drunkards grow hot, although experience teaches them that on the following or third day all things grow cold and the limbs tremble. But I speak concerning children. In cold places I would concede them no wine, or little and diluted wine; in hot places none at all. Cast a tender flower into must: you will receive it pale and without sap. No less does the slight flame of Falernian wine burn delicate entrails and hurry them into premature old age more quickly than the beard.

But what need is there of disputation? You may traverse all Europe: in cultivated cities you will find the pale faces of young men, slender bodies, thin little legs; in villages, strong offspring, lively color, muscular upper arms, broad shoulders, robust and masculine supports of the legs, and longevity. But concerning this matter eternal truth is my witness, Ecclesiasticus 37:34: “Because of debauchery many have died, but he who is abstinent will add to life.” Therefore let princes lay it up in their inmost mind that more persons must not perish in peace than in war. For what does it profit the commonwealth that swords are sheathed--or, as Scripture speaks, turned into plowshares--if the aconites of intemperance, if the poisons of wine rage more freely than any wars? Those who neglect these things sin against the health of human beings. “To sin against a human being's health is the crime of homicide,” says Cassiodorus.

The wretched flee plague and epidemic pestilence, although, if seized by it, they will die without crime. They follow the intemperance of wine and will die with dishonor and eternal destruction. What Augustine said concerning the son of one head of a household in a sermon on chastity--“What does it profit a man to have a son, nourish him, and love him, if he nourishes him for eternal torments?”--I say to the prince: What does it profit a prince to have subjects if all, or a great part, are being prepared for a miserable spectacle and the torments of hell?

§ 11. Enough has been said concerning the evils of the body whose cause is drunkenness; the plague of minds is greater. I am not speaking of the offense against the divine power and of sins, but of impediments to talent, memory,

judgment, and alacrity. Drunkenness takes away memory, scatters the senses, and confounds the intellect, as Augustine teaches: “Drunkenness makes a beast out of a man, a weak man out of a strong one, and a fool out of a prudent one.” As Origen and Jerome testify: “Nothing so overwhelms the understanding as feasting and drunkenness.” Cleomenes, when he emulated the *ἄμυστιν*--the drinking at one draught--of the Spartans, Scythians, and Thracians, was reduced to insanity.

The natural cause of insanity from wine is that it alters the body remarkably, especially by attacking the head and brain. Hence spasm, convulsion, frenzy, stupor, watering of the eyes, tremor, and the disturbance of the brain and its instruments as though of a clock or of strings produce stupidity. Campanian mothers are said to have smeared hedgehog's blood upon their breasts so that they might rear fierce offspring. But there was neither an abundance of that blood nor such efficacy in it, nor were the Campanians fierce, but luxurious. Caligula's nurse gave her nursling the blood of a girl torn apart and mangled together with her milk; yet this was not the cause of that cruelty of his by which he afflicted the human race. He took the greatest pleasure from slaughter, intent without satiety upon the spectacle of shed blood, as Dio testifies in Book LIX. But an inhuman nature, education, and drunkenness brought this about, and those were the evils of the times.

Certainly it was not without cause that the Lord said in Hosea 7, “The princes began to rage from wine.” Not without cause did Pythagoras say that three clusters grow upon the vine: the first of pleasure, the second of drunkenness, the third of insanity. Athenaeus, Book II, Chapter I, relates from Timaeus of Tauromenium that certain young Agrigentines came to such insanity that, while drunk, they thought that they were sailing and, as though a storm had arisen and as if they wished to lighten the ship of its cargoes, threw all the furniture through the windows. When the senate sent officers, they adored them as Tritons and promised victims and sacrifices if they should escape the storm. On the third day they scarcely returned to their mind; the house was called the Trireme. Therefore that temporary insanity, more frequently impressed upon the mind through wine, disturbs the judgment even of men when sober.

Histories relate the most foolish deeds of drunken princes even when they were at their most sober. Sardanapalus entrusted his forces and the care of his kingdom to others. Cambyses, intolerable to everyone and the most foolish of all, afflicted his father's empire. Bonosus, in his own age the most capacious of drinkers, merited hanging by his imprudence. Marcus Antonius, the most talented of the Romans, conducted very many things effeminately and childishly. Claudius, that stock and mushroom, who, as someone says, was so foolish that he could reign--what of the fact, as Seneca jokes,

[Printed page 157]

that when he saw his own funeral and obsequies, he then first understood that he was dead? That man, I say, held large and continual banquets. Caligula, Gallienus, and Maximinus, by the habit of drinking deeply, fell into the greatest disgraces.

§ 12. But what is the chief point: it is established that princes have overthrown the commonwealth through drunkenness. Alexander the Macedonian, the fortunate robber of Asia, conducted very many things youthfully and foolishly, and no one was more desirous of wine than he. No one would call Caligula sane if he should read even one chapter concerning his deeds in Suetonius; but if that man had lived a few years, he would have squandered the whole empire.

“But, lest I enumerate individual things,” says Suetonius, “he consumed immense resources and all that wealth of Tiberius Caesar, twenty-seven thousand times one hundred thousand sesterces, before a whole year had turned. Therefore, exhausted and needy, he turned his mind to robberies through a various and most exquisitely contrived class of false accusations, auctions, and taxes. He denied that those whose ancestors had obtained Roman citizenship for themselves and their posterity possessed it by right, unless they were sons, for he said that ‘posterity’ ought not to be understood beyond this degree. When the diplomas of the deified Julius and Augustus were produced, he lamented

that they were old and obsolete. He charged that census declarations had been wrongly submitted if afterward any increase whatsoever had accrued to them for any cause.

“He rescinded as ungrateful the wills of former chief centurions who, from the beginning of Tiberius's principate, had left neither him nor himself as heir; likewise, as invalid and empty, the wills of all others whom anyone said had intended, when dying, to leave Caesar as heir. When this fear had been injected, and he was now openly named heir both by strangers among their friends and by parents among their children, he called them mockers because they persisted in living after naming him, and he sent poisoned dainties to many. He moreover took cognizance of such cases after first fixing the amount of money for the completion of which he would sit; only when it had been completed was he roused. And, not patient even of a very little delay, he once condemned more than forty defendants on diverse charges by one sentence, and boasted to Caesonia, when she had awakened from sleep, how much he had accomplished while she took her midday rest.

“Having announced an auction, he put up and sold the remnants of all his spectacles, himself seeking the prices and extending them so far that some men, compelled to buy certain things at an immense price and stripped of their goods, cut their own veins. It is well known that when Aponius Saturninus was sleeping among the benches, Gaius admonished the auctioneer not to pass over a man of praetorian rank who was repeatedly nodding to him by a movement of the head; nor was an end made to the bidding until thirteen gladiators were knocked down to the unwitting man for nine million sesterces.”

Why should I set Nero before you, singing with a lyre among stage-players? And surely nothing was more foolish than he after he began to be drunk.

Tacitus shows how ruinous the gluttony of Vitellius was: “A foul and insatiable lust for feasts. From the city and from Italy the incitements of his gullet were carried in, while the roads from both seas resounded. The leading men of the cities were exhausted by the preparations for banquets. The cities themselves were laid waste. The soldier degenerated from labor and virtue through habituation to pleasures and contempt for his leader.”

And Tranquillus speaks in more words: “Most notorious above the others was the arrival-banquet given to him, at which two thousand of the choicest fish and seven thousand birds are reported to have been set out. He himself surpassed this too at the dedication of a dish which, on account of its immense size, they continually called the shield of Minerva, *ἀσπίδα πολιούχου*, ‘the shield of the Guardian of the City.’ In this he commingled the livers of parrotfish, the brains of pheasants and peacocks, the tongues of flamingos, and the milt of moray eels sought by ship-captains and triremes from as far as the Carpathian Sea and the strait of Spain. Moreover, as a man not only of profound but also untimely and sordid gluttony, he never restrained himself even at sacrifices or on any journey from chewing, right there among the altars, entrails and grain-cakes almost snatched from the hearth, and, around the cookshops of the roads, smoking dishes or those of the preceding day and half-eaten.”

He whose mind always dwells in dishes thinks nothing lofty, nothing worthy of a prince.

What of Gallienus? When the empire was being assailed by the armies of thirty enemies and tyrants, if at any time he had awakened from drunkenness, he was accustomed to ask: “And what do we have for luncheon? And what pleasures have been prepared? And what sort of dinner will there be tomorrow? What sort of Circensian games?” Thus Trebellius Pollio. Behold the care of a foolish emperor now reduced to the utmost straits. The same Trebellius speaks thus: “And lest his pitiable ingenuity be passed over: in springtime he made bedchambers of roses. He built fortresses out of fruit. He preserved grapes for three years. He presented melons in the depth of winter. He taught how must might be possessed throughout the year. He always supplied green figs and fresh fruit from trees in months foreign to them.”

Was Heliogabalus sane, concerning whom Aelius Lampridius says: “He is reported to have exhibited naval Circensian games in canals filled with wine”? For in comparison with so furious a prodigality, it is not worthy of mention to relate

that six hundred ostrich brains were served at one dinner, or that there were swimming-pools full of wine. It was once the height of luxury to give naval Circensian games. This man makes navigable canals out of wine. But whence such insanity? He had arranged matters with Pescennius in such a manner that the latter might attend to the empire while Heliogabalus himself might be free for pleasures.

Therefore immoderation in food and intemperance in drink, which overthrow prudence, the dispenser of all duties, must altogether be avoided. Prudence is not to be demanded from a man who is never sober. Most true is what Seneca says in Epistle LXXXIII: "Vices conceived in wine have force even without wine." And indeed this is especially true of that vice which is proper to wine: thoughtlessness, stupidity, and insanity. "The use of wine," says Philo in *On Monarchy*, "weighs down the soul, blunts the senses, and burdens the body."

The greatness of princes ought to produce not a license to sin, but a sense of shame.

§ 13. I shall finish with the example of a private man, which Seneca describes thus in Chapter X of the *Consolation to Helvia*: "Apicius lived in our memory; in that city from which philosophers were once ordered to depart as though they were corrupters of the young, he professed the science of the cookshop and infected the age with his teaching. It is worthwhile to know his end. When he had poured one hundred million sesterces into his kitchen, when he had swallowed up so many distributions of princes and an immense revenue of the Capitol in individual feasts, oppressed by debt he was then for the first time compelled to inspect his accounts. He calculated that ten million sesterces would remain to him; and, as though he would live in extreme hunger if he lived on ten million sesterces, he ended his life with poison. How great was the luxury of the man to whom ten million sesterces was poverty! Go now, and suppose that the measure of money pertains to the matter, not to the mind. Someone feared ten million sesterces and fled by poison from what others seek in prayer. Yet to that man of so depraved a mind his last draught was the most wholesome."

Drunkenness is therefore the mother of stupidity. Augustine speaks excellently: "If a drunkard swallows wine, he is swallowed by it; he becomes abominable to God, is despised by angels, derided by men, confounded by demons, and trampled upon by everyone. The drunkard confounds nature, loses grace, forfeits glory, and incurs damnation." How he confounds nature Augustine has already expounded above in Sermon CCXXXI. Within the memory of the ancients no nation was slower or more stupid than the Thracians; the common people could not count beyond four. Their stupor, propagated into their offspring from perpetual drunkenness, was a marvel to others. For the offspring of drunkards is deficient either in body or in mind, and more frequently in both. Nor unjustly, although with great bitterness, did Diogenes say to a young man

[Printed page 158]

who was dazed and ecstatic, ἐκστατικῷ:

Ὁ πατήρ σου μεθύων σε ἔσπειρε.

"Your father begot you when drunk." I have already intimated the reason why drunkenness obstructs wisdom even when that madness has now subsided. It must now be treated more fully.

§ 14. Those in whom yellow bile predominates are quick in talent; those in whom melancholy predominates are prudent and especially to be employed in public affairs. But the melancholy must be finer and nobler, one which does not have a mixture of stupidity joined to it. It belongs to a prudent man to remember and to understand, or to judge rightly. The seat of memory, imagination, and images is the brain; its temperament both retains past things and serves judgment through the imaginative faculties. If it flows with excessive moisture or is chilled, memory wavers. If it grows hot beyond measure, frenzy is engendered. Memory and judgment, therefore, consist in a mean temperament of the brain.

Pure and uncorrupted air itself is fertile in good talents, such as Attic, Palestinian, and German air. Thicker and more dreg-filled air possesses sluggish talents. You would swear that a Boeotian had been born in thick air. Excessive cold

renders talents torpid and as though lethargic, as are the nations of the Lapps toward the north. Excessive heat frequently renders them utterly stupid, such as those of many Ethiopians. Hence, amid the equality of souls, there is so great a diversity of talents that some human beings appear almost to be brute animals to others.

From both considerations it appears how much sobriety contributes to wisdom. For if purity of the air which we draw is necessary to talent, lest by the onset of a more turbid atmosphere the purity of the brain be corrupted and its order disturbed, how much greater is the confusion in the most violent beating of drunkenness, which is so great that it swells the tongue with moisture, weakens the whole body, and casts it down? Next, wine kindles excessive heats, especially in the head itself, the citadel of wisdom; it renders the vital and animal spirits more turbid and dreg-filled. And, what is the chief point, it extinguishes native heat. Therefore men easily forget past things and consult with little sagacity concerning future things. For while the head frequently seethes with wine, that which is delicate and lucid vanishes; the inferior and impure parts remain. Hence we often see veteran counsellors of princes grow torpid amid the very business and be surpassed by the perspicacity and diligence of younger men.

Seneca speaks concerning talents: "Daily the matter has been brought into a worse condition, whether through the luxury of the times--for nothing is so deadly to talents as luxury--or, when the rewards of the most beautiful thing ceased, every contest was transferred to disgraceful things." But when that stupor also belonged to the parents, it is frequent for men altogether dull and stupid to be born. But, to conclude, I affirm this as observed by all philosophers and physicians: children become slow and stupid through much food, drink, and sleep, and grow more defectively.

§ 15. Two things are customarily objected to me. The first is that some men are capable in drinking and their mind is vigorous in wine. The second is that many men distinguished in talent and prudence deliberate most wisely during intervals of sobriety. As examples of the former they put forward Bonosus, who, while drinking and urinating, invited the enemy's envoys and made them drunk so that they might disclose secrets; he himself could sustain much wine. They also put forward Cambyases, concerning whom Seneca relates in Book III, Chapter XIV of *On Anger*:

"Praexaspes, one of his dearest men, admonished him to drink more sparingly, saying that drunkenness was shameful in a king whom the eyes and ears of all followed. To this he said: 'That you may know how I never lose possession of myself, I shall prove presently that both my eyes and hands remain at their duty after wine.' He then drank more liberally than at other times, from more capacious cups. When already heavy and drunk, he ordered his reprover's son to proceed beyond the threshold and to stand with his left hand raised above his head. Then he drew his bow and struck the young man's very heart--for he had said that he was aiming at it--and, when the breast had been cut open, showed the point adhering in the very heart; and, looking back at the father, asked whether he had a sufficiently sure hand. But he denied that Apollo could have discharged an arrow more surely. May the gods destroy him wickedly--a slave more in soul than in condition. He was the praiser of a thing of which it was excessive merely to have been a spectator. He considered the breast of his son split into two parts and the heart beating beneath the wound an occasion for flattery."

They recount various examples of the latter marvel, even of men still living. Yet it is not difficult to meet the thoughtless patrons of vinousness. And first, indeed, the examples of two most shameful men, a king and an emperor, ought to have moved them to detestation of so foul a crime. Cambyases remained in possession of himself because his drunkenness from anger was greater than his drunkenness from wine. Indeed, the former shook off the latter. However he acted, he was not only cruel but most foolishly cruel. For he could not, unless insane, have been ignorant that by a deed so cruelly injurious the hatred of all was kindled against him. Therefore, although his right hand did not err, the counsel of his mind was nevertheless the insanity of a most insane mind.

The emperor Bonosus could not become drunk; for he did not drink but poured wine through his body as through a wineskin or channel. Hence, when someone saw him hanged, he said that an amphora was hanging--a jest that was also cast against Maximinus. I come to the other part, which I shall easily carry if my discourse is with the vinous men themselves, not with the eulogists of vinous men. For those who do not preserve moderation in food and drink perceive in fact that the digestion of varied courses is turbulent and unequal. Aristotle says in Problem I that many

foods are more easily eaten than digested. They also confess that they have attended more funerals caused by luxury than by old age. They see that Macrobius spoke truly: “Those who frequently become drunk quickly grow old.” *Saturnalia*, Book VII, Chapter VI. Most true also is what Arnobius says in Book VII: “Wine weakens the sinews of all the virtues.” But how? Because it diminishes wisdom, the bond and framework of all the virtues. It diminishes wisdom because it wrenches the seat of memory, imagination, and the internal senses, confounds the organs, and displaces them from their natural constitution.

But let us consider the matter itself. Those wise and talented drinkers prepared a name for themselves before they began to wear away their talent; now they retain it because they are talkative, because they prevail in experience, because they know precedents. But if new and difficult matters are proposed, if the battle-line of an adversary assails them, if there is need of much meditation, reading, and comparison of laws, then at length it will appear how much sagacity and understanding Bacchus has struck away with his thyrsus. Then they will say:

The bottom is turned in our wine-jars, and our opinion in us.

Let those talented and prudent men, after the ample drinking-parties of some years, be recalled to the academies and preside over disputations; let obscure and difficult matters be vigorously argued: they will seriously deplore their loss. Although even now they frequently pay the penalty, for to this day those very men do things which are prudently corrected by younger men. This is bitter and almost insulting, but sometimes necessary. For:

Πολὺς γὰρ οἶνος πολλὰ ἀμαρτάνειν ποιεῖ.

>

With much wine many errors are committed.

Themistocles passed a prodigal, criminal, and voluptuous youth with such wickedness and contumacy

[Printed page 159]

that he is said to have driven his mother to hang herself; but afterward he was the pillar of Greece. He was a man of great talent and a great spirit. But he had not yet buried his talent altogether, and amid a scarcity of good and brave men he suddenly shone forth. Yet he did not long maintain that position, for he conducted many things wickedly and foolishly. For what sort of plan was it to burn the whole fleet of victorious Greece in order that he might procure the empire for the Athenians alone? What else was this but to expose his unarmed fatherland to the barbarians? For Greece would not have fought on behalf of allies so treacherous.

Next, he himself is witness to how prudently he exercised command. “That boy,” he says, “commands the Greeks: for what he wishes, his mother wishes; what his mother wishes, I wish; what I wish, all the Greeks wish.” Behold the wisdom of a drunken leader, who could govern neither his son nor his wife--not even his agents; for he was overwhelmed by great debt. What wonder that this man fled his fatherland? Let them therefore cease boasting of the prudence of drunkards in political affairs. I can name men who, removed from affairs by premature delirium, passed an inglorious old age; others who altogether lost all authority. There remains an example full of ill will, but because it is fruitful in truth and has not been noted by many, it must be brought forward; for a man ought to hear his own vices, whether they delight him or are objects of hatred.

§ 16. Germany is divided into three parts, if you regard temperance. The first part is laborious, a hardener of sons and a drinker of water, in which the use of beer is rare and that of wine most rare. The second part abounds in wine and delicacies; in it the rich especially are drunken and rear their sons delicately. The third part is intermediate, akin to the virtues of the first and the vices of the second. All these parts, however, are not widely separated in place but in morals. Among them I have now observed many things over several years, and I appeal to all to whom old age has conferred experience. I was able to note what I shall say all the more conveniently because for twenty-four years the young in diverse colleges and academies were known to me, and I noted differences of talents.

First, in cultivated cities abounding in wine and given to delicacies, I have observed that many children of the wealthy and the magnates are little sound in mind and that some are altogether foolish; and this evil has been spread widely through many distinguished families. The natural cause is the drinking of mothers while they carry a child and while they nurse. For many at that time guzzle not only Rhenish wines but Spanish, Cretan, and dark wines, and force them upon their tender children. The most cunning appetite for wines invents the claim that this contributes to health, firmness, and the fostering of heat; but however useful this may be to mothers, undiluted wine is certainly poison to the talents of their children.

In this matter civic matrons offend more than noblewomen who are accustomed to dwell in fortresses, both because the discipline of nobility is more severe than that of luxurious cities--for they are accustomed to rear their children for labors and warfare and to habituate them to ordinary food--and because in cities there is not only an abundance of such things, but they are customarily given as gifts by relatives. Women and children do not easily abstain from delicacies. Therefore I judge that some law for restraining female appetite must be introduced in cities, and I demand the skill of physicians by which the health of mothers and offspring may be regulated.

But by what law will you restrain the women *Bebrias* and *Ebrias*, especially the mistresses of the cellar? What if the husband too is *Bebrius* *Ebrius*? The evil is difficult to cure because it is hidden, and when it has appeared the medicine is late; for the son, his mind injured, now carries about the drinking habit of his mother. Nevertheless, let the husband, preacher, and confessor admonish her. Above all, let parents and magistrates devote themselves to making it disgraceful for a daughter of a household to have drunk wine. Indeed, let it be so infamous to be regarded as a female drinker that such women can scarcely hope for an honorable marriage. Finally, let parents and husbands be both a lesson and an example of temperance. Otherwise they will always chatter in the woman's ear, "Where you are *Gaius*, there I am *Gaia*." A drunken old woman was dragging a drunken old man.

Second, I have observed that children reared delicately and accustomed to sip the last drops of little cups are for the most part talented, lively, and ready in memory until their twelfth or fourteenth year. But when they have left the grammar schools and are now applied to making verses and composing a speech by their own effort, most fail because there is need of reasoning, judgment, labor, and exertion of mind; and they show that the flower of their talent was perishable. When they come to philosophy, they fall in the first contest and either desert their studies altogether or display some title of doctorate purchased in Italy.

There is not one cause, for they waste their age either through negligence or other vices. But I am speaking of those who lack neither instruction nor labor, but whose talent, after it had built up great expectation in childhood, suddenly eludes the hope of everyone. The cause is that, while tender, because of the softness of the brain they quickly impress upon their memory things heard, for figures are easily impressed upon soft things. Therefore, since their study is occupied almost entirely with memorizing lessons and retaining the explanation of words, and since they are also by nature hot and lively for contests and literary exercises, from this they are called talented, but falsely. For they are stupid and slow, but their slowness is covered by age, ease of memory, and inborn alacrity. Nor is this astonishing, since, under the name of childhood and ingenuous simplicity, the stupidity of their children deceives the parents for some years.

"But many also possess precocious wisdom. They act dexterously and speak as men." It is plainly so; and that very precocious maturity, if it is from wine, is a sign of a talent that will not endure. Those fruits which anticipate their season, hurried to maturity by the external heat of furnaces, are not only very short-lived but also exhaust their own stock. For while alien heat digests their rawness, it also drinks up their vital parts. Death, therefore, always begrudges precocious talents; or, if they have always matured beforehand, they very quickly decay.

But why does the wine of grandfathers and parents, and much more wine poured into a tender age, make children precocious; why, if taken moderately by men, does it sharpen wisdom, but, if copiously, blunt it? The cause must be deduced from the principles of nature. The minds of children are deficient in wisdom for this reason: the brain, filled

with much moisture, is least fit for the acts of wisdom. That raw moisture is dissipated more quickly in some and more slowly in others, but it must be digested naturally, not violently. If the extraordinary heat of wine approaches, all those things are quickly dissipated, but, as I have said, not without injury to nature. For adventitious heat, consuming vital moisture and heat, accelerates old age; thus when they are men in age, they are infested by the chill and delirium of old men.

A moderate amount of wine sharpens the spirits and firm nerves of men, because with its slight heat it cannot harm strong things, yet it rouses and takes away their torpor. We plainly discern the same thing in plants. The warmth of a nearby fire and of furnaces ripens the sap, forces it to swell into buds and to break out into flowers; but that same heat immediately plucks away the beauty of the opened flower, so that, when it has begun to be looked at, it quickly withers. For

[Printed page 160]

the swelling and germination were contrary to nature. Thus, therefore, stands the rationale of vinousness in the commonwealth, and this is the outcome of children delicately reared. Although parents perceive these things, they nevertheless drag them to banquets and utterly corrupt with delicacies those who ought altogether to abstain from wine and to be fed sparingly, so that their extraordinary heat might be moderated for procuring longevity and talent. But I shall treat these things more fully when I discuss education. For we see many parents so stupid that they marvel that their sons are bad when they themselves have taught them nothing good. Vice has no need of a teacher; it is enough not to be restrained, enough for leisure to be granted and pleasures permitted.

§ 17. A third consequence follows from these things: the sons and posterity of the rich, for the most part burdened with another's money, are reduced to want. Sometimes, indeed, this happens by an unforeseen evil, and they are worthy of compassion. For the most part they cast themselves into the perils of poverty and are deservedly exposed to reproaches. The cause is the habit of delicacies, ignorance of household management, and flight from labor.

I see that the wealthiest men of the cities are those who come from some laborious region or whose parents and grandfathers immigrated. For they brought temperance and frugality with them, are devoted to labors, and rear their children severely. Therefore they easily preserve and increase their estate while the others dissolve in luxury. Nor is this all; that education extends itself more widely. In provinces and cities devoted to wine and luxury, I see that parish priests, schoolmasters, and scribes of towns are almost all newcomers--not because the people of those places disdain these offices, for very many of them are poor and live wretchedly, but because talents and industrious labor are lacking. Yet if they disdain those offices, do they also spurn greater ones?

Look in the cities at the colleges of canons, the principal preachers, doctors, and prelates, and count those who have been raised from delicate little flowers to those honors: you will find few; frost struck down most of them in flower. Review the courts of princes: you will understand that the chief places in prudence and counsel are conceded to those whose adolescence was exercised by labors and temperance, whom their native land did not corrupt. This is all the more astonishing because the recommendations of others have very great force in churches, in the commonwealth, and at court, yet we see men of lesser means, and frequently foreigners, preferred. The reason is that, when it comes to the matter itself, learned, industrious, untiring, and laborious men are sought, such as none of those whose childhood was corrupted by delicacies is--or if there is any such man, there is scarcely one in each court.

§ 18. I have spoken concerning the avoidance of drunkenness. But I shall add one thing which can, and indeed ought, to be adapted to other matters, but which in this cause is dangerous to princes. For I am thoroughly persuaded that many princes and magistrates have been eternally condemned both because of other sins of their subjects and because of drunkenness. I shall set forth my opinion briefly with this declaration: if even one sound-minded man out of a thousand doctors contradicts it, I shall absolve the magistrate from danger.

First. It is undoubted that care for the salvation of subjects, the divine glory, and the removal of scandals is incumbent upon the magistrate.

Second. It is also certain that drunkenness is a sin, that immense evils arise from it, and that good things are impeded.

Third. From this I conclude by an evident consequence that the prince is bound by the grave command of the eternal Majesty to remove this sin also from the commonwealth, and that unless he attempts this and inquires into ways and means, he cannot be saved, because the blood of all the souls is required from his hand. Indeed, he offends most gravely if his court is filled with vomit and filth.

Fourth. The obligation of all consuls, senators, and others who are in power is the same. For they ought to resist evil.

Fifth. Magistrates in Germany can easily remove drunkenness without tumult, without protest, and without fear of a greater evil. Therefore those who permit it can use no excuse, especially since they are also bound by imperial law.

Sixth. A few laws will complete the whole matter.

The first law: Let the prince and senate be sober, as well as the ministers of princes.

The second: Let him who recommends a counsellor, courtier, satrap, or quaestor to a prince first consider this, lest that man be a drunkard.

The third: Let affairs not be entrusted to a drunkard at court; if he persists, let him be dismissed.

The fourth: Let drunkards not be admitted to the chapters of collegiate churches; let those already admitted be corrected by canonical penalties.

The fifth: Let the drunkenness of citizens be corrected by deprivation of honors and then by a fine, or even by deprivation of the power of giving testimony.

The sixth: Let the masters of taverns--that is, workshops of drunkenness--be punished by a great monetary penalty if they do not report a drunken man to the magistrate.

The seventh: Let the guests and bridegrooms pay for the drunkenness of weddings.

The eighth: Let sumptuary laws be seriously defended.

Those laws are most just, and no one except either a demon or an attendant of a demon can intercede against them. For intemperance takes away health, talent, peace, resources, and fame, and brings in a cohort of innumerable evils. Therefore, although a good man is sometimes captured by wine, no one except a man infamous for vinousness can patronize it. This is especially so since pagan and drunken Rome detested Marcus Antonius more because he wrote a volume in defense of drunkenness than because he utterly gave himself to pleasure. For they judged thus: a drunken man sins against himself alone, and even if he should also give offense by his example, that would pertain to a few years; but the shamelessness of a teaching by which so great an evil was taught would do harm to all ages.

§ 19. Wretched is the condition of Germany. A region fertile in wine kills more men with its own good than die by the sword; and I dare to say that it expends more wine upon the deaths of human beings than upon health and delight. How many crowds of poor people could be preserved and refreshed by that wine with which you kill your friends? When these things are done, do we marvel that vines perish by cold, their flower by rain, and that frost corrupts grapes already growing yellow? The insanity of drinkers and the fury of drunkards burns the shoots with bitter frost, strikes down the flower, and scatters the clusters with hail.

For why do most men ask an abundance of wine from God? Is it not that they may pour wine through their body and destroy themselves? Is it not more merciful not to give a sword to madmen or wine to drunkards? Therefore let us abandon the morals of the nations and follow Christian temperance. They acted in one manner; the Lord willed that we

should act in another. Tertullian describes for us the fury of drunkards and the honorableness of temperance in Chapter XXXIX of the *Apology*:

“For you assail our modest suppers, besides as infamous for crime, also as prodigal. Doubtless Diogenes' saying concerning the Megarians was spoken of us: ‘The Megarians dine as though they were going to die the next day, but build as though they were never going to die.’ But who more easily sees a mote in another's eye than a beam in his own? The air grows sour with so many tribes, curiae, and decuries belching. When the Salii are to dine, a creditor will be necessary. An accountant will calculate the expense of the tithes offered to Hercules and of sacred banquets. Let selections of cooks be announced for the Apaturia, the Dionysia, and the Attic mysteries. At the smoke of the Serapic supper the firemen will be roused. It is only concerning the dining-room of the Christians that reconsideration is undertaken.

[Printed page 161]

“Our supper shows the reason for itself by its name. For it is called *ἀγάπη*, that which among the Greeks is affection. By however great expenses it is established, it is gain to make an expense in the name of piety, since we also assist the poor with that refreshment--not in the manner in which among you parasites aspire to the glory of an enslaved freedom, hired by their belly to be fattened amid insults, but in the manner in which with God there is greater consideration of the lowly. If the cause of the banquet is honorable, estimate the remainder of its order from the cause of its discipline. Since it comes from a duty of religion, it admits nothing base, nothing immodest.

“Men do not recline before prayer to God is tasted first. As much is eaten as the hungry take; as much is drunk as is useful to the chaste. They are so satiated as men who remember that even through the night they must adore God; they converse as men who know that the Lord hears. After water for the hands and lights, each person, as he is able, is called forth into the midst to sing to God either from the Holy Scriptures or from his own talent. From this it is proved how he has drunk. Prayer likewise dissolves the banquet. From there they depart not into bands of slayings, nor into companies of roving, nor into outbreaks of wantonness, but to the same care of modesty and chastity, as men who have dined not so much upon a supper as upon discipline.”

CHAPTER XV

Anger Is Equally Harmful to Rulers and Subjects

§ 1. To have conquered pleasures is a great part of wisdom; to have bridled anger belongs to a strong and almost unconquered spirit. Therefore this moderation too is altogether necessary in the commonwealth, and its consideration is connected with those things which we have said concerning pleasures. For irascibility is born especially from wine and a soft education.

“It is difficult,” says Seneca in Book II, Chapter XX of *On Anger*, “to change nature, nor is it permissible to alter the elements of things once commingled at birth. But the knowledge of this is useful, so that wine may be withdrawn from heated talents; Plato judges that it must be denied to children and forbids fire to be incited by fire. Nor indeed must they be filled with food, for their bodies will be distended and their minds will swell with the body.”

The same things which lead children to good hope generate insolence and irascibility. Nothing makes men more irascible than a soft and indulgent education. Thus Seneca, Book II, Chapter XXI of *On Anger*: “Therefore,” he says, “we shall not release them into idleness and leisure, and we shall keep them far from contact with delicacies. For from joy comes exultation; swelling and an excessive estimation of oneself follow exultation; thence comes irascibility, for it is an opinion that contempt or injury has been received.” Those who are reared indulgently and amid delicacies interpret it as an injury if they are not treated most softly.

“Therefore,” says the same Seneca, “the more indulgence is shown to only children and the more that wards are permitted, the more corrupt is their mind. He to whom nothing has ever been denied, whose tears an anxious mother has always wiped away, for whom satisfaction has been exacted from his tutor, will not withstand offenses. Do you not see that the greater each man's fortune is, the greater the anger which accompanies it? It appears especially in the rich, the noble, and magistrates, when a favorable breeze has raised up whatever was light and empty in their mind. Felicity nourishes irascibility where a crowd of flatterers has surrounded haughty ears.”

And in Chapter XXV: “The boy is insufficiently quick, or the water for drinking is rather lukewarm, or his couch is disturbed, or the table is set out rather negligently. It is insanity to be incited by these things. He is sick and of unhappy health whom a light breeze has contracted; eyes are diseased which a white garment troubles; that man is dissolved by delicacies whose side aches from another's labor. They say that Mindyrides was a citizen of the Sybarites. When he had seen someone digging and raising the mattock rather high, he complained that he was becoming weary and forbade the man to do the work in his sight. The same man complained more frequently because he had lain upon doubled rose-leaves. When pleasures have corrupted mind and body together, nothing seems tolerable--not because the things are hard, but because those who suffer them are soft.

“For what reason is there that someone's cough, or a sneeze, or a fly driven away with insufficient care should drive you into madness? Or an overturned cup, or a key slipped from the hands of a negligent slave? Will that man bear with an even mind civic reproach and curses heaped upon him in an assembly or senate-house, whose ears the creaking of a bench dragged along offends? Will he endure hunger and the thirst of a summer campaign who is angry at a boy for diluting the snow badly?”

§ 2. Blandishments, therefore, make men irascible because they make them delicate, because they make them weak, and especially because they make them arrogant. I am accustomed to laugh at foolish parents and indulgent teachers when they speak concerning the contumacy of young men: “I offended him in no matter, I denied him nothing; no parent ever loved his sons in this manner. Now he is ungrateful; others, upon whom I bestowed less, return great thanks.” On the contrary, he owes you no thanks because you corrupted him. One admonition has struck out the memory of all your blandishments.

But I shall treat these matters in the book concerning education. Now let us consider anger, the daughter of luxury. The daughter of luxury, I say, but the mother and servant of cruelty. For inhumanity is akin to delicacies. Nero was so soft that he seemed to possess nothing manly, so cruel that he seemed to possess nothing soft.

Anger, or *ὀργή*, is:

ὄρεξις μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας φαινομένης, διὰ φαινομένην τὴν ὀλιγωρίαν, τὴν εἰς αὐτόν, ἢ εἰς αὐτοῦ τινα, μὴ προσηκόντως.

1. Anger is a desire for vengeance; 2. with pain or sadness; 3. for apparent vengeance; 4. on account of apparent contempt for oneself or for one of one's own, unfittingly. Thus speaks the best master of defining in Book II, Chapter II of the *Rhetoric*.

He establishes three kinds of contempt. *Καταφρόνησιν*, disdain, when one values the thing and the person at nothing. *Ἐπηρεασμὸν*, spite, which is contempt when an impediment is placed in the way of another's wishes, not so that the man himself may obtain some advantage from the matter, but lest it accrue to the other. *Ὑβριν*, insult, when harm and vexation are inflicted upon another with dishonor to the sufferer, not so that something else may accrue to the agent, but so that he may take pleasure.

Seneca, in Book I, Chapter III of *On Anger*, cites the Aristotelian definition: anger is a desire to repay pain. But an irascible man differs from an angry man, as Seneca explains there in Chapter IV, as a drunkard differs from a drunk man, and one who is afraid from a timid man. Cicero says in Book IV of the *Tusculan Disputations* that they differ in the same manner as anxiety differs from anguish.

Seneca describes the variety of irascible men. I shall pass over the remaining things which, under several names among the Greeks, distinguish anger into species, because among us they do not have their own terms--even if we speak of a bitter man and a harsh one, and no less of a choleric, raging, clamorous, difficult, and rough man, all of which are differences of angers. Among these you may place the morose man, a delicate kind of irascibility. For there are some angers which subside within clamor; some are no less persistent than frequent; some are savage with the hand and more sparing in words; some pour themselves out in the bitterness of words and curses; some do not go beyond complaints and aversions; some are deep and grave and are turned inward. There are a thousand other species of this manifold evil.

The Greeks call them:

πικρούς, μακρολύπους, ἀκροχόλους, χαλεπούς, κρυψιχόλους, δυσαρέστους, ὀργίλους, ὀξύχολους, θυμοειδεῖς.

That is: bitter, long-grieving, readily choleric, difficult, concealing anger, hard to please, irascible, quick-tempered, and passionate. Enough has been said concerning the recognition of anger, which is more excellent than defining it.

§ 3. Anger is the greatest and a public evil, for it has afflicted the city more violently than any other thing. Homer too wished to indicate this when he calls the *μῆνιν*--the wrath--of Achilles *ὀλομένην*, destructive. Seneca says in Book III, Chapter II of *On Anger*: "Finally, the other vices seize individuals; this is the one affection which is sometimes conceived publicly. Never has a whole people burned with love for one woman,

[Printed page 162]

nor has an entire city placed its hope in money or profit. Ambition occupies individual men one by one; impotence is not a public evil. Often men have gone into anger in one column. Men, women, old men, children, princes, and the common people have agreed; and the whole multitude, incited by a very few words, has outstripped the inciter himself. Immediately there has been a running to arms and fires, and wars have been declared upon neighbors or waged with fellow-citizens. Whole houses have been burned with their entire stock; and a man held a short while ago in favor because of his eloquence, amid the height of honor, has borne the anger of his own assembly; legions have turned their javelins against their commander.

“The whole plebs has dissented from the fathers; the public council, the senate, without waiting for levies and without naming a commander, has chosen sudden leaders for its anger; and, pursuing noble men through the houses of the city, has taken punishment with its own hand. It has violated embassies, the law of nations having been broken, and unspeakable madness has carried off the state. No time was given in which the public swelling might subside, but fleets were immediately launched and loaded with a hastily gathered soldiery. Without custom, without auspices, the people, under the leadership of its own anger, attacked what chance offered and bore things snatched up as weapons; then with a great slaughter it paid for the rashness of its audacious anger.”

Saul suddenly slaughtered the priests and their city; Nebuchadnezzar condemned three leading men to the fire. I related the irascibility of Cambyses, joined with drunkenness, in the preceding chapter. But it especially befits kings to act without anger. Seneca speaks beautifully in Book III, Chapter XVI of *On Anger*: “But although restraint of their passions, and especially of this rabid and unbridled one, is useful to subjects, it is more useful to kings. All things perish where fortune permits as much as anger counsels, nor can a power which is exercised to the harm of many stand for long. For we are endangered when a common fear has joined those who groan separately. Therefore at one time individuals have slaughtered very many rulers, at another time all together, when public grief has compelled them to bring their angers together into one.”

Yet very many have exercised anger as though it were a royal insignia, as did Darius, who first, after the dominion was taken from the Magus, obtained the Persians and a great part of the East. For when he had declared war upon the Scythians, who surrounded the East, and was asked by Oeobazus, a noble old man, to leave one of his three sons as a consolation to his father and to use the service of two, he promised more than was asked and said that he would remit them all to him; then he cast them down, slain, in the sight of their parent--though he would have been cruel if he had led all of them away.

But how much more lenient was Xerxes? When Pythius, father of five sons, sought exemption for one, he permitted him to choose the one he wished; he then tore the chosen one into two parts, placed them on either side of the road, and purified his army with this victim. Therefore he had the end which he deserved. Defeated and routed far and wide, seeing everywhere his ruin laid flat, he walked amid the corpses of his men.

Was this ferocity in anger peculiar to barbarian kings whom no learning and no cultivation of letters had imbued? I shall give you from the bosom of Aristotle King Alexander, who at a banquet ran through with a weapon Clitus, a man most dear to him and reared together with him--and indeed with his own hand--because he flattered too little and passed reluctantly from a Macedonian and a free man into Persian servitude. For he cast Lysimachus, equally familiar to him, to a lion. Was this Lysimachus, then, after escaping the lion's teeth by a certain good fortune, milder on that account when he himself reigned? For he fed Telesphorus the Rhodian, his friend, for a long time in a cage as though he were some new and unusual animal, after he had cut him down on every side and cut off his ears and nose. When the deformity of the truncated and mutilated face had destroyed his human countenance, there were added hunger, squalor, and the filth of a body abandoned in its own dung; his knees and hands were calloused besides, for the narrowness of the place forced him to use them as feet, and his sides were ulcerated by rubbing. His appearance was no less foul than terrible to those who saw him; made a monster by his punishment, he had also lost compassion. Yet, although the man who suffered these things was most unlike a human being, the man who did them was more unlike one.

Would that this savagery had remained among foreign examples and that the barbarism of punishments and angers had not passed into Roman morals with other imported vices! Lucius Sulla ordered the legs of Marcus Marius--upon whom the people had set up statues street by street and to whom the Roman people made supplication with incense and wine--to be broken, his eyes torn out, and his hands cut off; and, as though he killed him as many times as he wounded him, he tore him apart gradually and limb by limb. Who was the minister of this command? Who but Catiline, already exercising his hands for every crime? He mangled him before the tomb of Quintus Catulus, a most grievous burden upon the ashes of a most gentle man; above them a popular man indeed of bad example, and loved not so undeservedly

as excessively, gave his blood drop by drop. Marius was worthy to suffer those things, Sulla to order them, Catiline to perform them; but the commonwealth was unworthy to receive into its own body the swords of enemies and citizens alike.

Why do I pursue ancient things? Just now Gaius Caesar, on one day, cut down with scourges and tortured Sextus Papinius, whose father had been consul; Belienus Bassus, his quaestor and the son of his procurator; other senators; and Roman knights--not for the sake of an inquiry, but for the sake of his disposition. Then he was so impatient of deferring the pleasure which immense cruelty demanded without delay that, while walking in the promenade of his mother's gardens which separates the portico from the riverbank, he decapitated some of them by lamplight in the company of matrons and other senators. What was pressing? What private or public danger did a single night threaten? How small a thing was it to wait for daylight? Finally, was it necessary that, wearing slippers, he should kill senators of the Roman people?

§ 4. Shall I add to these monsters the emperor Severus, truly severe and truly worthy of his name? The world has scarcely experienced a man more irascible. For whom of all those whom chance and necessity had cast into the opposing camp did he ever spare? Nor was his anger satiated by the death of his enemies. "He ordered," says Aelius Spartianus, "the corpses of the senators who had been slain in the war to be scattered. Then, when the body of Albinus, almost half-dead, was brought to him, he ordered the head to be cut off and carried to Rome, and accompanied it with a letter. Albinus was defeated on the eleventh day before the Kalends of March. He ordered the rest of his body to be exposed before his own house and divided. Moreover, sitting upon a horse himself, he drove it over Albinus's corpse and admonished it, when it took fright, to trample it boldly with the bridle loosened."

Others add that he ordered the same corpse to be cast into the Rhône together with those of his wife and children. After innumerable men of Albinus's party had been killed, among whom were many leading men of the state and many illustrious women, the goods of them all were confiscated and increased the treasury; then many nobles of the Spaniards and Gauls were killed. Finally, he gave the soldiers as much pay as no prince had given. He also left his sons as much from this proscription as none of the emperors had left, since he had already made a great part of the gold throughout the Gauls, Spains, and Italy imperial property; and then for the first time the administration of the private estates was established. Many, indeed, who preserved their loyalty to Albinus after his death were defeated in war by Severus.

§ 5. What movements does that beast excite in the commonwealth, with what swift desire for vengeance, with what blind rush to injure--and does it not spare itself? Valerius says in Book IX, Chapter III: When Livius Salinator was leaving the city to wage war against Hasdrubal, Fabius Maximus admonished him not to descend into battle before he had learned the strength and spirit of the enemy. He replied that he would not omit the first opportunity of fighting. When asked by the same man why he wished to join battle so hastily, he said, "That I may as quickly as possible take either glory from the defeated enemy or joy from my prostrate fellow-citizens." Anger and courage then divided his speech between them: the former mindful of his unjust condemnation, the latter intent upon the glory of a triumph. But I do not know whether saying this and conquering in this way belonged to the same man.

[Printed page 163]

No less blindly did Roman legions, to the great advantage of the enemy, satiate their resentment and anger. When Fabius was consul, the entire infantry was sent to destroy the enemy's forces. Although it could destroy them, it refused, retaining in its mind fixed anger over the agrarian law which he had obstructed. Under Appius as leader, although it could conquer, it preferred to turn its back upon the enemy, lest the commander, whose father it knew had assailed its advantages, should triumph in the manner of victors.

§ 6. Quintus Metellus, through hatred of Quintus Pompeius, who was being sent as his successor, almost betrayed conquered Spain. For he dismissed all who had only wished that their military service should be ended. He gave provisions to those requesting them without examining their grounds and without appointing a time. After removing

the guards, he offered the granaries ready for plunder. He ordered the bows and arrows of the Cretans to be broken and cast into a river. He forbade food to be given to the elephants. As by these deeds he indulged his desire, so he corrupted the glory of things magnificently conducted; and, a stronger conqueror of enemies than of anger, he lost the merited honor of a triumph.

What is more disgraceful than Julian, who, when administering justice and repeatedly blazing up, not only uttered indecorous reproaches and gestures, but, rushing in the manner of a buffoon upon countrymen disputing at law, struck them with his fists? For anger drives out all sense of shame. It is the more destructive because every angry person judges his own indignation just. For he who has been able to condemn it has already conquered it.

§ 7. If we look at the causes of angers and disturbances in the city and the household, we shall discover that most are doubtful, light, to be pardoned in view of the persons, or unjust; and when vengeance appears just, it nevertheless frequently exceeds measure.

Doubtful causes have entangled kings and cities in most certain destructions. "Therefore," says Seneca in Book II, Chapter XXII of *On Anger*, "we ought to fight against the first causes. The cause of irascibility is an opinion of injury, to which credence must not readily be given; nor indeed must one immediately accede even to open and manifest appearances. For some false things bear the appearance of truth. Time must always be given; a day reveals the truth. Let ears not be receptive to accusers; let this vice of human nature be suspected and known to us--that we willingly believe things which we hear unwillingly, and become angry before we judge. What of the fact that we are impelled not only by accusations but by suspicions, and, interpreting worse things from another's face and laugh, become angry at innocent men? Therefore the absent man's case must be pleaded against oneself, and anger must be held in suspense. For a delayed penalty can be exacted; an exacted one cannot be recalled."

That tyrannicide is well known who, seized before his work was completed and tortured by Hippias so that he might disclose his accomplices, named the friends of the tyrant who he knew held the tyrant's safety most dear. When Hippias had ordered each to be killed as he was named, he asked, "Does anyone remain?" "You alone," he said, "for I have left no one else to whom you were dear." Anger brought it about that the tyrant lent his hands to the tyrannicide and cut down his own defenses with his own sword.

With how great a spirit did Alexander act? When he had read his mother's letter, in which he was admonished to beware the poison of Philip the physician, he drank the potion he had received without being deterred. He trusted his friend more than himself. He was worthy to have an innocent friend, worthy to make him one. I praise this all the more in Alexander because no one was so liable to anger. But the rarer moderation is in kings, the more it must be praised.

There was the greatest affection between Aristobulus and his brother, but Aristobulus, credulous and hasty, destroyed his brother Antigonus and his only friend. Josephus relates the matter thus in Book XIII, Chapter XIX of the *Antiquities*. When Antigonus once returned magnificently from a war, at the time when the people celebrated the solemn feast of Tabernacles, it happened that Aristobulus lay sick. His brother, however, splendidly adorned because he was to participate in the sacred rites, ascended into the temple with an armed retinue, especially in order to make vows for the king's health. Then those whose purpose was to excite discord between the brothers, having obtained an opportunity from Antigonus's successful deeds and the procession which he had prepared, came to the king and exaggerated everything. They said that these things were now above the condition of a private man and were manifest indications that he was seeking the kingdom. They said that he would shortly come with a strong band of armed men to kill the king, because he judged it foolish to be content with a share of the honor when he could possess the royal throne.

Although Aristobulus did not entirely believe them, nevertheless, so that he might both take precautions and avoid suspicion and might consult his own security, he stationed guards in a certain dark and underground place--for he lay in the tower which afterward, its name having been changed, was called Antonia. He commanded that, if his brother came without arms, no one should touch him, but, if he approached armed, that he should be slain. Yet first he sent to

him one who was to ask that he come unarmed. But the queen and the remaining plotters persuaded the messenger to say the contrary: that his brother had heard that he had procured remarkable armor for himself and wished to behold him thus armed. Antigonus, suspecting nothing evil and relying upon his brother's benevolence, came just as he was, in all his armor, to Aristobulus, intending to offer himself for inspection. When he arrived at the tower of Straton, where the passage was very dark, he was slain by the guards. This misfortune easily shows how much envy and false accusation can do and how effective they are at overthrowing even natural benevolence. And at the same time these events teach that judgment should be deferred in a doubtful case.

What made Constantine's court Neronian and took the young Crispus from the empire, except hasty irascibility arising from credulity? What drove Herod into a fury against his own blood and affections, except that he believed doubtful and fabricated accusations as though true? Therefore, when you think that you have received an injury, restrain your spirit until you learn something certain. Let anger not rage before reason judges.

If others report something, doubt for a little while. "We ought not," says Seneca in Book II, Chapter XXIX, "quickly to believe things which have been narrated. Many lie in order to deceive; many because they have been deceived. One man seeks favor by an accusation and feigns an injury in order that he may seem to have grieved at its commission. There is some malicious man who wishes to tear apart close friendships; there is a suspicious man, and one who desires to watch games so that from far away and in safety he may look upon those whom he has brought into collision. If you were to judge concerning a very small sum, the matter would not be proved to you without a witness; a witness would have no force without swearing an oath. You would give both parties an advocate, you would give time, and you would not hear them at the same time; for truth shines forth the more, the more frequently it comes to hand."

This counsel is altogether golden. If princes and senators were willing to use it, wretched human beings would have avoided half their evils, and they would torment neither themselves with anxiety nor others with hatred.

§ 8. It is most grievous when supreme power has incited itself against an innocent man, because it admits no defense; it does not even permit innocence to be indicated, because it judges this to be a reproach against its unjust fury. Princes are therefore more inflamed by the remedy itself, since integrity itself, as though a witness of their unjust blazing-up, is rendered hateful to them. In turn, however, those princes are rendered most hateful who not only give ear to rash accusers but also believe them, deny access to men justly defending themselves, and moreover grow angry. And, what is the worst vice of the human disposition, because they think that those men have injured them, they hate them. They hate them for this reason: because they judge those men ill-disposed toward them and because they fear them.

[Printed page 164]

For although they know them to be weak, they nevertheless know that there is danger even from an invalid, especially if an adversary, of whatever sort, has been exasperated. For:

Anger assists hands however weak.

Therefore those who, with anger as leader, proceed to an accusation of princes or the commonwealth, and who declare hostility against more powerful men when they are permitted to be silent, dangerously indulge their own spirit. Let that most familiar saying of the man who grew old in attendance upon kings remain fixed in every mind. When someone asked how he had attained the rarest thing at court, old age, he said, "By receiving injuries and returning thanks." You stand on sufficiently slippery ground if you preside over a commonwealth or serve a prince; there is no need for you to drive yourself onward.

What did the Roman knights attain when they grieved so greatly that the praetorship had been conferred upon Gnaeus Flavius that they took off their rings and horse-trappings? So great was the impotence of their passions, but it was empty and ridiculous to the more powerful people. For first the people judged that they had thus placed their votes well; for they had ordered Flavius, a man of the lowest condition, to be praetor in order that they might brand proud

nobility with grief, and their disgrace would have been lost had the equestrian order not thus grown angry. Next, they alienated the people still more. For, since very many were equal to Gnaeus Flavius and very many inferior to him, all judged that they were despised in him as poor and low. Finally, they showed the people the part by which they lay open to a wound.

§ 9. It happens much more frequently that the cause for raging is light. And the smaller the cause, the more wicked the fury is. If hot water is not properly supplied, they drench the servant with boiling water. If a glass has been broken, a boy is dragged to the moray eels. If a shoe has been spattered with mud, the man who could not guard against it is beaten. If a toga has been disturbed, a day in court is appointed for the man who met it by chance. If a hare is insufficiently suited to the palate, the cook is cut apart by scourges. If one hair is arranged without order, a little maidservant is mangled. What sort of insanity is this? Anger is assuredly blind, or *κελαινώπις*, dark-eyed, and with its obscure eye it casts one down from the mind. Children dissolve into tears over lost nuts; arthritic men cry out at the suspicion of a touch; every breeze suddenly casts down weak bodies.

It is shameful to say how small a matter compels the most powerful kings into wars; but the same cause entangles private persons in quarrels and lawsuits. Their wars are not milder, nor their angers more civilized; their power is merely less. Wretched is the spirit which is so easily offended: it must be perpetually in grief, because small offenses are never lacking, and often immense ones also remain. The Greeks call *μικρολύπους*, “small-grievers,” those whom every loss and every adversity afflicts, who boil over at trifles, fashion tragedies out of minute things, and always swell as though in ferment.

Let them instead imitate Cotys. When pottery fashioned with costly workmanship but fragile had been given to him, he broke all of it, lest, if it should be shattered by servants handling it carelessly, it should furnish him an occasion for raging. Who would call Nero sane? He blazed up at the smallest things to such a degree that he ordered many men to be killed because they had praised the divine voice of the prince coldly or had disparaged the pleasures of the prince. He repudiated Octavia and struck out Poppaea's unborn child. While Gaius reigned and conducted many things foolishly, it was a capital crime for nobles to have laughed. In the presence of Tiberius, to have named a goat was a crime of treason, because, bloodthirsty as he was, beneath those broad jaws he wore a beard not unlike one. To have looked down from a higher place and noticed his baldness was punished by no lesser a penalty than if someone had cast stones at him as he passed. Therefore these men must be agitated by perpetual provocations of irascibility.

What of Mindyrides, the most ruined not merely of men but of Sybarites--or rather his name is Smindyrides--concerning whom Herodotus speaks in Book VII and Aelian in Book IX, Chapter XXIV? He boasts that for twenty years he had seen neither the sun rising nor setting. As Athenaeus relates in Book VI, Chapter XII, when he set out for Sicyon, he drew bird-catchers, fishermen, and a thousand cooks along that journey. With how great a care must we suppose him to have lived, how often angry, if there was a danger that he might see the rising or setting of the sun? He trembled at the light of dawn as though at the head of Medusa.

“When he saw someone digging,” says Seneca in Book II, Chapter XXV of *On Anger*, “and raising the mattock rather high, he complained that he was becoming weary and forbade the man to do the work in his sight. The same man complained more frequently because he had lain upon doubled rose-leaves.” The reading of another book in Justus Lipsius is more astonishing: “The same man complained more frequently that he had bile because he had lain upon doubled rose-leaves.” If things so small, so utterly nothing, aroused not merely anger but so great an anger, what may we think concerning the rest? For if his shoe pressed him, could he not have killed someone?

Even if the causes are neither doubtful nor light, they are nevertheless frequently of such a kind that they must be pardoned in view of the persons, or certainly not imputed. Nabal had inflicted a grave injury upon David, an innocent prince; but when David hastened to avenge himself and his men, he pardoned it at the entreaty of Nabal's wife and in consideration of his stupidity. If the man who injured you is an enemy, it is nothing new; if a friend, charge it to his former good deeds. Let the age of this man, the dignity of that one, and the imprudence of another excuse him. Among

equitable judges imprudence is held for innocence. Here the kindness and humanity of Christ the Savior is an example to us, as upon the cross he entreated for those who did not know what they were doing.

§ 10. Finally, if the cause is unjust, anger inflicts the greatest disasters and fills everything with plots and machinations: if a man grows angry because another either was unwilling or unable to drink as much as he ordered; if he refused to be the servant of tyrannical cruelty or lust; if he did not learn to flatter with sufficient abasement. Those dominions were never safe which pressed heavily and angrily upon virtues. But the treatment of these evils pertains to the books concerning war and sedition. Now we transmit those things which are fit for extinguishing so great and destructive a flame; both the things which have been said and those which I am about to say will contribute very greatly to this.

The recollection of oneself has drawn back many who were swift to vengeance and has put the brake upon armed anger. Christians and pagans counsel this alike. Gregory, *Morals*, Book V, Chapter XXXII: “The second manner of preserving forbearance is that, when we behold the excesses of others, we should consider our own offenses in which we have exceeded against others. For our own infirmity, when considered, excuses the evils of others to us. He patiently tolerates an injury inflicted upon him who piously remembers that perhaps he still possesses something in which he himself ought to be tolerated. And anger is extinguished as though by water when, as fury rises in the mind, each man's own fault is recalled to mind, because he blushes not to spare sins in another when he recollects that he himself has often committed things which need to be pardoned either by God or by his neighbor.”

And Seneca says in Book II, Chapter XXVIII: “But we cannot show ourselves according even to that strictest formula of innocence. We have done some things, thought others, wished others, favored others; in certain things we are innocent because we did not succeed. Thinking of this, let us be more equitable toward offenders; let us yield to those who reproach us; in any case let us not be angry with ourselves--with whom, indeed, shall we not be angry if we are angry even with ourselves?--and least of all with the gods. For we suffer whatever inconvenience befalls us not by their fault but by the law of mortality.”

And again: “Whoever refers to himself how often he has fallen into a false suspicion, how many of his services fortune has clothed with the appearance of injury, and how many men he began to love after hatred, will be able not to grow angry immediately--especially if, silently to himself, at every individual thing by which he is offended, he says, ‘I too have committed this.’ But where will you find so equitable a judge? The man who desires every other man's wife and considers it a sufficiently just cause for loving her that she belongs to another does not wish his own wife to be looked upon; the most severe exactor of fidelity is faithless; the man who pursues lies is himself perjured; the false accuser bears it most ill that a lawsuit is brought against him. He who has not spared his own chastity does not wish that of his little slaves to be assailed.”

[Printed page 165]

We have the faults of others before our eyes; our own are behind our back. Judah acknowledged his sin while, forgetful of his own fornication, he condemned his daughter-in-law to cruel flames. So great is the depravity of the human disposition that men most gravely prosecute offenses to which they themselves are especially liable. Pirates punish the thefts of their comrades with death; men who expend nations upon their own anger pronounce judgment concerning the lawsuits of citizens. “Pardon others much, yourself nothing,” was said to the ancient nations. I fear that this is too difficult for Christians. I shall therefore soften it; perhaps I shall obtain something: pardon something in others, you who pardon everything in yourself. The foolish love of the man who says this is worthy of notice:

I myself forgive myself.

But if nevertheless this self-love is too tenacious to be struck out, pardon others also. But if you are unwilling to pardon, you will be driven from the state of your mind more quickly than you will correct others by becoming angry. Gregory Nazianzen teaches that anger, when vehemently inflamed, casts and drives a man from the state of his mind.

Solomon too teaches thus, Proverbs 27:3: “A stone is heavy, and sand burdensome, but the anger of a fool is heavier than both.” And Saint Gregory, *Morals*, Book V, Chapter XXXI: “The heart kindled by the goads of anger throbs, the body trembles, the tongue entangles itself, the face grows fiery, the eyes become fierce, and acquaintances are not recognized at all. The tongue indeed forms an outcry, but the understanding does not know what it speaks. How far, then, is that man from one possessed, who is not conscious of his own action?”

And Seneca, Book II, Chapter XXXVI of *On Anger*: “This should be considered more: how many men anger has harmed by itself. Some have burst their veins through excessive heat; shouting raised beyond their strength has brought forth blood, and humor driven more violently into the eyes has flooded the sight of their eyes, and the sick have relapsed into diseases. No road to insanity is swifter. Many, therefore, have continued the fury of anger and never recovered the mind which they had driven out.

“Fury drove Ajax to death, anger into fury. Men pray for death for their children, want for themselves, and ruin for their house; and, no less than the insane deny that they are insane, these furious men deny that they are angry. Enemies to their dearest friends, to be avoided by those most dear to them, forgetful of laws except where laws injure, moved by the smallest things, they are accessible neither to speech, duty, nor approach. They conduct everything by force, prepared both to fight with swords and to fall upon them. For the greatest evil has seized them, one surpassing all vices.”

How great is this evil, which even invokes evil upon itself, when the other passions flee evil?

§ 11. It is a delight to see the angers of men behaving insanely and almost furiously. Plutarch's little book *Περὶ ἀπορησίας*, *On Freedom from Anger*, is golden. He relates concerning a certain pancratiast that he was so liable to anger that he kicked back against a mule which kicked him. See examples of foolish anger in kings; the first is--and would that it were the last:

The madness of Cyrus--the Gyndes.

“Cyrus,” says Seneca in Book III, Chapter XXI of *On Anger*, “was angry with a river. For when he was hastening to war in order to attack Babylon--a war whose greatest moments lie in opportunities--he attempted to cross by a ford the river Gyndes, which spread widely. This is scarcely safe even when it has felt the summer and been reduced to its lowest point. There one of the white horses which were accustomed to draw the royal chariot was swept away and vehemently moved the king. He therefore swore that he would reduce that river, which had taken passage away from royal horses, to such a condition that it could be crossed and even trodden upon by women. He then transferred the whole apparatus of war to this place and remained at the work until, the channel having been divided by one hundred and eighty trenches, he dispersed it into three hundred and sixty streams and left it dry as the waters flowed in diverse directions.

“Therefore time perished, with great loss in vain matters; the ardor of the soldiers, which useless labor broke, perished; and the opportunity of attacking men unprepared perished while he, after declaring war upon the enemy, waged it against the river.” Xerxes was more foolish, for he inflicted three hundred lashes upon the sea. Sapor, king of the Persians, was impious and foolish; when about to depart from Nisibis after his siege had been rendered vain by divine power, he discharged a missile into the air as though about to injure God. Many have turned their angers upon themselves, and this is assuredly the final thing, for every madness consumes itself; and the scorpion, when it has despaired of life, falls upon its own tail with a just wound.

All vices indeed produce anger: avarice, if you cut off profits or bring losses; lust, if you impede loves; and so the remaining vices, whenever the things sought are denied to desire, call angers to their aid. But nothing exasperates anger more than pride, for anger is therefore an opinion of contempt. Hence there are always quarrels among the proud. Hence among nobles, whose ancient vice is pride, there are so many contests, single combats, and plots, because they very easily judge that they have received an injury. Hence in cities which cultivate aristocracy there are

very many dissensions. Hence there are destructive laws, dangerous when war approaches, which indulge the anger of the powerful against subjects. Such are either the laws or customs of the Sarmatians by which the life of farmers is held cheap.

§ 12. Nevertheless, patrons of anger are not lacking--indeed, neither are its eulogists. They say that it is useful to the commonwealth and that without it authority is despised. In Plutarch anger is said to be the whetstone of courage, *οἷον βαφὴν τὸν θυμόν, ἢ στόμωμα*. They say that anger supplies courage with what dye supplies to cloth, which renders it conspicuous, and what steel supplies to iron, to which, when hardened, it imparts firmness and the power of cutting. They say that this appears in all wild animals, and that both for them and for human beings it is a *σύνφυτον ὄπλον*, “an inborn weapon.” The Latins too call it the whetstone of courage.

They say that not to grow angry belongs to sluggishness, and that anger befits brave men: *ἔχειν κότον ὄφρα τελέσῃ*; and that each man is then truly brave: *ὅταν κότον ἔθετο θυμῷ*. They say that one must possess anger which is not ineffectual, and that the spirit is then beautifully fortified when anger has been set upon it as a fearsome defense.

Nature herself stands constantly against them and cries out with her inborn voice: namely, that courage was given to her for the defense and preservation of herself; that anger is hostile to her and casts courage itself headlong. “Whether anger is according to nature,” says Seneca in Book I, Chapter V of *On Anger*, “will be plain if we examine the human being. What is gentler than he while his mind's disposition is right? But what is more cruel than anger? What is more loving of others than a human being? What is more hostile than anger? The human being has been born for mutual assistance; anger for destruction. The one wishes to be gathered together, the other to depart; the one to benefit, the other to injure; the one to succor even strangers, the other to assail even the dearest; the one is prepared even to expend itself for the advantages of others, anger to descend into danger provided that it drags another down.

“Who, therefore, is more ignorant of the nature of things than the man who assigns this savage and destructive vice to nature's best and most highly commended work? Anger, as we have said, is greedy for punishment. That desire should be present in the most peaceful breast of a human being is least of all according to his nature. For human life consists in benefits and concord, and is bound into a covenant and common assistance not by terror but by mutual love. What then? Is chastisement not sometimes necessary? Why not? But let it be sincere and accompanied by reason; for it does not injure but heals under the appearance of injuring.”

Aristotle, in Book VII, Chapter VII of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, says that anger is according to nature and numbers it among the *ὀρέξεις φυσικὰς*, “natural desires”; he says that it is more such than the other desires and therefore worthy of pardon.

[Printed page 166]

But all passions have their origin from nature and ought to be tempered by reason; those which wander beyond the path now destroy nature.

§ 13. Next, courage, unless it rests upon reason and wisdom, is rashness and audacity. Anger is destructive to prudence and hostile to counsel. Nazianzen says prudently:

Οὐδεὶς μετ' ὀργῆς ἀσφαλῶς βουλευέται,

>

Τὰ γὰρ μετ' ὀργῆς οὐδέπω βουλὴν ἔχει.

>

No one deliberates safely through anger,

>

For things done through anger never give place to counsel.

Therefore, not even in the conflicts themselves and in the arena, where there is both a school and a stripping-room for anger, must anger be joined to courage. Pyrrhus, a noble trainer of gladiators, ordered his pupils to lay aside anger. “Anger,” he said, “disturbs art.” But if anger casts headlong the art which the common people think proper to it, how much more the art of gentleness and prudence, according to which the state is ruled--the art whose business it is to gather many into one and bind them together by mutual charity and friendship?

By no other reason did a few Romans conquer the Cimbri and other nations infinite in number and excelling in courage than because the Romans proceeded into battle with reason, art, and counsel, while those nations, rushing with impetus, ferocity, and unconsidered anger, offered themselves to be slaughtered by barbarians. Therefore not an angry commander but a prudent and brave one must be chosen, one who brings against the enemy not fury but counsel. Anger, therefore, is not the companion of courage. For although a brave and angry man runs forward more swiftly and strikes more violently, nevertheless he acts less bravely because less prudently. He acts incautiously; he can strike but cannot defend himself. Every anger has this characteristic: it is prodigal of itself and attends to what may injure another, not to what may profit itself. Courage is strengthened by time and grows powerful because it uses counsel; anger languishes through delay. Give fury space; it subsides of its own accord.

So far am I from judging that this disease befits brave men that I judge irascible men least brave. The angers of children and women are sharper rather than weightier. Old men, the sick, the thirsty, and the hungry readily become angry. Plutarch certainly attributes anger to weakness in *Περὶ ἀσθησίας*:

Ὡς γὰρ οἰδημα μεγάλης ἐστὶν ἐν σαρκὶ πληγῆς πάθος, οὕτως ἡ ταῖς μαλακωτάταις ψυχαῖς ἢ πρὸς τὸ λυπηρὸν ἔνδοσις ἐκφέρει μείζονα θυμὸν ἀπὸ μείζονος ἀσθενείας. Διὸ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀνδρῶν ὀργιλώτεραι, καὶ νοσοῦντες ὑγιαίνοντων, καὶ γέροντες ἀκμαζόντων, καὶ δυστυχεῖς πρᾶττοντες εὐτυχούντων.

For as an ulcer or swelling is the affection of some great blow inflicted upon the flesh, so in the softest minds the yielding toward grief expresses and brings forth greater anger from greater weakness. Therefore women are more irascible than men, the sick than the healthy, old men than those in their prime, and the unfortunate than the fortunate.

The teacher of nature speaks no differently in Book II, Chapter II of the *Rhetoric*: “It is already apparent from these things in what dispositions men themselves grow angry, with whom, and on account of what. Men themselves grow angry when they grieve, for the grieving man desires something. Therefore, whether someone directly obstructs him--as, for example, a thirsty man from drinking--or not directly, he seems in like manner to accomplish the same thing; and if someone resists him, or does not assist him, or disturbs him in any other matter while he is in this disposition, he grows angry at all. For this reason the sick, those laboring under poverty, lovers, the thirsty--in general, those desiring something and not acting rightly--are irascible and fit to be incited.

“They are so especially against those who despise their present condition: the sick in matters which pertain to illness, the man laboring under poverty in matters which pertain to poverty, the warrior in matters which pertain to war, the lover in matters which pertain to love. It is similar also in the other cases; for each person is prepared for his own particular anger by the passion adhering to him.”

Anger is therefore a most feeble thing and comes from infirmity. “It is womanish,” says Seneca, “to rage in anger.” Scripture certainly testifies that there is no anger above the anger of a woman. Thus too the satirist sings in Satire VI:

Whenever anger makes this sex guilty,

>

And they are borne along, with rage inflaming the liver,

>

Headlong, like rocks torn from mountain ridges,

>

From which the mountain withdraws and the side recedes down the hanging slope.

Moreover, a woman is more irascible than herself when she bears a child or is heavy with age; thus the Conciliator teaches in Book X of the *Problems*, Chapter XXXV. Menander says best:

Πολὺ χεῖρόν ἐστιν ἐρετίσαι γράυν, ἢ κόνα.

>

It is worse to provoke an old woman than a dog.

§ 14. But that opinion inflicts injury not only upon the most holy martyrs, heroes truly and properly so called, but upon the bravest of all the brave, Christ the Lord, who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross and despised its shame. The highest courage is to stand immovable against pains, death, and torments; the gentlest of human beings have displayed this. Do you judge that Christ was angry when, hanging amid his torments, he said, “Father, forgive them”? Or Stephen, when he repeated the same words amid the blows of those stoning him? Courage, therefore, is most placid. Anger must never be admitted, although it has sometimes been useful by occasion of diverse causes. But in the same way drunkenness too was sometimes useful, because it put tyrants to sleep and freed innocent men. We inquire what is good, not what sometimes obtains good outcomes.

§ 15. How, then, will the rulers of peoples restrain so many desires of the wicked and avenge so many crimes unless they grow angry and terrify by anger?

The answer is ready. Let the wicked fear your justice, prudence, and strength, not your fury. Whatever is feared apart from these is hated; and it is not only hated but dangerous and exposed to contempt. For nothing is more accustomed to be laughed at than irascibility making a commotion in vain. Therefore a prince ought not to be angry at crimes, because, since all things are full of vices, he will never be able to lay aside anger if he thinks that he must be angry at them all. If you wish to be as angry as the unworthiness of crimes demands, you must not become angry but insane. The multitude of offenders removes the prince's anger, for he ought to be angry neither at all together nor at individuals. Let him be not a hater but a corrector of offenders; when punishment is required, let him decree the penalty without passion, in the manner of laws which do not know how to grow angry. Let him punish not so much because sin has been committed, but lest it be committed. A judge's anger renders even the most just sentence suspect. He torments more by his countenance than by death when, in the likeness of a Fury, he carries before him the dreadful face of a dreadful passion.

“Nevertheless, nothing has profited equally,” says Seneca in Book II, Chapter XXXV of *On Anger*, “with first looking upon the deformity of the thing, and then its danger. The face of no passion is more disturbed. It has made the most beautiful countenances foul and rendered savage faces out of the most tranquil. All grace abandons the angry; and even if a man's clothing has been arranged according to rule, he will drag his garment and pour out every care of himself. If the natural or artificial arrangement of his lying hair is not unshapely, it bristles together with his mind. The veins swell; the breast is shaken by frequent breath; a rabid eruption of the voice distends the neck. Then the limbs tremble, the hands are restless, the whole body fluctuates. What sort of mind do you suppose to be within when its image without

[Printed page 167]

is so foul? How much more terrible is the countenance within its breast, how much sharper the breath, how much more intense the impetus, which will burst itself unless it breaks forth? As are the appearances of enemies or wild beasts drenched in slaughter or going to slaughter; as the poets fashioned infernal monsters, girded with serpents and fiery breath; as the foulest Furies go forth to excite wars, divide discord among peoples, and tear apart peace--such let us

picture anger to ourselves: its eyes burning with flame; resounding with hissing, bellowing, groaning, and shrieking, and with whatever voice is more hateful than these; shaking weapons in both hands, for it has no care to hide itself; savage and bloody, scarred and livid from its own blows; of the gait of a madman; covered with much darkness; rushing upon, laying waste, and putting to flight; laboring under the hatred of all, especially of itself; desiring, if it cannot injure otherwise, that lands, seas, and heaven should fall; equally hostile and hated. Or, if it seems better, let it be such as it is among our poets:

Bellona shaking a bloody scourge in her right hand,

>

Or Discord goes rejoicing in her torn mantle.

A judge incurs the hatred of all when he attributes to his own passions what is owed to public utility. Everyone pities a defendant, although he deserves the utmost punishment, if they perceive that his judge is angry with him. A physician looks upon so many sick persons without indignation; a surgeon, when he cuts, burns, and, more gravely than a torturer, tears away flesh, does not grow angry. Therefore let every magistrate who belongs to the Christian profession imitate the gentleness of Christ, the holy martyrs, and the bishops. Let him strive with every effort to remove the angers, insults, and hostilities of citizens. Let him order those whose angers and contentions he knows to be incurable to go into exile. If they have dared crimes, let him visit them with deserved punishment. Let him never permit the anger of the more powerful to determine the punishment of a weaker man.

Unless he diligently takes care of this, immense difficulties will arise not only when advantage is displayed and the profit of crime set before men, but also when an insatiable zeal for conquering has occupied their spirits. The ardor of contention has exasperated many lawsuits which were light at the beginning. Contention from contention, anger from anger, as an image from an image when mirrors are placed opposite one another, is born, and evils are multiplied by their mutual reflections.

Look at the Roman commonwealth in Nero's age and you will not marvel that it fell. Seneca says in Book II of *On Anger*: "One man accuses the judgments of his father, which it would have been preferable to deserve; another stands in litigation with his mother; another comes as informer of a crime of which he is a manifest defendant; and a judge is chosen who is to condemn things which he himself has done; and the surrounding crowd is corrupted in favor of a bad case by the good voice of its advocate. Why do I pursue individual things? When you see the forum filled with a multitude, the enclosures full with the concourse of every class, and that circle in which the people displays the greatest part of itself, know this: there are as many vices there as human beings.

"Among those whom you see wearing the toga there is no peace. One is led to another's destruction for a slight profit. No one gains except from another's loss. They hate the fortunate and despise the unfortunate. They are burdened by a greater man and burdensome to a lesser. They are goaded by diverse desires. They desire that all things be destroyed for a slight pleasure and plunder. Life is no different from a gladiatorial school, since men live and fight with the same persons. It is an assembly of wild beasts, except that wild beasts are placid among themselves and abstain from biting their own kind, while these men are satiated by mutual laceration. In this one respect they differ from speechless animals: the latter become tame toward those who use them; the madness of the former devours the very men by whom it is nourished."

§ 16. I wish the prince to be tireless, diligent, effective, and active; I forbid him to be irascible. Clemency agrees well with grave punishment; anger never does. Saint Cyprian says in his book *On the Lapsed*: "He is an unskilled physician who handles the swelling recesses of wounds with a sparing hand and, by preserving the poison enclosed in the deep recesses of the entrails, increases it. The wound must be opened and cut, and, after the putrid parts have been amputated, treated with a stronger remedy. Let the impatient sick man shout and cry out and complain through pain; afterward he will give thanks when he has perceived health."

Often in the commonwealth safety is sought by severity, which is certainly necessary in military service. A distinguished commander, according to Tacitus in Book XIII, contained his army by severity. A soldier was noted who, carrying a bundle of wood, had his hands frozen so rigidly that, adhering to the burden, they fell away from the truncated arms. The commander himself, lightly clothed and with his head uncovered, was frequently present in the marching column and in labors, displaying praise to the vigorous, comfort to the weak, and an example to all. Then, because many refused and deserted on account of the harshness of the climate and military service, a remedy was sought by severity. For, unlike in other armies, a first and second offense was not pursued with pardon; rather, one who had abandoned the standards immediately paid the penalty with his head. This appeared wholesome in practice and better than mercy, for fewer deserted that camp than those in which pardon was given.

§ 17. The same thing often occurs in a kingdom. But just as discipline ought not to be dissolved by leniency, so harshness ought altogether to be absent. How dreadful and wicked was Piso's argument, which put justice forward as a pretext for the most unjust fury! Seneca relates it in Book I, Chapter XVI of *On Anger*:

"Gnaeus Piso was in our memory a man free from many vices, but depraved and one to whom rigor was pleasing in place of constancy. In anger he had ordered that man to be led away who had returned from leave without his fellow-soldier, as though he had killed the man whom he did not produce. When the soldier asked for some time to search, Piso did not give it. Condemned, he was led outside the rampart and was already extending his neck when suddenly that fellow-soldier who was thought to have been killed appeared. Then the centurion set over the execution ordered the executioner to sheath his sword and led the condemned man back to Piso, intending to return innocence to Piso, for fortune had returned the soldier. Amid an immense concourse the fellow-soldiers were led in, embracing one another, with great joy in the camp.

"Piso, raging, ascended the tribunal and ordered both to be led away: both the soldier who had not killed and the one who had not perished. What could be more unworthy than this? Because one innocent man had appeared, two were perishing. Piso added a third, for he ordered the very centurion who had led the condemned man back to be led away. Three men were stationed in that same place to perish on account of one man's innocence. O how ingenious irascibility is at fashioning causes of fury! 'I order you,' he said, 'to be led away because you were condemned; you, because you were the cause of your fellow-soldier's condemnation; you, because, though ordered to kill, you did not obey your commander.' He contrived how he might make three crimes because he had found none."

This anger destroys everything, and the world deservedly attributes to angers its destructions, which rage by turns everywhere and always make devastation in some place. The same Seneca--whom I produce more frequently in this place because among all pagans he wrote most effectively concerning anger--says in Book I, Chapter II: "Now, if you wish to look upon its effects and harms, no plague has cost the human race more. You will see slaughter and poisonings, the mutual filth of defendants, the disasters of cities, the destructions of whole nations, the heads of princes put up for sale beneath the public spear, torches placed beneath roofs, and fires not confined within walls but immense expanses of regions shining with hostile flame.

"Look upon the foundations of the noblest cities, scarcely discernible: anger cast them down. Look upon the solitudes deserted without habitation for many thousands of miles: anger exhausted them. Look upon so many commanders delivered to memory as examples of an evil fate: anger stabbed one in his bed; struck another amid the sacred rites of the table; tore another apart amid the laws and the crowded spectacle of the forum; ordered another to give his blood to the parricide of a son; another to open a royal throat by a servile hand; another to divide his limbs upon crosses. And thus far I relate the punishments of individuals.

[Printed page 168]

"What if it should please you, leaving those against whom anger blazed individually, to look upon assemblies cut down by the sword, a plebs slaughtered after soldiers were sent in, and entire peoples condemned to capital punishment for indiscriminate destruction, as though they had abandoned our care or despised our authority?"

§ 18. I have spoken concerning the moderation of anger and am about to pass to other matters. I give the admonition which others gave long ago: namely, the greatest remedy for anger is delay. Do not initially ask anger to pardon, but to judge. It will cease if it waits. Do not attempt to remove the whole of it at once; its first impulses are grave. It is wholly conquered while it is plucked away in parts.

Athenodorus, now an old man--I think he was the man who was the teacher of Dionysius the Areopagite--when he had obtained his discharge from Augustus, left this final command to the emperor while saying farewell: "When you are angry, say or do nothing before you have recited to yourself the names of the twenty-four Greek letters." Delighted by this saying, Augustus took hold of his right hand and said, "I still need you present," and kept him with himself for a whole year.

But if you will listen to me for a little while, O prince, when you are angry, do nothing and say nothing unless you have first said the Lord's Prayer in your heart. Or, if this is too much, at least run through these words: "And forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors." But if a mind twisted by anger cannot be directed toward prayer, merely recite some sentence, for example Matthew 6:14: "For if you forgive human beings their sins, your heavenly Father will also forgive your offenses. But if you do not forgive human beings, neither will your Father forgive your offenses."

Or Chapter 5:22: "But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment. But he who says to his brother, 'Raca,' will be liable to the council. But he who says, 'Fool,' will be liable to the Gehenna of fire."

Or Job 28: "An irascible man kindles a quarrel, and a sinful man will trouble friends and cast enmity into the midst of those possessing peace."

Or Proverbs 15:1: "A soft answer breaks anger; a hard word arouses fury."

Or Job 36:18: "Therefore let anger not overcome you, so that you oppress someone."

Or Ecclesiastes 11:10: "Remove anger from your heart."

Or Ephesians 4:31: "Let all bitterness and anger and indignation and clamor and blasphemy be taken away from us, with all malice."

But if he does not admit even sacred counsels, let him take some pagan as counsellor and say:

He who will not moderate his anger

>

Will wish undone what grief and mind have counselled,

>

While he hastens by force to exact penalties for unavenged hatred.

>

Anger is a brief madness. Rule your spirit, which, unless it obeys,

>

Commands. Restrain it with bridles, restrain it with a chain.

An angry man understands his error after the deed.

If you are angry, you are mad.

Trust no angry man--not even your own spirit.

The irascibility of a good man quickly dies.

CHAPTER XVI

Clemency Must Be Cultivated in Every Commonwealth

§ 1. Gentleness and clemency are twin virtues. They almost always advance with equal step and conspire toward one effect of human actions. Gentleness is the moderator of anger according to right reason; clemency, of punishments. Saint Thomas refers both, by a certain likeness, to temperance in *Summa theologiae* II-II, Question 157, Article 3. For just as temperance restrains pleasures within the circuit of reason and does not permit them to pass beyond the limits of honor, so gentleness mitigates that most ferocious beast, anger, confined with chains and in prison, and renders it tame, so that it not only does no injury but even contains itself within the lawful and prescribed bounds of justice.

Thus clemency is not that which abstains from raging through force and injustice, but that which inflicts milder punishments than the rigor of law. Clemency is the temperance of the mind in the power of taking vengeance; or the lenity of a superior toward an inferior in establishing punishments; or an inclination of the mind toward lenity in exacting punishment; or the virtue which remits something of a merited and owed punishment. These definitions are Seneca's, from Book II, Chapter III of *On Clemency*. Clearer, and one which removes objections, is the definition of Lipsius in Book II, Chapter XII: "Clemency is the virtue which, with judgment, inclines the mind away from punishment or vengeance toward lenity."

§ 2. Although they are the most excellent virtues and strengthen the throne of a kingdom, as is said in Proverbs 20:28, nevertheless a controversy concerning the status of both is raised by men who teach how to dispute rather than how to live. "Gentleness," they say, "diminishes anger, and clemency punishments; but virtue consists in the mean. These virtues, however, supply less than what is due; therefore they stand short of the right and of those boundaries which the norm of virtue has fixed."

But we must hold the teaching not only of the Sacred Scriptures but also of the more moderate philosophers and political writers: that gentleness and clemency are distinguished virtues, and indeed so honorable that the other virtues sometimes defer to them. Gentleness diminishes anger because, since an appetite for vengeance is innate in all and taking vengeance is sweet to an angry man, and since no one readily judges injuries inflicted upon himself to be small, a most noble virtue is engaged in a great contest.

Clemency indeed remits the punishment which legal justice demands according to the common law, yet is not unjust but benign. For according to right reason it remits the punishment owed, or a part of the punishment. It does this on account of certain particular circumstances, the consideration of which causes a departure from severity in punishing to be right. Therefore clemency is contrary neither to severity nor to justice, for no virtue is opposed to another virtue. Severity according to right reason exacts punishments when, from whom, and of what magnitude they are to be exacted. Clemency, led by the same reason, remits them in the proper place and time.

Thus *ἐπιείκεια*, equity, which benignly interprets the words of a rigid law according to the legislator's intention and judges according to it, does not overthrow justice, but recalls the highest law--which is often the highest injustice--to equity, indeed, if we wish to confess the truth, to justice. "But if justice," they say, "demands punishment, clemency cannot remit it unless it oppresses justice." On the contrary, the common law demands punishment and gives the power of exacting it. Nevertheless, it does not prohibit pity, pardon, or mitigation for certain causes. Nor is any legislator, or ought any legislator to be, so tenacious of his laws that he does not sometimes leave a place for prayers and humanity.

Cruelty is opposed to clemency; it is atrocity of mind in exacting punishments. Seneca, Book II, Chapter IV of *On Anger*: "What, then, is opposed to clemency? Cruelty, which is nothing other than atrocity of mind in exacting punishments. But some do not exact punishments and nevertheless are cruel--as those who kill unknown persons

whom they meet, not for profit but for the sake of killing. Not content to kill, they rage, as did Sinis and Procrustes and the pirates who scourge captives and place them alive upon the fire.

[Printed page 169]

“This indeed is cruelty; but because it does not follow vengeance--for it was not injured--and does not grow angry at any sin--for no crime preceded it--it falls outside our definition, which contained intemperance of mind in exacting punishments. We can say that this is not cruelty but ferocity, whose pleasure is savagery; we can call it insanity, for its kinds are various, and none is more certain than that which arrives at the slaughter and mangling of human beings. Therefore I shall call cruel those who possess a cause for punishing but possess no measure.”

Cruelty therefore exasperates punishments. Sometimes it rages without cause, from the pleasure of another's pain alone, by which many violate justice, charity, mercy, clemency, and every divine and human law. They are not human beings but savage beasts which bite more than they hunger.

§ 3. I shall treat three things in this chapter. First, I shall show that in very many kings anger has ruled in place of gentleness and cruelty in place of clemency. Second, I shall teach how necessary clemency is to the commonwealth and how harmful cruelty is. Third, I shall explain what the measure of clemency is, lest discipline and the force of laws be weakened.

§ 4. Among the other vices of the nations, the Apostle Paul enumerates in Romans 1:31 that they are *ἀνελεήμονας*, unmerciful, murderous, and therefore cruel. Stoic *ἀπάθεια*, apathy, inflamed those vices when the Stoics denied that pity and pardon belonged to a wise man. But Seneca errs with the Stoics. For mercy is a pain of the will, or displeasure, conceived according to right reason concerning another's misery; there is no need for passion or grief which pour themselves out into lamentation and wailing. But that movement of the lower appetite--whether fellow-suffering or emotion--is not only not a vice if it is governed by right reason, but even serves true mercy, which resides in the will and is a virtue. The Apostle must be heard: “Weep with those who weep.”

That movement of the mind serves reason when mercy is supplied in such a way that justice is preserved, whether something is given to the needy or pardon to the penitent. Nevertheless, that movement of the appetitive power is not necessary to mercy, for the will alone, aided by reason, can have mercy. Augustine therefore clearly refutes the Stoics in Book I, Chapter XXVII of *On the Morals of the Catholic Church*:

“Therefore all those who courteously and humanely supply the things by which evils or disadvantages of this kind are resisted are called merciful, even if they are wise to such a degree that they are now disturbed by no pain of mind. For who does not know that mercy is so named because it makes the heart miserable by fellow-suffering with another's evil? And who would not concede that the wise man ought to be free from every misery when he assists the needy, supplies food to the hungry and drink to the thirsty, clothes the naked, receives the stranger beneath a roof, frees the oppressed, and finally extends his humanity as far as the burial of the dead? Even if he does this with a tranquil mind, goaded by no stings of pain but led by the duty of goodness, he must nevertheless be called merciful. For the name does him no harm when misery is absent.

“But fools, when they avoid mercy as though a vice, because they cannot be sufficiently moved by duty if they are not also moved by a disturbance, are frozen rather by the cold of inhumanity than made serene by the tranquility of reason. Therefore God himself is said much more prudently to be merciful. How he is so called remains for those to understand who have made themselves fit by religion and study, lest, when we ineptly use the words of the learned, we make the souls of the unlearned grow hard by avoiding mercy before we make them grow gentle by seeking benignity. And, as mercy commands us to drive these disadvantages away from a human being, so innocence prohibits us from inflicting them.”

Therefore I altogether prefer a mercy which even makes the heart miserable and sorrowful, which burns when someone is scandalized, which cries out with David, “Absalom, my son, my son Absalom,” which with Christ lifts its

eyes over Jerusalem and weeps, to that harsh philosophy which hardens minds to every inhumanity and inflames cruelty.

§ 5. Therefore all the dominions of the ancient nations fell into the highest cruelty just as into other vices. And properly that passion which Aristotle describes in Book VII, Chapter I of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is called *θηριότης*, bestiality. Thus, if--as they say--men become gods on account of the excellence and preeminence of virtue, that disposition of mind which is opposed to this bestial disposition will assuredly be such a disposition. For just as neither vice nor virtue belongs to a wild beast, so neither belongs to gods; but the divine disposition is something more excellent and honorable than virtue, while the other is another kind distinct from vice.

But since it very rarely happens that a divine man exists--as the Pavones are accustomed to call and salute a man divine whom they greatly admire, saying, "O divine man"--so among human beings someone resembling wild beasts in nature is rarely found. Certain inhumanities of this kind, however, are produced by diseases and debilities of the limbs. And we call those human beings who excel others in vice savage and inhuman by a foul and infamous name. But something will have to be said later by us concerning this passion of mind.

And in Chapter VI: "But since some things are pleasant by nature, and of these some are pleasant simply and absolutely, others to diverse classes of living creatures and human beings; while other things are not pleasant by nature but become pleasant partly on account of debilities of bodies, partly on account of habit, and partly on account of vicious natures, it is possible in each of these to observe similar dispositions. I call inhuman and bestial dispositions such as that of the woman who, they say, was accustomed to cut open pregnant women who had reached full term and devour the children; or such things as certain savage peoples around Pontus are reported to delight in--some in raw flesh, others in human flesh, others in giving their children to one another for feasts; or such as that which is commonly said concerning Phalaris. These, then, are bestial dispositions.

"Others arise in some men on account of diseases and madnesses, such as the man who sacrificed and ate his mother and the man who ate the liver of his fellow-slave. Other diseased dispositions proceed from habit, such as pulling out hair, gnawing nails, and eating charcoal and earth; in addition, sexual intercourse with males. For these desires are natural to some and arise in others from habit, as in those who were accustomed to them from boyhood. And no one would call any of those for whom nature supplies the cause incontinent, just as no one calls women incontinent because in sexual intercourse they do not act but are acted upon. By the same reasoning, neither do we call those incontinent who have contracted by habit a vice similar to disease.

"To be tempted by each of these evils of the mind is to pass beyond the limits and boundaries of vice, just as by ferocity it is to approach very near the nature of beasts. But to be superior or inferior when tempted and affected by these things is not simple continence or incontinence, but is so by resemblance; just as we ought not to call that man incontinent in respect of this disturbance who is so affected in anger that he is conquered by it.

[Printed page 170]

"For every viciousness exceeding measure--madness, timidity, intemperance, and savagery--is either bestial or diseased."

Aristotle speaks rightly in the remaining things, but altogether badly in this: that he recognizes few men, and only among the barbarians, as *θηριώδεις*, bestial and inhuman. I must demonstrate the contrary, so that from this part at least it may appear what Christian piety has conferred upon the world.

§ 6. The most ancient vice of the human race is to rage against the associates of one's own kind. While his brother was alive, the world seemed narrow to Cain. The giants before the flood were avaricious, cruel, and lustful. Scarcely had the world been restored when Nimrod seized tyranny; and while Abraham was alive, and Noah, Shem, and others were still mourning, kings prepared distant wars, Genesis 13. Moses shows in many places that the custom of lusting and raging existed when he writes that Abraham asked Sarah to say that she was his sister, lest perhaps she should be

seized and, after her husband had been killed, an empty marriage-bed should be allotted to the ravisher. They judged homicide a lesser evil than adultery. So cheap was human blood to a human being while the world was still empty.

Nor was Pharaoh gentler toward the infants of the Jews; nor was the utmost cruelty absent from the most ancient wars of the Emim, Horites, Zamzummim, and Cappadocians, when entire nations were destroyed. What happened in Palestine? Did not seventy kings, the extremities of their hands and feet having been amputated, gather crumbs beneath the table of Adoni-bezek? But most cruelties of very ancient times lie hidden because men were lacking who might transmit them to posterity.

Let us look upon the cruelty of the four most celebrated monarchies, for in them we shall find the human race raging. The first is called either Assyrian or Chaldaean, for they are customarily joined. Habakkuk describes the Chaldaeans for us, Chapter 1:6: "For behold, I shall raise up the Chaldaeans, a bitter and swift nation, walking over the breadth of the earth to possess dwellings not its own. It is horrible and terrible; from itself its judgment and burden shall go forth. Its horses are lighter than leopards and swifter than evening wolves, and its horsemen shall be spread abroad; for its horsemen shall come from far away; they shall fly like an eagle hastening to eat. All shall come for plunder; their faces are a burning wind, and it shall gather captivity like sand. It shall triumph over kings, and tyrants shall be its mockery. It shall laugh at every fortification, heap up an embankment, and take it."

And Isaiah 14:5: "He has broken the staff of the wicked, the rod of rulers, which struck peoples in indignation with an incurable wound, which subjected nations in fury, which pursued cruelly." And verse 12: "Have you fallen to the earth, you who wounded the nations?" And verse 17: "Is this the man who disturbed the earth, who shook kingdoms, who made the world a desert and destroyed its cities, who did not open the prison to his captives?" And verse 20: "For you have destroyed your land; you have killed your people. The seed of the wicked shall not be named forever. Prepare his sons for slaughter." Daniel too says that he killed those whom he wished.

The administration of that kingdom was therefore grievous and tyrannical. Daniel 7:4 compares it to a lioness: "The first was like a lioness and had wings like an eagle." Jerome says that it is called a lioness, *לַאֲרִי*, on account of luxury and cruelty, for the female is more savage than the male. Those who have written concerning the natures of beasts say that lionesses are more ferocious, especially if they nourish cubs, and always eager for intercourse. Cruelty and womanishness are perpetually connected.

Moreover, the lioness is swift with an eagle's wings, as Habakkuk too describes it. The hunger of a lion is more savage because it never returns to the remains of prey but always threatens warm blood. The tyranny of eagles too is celebrated, for Olaus says in Book XIX, Chapter VII that one pair requires a broad territory for plundering. He then relates how much profit northern farmers make from two chicks which they compel to hunger, while their anxious parents carry every kind of game into the nests. Therefore the Chaldaean monarchy is a *γρυπαετός ἀγκυλοχείλης*, a crooked-beaked griffin-eagle; and I judge that the tale concerning the griffin-eagle arose from Daniel and that report. Thus that eagle in Jeremiah 48:40 brings extreme calamity upon the Moabites: "Behold, like an eagle he shall fly and extend his hands against Moab." And Lamentations 4:19: "Our persecutors were swifter than the eagles of heaven, and they pursued us over the mountains." This, therefore, was the cruelty of the Chaldaeans and Assyrians.

§ 7. But that of the Medes and Persians was much greater. Daniel speaks thus concerning the second monarchy, Chapter 7, verse 5: "And behold another beast like a bear; it stood upon one part, and there were three rows in its order and in its teeth, and thus they said to it: 'Arise, eat very much flesh.'" The bear is a beast of foul and ignoble savagery:

Do not, though ruined by its rabid mouth,

>

Try the nose of a bear steaming with wine;

>

Though it be placid and lick your fingers and hands,

>

If pain and bile, if just anger should compel it,

>

It will be a bear.

It is an omnivorous and faithless animal. It surpasses all beasts in ferocity, as Philostratus says. But the most rabid of bears are in Persia. "Persian bears rage beyond all madness," says Marcellinus. The three rows of teeth indicate this, and so does that incitement: "Arise, eat very much flesh." They devoured very many kingdoms; and among them Babylon first experienced their ferocity and raw hunger. Whoever reads its most wretched destruction will recognize the work of the Medes and Persians. Isaiah 13:17: "Behold, I shall raise up against them the Medes, who do not seek silver nor desire gold; but with arrows they shall kill little children, shall not pity the wombs of nursing mothers, and their eye shall not spare sons."

Ammianus says in Book XXX that the Persian nation always exercised a cruel variety of punishments. Hence the flaying of the living, in the same author's Book XXXIII; hence the deaths of relatives in Xenophon, Book III of the *Ἀνάβασις*, *Anabasis*; hence the burying of living persons in Herodotus, Books VIII and IV; burning men alive in Ctesias's fragments. See also Heliodorus, Book VIII of the *Aethiopian History*, Socrates, Book I, Chapter XXII, and Procopius, Book I of the *Persian War*, witnesses of the utmost and savage inhumanity.

Cyrus himself, greedy for blood, paid the penalty for cruelty with blood. What Darius did against the seven nobles is related both by others and briefly by Valerius in Book VI. But Ochus, who was afterward called Darius, was bound by the oath most sacred among the Persians not to kill by poison, sword, any violence, or deprivation of food any of the conspirators who had overthrown the seven Magi with him. He devised a crueller manner of death by which he might remove those burdensome to him without breaking the bond of religion. He enclosed a place with high walls and filled it with ashes, and, after setting up a projecting beam, placed upon it men benignly received with food and drink; when overcome by sleep, they fell from it into that treacherous heap.

Concerning the other Ochus: the cruelty of another Ochus, surnamed Artaxerxes, was more open and more loathsome. He buried alive Ocha, his sister and at the same time his mother-in-law; and he fixed his paternal uncle, together with more than one hundred sons and grandsons, with javelins in an empty, abandoned enclosure. He had been provoked by no injury, but saw that among the Persians the greatest praise for probity and courage consisted in these things.

[Printed page 171]

Among their cruel punishments was *σκαφισμός*, scaphism, by which Mithridates died in Plutarch's *Artaxerxes*; it lasted seventeen days, while his body was almost devoured by worms. Memnon--in Book II of Xenophon's *Ἀνάβασις*--was tortured *ἐπὶ δὲ ἐνιαυτόν*, for an entire year. Nor is this novel: a royal woman tortured her sister's physician in this way.

But what sort were they toward enemies? Justin relates in Book X that eight hundred men met Alexander after suffering servitude with part of the body truncated. Were so many mutilated together in one place? Things not dissimilar are found in Curtius, Book III. Diodorus Siculus speaks concerning the same men in Book XVIII:

Ἡκρωτηριασμένοι ὄντες πάντες, οἱ μὲν χεῖρας, οἱ δὲ πόδας, οἱ δὲ ὄτα καὶ ῥῖνας.

All had their extremities mutilated: some their hands, others their feet, others their ears and noses. Let the deeds of Cambyses in Egypt be seen in Herodotus, Book III. The calamity of the Rhinocolura came from a Persian king according to Seneca, Book III, Chapter XX of *On Anger*. Diodorus in Book I, Chapter II of the *Library* and Strabo in Book XVI attribute it to the king of the Ethiopians.

Plutarch, in his book *Which Animals Are More Clever*, recalls how they hunted human beings; Herodotus explains the method in Book VI:

Ὁ δὲ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς, ὑστερέων χειμερινὰς περὶ Μίλητον τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει, ὥς ἀνέπλωσε, αἰρέει ἐπιθέων τὰς νήσους, τὰς πρὸς τῇ ἡπείρῳ κειμένας, Χίον, καὶ Λέσβον, καὶ Τένεδον, δίκην σαγήνης. Τῶν νήσων, ὥς ἐκάστην αἰρέοιτο οἱ βάρβαροι, ἐσαγήνευον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· σαγηνεύουσι δὲ τὸν τρόπον, ἀνὴρ ἀνδρὸς ἀψάμενος τῆς χερὸς ἐκ θαλάσσης τῆς βορέης ἐπὶ τὴν νοτὶν διήκουσι, καὶ ἔπειτα διὰ πάσης τῆς νήσου διέρχονται, ἐκθηρεύοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Αἰρέοντο δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐν ἡπείρῳ πόλεις, τὰς Ἰάδας, κατὰ ταῦτα, πλὴν οὐκ ἐσαγήνευον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, οὐ γὰρ οἷά τε ἦν.

The Persian naval army, after wintering around Miletus in the second year, when it sailed up, quickly occupied the islands situated near the mainland: Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos. After the barbarians occupied each of the islands, they caught the human beings with a dragnet. They caught them with a dragnet in this manner: man grasping man's hand, they advanced from the northern shore to the southern and hunted the human beings. They also took the Ionian cities on the mainland, but did not enclose the human beings in a dragnet, for it could not be done.

§ 8. Lest you hope for milder things, the leopard avenges the cruelty of the bear. The kingdom of Greece chastises Persian savagery with another barbarity. For thus Daniel 7:6 says: “After this I looked, and behold another beast like a leopard; and it had four wings like a bird upon itself, and four heads were upon the beast, and power was given to it.” Four wings, that it may surpass the lion; four heads, that it may tear apart the bear. It is the swiftest animal and overtakes wild beasts by three or four bounds. Pollux says that the leopard's body is *ὕγρον, εὔελικτον, πηδητικόν, ἀλτικόν, εὐπαλες*: moist, flexible, fit for leaps, springing, and pugnacious.

Alexander cast down the bear in the course of a few victories; afterward he himself died, the leading men who had lived with him were quickly removed, and the rest languished. But the leopard's ferocity must be discussed. Alexander, after overthrowing Thebes and oppressing Greece, inaugurated the Persian War with the slaughter of brothers and relatives. He sent an entire nation as funeral victims to Hephaestion. He himself--which is an indication of great cruelty--was more desirous of wine than all mortals and therefore in this part too was a leopard, for leopards also are devoted to wine and were generally captured through drunkenness, as Oppian relates.

Cruelty is the companion of drunkenness, as Seneca truly says in Epistle LXXXIII: “This thing rendered him an enemy of the commonwealth, this rendered him unequal to his enemies, this rendered him cruel: when the heads of the leading men of the state were brought to him while he dined; when, amid the most elaborate feasts and royal luxury, he identified the faces and hands of proscribed men; when, heavy with wine, he nevertheless thirsted for blood. What he did when drunk was intolerable even if he had done it when sober; how much more intolerable that he did these things amid drunkenness itself? Cruelty generally follows vinousness, for the sanity of the mind is violated and exasperated. Just as lingering diseases render eyes difficult even at the smallest offense of a sunbeam, so continual bouts of drunkenness render minds savage. For since they are frequently not in possession of themselves, vices hardened by the habit of insanity and conceived in wine have force even without it.”

Certainly Alexander's drunkenness destroyed more friends than the many battles which he entered. The leopard's peculiar characteristic, however, is malicious and raw deceit. For if its attack is cheated of its prey, it turns against the hunter. Therefore those who use it in hunting always keep sheep, lambs, and other things at hand with which they appease the fury from which the greater beast escaped. Nothing is more like the cruelty of the Greek monarchy. Alexander's fellow-soldiers first, and then his successors, turned their arms against one another. Nowhere were there more or more atrocious crimes and slaughters than among the Seleucids, Ptolemies, and Macedonians. For there were perpetual butcheries of nations in Greece, Egypt, Syria, and Asia, and the outcomes of royal families were horrible and mournful.

§ 9. While the third beast rages, a fourth grows for its destruction, namely the Roman Empire, which Daniel describes thus: “After this I looked in a vision of the night, and behold a fourth beast, terrible and wondrous and exceedingly strong. It had great iron teeth, eating and breaking in pieces and trampling the remainder with its feet.”

First, he calls it terrible, which properly belongs to inhumanity; for animals are feared not on account of their size, however vast they may be, but because they are cruel and bloodthirsty. The Hebrew names it דְּחִילָה, *dechila*, a word used of great terror; thus דְּחָלָן, *dechalan*. Among the Chaldaean demons are so called because they are greatly feared. Second, it is wondrous; the Septuagint names it ἑκθαμβον, because it renders men astonished with terror. Third, it is strong in treasury and cities. Fourth, its iron teeth are strong emperors, armies, and fleets. Fifth, it eats and breaks in pieces the forces of enemies and the spoils of provinces. For it was not enough to enrich one king: so many patricians, proconsuls, and governors had to be filled from the wretched provinces; new colonies had to be received; land had to be yielded.

How great was Rome itself? Lipsius, in Books I, Chapters II and III of *On Roman Greatness*, says that in the time of Augustus there were more than 320,000 poorer citizens who lived from the public treasury--that is, from the sweat and blood of the provinces. And not only they: from the same plunder the rich, the equestrian order, and senators lived luxuriously. Add to these wives, children, and little slaves, and you will make an entire nation. It was customary to draw along great armies of slaves. Crassus maintained five hundred craftsmen in his household; others maintained more. The number of slaves at Rome was immense. When it was once discussed in the senate that slaves should use one kind of clothing and free persons another, it was understood how dangerous it would be

[Printed page 172]

if slaves began to count the free, as Seneca teaches. The same man in the *Consolation to Helvia* indicates that the crowd of foreigners at Rome was greater than that of citizens. The courts of the Caesars contained up to one hundred thousand. Now weigh the distributions, games, public banquets, and other insanities, and you will understand that so voracious a beast could not exist without the blood of many animals.

These things, therefore, are cruel; but the Holy Spirit indicates in those words a distinguished inhumanity not used so furiously by the other monarchies: “And trampling the remainder with its feet.” A ferocious and bloodthirsty beast for which it is too little to feed, grow fat, and be distended upon the deaths of the weak unless, through savagery and most arrogant contempt, it also insults the perishing.

There were two things grievous to the whole world. The first was the Roman games: Circensian, theatrical, and others. The preparations for trifles were immense. In the *Agamemnon* there were six hundred mules. A theater was covered with gold by Nero for one day. Caesar at his father's funeral made the equipment of the stage silver, and he was not yet Caesar, had not yet plundered Gaul or the city. In Pliny's time silver stages existed everywhere in colonies and municipalities. I have spoken above concerning Heliogabalus, who exhibited naval Circensian games in canals full of wine. These had to be long and broad so that ships might run in them; I judge that scarcely one year's wine was enough for so great a madness.

Add not only the preparation and sails floating over the full theater, but also the things cast among the people--namely, that at Rome the Arabs were drenched by their own rains. Tiraquellus in *Octavius*: “Things of every kind were scattered and cast among the people: on every day, each day a thousand birds; a manifold store of every kind; vouchers for grain, clothing, gold, silver, gems, pearls, painted panels, beasts of burden, and even tame wild beasts; finally ships, islands, and estates.”

But the chief point of cruelty was in the amphitheater, where human beings died solely for the pleasure of the spectators. Let the reader consult the *Saturnalia* of the most learned Justus if this matter is his concern. In individual years the arena consumed two hundred thousand--or rather three hundred thousand--human beings in the most cruel pleasures. Caesar presented hunts for five days, and finally a battle was joined on each side with five hundred

infantrymen, twenty elephants, and thirty horsemen. Tranquillus, *Julius*, Chapter XXXIX. The same man brought forward biremes, triremes, and quadriremes in a naval battle with a great number of fighters. Tranquillus speaks concerning Augustus in Chapter XLIII and Claudius in Chapter XXI, who joined twelve triremes on each side; one part was called the Sicilian fleet, the other the Rhodian. This was the pleasure of one day, upon which many thousands were expended.

Hadrian consumed several thousands over three days; Gordian over an entire year. Titus consumed gladiators, hunts, and naval battles over one hundred days. Trajan consumed ten thousand over one hundred and twenty-three days. These things happened at Rome and belonged to the Caesars; but there were more spectacles. Consuls, praetors, aediles, and priests gave games. Emperors made immense expenditures. At the adoption of Commodus Hadrian said, “We have lost four thousand times one hundred thousand sesterces”—that is, ten millions. You truly lost them upon trifles; you truly lost them most cruelly upon the deaths of wretched human beings and pleasures more wretched than deaths.

Magistrates at Rome and in the provinces did the same things. Augustus gave games twenty-four times in his own name, and twenty-three times in the names of others who were absent or unable. Herod, in the Holy Land itself, established theaters in almost every town and joined seven hundred pairs at once. This custom also existed at funerals, for we read that heirs, if they had not thus provided for one hundred condemned pairs of gladiators, were prosecuted. The banquets themselves and the feasts themselves were sprinkled with cruel blood. All funerals of magnates were rendered more deadly by gladiatorial funeral offerings; all weddings and banquets of nobles were loathsome with barbaric cruelty.

§ 10. The preparation itself cost no less blood. Pompey presented more than four hundred lions, as did others. Gordian presented one hundred Libyan wild beasts in one day and one thousand bears in one day. Under Augustus a show completed three thousand five hundred wild beasts in a single set of games, as the Ancyran stone, a witness of immense cruelty, confesses. Vopiscus says in his *Probus* that he presented one thousand ostriches, one thousand stags, and one thousand boars. And lest you think these few, Statilius Taurus built a stone theater in the Campus Martius for hunts. But Severus, despising it, discovered new kinds of cruelty lest he should ever be capable of being satiated; for from a collapsible ship he released four hundred lions in one moment. Carinus introduced the sea and swimming monsters. It is wearisome to relate the remaining things which trustworthy histories transmit concerning Nero and others.

Let us consider this beast, the subduer of all beasts. First, so many gladiators are matched against one another in amphitheaters, at funerals, and at banquets throughout all the provinces. Then they are cast to wild beasts. For how many little human beings could be equal to four hundred lions? But cruelty does not stop here. There is greater cruelty in the hunting of wild beasts. See entire provinces in Africa, Asia, and Mesopotamia occupied with hunting beasts at danger to life. Scarcely one lion is captured without wounds; here four hundred are to perish in one day. How much labor is needed to capture them?

If they were captured so that forests might be safe for gentle animals and so that they would not infest the fields, this could seem a recompense for danger and labor. But now they are captured, and care is taken that they be captured alive, so that, brought to Rome over tracts of lands and seas and fed at great expense, they may mangle a human being. This is most inhuman: for a human being to favor a beast against a human being. Then, that they should mangle a human being for a human being's pleasure is now beyond every madness of savagery. For few beasts rage except for the sake of food; the human being casts a human being to beasts because he seeks the pain of a human being and a variety of delight from a variety of punishment. Not one or another man does these things, but the whole empire--indeed, almost the whole more cultivated world--does, praises, commands, and demands them. These things surpass every crime of inhumanity.

As much was expended upon lions, tigers, bears, and devourers of human beings as upon whole armies. There were other public and cruel customs: to kill monstrous offspring without penalty; to expose the weak and maimed; to sell rejected slaves to the gladiatorial school, the beasts, and the mines; to exercise the savage right of masters over slaves.

§ 11. After that public cruelty of the whole people, what can be said concerning the inhumanity and savagery of individuals is a small thing. It is established concerning Augustus that, when his cruelty was now weary, he laid aside the sword. Tiberius did nothing other than exhibit a slaughterhouse. Dio speaks thus concerning Caligula: “Since Gaius could not be filled with blood, he took care that as many as possible should fight one another and sometimes ordered them to engage in pairs, at other times crowded together as in a battle-line, so that twenty-six knights were slain in one day. For so great was his cruelty that, when those condemned to the beasts had run out, he ordered certain men from that

[Printed page 173]

crowd which sat upon the benches to be seized and cast to the beasts, and ordered their tongues cut out so that they could not speak or accuse anyone.”

Seneca is graver than Dio in Book III, Chapter XIX of *On Anger*: “Just now Gaius Caesar, on one day, cut down with scourges and tortured Sextus Papinius, whose father had been consul; Bassus, his quaestor and the son of his procurator; other senators; and Roman knights--not for the sake of an inquiry, but for the sake of his disposition. Then he was so impatient of deferring the pleasure which immense cruelty demanded without delay that, while walking in the promenade of his mother's gardens which separates the portico from the riverbank, he decapitated some of them by lamplight in the company of matrons and other senators. What was pressing? What private or public danger did a single night threaten? How small a thing was it to wait for daylight? Finally, was it necessary that, wearing slippers, he should kill senators of the Roman people?

“It pertains to the matter to know how arrogant his cruelty was, although we may seem to wander elsewhere and go astray. But this very thing will be part of anger raging beyond its accustomed measure. He had beaten senators with scourges; he himself brought it about that it could be said, ‘It commonly happens.’ He had tortured them by all the things which are most grievous in the nature of things: cords, plates, the rack, fire, and his own countenance. At this point the answer will be: ‘A great matter, if he divided three senators, like worthless slaves, among blows and flames!’--a man who considered slaughtering the entire senate and wished that the Roman people had one neck, so that he might gather his crimes, drawn out over so many places and times, into one blow and one day.”

Claudius was more savage without inspecting the charges. Nero too, amid the softest beginnings of his reign, prepared poison for Britannicus, impatient of a slow crime. Tacitus, Book XIII. Afterward he was equally savage against his mother, his teacher, the Apostles, and everyone. Severus Antoninus contrived his father's death through physicians, but, because they had insufficiently obeyed him, after his parent was dead he slaughtered them all, together with his father's friends, not leaving even one. Thus before him the elder Severus had slaughtered all the friends of Niger.

What sort of portent was it, and whence did these things proceed? Gallienus wrote to Verianus: “You will not satisfy me if you kill only armed men whom the chance of war too could have killed. Every person of the male sex must be destroyed--if old men and the immature could also be killed without our censure. Whoever has spoken badly against me, against the son of Valerian, against the father and brother of so many princes, must be killed. Ingenuus has been made emperor. Tear apart, kill, cut down. You can understand my spirit. Be angry with my mind, you who know that I have written these things with my own hand.” Thus Trebellius in the *Thirty Tyrants*.

Maximinus, in addition to the cruelty exercised against Christians, was proclaimed emperor from the post of prefect of recruits and, at the very beginning, slaughtered four thousand of Alexander's friends. Julius Capitolinus describes his cruelty: “But amid these virtues he was so cruel that some called him Cyclops, others Busiris, others Sciron, some Phalaris, many Typhon or Gyges. The senate feared him so much that prayers were made publicly and privately in the

temples--even by women with their children--that he might never see the city of Rome. For they heard that some were raised upon the cross, others enclosed in recently slaughtered animals, others cast to wild beasts, and others crushed with clubs; and all these things without regard to dignity, since he seemed to wish to govern military discipline, by whose example he wished also to correct civil affairs. This does not befit a prince who wishes to be loved. For he was persuaded that dominion could not be held except by cruelty."

Trebellius Pollio agrees with Capitolinus: "He was, however, of excessive cruelty toward the soldiers, for he killed three thousand and four thousand soldiers on individual days."

Macrinus was a grave and just avenger of crimes--if he had not himself been the most criminal man. He drove soldiers onto crosses, enclosed them in oxen for fornication, killed a tribune because he had permitted the watches to be abandoned, and represented the punishments of Mezentius.

Aurelian, coming to Rome, avenged a sedition with so much blood that he almost filled the city with funerals.

§ 12. Now let us turn our eyes and mind toward our commonwealth, to which, before all things, clemency and rarity and sparingness of punishments are fitting. It altogether befits a prince to be clement. Human beings have entrusted life and fortunes to you; it befits you not to betray the trust of so many faithful persons. It was said by an ancient sage: "Spare another's blood as your own." Judge that this was said to you, O prince: spare another's blood as Christ's. For if they are your fellow-servants and members of Christ, the blood of his members cannot be foreign to Christ. It befits all who have been appointed to preserve human beings to be benevolent toward all and to confer benefits upon those upon whom they can. Even the man conscious in himself of no fault should judge nothing more beautiful for himself than to grant pardon for many things and seek it for none. But the man who himself possesses something which ought to be pardoned cannot, without the highest disgrace, be cruel toward others.

In this matter imitate God, who is beneficent toward all. Saint Cyprian says in *On the Good of Patience*: "We see that, with the inseparable equality of patience, at God's command the seasons obey the guilty and the innocent, the religious and impious, the grateful and ungrateful; the elements serve; the winds blow; springs flow; the abundance of crops grows; the fruits of vineyards ripen; orchards overflow with fruit; groves grow leafy; meadows flower. And although God is exasperated by frequent--indeed, continual--offenses, he tempers his indignation and patiently awaits the day of retribution once appointed. And although vengeance is in his power, he prefers to preserve patience for a long time, bearing clemently and deferring, so that, if it can be, prolonged malice may at some time be changed, and a human being wallowing in the contagion of errors and crimes may even late be converted to the Lord, as he himself admonishes and says: 'I do not desire the death of the dying, only that he return and live.'"

§ 13. Thus a human being was born for the assistance of human beings, and, in addition to nature, the very office of a prince requires this. Seneca speaks with the same mind in Book I, Chapter V of *On Clemency*: "A great spirit befits great fortune. Unless it has raised itself to that fortune and stands higher, it also draws that fortune beneath the earth. But it is proper to a great spirit to be placid and tranquil and to look down from above upon injuries and offenses. It is womanish to rage in anger; it belongs to wild beasts--and not even noble ones--to bite and press those cast down. Elephants and lions pass by what they have struck down; persistence belongs to an ignoble beast.

"Savage and inexorable anger does not befit a king, for he rises little above the man with whom he makes himself equal by growing angry. But if he gives life, if he gives dignity to those in danger and deserving to lose it, he does what is permitted to none except one who possesses mastery of affairs. For life is taken away even from a superior; it is never given except to an inferior. To preserve is proper to exalted fortune, which ought never to be more admired than when it happens to possess the same power as the gods, by whose beneficence we are brought forth into the light, the good and evil alike."

§ 14. Just as Christian princes are accustomed to celebrate the day of the Resurrection and the other feasts of the most holy religion by a release of condemned persons, so that, although they dwell in filth and darkness, they may

nevertheless rejoice in some light and fruit of redemption, so Constantine the Great wished there to be many places of refuge

[Printed page 174]

for the afflicted in holy churches. Nor will good princes celebrate their birthday bloodily with slaughter in the amphitheater; for why should so many die on the day on which you were born? Rather, by beneficence they will make it lovable and awaited by the peoples. Constantine pardoned all on account of the birth of Crispus and on account of Helena's delivery, except poisoners, murderers, and adulterers. With this disposition in a prince, how many prayers, we may suppose, will be offered for the safety of his children?

Moreover, clemency is of correspondingly greater importance in the commonwealth and its magistrates the more widely it extends and the greater the material it has upon which to act. Seneca too, the best teacher of clemency but the master of most cruel pupils, teaches this in Book I, Chapter V: "Accordingly, even citizens who are to be condemned must be spared, no differently from diseased limbs; and if at any time there is need to let blood, one must refrain from cutting beyond what is necessary. Therefore, as I was saying, clemency is indeed in accordance with nature for all human beings, but is most becoming to commanders, inasmuch as it has more to preserve among them and appears upon a greater field. For how very little harm private cruelty does! The savagery of princes is war. Although, moreover, there is concord among the virtues, and no one of them is better or more honorable than another, nevertheless a certain virtue is more suited to certain persons. Magnanimity becomes every mortal, even him beneath whom there is nothing. For what is greater or braver than to beat back evil fortune? Yet this magnanimity has a wider place in good fortune and is seen better upon a tribunal than upon level ground. Into whatever house clemency comes, it will render it happy and tranquil; but in a royal house, the rarer it is, the more marvelous. For what is more marvelous than that he whose anger nothing obstructs, to whose graver sentence even those who perish assent, whom no one will question--indeed, if he has flared up more violently, whom no one will even entreat--should himself lay a hand upon himself and employ his power for what is better and milder?" But this is rare; for although one person is sometimes spared, unjust death is nevertheless inflicted upon many thousands.

Alas, how often has that gentle piety of the Christians lamented these things? Cyprian, Epistle II: "Observe the roads closed by robbers, the seas beset by pirates, and wars everywhere divided by the bloody horror of camps. The world is wet with mutual blood; and when individuals commit homicide, it is a crime, but it is called a virtue when it is done publicly. Not the consideration of innocence, but the magnitude of savagery, obtains impunity for crimes. Now turn your eyes and countenance toward the cities themselves: you will encounter a crowded spectacle more mournful than every solitude. A gladiatorial game is prepared so that blood may delight the lust of cruel eyes. The body is filled with richer foods for nourishment, and the robust mass of limbs grows fat with layers of grease, so that, fattened for punishment, it may perish at a dearer price. A human being is killed for a human being's pleasure; and that anyone should be able to kill is expertise, practice, and art. The crime is not only committed but also taught. What more inhuman, what more bitter can be spoken? It is a discipline that a man should be able to destroy, and a glory that he does destroy. I ask you, what kind of thing is that, when they cast to wild beasts men whom no one has condemned? In the fullness of youth, with sufficiently honorable appearance and costly clothing, living young men are adorned for a voluntary funeral; the wretched glory in their own evils. They fight against beasts not because of a crime but because of madness. Fathers watch their sons; a brother is in the arena, and his sister is present."

Tertullian, however, pursues these matters in Chapter XXI of *On the Spectacles*: "And he who shudders at the corpse of a human being who has died by the common law of nature, this same man in the amphitheater bends down from above with most enduring eyes over bodies torn apart and scattered and fouled in their own blood. Indeed, he who comes to the spectacle to approve the punishment of a murderer, this same man with scourges and rods drives an unwilling gladiator to murder. And he who demands the lion for some more notorious murderer, this same man seeks the release-rod for an atrocious gladiator and bestows the cap as a reward. But he also calls back the man already

finished for the spectacle of his pleasure, more gladly recognizing close at hand the man whom he wished to kill from afar--so much the harder if he did not wish it."

How can those who live in this way accuse the cruelty of their own princes--how can they accuse that of tyrants? You shudder at Gaius's saying when he wishes that the Roman people had one neck. You are all citizens worthy of Gaius; nothing is cheaper to you than a human being, in whose blood alone a spectacle is sought. A human being kills a human being--not angry, not afraid, not hoping, seeking nothing, but merely in order to watch. Nor is a single death discharged by one blow; pain is not deceived by a sword which kills before it is felt, but mutilation, disembowelment, and the throbbing of the dying man are the spectators' delights. Even those who raved condemned those spectacles. Seneca, Epistle XCV: "We rage not only privately but publicly. We restrain homicides and individual killings; but what of wars and the glorious crime of slaughtered nations? Neither avarice nor cruelty knows a limit; and so long as those things are done furtively and by individuals, they are less harmful and less monstrous. Crimes are practiced by decrees of the senate and resolutions of the people, and what is forbidden privately is publicly commanded. Certain deeds would be expiated with one's head if committed privately; the same deeds, because men wearing military cloaks have done them, we praise. Human beings, the gentlest race, are not ashamed to rejoice in one another's blood, to wage wars, and to hand wars down to their children, although peace exists even among dumb and savage beasts. Against so powerful and widely unfolded a madness philosophy has become more laborious, and it has assumed as much strength for itself as has accrued to the things against which it was being prepared. It was an easy matter to rebuke men indulging in wine and seeking more delicate food; a mind which had departed only a little from frugality did not have to be brought back by great force."

§ 15. Very well, O Seneca: you rage publicly. For that cruelty was public, and it was entrusted to magistrates not only in the amphitheater but by law, by custom, or by an eagerness to please. You accuse Tiberius, Gaius, Nero, Claudius, Domitian, Severus, and Commodus as savage toward certain senators and knights out of fear, hatred, or mere inclination. But what will those accusers of another's cruelty determine concerning themselves, who lavished so much blood of innocent men upon their own pleasures? What is more just than that those who ordered so many thousands of contracted gladiators to die by the turning of a thumb should be cast before the savagery of bloodthirsty princes? What wonder is it, while God's avenging eye keeps watch, that those men die in such a way as to feel themselves dying, who so often repeated that savage cry: "Again!" Blind paganism was not ignorant of its own bloodthirsty inhumanity, but loved it. Thus all were filled with homicide, stripped of the human being, clothed in a bestial mind, not commonly savage but conquerors of every savagery. For beasts abstain from their own kind and rarely bite more than they eat. These men, however, rejoiced in homicide, in the slaughter not of another species, and without any advantage to themselves. And so they experienced men of the same kind not only as enemies but also as their emperors.

§ 16. But to you, O commonwealth, I commend mercy, gentleness, and clemency. If anyone delights in human miseries, command him to be miserable. We are commanded to be merciful as our heavenly Father is merciful. God threatens that

[Printed page 175]

those who have not shown mercy to their neighbor will not obtain it. Mercy is preferred to all sacrifices. That it must be shown to one's neighbor is taught in Psalm 112:5, 9; Proverbs 11:17; 14:21; 15:27; 24:21, 31; 19:7; 25:21; 29:7; Hosea 6:11; Micah 6:8; Zechariah 7:9; Matthew 5:7; 19:13; 10:33; 25:41; and Galatians 6:12. Thus not only is the steadfast will to bring aid, to relieve human miseries, to redeem captives, and to enrich the poorer most praiseworthy and, as Cicero says, characteristic of a great and weighty man; but even that most tender softness of mind by which we are affected by the evils of others, if it is governed by right reason, is an excellent instrument of beneficence and a solace for human evils enclosed by the most merciful God within the breasts of his children. For we see that the miserable also derive consolation from the affections of those who grieve with them. Therefore:

Nature confesses that she gave the softest hearts

To the human race, for she gave tears; this is the best part
Of our feeling. Therefore she commands us to weep at the cause pleaded by a friend,
At the squalor of a defendant, at an orphan summoning to law
His defrauder, whose face, streaming with weeping,
His girlish hair renders uncertain.
At nature's command we groan when the funeral of a marriageable
Maiden meets us, or an infant is enclosed by the earth,
Younger than the fire of the pyre, what good man, or man worthy of the torch
Of the mysteries, such as Ceres wishes her priest to be,
Believes any evils of another foreign to himself? This separates us
From the herd of dumb creatures; and therefore we alone received
A venerable nature, capable of divine things
And fit for practicing and receiving the arts;
We drew down feeling from the citadel of heaven.
The beasts that gaze bent toward the earth lack it.
At the beginning the common Creator enclosed in them
Souls only, but in us a mind as well, so that mutual
Affection might command us to seek and to furnish aid,
To draw the scattered into a people, to migrate from the ancient
Grove, and to leave the forests inhabited by our forefathers;
To build houses, to join another roof to our household gods,
So that confidence, united by a neighbor's light, might grant safe sleep;
To protect with arms a fallen citizen or one reeling from a great wound;
To give the signals by a common trumpet, to be defended by the same
Towers, and to be held by the single key of the gates.
But now concord among serpents is greater: a beast with like markings
Spares its kin. When did a stronger lion ever take
The life of a lion? In what forest did a boar ever expire
By the tusks of a larger boar? The Indian tiger maintains
Perpetual peace with a raging tiger; savage bears agree among themselves.
But for the human being it is too little to have produced deadly iron
On an accursed anvil, although the first smiths, accustomed only
To forge rakes and hoes and wearied by mattocks and ploughshares,

Did not know how to hammer out swords.

The cause of the humanity implanted in us is that no animal is by nature more loving toward its own kind than the human being. The *στοργή* of beasts, and their affection toward their offspring, fades when the offspring is grown, nor is there any regard for kinship. Next, because most human beings require pardon, the human being ought to be kindly toward his own nature. In Book I, Chapter VI of *On Clemency*, Seneca exhorts Nero to clemency for this reason: “We have all sinned: some grievously, some more lightly, some deliberately, others perhaps driven by impulse or carried away by another’s wickedness; others have stood insufficiently bravely in good counsels and have lost innocence unwillingly and while resisting. Nor do we offend only once, but we shall offend to the very end of life. Even if someone has so thoroughly purified his mind that nothing can disturb or deceive him any longer, nevertheless he has reached innocence through sinning.”

For this reason Titus readily pardoned even grave offenses. “Two men of patrician family,” says Tranquillus in Chapter IX, “convicted of aspiring to the empire, he did nothing more than admonish to desist, saying that the principate is given by fate; if they desired anything besides it, he promised that he would grant it.”

§ 17. But the chief consideration by which all must very greatly be incited to clemency is that through it love is born, and security from love. From cruelty arise hatred and fear; from hatred, plots; from fear, flight and, when it hopes for victory, seditions and wars.

With one voice the whole human race proclaims how much love the clemency of princes and of the commonwealth conciliates. Seneca demonstrates this to his prince in Book I, Chapter III of *On Clemency*: “The greatness of that man alone is stable and founded whom all know to be as much for them as above them; whose care for the safety of individuals and of all together they experience keeping watch every day; at whose approach they do not scatter as though some evil or harmful animal had leapt from its lair, but fly eagerly toward him as toward a bright and beneficent star, most ready to cast themselves before the blades of plotters for him and to lay their bodies beneath him if a road to safety must be constructed for him through human slaughter. They protect his sleep with nightly watches; placed before and poured around him, they defend his sides; they oppose themselves to dangers rushing in. This agreement of peoples and cities in thus protecting and arming kings, and in casting themselves and their possessions wherever the safety of their commander desires, is not without reason.”

And in Chapter XIII: “On the other hand, he who has care of all things, although he guards some more and others less, nourishes every part of the commonwealth as though it were part of himself, inclined toward milder measures; even if it is expedient to punish, he shows how unwillingly he lays hands upon a harsh remedy. In his mind there is nothing hostile, nothing savage. He exercises his power placidly and beneficially, desiring that his commands be approved by the citizens; he considers himself abundantly happy if he has made his fortune public; affable in speech and easy of access, lovable in countenance--which above all wins over peoples--favorably disposed toward just desires and stern toward unjust ones, he is loved, defended, and revered by the whole city.”

§ 18. Cruelty, however, is more powerful for producing hatred than clemency is for producing love. Ancient Rome saw scarcely two clement princes, Germanicus, whom it did not fear to have as Caesar, and Titus, whom it could not retain for long. Tacitus speaks thus of the most clement Germanicus in Book II of the *Annals*: “Not long afterward he died, to the immense grief of the province and the surrounding peoples. Foreign nations and kings grieved: such was his courtesy toward allies and gentleness toward enemies; equally venerable in sight and hearing, while he retained the grandeur and gravity of the highest fortune, he had escaped envy and arrogance. His funeral, without ancestral images and procession, was renowned through praises and the memory of his virtues. And there were those who equated his appearance, age, kind of death, and also the nearness of the places in which he perished with the fate of Alexander the Great. For both were of handsome body and distinguished lineage, had passed scarcely beyond thirty years, and died through the plots of their own people among foreign nations. But this man had been gentle toward friends, moderate in pleasures, had lived in one marriage with legitimate children, and was no less a warrior, even if rashness was absent

and he was hindered from pressing into servitude the Germanies shattered by so many victories. But if he had been the sole arbiter of affairs, if he had possessed royal right and title, he would have attained military glory the more readily in proportion as he excelled in clemency, temperance, and the other good arts.”

[Printed page 176]

Of Titus, Suetonius, Chapter XII: “He died in the same villa as his father, on the Ides of September, after two years, two months, and nine days from the time he succeeded his father, in the forty-second year of his age. When this became public, all mourned publicly no differently than in a domestic bereavement; before it was summoned by edict, the senate ran to the senate-house and, while the doors were still barred and afterward opened, rendered the dead man such thanks and heaped upon him such praises as it never heaped upon him even when alive and present.”

You may compare with these the deaths of others. The case of Titus is more marvelous because at the beginning of his rule he had been secretly cruel, but thereby conciliated greater hatred. For Suetonius, Chapter VI, says: “And he acted somewhat less civilly and more violently. Indeed, he unhesitatingly crushed everyone most suspected by him, sending men through theaters and camps to demand their punishment as though by common consent. Among these was Aulus Caecina, a man of consular rank, whom, after inviting him to dinner and when he had scarcely departed from the dining room, he ordered to be stabbed--admittedly because danger was urgent, since even a document in Caecina’s handwriting concerning a conspiracy prepared among the soldiers had been discovered. By these actions, just as he made sufficient provision for his future security, so for the present he contracted the greatest unpopularity, such that scarcely anyone passed to the principate with so adverse a report and with all men more unwilling.”

But afterward he corrected this and left behind a great longing for himself. It was not so at the death of Tiberius. “The people rejoiced so much at his death,” says Suetonius, Chapter LXXV, “that at the first report they ran about, some crying that Tiberius should be dragged into the Tiber, some praying Mother Earth and the infernal gods that they would give the dead man no abode except among the impious, while others threatened his corpse with the hook and the Gemonian stairs, exasperated not only by the memory of his former cruelty but also by a recent atrocity.”

So great was the public joy at Nero’s death that the common people ran throughout the whole city wearing caps. Suetonius, Chapter LVII. Vitellius, with his hands bound behind his back and his garment torn, was led as a foul spectacle, with many reviling and no one weeping; the deformity of his end had removed pity. Amid great mockeries of deeds and words he was led through the whole length of the Sacred Way, his hair drawn back from his head as condemned men are accustomed, and even the point of a sword placed beneath his chin so that he would present his face to be seen and not lower it; some assailed him with dung and mud, others shouted “incendiary” and “glutton,” and part of the crowd even reproached the defects of his body. For he possessed an enormous height, a face generally red from drunkenness, a swollen belly, and one thigh somewhat weak from the impact of a chariot long before, when he attended Gaius as he drove. Finally, at the Gemonian stairs, he was lacerated and killed by the smallest blows and thereafter dragged by a hook into the Tiber.

The senate rejoiced so much at the killing of Domitian, according to Suetonius, Chapter XXIII, that when the senate-house had been filled in eager rivalry, it did not refrain from mangling the dead man with the most insulting and bitter kind of acclamations. It even ordered ladders to be brought in, his shields and images to be pulled down before their eyes and dashed against the ground in that very place, and finally decreed that his inscriptions everywhere be erased and all memory of him abolished.

I say nothing of the Maximini, Commodus, and others; they too experienced many mockeries after death. How are those men safe or secure whom all pursue with so much hatred?

§ 19. Although some have reached such madness that they have upon their lips, “Let them hate, provided that they fear,” they nevertheless obtain no security through the slaughter of many. Machiavelli, the worst adviser of princes, teaches thus in Chapter XVII of his *Prince*: “Passing now to the other qualities which we enumerated above, it would

be desirable for every prince to be held clement, not cruel; nevertheless, caution must be employed lest he abuse this clemency. Valentino was considered inhuman; yet his inhumanity restored all Romagna to soundness, united it into one, and brought it back to peace and fidelity. If this is duly considered, he will be found more merciful than the Florentine people, who, in order to escape the name of cruelty, permitted the city of Pistoia to be destroyed. Therefore, let a prince care little for the name of savagery by which he may keep his people united in fidelity. For with a very few examples he will be more clement than those who, through excessive mildness, permit disturbances of affairs to follow, whence killings or plunder arise.”

In general he thinks it better to be feared than loved. But he is very greatly mistaken, for the fear that arises from cruelty always has hatred joined to it; the fear of the wicked which arises from a prince’s justice, and the reverence of the good, is not pernicious because it is without hatred. There is no security for a prince amid the fear and hatred of the good. He provokes the hatred of all if he rages against a few. While Augustus raged, he suffered many conspiracies, for he did not lack even a conspiracy by men whom one would be ashamed to know had dared so great a deed. But when he turned himself to clemency, he lived secure. This was Livia’s counsel, whose speech is found in Dio, and its abridgment in Seneca, Book I, Chapter IX of *On Clemency*: “Admit,” she says, “a woman’s counsel. Do what physicians are accustomed to do: when customary remedies do not succeed, they try their opposites. You have accomplished nothing thus far by severity. Salvidienus was followed by Lepidus, Lepidus by Murena, Murena by Caepio, Caepio by Egnatius—to be silent about others whose audacity one is at last ashamed of. Now try how clemency may turn out for you.”

He pardoned Cinna, gave him the consulship, and possessed him as his most faithful friend. And Ovid, the luxurious knight of a most luxurious Caesar, sings truly:

I have seen many also increased in riches and honors

Who had borne arms against your head.

“Clemency,” says Seneca in Book I, Chapter X of *On Clemency*, “brought him to safety and security; it rendered him pleasing and favored, although he had laid his hand upon the neck of a commonwealth not yet subdued. This today still grants him a reputation which scarcely serves living princes. We believe him to be a god, not as though we had been ordered. We confess that Augustus was a good prince and that the name of father suited him well.”

§ 20. What clemency, then, truly befits a prince? That which Seneca perceived he had falsely attributed to his Nero in Chapter XI: “This, Caesar, is true clemency, which you display, which did not begin from repentance for savagery: to possess no stain, never to have shed civil blood. This, amid the greatest power, is the truest temperance of mind and an incomprehensible love of the human race: not to be inflamed by some desire or rashness, nor, corrupted by the examples of former princes, to test by experiment how much is permitted against one’s citizens, but to blunt the edge of one’s command. You have furnished, Caesar, a bloodless city; and this of which you have gloried with a great spirit—that you have not shed a single drop of human blood in the whole world—is the greater and more marvelous because the sword was never entrusted to anyone more quickly. Clemency, therefore, not only renders princes more honorable but also safer, and it is an ornament of empires and at the same time their most certain safety. Kings have grown old and handed kingdoms to their children and grandchildren; the power of tyrants is execrable and brief. What difference is there between a tyrant and a king? For the outward appearance of their fortune and their license are equal, except that tyrants rage from pleasure, kings only from cause and necessity.”

This praise was altogether false, and Seneca’s lie was not hidden. At the beginning, poison was given to Silanus the proconsul amid a banquet. There would have been a progression to further slaughter if Afranius

[Printed page 177]

Burrus and Annaeus Seneca had not stood in the way. Certainly the poison administered to Britannicus amid the banquet, his sudden funeral, and other things proved cruelty. A pious and humane prince has arms as a protection of

peace--or rather as an ornament. Mamertinus in his *Panegyric of Julian*: “Therefore arms and young men with swords and javelins are not guards of your body, but a certain solemn ornament of imperial majesty. For what need is there of them when you are surrounded by the strongest wall of civic love?”

A tyrant, on the contrary, looks securely upon no arms. Experience speaks thus in *Thyestes*:

While I stood aloft,

I never ceased to fear, and to fear the very sword at my side.

He will never restrain great hatreds by the sword; he turns his guards against himself:

He fears the man who fears him; fear returns upon its author.

Plutarch speaks excellently to all princes:

τῷ γὰρ ὄντι δεδίασιν οἱ βασιλεῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχομένων, οἱ δὲ τύραννοι τοὺς ἀρχομένους· διὸ τῇ δυνάμει τὸ δέος συναύξει· πλείονων γὰρ ἄρχοντες, πλείονας φοβοῦνται.

Kings truly fear on behalf of their subjects; tyrants fear their subjects. If their power increases, their fear also increases. And when they command more people, they fear more people.

“For he errs,” says Seneca in Book I, Chapter XIX of *On Clemency*, “if anyone thinks that a king is safe where nothing is safe from the king. Security must be purchased by mutual security. There is no need to build citadels raised aloft, nor to fortify hills difficult of ascent, nor to cut away the sides of mountains, nor to enclose oneself with manifold walls and towers. Clemency will furnish a king safety in the open. There is one impregnable fortification: the love of the citizens. What is more beautiful than to live while all desire it and offer their prayers without a guard? If his health has faltered a little, that not the hope of men but their fear should be aroused? That nothing should be so precious to anyone that he would not wish it exchanged for the safety of his protector? That he should reckon whatever happens to him as happening also to himself? In this he has proved by continual arguments of goodness that the commonwealth is not his, but that he belongs to the commonwealth.”

And in Chapter XXVI: “Even the hands of slaves have avenged the cruelty of private men under certain danger of the cross; whole nations and peoples have attempted to cut off tyrants--both those whose evil it was and those whom it threatened. Sometimes their own guards have risen against them and practiced upon them the perfidy, impiety, ferocity, and whatever else they had learned from them. For what can anyone hope from a man whom he has taught to be evil? Wickedness does not obey for long, nor does it sin only so far as it is commanded.”

Let no one deceive himself. The experiences of all kingdoms have taught that the most faithful guard of the commonwealth is the clemency of the prince.

The reason is that all willingly submit themselves to a ruler who is gentle, kindly, and loving toward the citizens, and entrust all their possessions to him; all turn away from a cruel ruler. All subjects flee a prince's cruelty as a public pestilence and an incurable disease; they indignantly endure standing beneath the blow. They are all detained as though in a free prison and judge their prince to be a jailer and executioner. When the first hope appears, they vindicate themselves into liberty. Nor is security prepared by the slaughter of enemies, although many fall. For those who survive hate more actively, since they judge themselves safe through hiding and obscurity. Furthermore, scarcely any human being is so solitary that he has no relatives, connections, or friends. A cruel prince incites all of these to hatred of himself, and therefore increases the number of his enemies by raging. It was rightly objected to a tyrant who boasted that he had killed all his enemies: “But their children have not also been killed; they survive as avengers.” No one has ever killed his own successor, no one his avenger. He lies hidden among thousands of flatterers. For this is remarkable: most men who commanded cruelly were slaughtered by those whom they judged most faithful. When this happens all marvel. Brutus killed Caesar, Macro Tiberius, and Chaerea Gaius. Yet it is necessary that it happen so: all hate them; the suspected are removed from their midst; friends alone can be avengers.

§ 21. Now the measure of clemency must also be discussed, for it must be tempered with salutary severity. For you would not praise a physician who binds up with sweet potions and soft fomentations those evils which demand the iron and fire. Let him use the scalpel and cautery when necessity requires, provided that the remedy does not rage beyond the disease. Wounds are often treated more painfully than they are. A Hippocratic slaughterhouse is crueller than brigandage when

The remedy has exceeded its measure.

It belongs to a clement magistrate to disregard private injuries. That saying is worthy of immortality: “The King of France does not avenge the injuries of the Duke of Orléans.” A great spirit is needed for this, lest the man who, as an equal, was troublesome in like measure be crushed when the other becomes more powerful. And indeed, most men, when they are elevated to great and unexpected honors, hate those by whom they understand that they were known as humble and abject. Vitellius, now emperor, defrauded all his creditors and compelled them to return the records of their contracts, for he boasted that he returned life in place of money--with an altogether brigand-like spirit, as though inflicting death upon creditors were part of justice. When this saying of his was spread among the common people, immense hatred was aroused among all, in which he soon burned away. Retirement embittered Tiberius, and he was more cruel because many had despised him as a private man. For this reason he also furnished material for witticisms:

He who comes from exile to command

Will reign with much blood.

§ 22. The clemency which is mild in pardoning injuries against the prince is more illustrious than that which forgives or dissembles crimes committed against the commonwealth. Yet the contrary frequently occurs. Many men become less angry at enemies gnawing away the extremities of provinces, at avaricious governors, and at authors of dissension than at a light jest or an act of neglect. When Severus entered Rome in ovation, he put forty men of consular rank and fit for command to death upon fabricated and most trifling charges. Many were killed because they had jested about his name, because they had called him truly Severus, truly an emperor bearing his own name, and the Punic Sulla. Thus Spartianus: “He thereafter set out for the Parthian war, after presenting a gladiatorial show and giving a largesse to the people. Amid these things he killed many upon either true or fabricated charges. Many, moreover, were condemned because they had jested, others because they had been silent, others because they had spoken many things figuratively: that he was truly an emperor of his name, truly Pertinax, truly Severus.”

But what will you do to the man who ordered three hundred lashes to be laid upon a slave because he had brought the hot water rather late? Who killed with clubs a wretched man who, when bitten during the hunt, released a Spartan hound before the proper time? How much more clement was Augustus, who despised insults cast against himself and his house? How much better did Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius, Augustuses, decree that if anyone, forgetful of modesty, had cursed the emperor, he should not be subjected to punishment?

§ 23. Clemency toward the public must be exercised with great judgment, lest, if impunity is displayed to criminals without judgment and reason, weaker persons be rendered liable to injuries,

[Printed page 178]

the audacity of criminals be nourished, and the commonwealth suffer loss for that reason. For he who spares an incurably evil thing does as much harm as he who cuts away sound things. Therefore a wise prince will not imitate the Indian king whose kingdom is said to have been filled with robbers because of the slowness of judgments. The *Treasury of Indian Affairs*, Tome III, Book II, Chapter XXVII, explains it thus: “The king of Bisnagar is rather too lenient toward criminals and forbids them to be punished. Hence there is everywhere throughout the whole kingdom a marvelous and unbridled license even among those insolent against the royal majesty. The Great Mughal had recently sent ambassadors to him, and at the same time several most excellent horses and other costly gifts. When these, together with the noblest horse, had secretly been taken by one of his subjects along the road, he imposed no

punishment for the insolent deed; he merely ordered the horse to be returned and gave it to the ambassador.” Nor was Nero’s saying clement but a foolish veiling of inhumanity. For when his signature upon the sentences of condemned men was sought, he said, “How I wish I did not know letters!” Would that you had not known poisons and truculent words. Nevertheless, even this was an ill-considered saying. The punishments of guilty men and the gentleness of a prince do not conflict. With a better spirit, but one more flattering than correct, Antoninus the Philosopher bound himself to clemency in a speech: “Far be it that, while I hold the principate, any one of you should be condemned to death by my decree and yours.” Excessive indulgence and excessive impunity introduce great crimes and finally compel the prince suddenly to become cruel.

§ 24. Let him not add mockeries to the slain. For these instill horror, as though he had not been content with death. Severus affixed the head of Albinus to a gibbet. Barbarians enclosed the skull of an enemy in gold, brought it to banquets, and used it as a cup. Nor was that savagery always absent from Christians. German soldiers played ball with the heads of the Cremonese; the Cremonese cut Germans limb from limb. There are innumerable examples. But such things are committed with great infamy. Insult against a dying man is more bitter than death itself.

§ 25. Even to have uttered a cruel saying is imputed as a crime, because such sayings indicate a bestial mind. Of this kind are: “Strike in such a way that he may feel himself dying.” “I have not yet returned to favor with you.” “An antidote against Caesar?” “Why does he not die willingly?” “Again!” “Would that you all had one neck.” “Would that my brother were alive.” “From the bald man to the bald man.” For these sayings are spread in such a way that they arouse the most dangerous hatred, since human beings by their own nature abhor cruelty. For even historians who have passed over the deaths of many most illustrious persons nevertheless commit those signs of inhumanity to writing. Julius was not ignorant of this. For when, after the fatherland had been crushed, he plundered its patrimony--that is, the treasury--he threatened death to the quaestor who resisted. When the man marveled, Caesar said that it was easier for him to do this than to say it. By a nod, while absent and as though unaware, he could do it without the reputation for cruelty which, while the opposing party still stood, was destructive; by voice he could not command it. A horrible saying certainly rendered Octavius detestable. Tranquillus reports it thus: “When Perusia had been captured, he punished very many, meeting those who attempted to beg pardon or excuse themselves with one answer: ‘You must die.’”

§ 26. Above all, let him take care that treachery or mockery is not joined to savagery. The prefect Maximinus, after promising that he would destroy no one by fire or iron, ordered them to be crushed with lead, mocking the credulity of simple men. He increased hatred by a double evil and brought it about that no one trusted him.

§ 27. When reason dictates, let the prince himself mitigate the severity of the laws. This will always find a place when the words admit moderation. The laws themselves command this. Through interpretation of the laws, punishments must be softened rather than made harsher. Julius gave an example of clemency. Captured as a boy by pirates, in jest he threatened them with the cross, and confirmed it with an oath; after they were captured, he first killed them and thereafter placed them upon crosses. He interpreted the obligation of his oath courteously. Certainly by this deed he obtained reputation and the affection of the Roman people. The contrary was done by Valentinian, a most severe and sometimes cruel enforcer of laws. He is also reproached because, when reviewing the prisons, he never subscribed a milder judgment for any condemned person. For it was customary that a prince subscribe to the penalties of condemned men and, out of gentleness and clemency, sometimes mitigate the punishments of the laws. Hence it was also established that those condemned by the word of the prince or the sentence of judges should not be led away before the tenth day. Afterward Theodosius added twenty days, upon the admonition of Saint Ambrose, bishop of Milan, for this reason: lest anyone fall through the sudden anger of the prince, but that delay might disclose the truth and calm indignation.

§ 28. Let him spare his eyes: let him not be present at punishments, lest he appear to have wished not so much to obey the laws because moved by justice as to exhibit a spectacle to himself. Gaius tortured innocent men with various kinds of torments and with his own countenance. All these considerations have place especially when the prince himself has

been injured. For he ought to be moved less by his own injuries than by those of others. But to wish parents or other loved ones to be present at punishments is altogether tyrannical. Caligula had this as a custom. Dio reports: “Furthermore, he ordered Cassius Melinus to be killed and compelled Capito, his father, a good man accused of no offense, to be present at his son’s punishment. When Capito asked Gaius that he be permitted to close his eyes, he was ordered to be killed along with him.”

§ 29. When the commonwealth requires severity, clemency is content with the punishments established by law. To be ingenious in devising new tortures is the surest sign of savagery. All new and unusual things not only bring infamy; but because they are eagerly narrated and heard like prodigies, they carry infamy very far. Although the bitterness of punishments may remain within the measure prescribed by law, nevertheless, if it is novel, it reveals a cruel mind.

§ 30. Those punishments must also be avoided which contain some singular, long-premeditated, laborious, and shameful malice. Of this kind was the inhumanity of Elagabalus. “He is said,” says Aelius Lampridius, “to have collected serpents through the priests of the Marsian nation and suddenly released them before dawn, at the time when the people are accustomed to assemble for celebrated games, so that many were afflicted by bites and in the flight.”

The Marsian nation, victorious over asps and snakes, had been given for the safety of peoples against the most hostile beasts; it collected serpents for medicine or in order to destroy them. But that monster, more harmful than an asp or basilisk, turned the gift and labor of that nation to the destruction of his own people. It belongs to barbarians to delight in devising punishments. They killed the Christian of Arethusa with the writing-styles of boys after exquisite tortures. In the Thebaid, after drawing down and releasing the branches of trees, they tore many apart; they killed women in the foulest and altogether pitiable manner, bound by one foot while the other was drawn by machines. They burned Christians smeared with pitch, tow, and resin for use as nocturnal lamps; covered with the skins of beasts,

[Printed page 179]

they cast them to dogs. They buried Chrysanthus and Daria alive in the earth. They cut open the bellies of virgins and, after filling them with barley, fed pigs from them. That barbarity held the empire while it harassed Christians with various punishments. This occurred by God’s permission, so that even in this way posterity might recognize that such foul slaughterhouses belong to savagery, not justice. The Huguenots in France surpassed them in many ways by novelty, bitterness, and foulness, as the *Theater of Calvinist Cruelty* shows.

§ 31. The punishments of many persons, whether taken at one time or at different times, must be avoided. For where the slaughter of many lies, something must be taken away from severity so that more may be added to charity. Let the commonwealth imitate physicians, who use gentle fomentations when they can heal without the iron. When much blood is shed, even guilty blood, the commonwealth is weakened; and just as, when a vein is opened, sound blood and the power of the natural spirits escape together with harmful blood, so among many condemned persons some are always believed innocent or capable of being healed by a milder hand. There is a great difference among defendants condemned by one law. Cruelty is never greater or more unjust than when kinds of human beings, not crimes, are punished, which frequently occurs when a multitude of offenders is presumed. Hence so many thousands of Christians formerly perished, because their name and profession were judged impiety. Hence at Caesarea, under the emperor Maximinus, when the corpses of martyrs were scattered everywhere, the forum, the streets, and the columns wept. Eusebius, Book VIII, Chapter XIX. Not only within the city but also against an enemy already conquered there must be moderation in killings. You shed hostile blood, but human blood, blood of your own kind. No animal except the sparrowhawk (*nisus*) and the human being rages against its own kind. Certainly God, when the ram has struck the wall, when the trumpets have sounded, and when war has been imbued with blood, nevertheless requires clemency even in the now-victorious battle-line. 2 Chronicles 28:6: “Pekah the son of Remaliah killed one hundred and twenty thousand of Judah in one day, all fighting men, because they had forsaken the God of their fathers. And the children of Israel captured from their brothers two hundred thousand women, boys, and girls and boundless spoil, and carried it to Samaria. At that time a prophet of the Lord named Oded was there. Going out to meet the army coming to Samaria, he

said to them: ‘Behold, the Lord God of your fathers, angry against Judah, delivered them into your hands, and you killed them atrociously, so that your cruelty reached to heaven.

“‘Moreover, you wish to subject the children of Judah and Jerusalem to yourselves as male and female slaves, which ought by no means to be done; for in this too you have sinned against the Lord your God. But hear my counsel and lead back the captives whom you have brought from your brothers, because the great wrath of the Lord threatens you.’ Therefore, men from among the princes of the children of Ephraim--Azariah the son of Johanan, Berechiah the son of Zillum, and Amasa the son of Hadlai--stood against those who were coming from battle and said to them: ‘You shall not bring the captives here, lest we sin against the Lord. Why do you wish to add these things upon our sins and heap them upon our former offenses? For the sin is great, and the anger of the Lord’s wrath threatens Israel.’”

§ 32. Therefore, let every commonwealth which desires to be long-lasting avoid all cruelty and even the suspicion of cruelty. Let it educate children with simple food and clothing that is not costly; from their tender nails let even the children of princes learn to endure someone as though an equal, lest when grown they judge it a crime of majesty if anyone thinks contrary to them.

Commodus was held the cruellest of all the ancients; nature and education made him so. When he was twelve years old--at an age when the sight of blood is a horror to children--he commanded that a bath attendant who had heated the bath more than was right be cast into the furnace; nor did his cruelty grow quiet until, exulting with joy, he perceived the smell of the skins which his tutor, deceiving his madness, had thrown in place of the bath attendant. It is no marvel that he inflicted so much slaughter, when so much was permitted him in childhood. It harmed him to have had evil attendants, for from them he himself learned that by which he afterward made others evil.

Therefore, O princes, embrace clemency, which nature herself teaches you and your dignity demands; flee cruelty. Do not forget humanity and gentleness even when the law is at issue. The impregnable citadel of your security is clemency; cruelty makes all things uncertain and renders even its own ministers unfaithful. Nor should you alone cultivate clemency yourselves; require it from counselors, governors, and praetors. Command them to govern subjects not as governors but as bishops. The clemency of one king accomplishes little if, through the cruelty of petty tyrants, subjects are prevented from enjoying it. Let him be angry here; let him avenge his insults here, so that he may provide for his subjects. Cruelty is never honorable; in one outcome alone it is pleasing--if it is exercised against cruel ministers.

No spectacle is more desirable to a people than to see cruelty perish by its own examples. This alone is praised in Phalaris: that he enclosed the inventor in his own bull. Fix most deeply within your breasts that which reason dictates, which all wise men have taught, which the examples of all kingdoms have demonstrated, which eternal Truth, reigning most clemently for eternity, proclaimed: **BLESSED ARE THE MEEK, FOR THEY SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH.**

In truth, harsh medicine is more dangerous than the disease itself. For it brings it about that no one dares to counsel right things if to have counseled is a danger. Confidence is the mother of that ferocity which has overturned very many kingdoms and has either destroyed very many of the Turks or troubled them with sedition. Indeed, their commanders pay even for accidental events. But the times are often such that no crime lacks its defense. Boccacini, Book II, Chapter XXXIII of *Parnassus*, even excuses Tiberian cruelty. From this arises the oppression of subjects, which crushes the whole commonwealth.

CHAPTER XVII

All Persons in the Commonwealth Must Be Trained in Fortitude

§ 1. At this point, indeed, I have the pseudo-politicians in agreement, for all teach that the strength and constancy of the inhabitants are the support of the city. Next, although they thrust forward hypocrisy in place of piety, cunning in place of prudence, and simulation in place of temperance, they nevertheless require true and genuine fortitude, which undertakes and repels dangers with reason. It was formerly said that the sons of the rich rightly learned two things: the art of throwing the javelin and of riding; flattery bestowed the rest upon them through blandishments. But if they wandered from the target or did not know how to cling to the horse, they could not flatter even themselves. So also now it is fortitude that is not accustomed to being counterfeited; or if at some time a cowardly ass puts on the skin of a lion, if Patroclus in Achilles' armor terrifies the Trojans for a time, soon

[Printed page 180]

he pays for the simulation with his blood. Fortitude is held in great honor. Aristotle asks in *Problems*, Section XXVII.5:

Διὰ τί μάλιστα τὴν ἀνδρείαν τιμῶσιν αἱ πόλεις, οὐ βελτίστην οὖσαν τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἢ ὅτι διατελοῦσιν ἢ πολεμοῦντες ἢ πολεμούμενοι; αὕτη δὲ ἀμφοῖν χρησιμωτάτη ἐστίν. Τιμῶσι δ' οὐ τὰ βέλτιστα, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς τὰ βέλτιστα.

Why do cities honor fortitude most, although it is not the most excellent of the virtues? Is it because they are always either making war or being warred upon, and this virtue is most useful in either time? They honor not the things that are best, but the things that are best for themselves. And so in free cities and among kings, the greatest honors are decreed for those who have perished in war. Therefore, the fatherland requires not glass-like fortitude but true and solid fortitude.

§ 2. Fortitude is

μεσότης περὶ φόβου καὶ θάρρη,

a mean concerning fears and confidence, as Aristotle says in Book IV, Chapter IX of the *Morals*. Augustine, in *Eighty-Three Questions*: “Fortitude is the considered undertaking of dangers and the endurance of labors.” This is that very constancy concerning which the noble disputation of Justus Lipsius is in everyone's hands. For it is an upright and immovable strength of mind, neither elevated by fortuitous things nor cast down. I also include patience, the voluntary endurance, without complaint, of all adversities which befall. These things concern fortitude taken strictly.

For just as in every virtue wisdom holds the helm as though its moderator, so fortitude binds and fortifies them all like a firm anchor in this stormy sea of life, for every virtue without constancy is widowed. Fear casts out counsels wisely established; take away Lucretia's constancy, and fear, not lust, will make her an adulteress. Strike fear into a commander, and he will make a shameful treaty at the Caudine Forks. Therefore fortitude is the guardian of all virtues.

There are also other virtues which have the appearance of fortitude. Thus soldiers act bravely in battle through fear of cowardice and desire for glory. Here shame, flight from disgrace, and appetite for praise make a man brave.

Frequently even a greater fear compels one to be brave amid lesser pain. Mucius places his hand upon the brazier. If he did it from desire for what is honorable, it belonged to a brave man to provide an enemy king with a spectacle from himself so that the king might consider it most dangerous to wage war with brave men. If he did it from fear of death--for after the deed what else could he expect but to perish by a lingering death, tortured by the most exquisite torments?--not even thus does it cease to be fortitude. For it belonged to a brave mind to avert extreme punishments by a lesser danger. Indeed, that contracted gladiator who, ordered to represent Mucius on the stage with the present

“troublesome tunic,” did not dare say, “I will not do it,” possessed a wretched and calamitous fortitude. For if a soldier fighting bravely in the battle-line prefers to meet a beautiful death through wounds rather than be led in an arrogant triumph, why should the wretched man whom the countenance of the threatening tyrant and the ardor of citizens cruelly commanding have seized not prefer to give his hand to be burned rather than blaze with his whole body in the flames? For here there is a measured endurance of pain according to right reason. Those who are driven into battle through fear of their commanders, although they are not brave, nevertheless, if they prefer to contend under an uncertain Mars rather than be surrendered to certain destruction with disgrace, have begun certain rudiments of fortitude. But because they do honorable things altogether unwillingly, they are distant from perfect virtue.

They also call those whom anger has made furious brave:

ιητικώτατον γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους.

For anger rushes in and casts itself headlong into dangers.

σθένος ἔμβαλε θυμῷ,

it casts strength into the spirit;

μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔγειρε, ἔζεσεν αἷμα.

It aroused rage and anger; the blood boiled. Anger indeed assists an impulse, but it does not increase virtue when it diminishes reason.

Nor are those brave who trust in strength and, because they have often conquered, presume altogether the best. But the foolish and drunken hope most of all; yet when the matter turns out otherwise, they immediately flee and withdraw themselves from danger. Thus, when the Argives thought they were going with great boldness against the soft and timid Sicyonians, but had fallen upon Spartans, in a disorderly flight they furnished laughter to their enemies.

Therefore fortitude endures pains and troubles when it is honorable to endure them, and because it is honorable--or when not to endure them is shameful.

The dignity of fortitude lies in the fact that it is difficult and arduous to tolerate tortures, troubles, and death. This is more difficult than to resist pleasure. Nevertheless, we perceive the bravest men to be those who at the same time resisted both pleasures and fears.

§ 3. Fortitude renders the spirits of individuals unconquered, and consequently the whole commonwealth. Nothing is impregnable to the brave; nothing is fortified against the spirited. Ambrose speaks excellently in Book II of *On Duties*: “Fortitude is no ordinary strength of mind. It alone defends the ornaments of all the virtues and guards justice; it contends in inextinguishable battle against all vices, unconquered by labors, brave amid dangers, sterner against pleasures, so as to flee avarice like a certain stain which effeminates virtue.” And Cicero in the *Rhetoric*: “Fortitude is a glorious brilliance of mind, immovable amid adversities, administering arduous affairs beautifully, which is neither broken by adversities when they assail nor raised up by prosperities when they flatter.”

Nor does it collapse through another’s malice. It stands above its own punishment. “Fortitude is useful,” says Seneca in Book IV, Chapter XXII of *On Benefits*, “both upon the rack and in the fire, which may be applied to individual limbs and gradually make its way around a living body. Although the very body full of good conscience should drip away, the fire through which good faith will shine shall please him.”

Therefore fortitude is a despiser of things to be feared. It despises, challenges, and breaks terrible things and those that place our liberty beneath the yoke.

§ 4. Fortitude renders the commonwealth safe because it terrifies enemies by reputation alone. Recently, four Spanish ships afflicted two hundred ships of the barbarians; thirty thousand human beings fell. At the voice of the lion all animals tremble; the grim brow of bulls, although tame, is feared. Boldness against the brave is not safe. On the

contrary, nothing is safe for the fearful. If enemies are lacking, they will fear their own shadow. Therefore they are attacked by all. The hare is the prey of all; the lion of none.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀθυμοῦντες ἄνδρες οὐπω τρόπαιον ἔστησαν.

But men weak in spirit have never erected a trophy.

Therefore those helmeted hares invite the enemy; they do not terrify him, and though present they are absent. Let no king count bodies, but spirits.

δειλοί γὰρ ἄνδρες οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐν μάχῃ

ἀριθμόν, ἀλλ' ἄπεισι, καὶ παρῶσιν ὁμῶς.

Fearful men are of no account in the battle-line, for they are absent although they are present together.

I do not wish to produce as an example Pisander, who is said to have been terrified lest, when dead, he should see his own shadow; nor Antemon, above whose head two little slaves always held a bronze

[Printed page 181]

shield lest he be injured by the fall of anything. The commonwealth has no need of so prodigious a fear that it should possess arms against itself and preserve resources for the enemy.

Unless it possesses fearless spirits within its ramparts and walls, all things fall as prey to the enemy. If men obtain the name and reputation of the brave, many seek their alliance; no one dares inflict injury, any more than pluck a lion's beard. By the reputation of fortitude alone David cast off danger and escaped the parricidal hands of his son.

2 Samuel 17:8: "You know your father and the men who are with him to be most brave and of armed spirit, like a bear raging in the forest when her cubs have been taken; moreover, your father is a warrior and will not remain with the people. Perhaps he now lies hidden in pits or in whatever place he has chosen; and when any one man has fallen at the beginning, whoever hears it will hear and say: 'A slaughter has been made among the people who followed Absalom.' Then even the bravest man, whose heart is like that of a lion, will be dissolved by fear; for all the people of Israel know that your father is brave and that all who are with him are strong."

Most things in war are accomplished by reputation and fear; few by the hand. But these matters must be treated more fully when military fortitude, which is a distinguished part of fortitude, is to be discussed.

§ 5. The reason fortitude is always unconquered, and contempt of death conquers all things, is that it is a natural fortification, the armor of nature, not taken from elsewhere. For he who has despised all terrible things is most free, is loved by all, and is feared even by the evil. Seneca, Epistle CXIII: "Teach me not whether fortitude is an animal, but that no animal is happy without fortitude unless it has grown strong against fortuitous things and subdued all accidents by meditation before receiving them. What is fortitude? An impregnable fortification of human weakness; the man who has surrounded himself with it endures secure in this siege of life. For he uses his own strength and his own weapons. At this point I wish to report to you the opinion of our Posidonius: 'There is no reason for you ever to think yourself safe with the weapons of fortune. Fight against fortune with your own. Fortuitous things do not arm us; therefore men are equipped against enemies but unarmed against fortune herself.'"

And in Chapter VIII of *On Firmness*: "If we receive with an equal and placid spirit that greatest thing, beyond which angry laws or the most savage masters have nothing to threaten, in which fortune consumes her power, and if we know that death is not an evil and therefore not even an injury, we shall much more easily tolerate other things: losses, pains, disgraces, changes of place, bereavements, and dissensions, which do not submerge a wise man even if they surround him all at once, much less does he grieve at their individual impacts. And if he bears the injuries of fortune moderately, how much more those of powerful human beings, whom he knows to be the hands of fortune?"

Fortitude furnishes all these things by despising just dangers, or through knowledge and the spirit for repelling, receiving, and challenging dangers.

§ 6. Nothing protects and strengthens the commonwealth so much as good counsels; but when dangers surround it, those counsels generally arise from fortitude alone. Fear first disturbs the counsels themselves; next, even if the senate has resolved bravely and the people has commanded, fear will nevertheless impede the action to be performed. It is decreed that war must be waged in Spain, but no one among the chiefs of the Quirites whose spirit was equal to so great a danger can be found. Had Scipio been absent, Rome would not have recovered Spain; moreover, it would have lost Italy. Valerius, Book III, Chapter VI: “After Publius and Gnaeus Scipio in Spain, together with the greater part of the army, had been crushed by the Punic battle-line, and all the nations of that province had followed the friendship of the Carthaginians, none of our commanders daring to set out there to correct the matter, Publius Scipio, then in his twenty-fourth year, promised that he would go. That confidence indeed gave the Roman people hope of safety and victory, and he employed the same confidence in Spain itself. For when he was besieging the town of Badia, he ordered those approaching his tribunal to enter recognizances for the next day in the temple which was within the enemy’s walls. Having immediately gained possession of the city, at the time and place which he had foretold, he placed his curule chair and administered justice to them. Nothing was more noble than this confidence, nothing truer than the prediction, nothing more effective than the speed, and nothing more worthy even than the dignity.”

Counsels are so certain for fortitude that at times they do not fear to disclose them to enemies, so that the enemies may be rendered more fearful. Scipio Africanus, after scouts of Hannibal were detected in his camp, took care that they be led most diligently through all the maniples; thereafter, having received them at dinner and asked whether they had sufficiently considered the things for which they had been ordered to come, he sent them away unharmed. By this confidence he crushed the spirits of the enemy. Weak and very small commonwealths frequently regulate their military counsels from necessity, suspicion, and fear. And therefore fortitude is the most diligent guardian of itself, because it employs not only undisturbed counsel but also deed and hand. Two gladiators were once present with eyes closed, and thereby unconquered; and no army was ever conquered unless some fear was in it. For the three hundred Lacedaemonians, and any who were like them, were wearied by conquering and lay down upon their own trophies.

§ 7. The endurance of injuries and insults pertains to fortitude. It is altogether necessary to accustom the spirits of citizens to this. No one was superior to Augustus in this matter, if we look among the unbelievers. Cato indeed plainly appeared ἀπαθής, impassible, but falsely. When someone had spat into Socrates’ face while he was in bonds, Socrates said that the man should be admonished by the magistrate not to yawn so disgracefully. Yet the ancients judged Socrates to have surpassed three hundred Catos. I judge this virtue to be the bond of peace and charity in the commonwealth. The reason is taken from experience itself. Their own ages did not value the best men, the pillars of their own commonwealth, the fathers of the fatherland. They repelled Cato from the praetorship, afflicted him with insults, and defiled him with spittle; they envied the Scipios, their liberators, as I explained in the chapter on gratitude. And if we consider our own examples, they agitated Moses with seditions, rejected Samuel, and attacked David. In the commonwealth there are many adversaries, slanderers, and rivals, against whom there is one shield: patience. The man who is weak in spirit is rendered liable to all of them. If he can suffer and keep silent, he will conquer. The invulnerable man is not he who is not struck, but he who is not injured. So many evils strike and beat from every side; the brave and patient man alone is greater than injury and repels the things that come against him with solid strength. History has taught that the causes of civil wars are generally tender spirits, impatient of the most trifling things.

But in what manner shall the commonwealth train its citizens in fortitude? Those who judge this question superfluous because boldness cannot be handed over to the timid through discipline, but this good is a gift of nature, wander far from the truth and do not sufficiently distinguish a human being from beasts. The lion is fearless by nature, the tiger wrathful, the horse high-spirited, the doe timid, the sheep placid, and the ape servile. Those dispositions belong to their natures, which training nevertheless often changes and corrects. In the human being, reason, the mistress of all things, and virtue can do all these things. And thus both boys and tender

[Printed page 182]

girls, to whom fear is peculiar and who are accustomed to cry out even at masks and frightful objects, have laughed at the threats and torments of tyrants. Sacred history teaches this concerning the Maccabees; the Christian Church glories in thousands of martyrs. Therefore true fortitude consists in an unconquered, persevering, and unchangeable purpose of mind. The mind of the most timid virgin can be so strengthened and made solid that it bears all blows of fortuitous things and all torments with inviolable hardness.

§ 8. Therefore, God is the foundation of fortitude and constancy. This seemed true even to the ancient idolaters, to such an extent that they ranked conquerors of tortures and death among the gods. Therefore those who forsake God are wrongly brave, as Saint Augustine admonishes: “He alone is brave who is brave not in himself but in the Lord.” Sermon III to the Brothers in the Desert: “O my brothers and the joy of my heart, consider how great fortitude was in the martyrs, who, as though incapable of suffering, despise torments, crush tyrants, and despise all things that belong to the world; who, although flayed, although burned, although afflicted in all their limbs, although cast down in the whole body, nevertheless we do not read that they were changed in mind. But you ought to know, my brothers, that fortitude is spoken of in many ways: namely, that of hypocrites, philosophers, and good faithful persons. In short, the hypocrite sustains many things, bears many things, and appears brave in all things.”

And: “O fortitude! You empty out all cruelty, reject prison, do not fear the cross, embrace the rack, desire chains, and always run spontaneously to death. O monk, your course for the prize is worth nothing, your work is worth nothing unless it is strengthened by the column of fortitude; the edifice of a good work is worth nothing unless you embrace the column of fortitude. But if the column of fortitude is taken away, the whole edifice of good works falls.”

And Cyprian, *To Quirinus*, Book III: “One must glory in nothing, since nothing is ours; in the Gospel *κατὰ* John: ‘No one can receive anything unless it has been given him from heaven.’ Likewise in the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: ‘For what do you have that you have not received? But if you have received it, why do you glory as though you had not received it?’ Likewise in First *Βασιλειῶν*: ‘Do not glory, nor speak lofty things, and let boastful speech not proceed from your mouth, because God is the Lord of knowledge.’ Likewise: ‘The bow of the powerful has been weakened, and the weak have been girded with strength.’ Concerning this very thing in Maccabees: ‘It is just to be subject to God and for a mortal not to think himself equal to God.’ Likewise there: ‘And do not fear the words of a sinful man, because his glory shall be in dung and worms. Today he shall be exalted, and tomorrow he shall not be found, because he has been turned into his earth and his thought has perished.’”

This, therefore, is the fortitude of the martyrs, to which nothing is equal or second. It made the cross desirable to Peter; it strengthened Andrew so that, standing upon the nails themselves, fixed and clinging, he feared to be released. In God, Julius, Martinianus, and Processus, while their faces were being crushed with stones, cried: “Glory to God in the highest.” A public voice sounding from heaven showed that it was the gift of God. For when Saint Polycarp entered the stadium, it was said by an angel: “Be brave, Polycarp, and conduct the matter with a lofty spirit.”

When the torturers had determined to fasten him with nails so that he might be burned alive, he said: “There is no need of nails; I shall sustain the fire willingly.” The flame itself revered so great a constancy and surrounded the unconquered martyr in the manner of an arch; for God wished to erect for his servant a triumphal arch of fire and to show the instrument through which he conquered. There was equal fortitude in an unequal age. Live coals and incense were placed in the hand of Justus, a young man, and he was ordered to extend it above the altar, so that if, conquered by pain, he shook off the fire and incense, he might appear to have sacrificed. But lest he leave anything even for calumny, he preferred his limbs to be burned rather than shake off the fire without sin. Cyrilla, a woman of heroic spirit, accomplished the same thing. What similar thing could Mucius, or anyone among the ancients, do here? Mucius endured the brazier of the altar, but he was deservedly brave, so that by the wonder of his endurance he might stupefy the king whom he could not kill. Here no fear of a greater torment instilled patience under a lighter pain. If Justus had shaken off the coals and pain by a slight movement of his right hand, he could then have hoped for praise and honors.

How great was the perseverance in Theodore, a young man, who, after passing the whole day in most bitter torments as though among roses, when the judge urged him to provide for his own safety, answered with a joyful and brave voice: "Let all who adore graven images be confounded, and those who glory in their idols." But in these very years the constancy of a Japanese boy was incredible and beyond the human. He was thirteen years old, not yet his own master, but a precocious herald of the divine majesty. He was bound with others to a stake so that he might be burned alive for Christ. When he felt that the slow flame had loosened the tow bonds and, released, approached his mother burning at another stake as her exhorter and consoler, she said to him: "Is it thus, my son, that you desert your station?" Struck by this saying, although he had by no means departed as a deserter, he returned to his place. Without any bond he endured and conquered the fires raging within his entrails. Constancy was in place of ropes and chains. Fearless, this recruit of Christ looked upon his half-burned limbs and enjoyed his own torments as though delights. Japanese letters and the *Indian Histories* report many more deeds according to this manner and pattern, emulating the primitive Church.

But how great was the spirit of James the Anchorite! When demons attacked him in the appearance of Isaurians, as though they were robbers, he, fearless before death because he judged them robbers, immediately gathered up the hair flowing over his neck and shoulders so that he might present a bare neck prepared for the sword; and in this posture throughout the whole night he awaited the coming blow. With a great spirit he challenged death. These things are divine, and they are fortifications of the spirit from heaven, with which the history of the Christians is full.

§ 9. Therefore, those defenses must be sought from God and drawn from the divine sacraments. Cyprian, Epistle LIV, shows that the arms of our fortitude must be sought from God: "But now peace is necessary not for the weak but for the brave, and communion must be given by us not to the dying but to the living, so that we may not leave unarmed and naked those whom we arouse and exhort to battle, but fortify them with the protection of the blood and body of Christ. And since the Eucharist is made for this purpose, that it may be a protection for those who receive it, let us arm with the fortification of the Lord's abundance those whom we wish to be safe against the adversary. For how do we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in confession of the name if we deny the blood of Christ to those about to fight? Or how do we make them fit for the cup of martyrdom if we do not first admit them by right of communion to drink the cup of the Lord in the Church?"

And a little afterward: "First, he cannot be fit for martyrdom who is not armed by the Church for battle; and the mind which the received Eucharist does not raise up and kindle fails. For the Lord says in his Gospel: 'But when they deliver you up, do not consider what you shall speak; for it shall be given to you in that hour what you shall speak. For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you.'"

§ 10. Perhaps the politician will say that commonwealths have no need of this fortitude, but rather of that other fortitude

[Printed page 183]

which expends blood in defense of the fatherland, which runs amid flying javelins secure from death, which plunges into the enemy battle-line and seeks a beautiful death through wounds. As though it were not one and the same virtue which despises the swords and javelins of enemies and the racks and devices of executioners. A man prepared to die, if justice and the public safety command him to fight, will be unconquered through contempt of death. For the sole cause why men fight languidly is fear of death. Tertullian once terrified the pagans by this argument and showed that Christians could do all things and reduce the Gentiles themselves beneath their dominion, being so many and so prepared to die. When the imperial prefect Arius raged inhumanly, nevertheless the eagerness of the Christians to endure torments and death was greater. Therefore, they eagerly professed themselves Christians and offered themselves to slaughter in so great a number that the governor, weary with cruelty, said:

ὦ δειλοί, εἰ θέλετε ἀποθνήσκειν, κρημνούς καὶ βρόχους ἔχετε.

“O wretched men, if you wish to die, you have precipices and nooses.” Thus indeed the bloody slave of a tyrant interpreted the Christian fortitude which he was torturing more criminally than before. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon us to weigh how great a defense such men could be to their commonwealth if they were lawfully led against an enemy by a legitimate magistrate. No one would draw back his foot; no one would desert the ranks through fear; all would strive to protect a fellow soldier by their own death. With great effort, individuals would ascend the enemy’s wall and rampart at a swift rush, not from an empty desire for donatives but from hope of eternal remuneration. Therefore our fortitude is in God and from God. Zion is the city of our fortitude; its wall and bulwark is the Creator himself. “I have hoped in God,” says David in Psalm 55:5; “what shall flesh do to me?” “The Lord is the protector of my life; before whom shall I tremble? If camps stand together against me, my heart shall not fear.” “The Lord is my strength and my praise, and he has become my salvation.” And thus in 1 Maccabees 5:61, those priests whom the Lord had not chosen to liberate Israel fell in battle while they considered themselves to be acting bravely. Therefore, the highest fortitude is to have hope fixed in God. A beautiful exhortation occurs in Sozomen, Book II, Chapter VIII, addressed to Ananias the old man as he trembled at the atrocious deaths of his fellow martyrs, by which the prefect of the royal craftsmen encouraged him to constancy: “For a little while, O old man, close your eyes and be of good spirit, for immediately you shall see the light of God.”

§ 11. The second thing which renders citizens brave is zeal for sobriety and temperance. For delights enervate and effeminate spirits; indeed, the luxurious man and the brave man are entirely opposed. Truculent, bitter, and terrifying things are conquered by fortitude; fortitude is armed against pains and death itself; luxury pursues sweetnesss. Therefore, since delights flee every labor, they cannot behold fortitude, which enjoins hard things, even from afar. Next, softer education, which dissolves spirits into luxury, violently inflames the desire to preserve life which is naturally implanted in all; and therefore they are terrified at the smallest suspicion of danger. For the delights that accompany life, which is already exceedingly dear, render it still dearer. Thus, when those whose whole life has been passed in shade and banquets are summoned to arduous things, they tremble as though they must die twice. For when delights are denied they grieve as though at death, and they fear death as cowards. The Laconians held command for a long time through hardness of life. The Greeks, broken by delights, became slaves. The Egyptians, accustomed to delights, were the slaves of all kings. Camps themselves have experienced delights as poison. They broke Hannibal at Capua. Nor did the poets invent Hercules drawing wool under a woman’s command for any other reason than to show that the brave cannot exist amid delights. I shall say more concerning these matters when military discipline is to be treated.

§ 12. Practice in dangers and the examples of others also sharpen fortitude marvelously. All unforeseen things seem greater, especially amid dangers. A man inexperienced in sailing cries out at the first blow of the storm, but a prudent helmsman does not pale even at the tenth wave. In undertaking dangers the first step is the most difficult; when examples have gone before, many follow willingly. Seneca in *On Tranquility of Mind*: “Unless you regard whatever can happen as something that will happen, you give adverse things strength against you--a strength which anyone who has first seen them has broken, but much more anyone who has experienced them.” And Saint Ambrose, Book I, Chapter XXXVIII of *On Duties*: “This, therefore, belongs to diligence, that a man prepare himself in this way; that belongs to natural ability, if anyone can foresee by vigor of mind the things which will happen and place them, as it were, before his eyes; determine what can occur and what he ought to do if it occurs; sometimes turn two or three possibilities together in his mind which he conjectures can occur either individually or conjointly, and arrange actions for either the individual or conjoined events which he understands will be advantageous. Therefore, it belongs to a brave man not to dissemble when something threatens but to anticipate it and, as though from a certain watchtower of the mind, explore it, and to meet future events with provident thought, lest perhaps he afterward say: ‘I fell into these things because I did not think they could happen.’ In short, unless they are quickly forestalled, just as in war an unforeseen enemy is scarcely sustained and, if he finds men unprepared, easily crushes them, so unexplored evils break the mind more greatly.”

§ 13. Let great rewards be proposed for fortitude, not so that men may act rightly from hope of advantage and honors--although this too pertains to government--but so that the magnitude of the rewards may show the excellence of virtue to tender spirits. Therefore, those who have persisted with a brave spirit in sudden and grave crises and have repelled enemies must be treated with great honor. For in these cases fortitude especially shines forth. Aristotle, Book III, Chapter VI of the *Ethics*: “That man is properly called brave who is fearless concerning an honorable death and all those things which occur suddenly and bring it.”

And Cicero, Book I of *On Duties*: “It belongs to a brave and steadfast spirit not to be disturbed in harsh circumstances nor, as is said, to be cast from its position while in tumult, but to employ the counsel of a present mind and not depart from reason. Although this belongs to a great spirit, that also belongs to a great natural ability: to anticipate future things in thought, determine beforehand what can happen on either side and what must be done when anything has happened, and not to commit anything such that at some time it must be said, ‘I had not thought it.’”

Therefore, virtue of this kind has always been cultivated with the highest honor. Thus Mattathias killed the royal prefect who compelled men to adore idols and the apostate who was sacrificing. Eleazar went beneath the beast, killed it after piercing its belly, and was thus buried in his own triumph. Another Eleazar, the Ahohite, one of David’s mighty men, by no means gave himself as a companion to the fleeing; rather, after all the others had scattered in immense terror, he alone persisted and struck the Philistines until his hand stiffened with the sword. The Lord wrought a great salvation on that day, and the people who had fled returned to strip the spoil from the slain. 2 Samuel 23:11. And Shammah the son of Agee protected the fleeing people and struck the Philistines. Behold the spirit: in a sudden event the whole army flees, and one soldier defends it as it flees; and, what is more marvelous, one man delays and puts to flight the victors as they rush forward. And in verse 18, Abishai raised his spear against three hundred and killed them.

Finally, “love is strong as death, jealousy hard as

[Printed page 184]

hell.” Love of God renders citizens brave. Song of Songs 8:6. “For who shall separate us from the charity of Christ? Tribulation, or distress, or famine, or nakedness, or danger, or persecution?” Augustine, Chapter XLVII of *On True Religion*: “That man is most truly and certainly unconquered who clings to God, not so that he may merit some good external to him from God, but because for him nothing is good except to cling to God himself. As long as this man is in this life, he uses a friend to repay a kindness; he uses an enemy for patience; he uses those whom he can for beneficence; he uses all for benevolence.” And a little afterward: “But amid all dutiful labors he is not broken in his expectation of future rest. For what will harm him who can make good use even of an enemy? By the defense and fortification of him by whose precept and gift he loves his enemies, he will not fear enmities. For this man it is too little not to be saddened amid tribulations unless he even rejoices, knowing that tribulation works patience, patience trial, trial hope, and hope does not confound, because the charity of God has been poured forth in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given to us.”

Therefore, let the commonwealth train its citizens in the true and constant love of God. For if the love of creatures renders men furious and contemptuous of all dangers, why should not love of the divinity, resting upon the highest reason, render them unconquered?

CHAPTER XVIII

Fortitude Is Not Acquired by Bloody Spectacles

§ 1. Against bloody spectacles, much was said by me in the chapter on avoiding cruelty. Yet there have not been lacking those who judged that they should be recalled, so that youth, accustomed to wounds and blood, might not shudder in war at things it had often watched in peace, as though they were unfamiliar. They therefore judge that men are rendered brave and warlike by watching the combats of gladiators, and for this reason they praise the Romans. Those counsels contrive cruelty and destruction for the human race. Even now, are not cruel spirits seen to delight in cheap blood and the degenerate common people? How great is the concourse to watch the punishment of one wretched little man? Neglecting their own affairs, they purchase the spectacle of a dying man, and would purchase it even at a price if that were required. And lest you marvel that such cruel spectacles are demanded again by those who make a profession of the Christian religion, weigh in your mind the things which experience teaches us to occur. Many teach in cities the art of fighting with the sword, spear, and other weapons. They challenge one another in mutual rivalry. With how much zeal do men press themselves forward and purchase a place for watching at a price? Nor are there lacking those who, by sending gifts, because they cannot do so by command, attempt to incite them to fiercer combat. Sometimes they exhibit these spectacles for themselves at weddings, and not rarely they are gravely wounded or fall. But if some men, as indeed happens wickedly and against the laws, decide life by a challenge, how great a multitude of spectators runs together? How few out of so many exhort them to peace. Some even possess such savagery that they eagerly attend the tortures of those subjected to judicial examination. The desire of human beings is depraved and malicious; they delight in a human being's violent death. But against cruelty, expense, and the other evils, the fruit of fortitude, courage, and military glory is alleged: that by so dreadful and deadly a spectacle spirits are strengthened against wounds and iron. I judge the contrary to be true: that by gladiatorial spectacles, the mangling of wild beasts, and acts of cruelty an immense terror is instilled, every virtue avoided, and lofty spirits cast down and effeminated, in no way raised or strengthened.

§ 2. In the first place, I shall employ examples, which have very great force in a political matter. Gaius Caesar delighted in bloody spectacles above all, as all authorities transmit, and he was most cruel. After Gaius came Claudius, concerning whom Dio says: "He frequently exhibited gladiatorial games, in which he delighted greatly. Among other things, he willingly watched at lunchtime those who were torn apart in the middle of the theater; although he killed a lion trained to eat human beings and pleasing to the common people for that reason, because it was not fitting for the Roman people to see spectacles of this sort."

But Claudius was always fearful to a marvelous degree, and fearful when he came to power. Tiberius too was devoted to that cruelty, for he gave a most magnificent show, even recalling certain discharged gladiators, as Suetonius is the authority, with a fee of one hundred thousand sesterces. But he went mad in this way when already an old man; Nero, immediately from the beginning. Hadrian too, on his birthday, killed one hundred lions and one hundred lionesses. Martial's servile flattery made Domitian's arena celebrated; all these things show that he was devoted to the savagery of the amphitheater to the point of complete insanity. Nevertheless, no one was more fearful than he, who expected death at every hour, who covered a wall with phengite stone lest someone unexpectedly attack him from behind while he was walking. The madness of all was surpassed by the frenzy of Commodus. He himself was gladiator, charioteer, and trainer; he lived more in the school than in the palace. Gladiators and hunts were exhibited while he dined. He himself fought seven hundred and thirty-five times. Amid applause he was called "Paulus, first of the secutores" six hundred and twenty times; he preferred so to be called rather than "first of the emperors." He killed or conquered one thousand gladiators--for who would test his strength against Caesar? He killed many thousands of wild beasts with his own right hand; and lest you think it was without skill, he killed one hundred lions with one hundred blows. It is marvelous that so portentous a man had so certain a hand. These things are from Lampridius. Nor amid these savage

games did he forget his majesty, for he cast to wild beasts those by whom he was mocked. Gallus, the nephew of Constantius, according to Marcellinus, Book XIV, delighted in bloody games and in boxers falling beneath one another.

These men, certainly cowardly or altogether averse to war, rendered the empire liable to barbarians. Tiberius, after obtaining the empire, oppressed the city and thereafter defiled Capri; nor did he administer anything in military affairs, except to separate brave commanders from distinguished legions and to pretend that he would go into provinces and wars--in which matter, according to Tacitus, he deceived the senate for a long time, the armies longer, and the provinces longest. Gaius, although educated in war and called Caligula in a military jest, was nevertheless not a brave commander. He assembled a great army in which there were two hundred and fifty thousand soldiers, and destroyed a great part of them; for he killed them individually and sometimes even in crowds. Concerning his German expedition, Suetonius, after many things most foolishly done, relates the following in Chapter XLVI: "Finally, as though about to accomplish a war, after drawing up his battle-line upon the shore of the Ocean and placing ballistae and engines, while no one knew or imagined what he was about to undertake, he suddenly commanded them to gather shells and fill their helmets and folds of clothing, calling them the spoils of the Ocean owed to the Capitol and palace. As a memorial of victory he raised a very high tower, from which, as from a lighthouse, fires would shine at night to direct the courses of ships; and after proclaiming to the soldiers a donative of one hundred denarii per man, as though he had surpassed every example

[Printed page 185]

of liberality, he said: 'Go away happy; go away rich.'"

Claudius, bloody in spectacles, did not permit military command even to brave men. When Corbulo's virtue became known, he revoked his command. Corbulo deservedly exclaimed: "The ancient commanders were fortunate, for they were permitted to be brave without danger; but I am prevented from it by Caesar's envy." Nero, so savage in spectacles, set out for Greece. Dio relates the matter in Chapter XIV: "For Rome was not sufficient for him, nor the theater of Pompey, nor the Circus Maximus; but there was need of an expedition, so that he might become, as he said, **περιοδονίκης**." He brought with him so great a multitude, not only of the Augustales but also of other human beings, as though an army of enemies were present or he had captured the Parthians or other nations. But those were, of course, Neronian soldiers, and in place of arms they carried lyres, plectra, masks, and tragic shoes. Therefore he brought back a victory worthy of such an army and conquered Terpnus, Diodorus, and Pammenes in place of Philip, Perseus, and Antiochus.

And lest you think that cruelty was left behind at Rome, Dio adds: "Even if these things alone, as I said a little before, had been done, nevertheless the affair would have been exceedingly carefree, marked with disgrace, and held in mockery. But now, as though he had truly come to wage war, he plundered Greece although he left it free, committed infinite killings, confiscated the goods of certain persons still living, and took away innumerable offerings which had been deposited even in the temples at Rome."

Dio describes Domitian's costly and cruel spectacles and his timid and unwarlike spirit in this manner: "But Domitian, after leading an army against them--the Dacians--although he himself took no part in the war, for he was not only incapable of enduring bodily labor but also timid and unwarlike in spirit, wanton and lustful not only toward women but also toward boys, nevertheless, after sending commanders to wage the war and shamefully losing a great part of the soldiers, sent letters to Rome as victor. For this reason so many and so great decrees were made for him that throughout almost the whole world which was beneath his dominion golden and silver statues were erected. He presented a costly spectacle, from which we have learned nothing worthy of history except that virgins competed in a race. After these things he celebrated festival days, namely triumphal days. He frequently exhibited contests, with battles of infantry and thereafter cavalry joined in the circus, and also a naval battle in a certain new place, in which not only did almost all who fought die, but also many spectators, because, when a very great rain and violent storm

suddenly arose, he permitted no one to depart from the spectacle; and although he himself changed his cloak, he allowed the others to change nothing. As a result, not a few fell into grave illnesses and died. And so he gave the people a nocturnal banquet for the sake of consoling them. For he often exhibited contests at night and introduced nuns and women into them.”

Commodus fled most shamefully from war and purchased peace from the barbarians. “So that by money,” says Herodian, “in which he especially abounded, he might purchase security, he denied them nothing they requested.” This was the man who nevertheless had determined to go out not from the palace clothed in purple but armed from the gladiatorial school; yet the death inflicted upon him that same night averted this disgrace from the Roman Empire.

The matter itself therefore sufficiently teaches that by such inhuman and foul spectacles not commanders and soldiers but cruel men are made brave. If we consider Rome herself, when she was formerly rustic her soldier was braver without a spectacle of domestic slaughter. Thereafter the most cowardly common people attended daily killings. A few soldiers restrained so many hundreds of thousands through fear and, when they pleased, cut them down. When gladiatorial spectacles were frequent, genuine virtue languished, and selections of the bravest began to be obtained from Gaul, Batavia, and Thrace.

§ 3. But what becomes clear to one who consults history, I am confident that I shall also prove by a reason sought from the nature of things. I shall employ a true sorites approved by philosophers. He who rejoices in bloody spectacles, as Drusus and others did, is cruel; he who is cruel is also lustful; he who is such is also timid and unwarlike; therefore he who rejoices in human blood is unwarlike.

Next, cruelty--savagery seen and practiced--is rendered more incited and inhuman, just as lust by pleasures, avarice by plunder, pride by flatteries, and ambition by honors. Thus fear and the evils connected with it are also increased.

Human beings, like the other animals, are moved by the perception and imagination of things that are pleasing and pleasurable and flee things that are sorrowful and atrocious. But it matters very greatly how forcefully and vividly custom or perception has impressed anything upon the mind. For if the mind remains fixed in attentive thought upon those things which flood the senses with pleasure, desires are incited and carried beyond bounds. If it sees a human being burned, cut, and tortured, and conceives in the mind from his voice, movement, and countenance the goads of pain, the whole body must necessarily be shaken by horror of such things. Those, therefore, who are not accustomed to them grow pale, shudder, and have their hair stand upright. For there is a certain sympathy of nature which, at another's evil, excites pain in another. There are some who fall down at the sight of another's pain, as Aristotle also explains in *Problems*, Section XXVII. Hence it follows that those who have known with their eyes, thought, and countenance the bitterness of grave torments in others more violently shudder at things whose magnitude they have accurately weighed. Thus they judge those persons most wretched and the evils intolerable. From this it necessarily happens that the things concerning which fortitude is exercised appear more terrible to those who have employed experience in others. For just as, when the enticements of another's pleasure have been seen, the affection is incited to enjoy them, so also, when the bitterness of another's torture is cast before the eyes, nature, the preserver of itself, recoils with great impulse and is afraid. Therefore, just as those who serve pimps and brothels are rendered more desirous of pleasures and thus more intemperate, so each person, by a raw spectacle of inhumanity, becomes more disposed to flee pains. Hence executioners and their household--a crowd ingenious in punishments--are said to be most weak if they undergo judicial tortures by their own example, as they sometimes deserve. For the whole heap of evil has already forced itself upon their vivid meditation and shaken the mind with fear before pain burns the body. They therefore suffer so great an evil twice.

§ 4. Added to the sum of the evil is the end and object which the spectators of gladiators have set before themselves. It does not tend toward making them fearless in receiving wounds, but toward their enjoying a cruel, inhuman, bestial pleasure. But the enjoyment of pleasures blunts fortitude's edge. The pagans themselves called those spectacles consolations of the eyes, not incitements to fortitude; for every most loathsome person, useless in war, sat at them.

Caelius, to be sure, the intimate of Tullius, did not dare to watch the chariot-fighters in Britain, although, says Cicero, we could not have cheated him even of an andabata. Women themselves--the Vestal Virgins--rise at the blows and say that it is their delight when they see breasts broken open by a turned thumb.

[Printed page 186]

Therefore, just as those who gaze upon the filth, hunger, and calamities of the needy press more ardently upon riches and seek them through the dangers of seas, lands, and treasures deposited among the dead, so also those who most willingly watch pains in others fear the pains they have watched all the more. For they desire not the exercise of skill, not the strength of bodies, but butchery. Thus Seneca writes concerning the midday spectacles in his *Letters*: "Now, trifles having been set aside, they are sheer homicides. They have nothing with which they may be covered. Exposed to a blow with their whole bodies, they never direct the hand in vain. Most prefer this to the ordinary pairs and the fighters demanded in addition. Why should they not prefer it? The sword is repelled by neither helmet nor shield. To what end are defenses? To what end the arts of the sword? All those things are delays of death. In the morning human beings are cast to lions and bears; at midday they are cast to their spectators. They command those who have killed to be exposed to those who will kill them, and they reserve the victor for another slaughter. The conclusion for the fighters is death; the business is conducted with sword and fire. These things take place while the arena is unoccupied. But someone has committed robbery. What, then, did he deserve? That he be hanged. He killed a human being: because he killed, he deserved to suffer this. But you, wretched man, what have you deserved, that you should watch these things? 'Kill, burn, scourge! Why does he rush upon the sword so timidly? Why does he kill with too little boldness? Why does he die with too little willingness?' By blows they are driven into wounds, and with breasts bare and exposed they receive mutual strokes. Has the spectacle been interrupted? Meanwhile human beings have their throats cut, lest nothing be done."

§ 5. He who often gazes upon wounds and blood does not tremble before them. So indeed--if he himself is outside the danger. Not even an executioner grows pale amid his daily offices of torture, unless perhaps he himself is summoned to the rack; nor is he therefore brave, but, if he does not pity those whom he torments, savage.

The gladiators themselves, indeed, exhibited an example of constancy. "What ordinary gladiator," says Cicero, "has groaned? Who has ever changed his countenance? Who has not stood, and even lain down, honorably? Who, when he had lain down and was ordered to receive the sword, drew in his neck? So great is the power of training, meditation, and custom."

Yet gladiators are not brave, because they undergo dangers not by reason but by miserable necessity or avarice. Training, meditation, custom--indeed necessity--drive them toward imitations of virtue, if they do not wish to fight with the spectators hostile to them, if they do not wish to be burned and cut, if they prefer to be dispatched by one wound rather than by repeated blows. But the dangers of others do not strengthen the spectators. Otherwise, how were the Romans so brave for four hundred and ninety years? For in the year 490 of the city Marcus and Decimus Brutus first presented three pairs at their father's funeral, and thereafter the thing was rare, until, when morals had been corrupted, it grew beyond measure; for this crime long remained within a limit. In the five hundred and eightieth year of the city, some other small gladiatorial shows were given, says Livy in Book XLI. One was distinguished above the rest, in that seventy-four human beings fought over the course of three days.

The homeland of luxury and softness itself teaches that these spectacles were joined with luxury and timidity. Campanian luxury is celebrated in history, and its cruelty is well known. See Silius, Book II; Lipsius, *Saturnalia*, Book I, Chapter VI. For at every more sumptuous banquet it was customary to exhibit several pairs of gladiators for combat in the dining room. The custom seems to have arisen among the Campanians, concerning whom Silius writes in Book II of the *Punic Wars*:

Indeed, it was their ancient custom to enliven men's banquets with slaughter,

And to mingle with feasts the dreadful spectacles

Of men contending with the sword and often falling over the very cups,

The tables spattered with no sparing blood.

And Strabo writes concerning the same people in Book V:

ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἐξετρώφισαν ὥστ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἐκάλουν πρὸς ζεύγη μονομάχων, ὀρίζοντες ἀριθμὸν κατὰ τὴν τῶν συνδείπνων ἀξίαν.

That is: "To such a point were they carried by luxury that they invited guests to pairs of gladiators, whose number they increased or diminished according to the dignity of each banquet."

So savage a pleasure therefore belongs to soft and servile dispositions, and to those whom delights have subjected to the commands of others. Thus it truly is: cruelty makes men timid; and, as I have said, the timid are cruel.

But the frequent practice of cruelty makes men more timid in the face of dangers. For those who pursue pleasure recoil from serious things, and much more from dangerous things. Hence they were accustomed also to say proverbially, "Tomorrow we shall attend to serious matters"--a saying which brought destruction to several cities. The nature of animals also shows cruelty to belong to fear; for in every kind the females are more cruel than the males, and more timid. Aristotle rightly says--or someone else is the author--in Chapter V of the *Physiognomy*:

"Female animals appear to me to be more malicious than males, more wanton, less liberal, and weaker. The females among those animals which are raised around us are therefore very evident examples; as for those in the forest, all shepherds and hunters acknowledge that they are such as has been stated.

"But this too is evident: among individuals in each kind the female has a smaller head than the male, a narrower face and a more slender neck; they have weaker breasts and smaller sides, but thighs fleshier than the males'; they have soft knees and slender legs. Their feet are more beautiful, and the form of the whole body softer rather than stronger. They have fewer sinews, are softer, and are furnished with moister flesh. Males, having the contrary of all these things, are by nature of a stronger and more just kind, but the female is by nature more timid and unjust. Since these things are so, the lion appears to be the most perfect of all animals in assuming the form of the male."

Those spectacles, therefore, belong neither to a brave man nor to a wise one, but to an evildoer; animals themselves are cruel through fear. When a stag has conquered, it cruelly tramples its adversary beneath its feet. Fear chills; it likewise causes torpor to be excited and inclines one toward the enticements of pleasures. Those whose blood is diluted are timid, for fear chills, and the same persons are cruel. Great cruelty formerly belonged to the Carthaginians, and even now belongs to the Ethiopians and those who inhabit the torrid zone. But they are colder by nature, as Aristotle teaches in *Problems*, Section XIV, Problem VIII:

διὰ τί οἱ μὲν ἐν τοῖς εὐπνόοις τόποις βραδέως γηράσκουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν τοῖς κοίλοις καὶ ἐλώδεσι ταχέως; ἢ τὸ γῆρας σηπεδὼν τις ἐστί. σήπεται δὲ τὸ ἡρεμοῦν, τὸ δὲ ἐν κινήσει ὃν ἢ ὅλως ἄσηπές, ἢ ἥττον τοῦτο πάσχει, οἷον τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς, διὰ τὴν εὐπνοίαν, ὁ ἀῆρ ἐν κινήσει ἐστίν· ἐν δὲ τοῖς κοίλοις μένει. ἐπὶ δὲ ἐκεῖ μὲν διὰ τὴν κίνησιν ἀεὶ καθαρὸς ὁ ἀῆρ καὶ ἕτερος γίνεται· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐλώδεσι μένει.

"Why do those who inhabit elevated and open places grow old more slowly, while those who inhabit hollow and marshy places do so more quickly? Is it because old age is a kind of putrefaction? But that which is at rest putrefies; that which is moved is in no way affected thus, or is less affected, as flowing and enclosed water show. Therefore, just as in elevated places the air is stirred by breath blowing upon it from every side, so in hollow places it remains unmoved. In addition, in open places the air is continually kept pure and varied because of the agitation; in marshy places it is impure, and the same air always grows stale."

The signs of a timid man in Chapter III of the *Physiognomy* are soft hair, an inclination of the body, a posture not erect, the belly drawn upward, a yellowish color, weak and blinking eyes--broken, lean, and mobile--weak extremities of the body, small legs, long and slender hands, and small and weak loins. The body is *σύντονον* in its movements; likewise the timid man is not vehement,

[Printed page 187]

but supine; he is easily stupefied by terror, is readily moved in countenance and head, is anxious, looks downward, has a wrinkled face, and the face itself is small. You will find most of these things in the cruel--that is, in those who are such by nature; for some, although gentle by nature, have nevertheless degenerated into cruelty by custom and habit. Since, therefore, those spectacles do not change bodily affections but make them worse, and do not confer strength upon the mind either, they in no way make men brave. Consequently, in order to excuse butchery and blood poured out in peace through a most loathsome pleasure, some have said that these things are not the rudiments of fortitude but certain sacrifices for appeasing Nemesis, so that she, appeased through domestic slaughters, might favor the killing of enemies.

§ 6. But if they judged gladiatorial shows useful in war, why did they not send the gladiators themselves into dangers? Why did they wish them to be infamous? For they ought to have been the bravest of nations; yet this was done rarely and only in the utmost necessity. Nor did they arrange matches in camps before battle and, by watching a wound, animate themselves for death. For they judged it foolish to display in another's body the lot which each man was now to expect for himself. Fortitude consists in the meditation upon and love of surpassing dignity and moral worth, on account of which it despises dangers and pains; it does not consist in delights derived from another's torment. It weighs by right reason the causes which may raise up and strengthen the mind for acting and suffering bravely; it does not say that the blood of a worthless, hired scoundrel is the food of its spirit.

Tiberius exhibited cruel games, imitating Augustus. "There lay," says Tacitus, "an immense slaughter: every sex, every age, the illustrious and the obscure, scattered or gathered together." He whom that heap delights will never be brave. He holds so tenaciously to his own pleasure that he procures it by so many deadly things. That man, of course, will fight for his fatherland for whose pleasures you will give a show only when you have killed all the citizens--and a show most pleasing of all shows. He is afraid to die who demands the deaths of others, not for his own safety or for the defense of the fatherland, but for his own delights. A brave man lays down his life for a friend, and even for an unknown person; he judges it shameful to purchase life by the vicarious death of another. This man judges it a great fruit of life to gaze upon the deaths of human beings.

How far have those pursuits of more recent men departed from the ancient integrity of Christians? By the great care and severity of bishops Christians were kept away from that savagery. What did the pagans infer from this? This, of course: that the pleasures of spectacles were avoided by Christians so that, having renounced the enticements of life, they might more easily abandon life. Thus Tertullian writes in Chapter I of *On the Spectacles*: "There are those who suppose that the Christian kind, ready for death, is trained for this obstinacy by the renunciation of pleasures, so that they may more easily despise life when, as though its restraining ties had been cut away, they do not desire that which they have already rendered superfluous to themselves; so that it may be thought to have been determined by this policy and by human foresight rather than prescribed by a divine command. It would, of course, be irksome, even while persevering amid such pleasures, to die for God. Although, even if it were so, obedience was owed to so suitable a policy and to the discipline of so great an obstinacy."

The Romans, therefore, were so far from thinking that they were strengthened by those spectacles to undergo death and the dangers of death courageously that they said the spectacles were avoided by Christians for precisely this reason: lest, by pursuing the pleasures of life, they should refuse to leave life itself when virtue demanded it. Tertullian continues in Chapter II: "In short, you would find more men whom the danger of pleasure than the danger of life calls

away from this sect. For even a fool does not dread death as something owed; even a wise man does not despise pleasure as so great a thing, since there is no other charm of life both for the fool and for the wise except pleasure.”

The nations therefore sought not fortitude but pleasure from the amphitheater. Among such things Tertullian reckons the circus, the lion, bodily strength, and the charms of the voice. He names the lion when he censures all the bloodiest spectacles, for in these was the height of madness. Scaevola presented many lions; Sulla, when praetor, presented one hundred maned lions; Pompey the Great, Sulla’s pupil, six hundred, among which were three hundred and fifteen maned lions. For it was fitting that the teacher, who did not know letters, should be surpassed by his pupil. But Julius surpassed Pompey even in this disgrace, for he brought forth eight hundred. Besides these they also presented panthers, after, through wickedness, an ancient decree of the senate had been abrogated by command of the people. Scaurus, in his aedileship, presented one hundred and fifty of various kinds; Pompey the Great, four hundred and ten; Augustus bestowed four hundred and twenty. These were the things because of which the nations feared to die.

Moreover, Tertullian teaches in Chapter XV of *On the Spectacles* that the spirit is shaken by spectacles: “No one comes to pleasure without emotion; no one experiences emotion without its own accidents. The accidents themselves are incitements of emotion. But if emotion ceases, there is no pleasure; and the man who goes to the place where he obtains nothing is guilty of so much vanity. I think, moreover, that vanity too is foreign to us. What of the fact that he also judges himself when placed among those whose like he does not wish to be, and surely confesses himself their detester? It is not enough for us if we ourselves do no such thing, unless we also are not joined with those who do such things. ‘If you saw a thief,’ he says, ‘you ran together with him.’ Would that we did not even dwell in the world together with them; nevertheless, we are separated from them in worldly things, because the world is God’s, but worldly things are the devil’s.”

If those men are brave, why are their souls held cheap and infamous? Tertullian writes in Chapter XXII of *On the Spectacles*: “For the very authors and administrators of the spectacles--the charioteers, actors, athletes of the exercise-ground, and those most beloved men of the arena--to whom women subject their cheap souls or those men even their bodies, for whose sake they commit the things they censure: from the same quarter from which it magnifies them, society casts them down and diminishes them; indeed, it manifestly condemns them by ignominy and diminution of civil status, keeping them from the curia, the rostra, the senate, the equestrian order, and all other honors and ornaments together. How great is their perversity! They love those whom they punish; they depreciate those whom they approve. They magnify the art and stigmatize the artist. What sort of judgment is it, that someone should be disgraced by the things through which he merits favor? Indeed, how great a confession of an evil thing it is that its authors, although most acceptable, are not without a mark of disgrace.”

I finish, and give this one admonition: if for constancy you desire blood, you have Christ’s. Tertullian, *On the Spectacles*, Chapter XXIX.

CHAPTER XIX

A Commonwealth, However Powerful and Rich, Ought to Hold Most Tenaciously to Modesty

§ 1. For the unconquered strength of a city, for the powers of a kingdom, nothing is so impregnable as modesty and what Christians call humility. Do you judge it right that those placed on high should be humble? Do you call to self-contempt those whose whole life is worn away by a most laborious and anxious ambition? Christ teaches that it must be done altogether so, and the safety of the commonwealth teaches it too--that safety which is nothing without Christ; but I shall now discuss it politically.

[Printed page 188]

Yet do not recoil from discourse about humility, O prince; I shall add to it majesty, magnanimity, and care for fame and glory, for I shall discuss these things in order.

§ 2. Humility is, from a full knowledge of oneself, a true estimation of one's own goods and evils, and a contempt for preeminence. It is a great virtue, and plainly one belonging to a heroic spirit, by which those things which appear great but are small are appraised at their own prices. Its destruction and plague is pride: an appetite for dignity and preeminence contrary to right reason. Nothing is more monstrous than that vice, nothing more hateful to God, nothing more pernicious to the commonwealth. Let all, therefore--prince, nobles, citizens, farmers--be trained in modesty and submission. All, I say; for pride can belong to the poor, and humility to princes. The crime is not in the things but in their use. In the magnificence of princes there is often a spirit that despises riches and honors; in the will of the most abject there is a most arrogant vanity.

Let the most holy wife of the proudest king, Esther, be an example. Esther 14:16: "You know my necessity: that I abominate the sign of my pride which is upon my head on the day of my display; and that I detest it as the rag of a menstruous woman and do not wear it on the days of my silence; and that I have not eaten at Haman's table, nor has the king's banquet pleased me, nor have I drunk the wine of libations; and your handmaid has never rejoiced from the time when I was brought here until the present day, except in you, O Lord God of Abraham."

Haman has exhibited for us an example of raging arrogance; he gravely shook both himself and the commonwealth.

The second foundation of the commonwealth, therefore, is humility. The breath of vainglory, striving upward, overthrows it as though by an earthquake. "A proud human being is a great misery," says Augustine; but a proud commonwealth is a great and manifold misery.

§ 3. First, indeed, humility is pleasing to God, because it distrusts itself and relies upon God. It has God as protector; pride has him as destroyer. Psalm 17:28: "For you will save the humble people, and will humble the eyes of the proud." Deservedly, therefore, does a proud commonwealth experience God as an enemy, since it does not acknowledge him as the author of its felicity. He "regards the humble things in heaven and on earth." So truly, as Augustine testifies in Book III, Chapter XXIII of *On Christian Doctrine*, "There is scarcely a page of the holy books in which it does not resound that God resists the proud but gives grace to the humble."

Pride brought about the ruin of the whole world, for it was the beginning of sin. Pride dragged Pharaoh into the depth of the Red Sea as though he were a stone. "Who is the Lord, that I should hear his voice and let Israel go? I do not know the Lord, and I will not let Israel go." Sennacherib, in 4 Kings 18 and 19, terrifies Hezekiah with enormous pride; but, after his army is slain, he himself is butchered by his sons in the sight of his idol. "Since, therefore, the power of God is not in multitude, nor his will in the strength of horses, nor have the proud pleased him from the beginning, but the prayer of the humble and meek has always pleased him," Judith 9:16. A city which raises itself up against majesty cannot stand, for the Lord detests lofty eyes. Proverbs 9:17. All the great men whom power has puffed

up have experienced what Solomon threatens in Proverbs 15:25: “The Lord will demolish the house of the proud, and will make firm the boundaries of the widow.”

§ 4. A few sin at the peril of all; indeed, the wantonness of women is sufficient for destruction, as Isaiah 3:16 bears witness. No riches, no confidence exempts the proud. How strong in calamity were the Israelites? Isaiah 9:9: “And all the people of Ephraim shall know, and the inhabitants of Samaria, saying in pride and greatness of heart: ‘The bricks have fallen, but we shall build with hewn stones; they have cut down the sycamores, but we shall put cedars in their place.’ And the Lord will raise up the enemies of Rezin over him and turn his enemies into a tumult--Syria from the East and the Philistines from the West--and they shall devour Israel with the whole mouth.”

How magnificently Assyria boasts in the same prophet, Chapter 10:12: “In the strength of my hand I have done it, and in my wisdom I have understood; and I have removed the boundaries of peoples, plundered their princes, and, like a mighty man, pulled down those seated on high.” What does the prophet, from God’s secret counsel, foretell to so great a monarch? Verse 16: “For this reason the ruler, the Lord of hosts, will send leanness among his fat ones, and beneath his glory a burning shall blaze like the burning of fire.”

Scarcely can a pride greater than Babylon’s be conceived; Isaiah speaks of it in Chapters 13 and 14. Yet it was drawn down to the lower regions. “And that Babylon, glorious among kingdoms, renowned in the pride of the Chaldeans, shall be as when the Lord overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.” The Lord says to her in Isaiah 47:8: “And now hear these things, you delicate woman who dwells confidently, who say in your heart: ‘I am, and there is none besides me any longer; I shall not sit as a widow, and I shall not know barrenness.’ These two things shall suddenly come upon you in one day, barrenness and widowhood; all things have come upon you because of the multitude of your evil deeds and because of the exceedingly great hardness of your enchanters.”

Moab has the same pride, but with less power. Jeremiah 48:29: “We have heard the pride of Moab; he is exceedingly proud--his loftiness, his arrogance, his pride, and the elevation of his heart. I know,” says the Lord, “his boasting, and that his strength is not proportionate to it, nor has he attempted to do according to what he was able. Therefore I shall wail over Moab and cry out to all Moab, lamenting to the men of the earthen wall.”

This vice, therefore, is hateful to God and always precedes the destruction of commonwealths, for it contains an express contempt for the divinity. This argument from divine judgment and oracles is abundant for a pious prince. Writers ignorant of our affairs have likewise taught that the punishment of pride is most grave. Orpheus, Plato, and Libanius, in chastising that vice, coined the proper name *Νεμέσεως*. We think that the other vices are punished more gently, but that pride is crushed. They called her the maiden Adrastia and Rhamnusia. But let us turn our mind to political reasons.

§ 5. The second evil of pride is that it overturns the commonwealth by hatred of itself. The other vices--imprudence, timidity, drunkenness--admit allies and partnerships. Neither a modest man nor a proud man can endure a proud man. All desire to rise above, all to command, none to be subjected. Since all are borne toward the same point, it is necessary that all collide. “Among the proud there are always quarrels.” Proverbs 13:10. Pride makes princes, and especially nobles, hateful. They called Tarquin--headlong in lust, blind with avarice, mad with fury--“the Proud,” and thought the reproach sufficient. Nor does it render merely the prince, but even the prince’s virtues, hateful.

Pride joined to distinguished conduct pollutes it.

Indeed, pride itself withdrew far away--

A vice customary in prosperous circumstances,

And an unwelcome companion of virtues.

No other cause has afflicted great men more

than pride arising from deeds well done, because it produces envy and hatred; but against the hatreds of many no resources can prevail. Benefits themselves, when given proudly, are thankless; when cast up as reproaches, they are turned into injuries. But if Camillus, if Marius, if the Scipios act arrogantly, they make unwelcome the safety they brought to the fatherland.

Seneca writes in Book II, Chapter XI of *On Benefits*: “If you wish to have grateful men whom you bind by obligation, you ought not only to give benefits but to love. Above all, as I have said, let us spare their ears: admonition produces weariness; reproach, hatred. Nothing must be avoided equally in giving a benefit as pride. What need is there for arrogance of countenance? What need for swelling words? The thing itself exalts you. Empty boasting must be removed; the deeds will speak while we are silent. A benefit proudly given is not merely unwelcome but hateful.

“Caesar gave life to Pompeius Pennus--if he gives who does not take it away. Then, after Pennus had been acquitted and was giving thanks, Caesar extended his left foot to be kissed. Those who excuse him and deny that this was done for the sake of insolence say that he wished to display his gilded slipper--indeed, his golden one, adorned with pearls. Precisely so: what is insulting here, if a man of consular rank kissed gold and pearls, and if he would otherwise have chosen no part upon Caesar’s body which he could kiss more cleanly? A man born for this purpose, that he might exchange the customs of a free state for Persian servitude, judged it too little if an old senator who had enjoyed the highest honors had lain suppliant before him in the sight of the foremost men in the manner in which conquered enemies have lain before conquerors. He found something below the knees to which he might thrust liberty down. Is this not to trample the commonwealth--and, someone will say (for it can pertain to the matter), with the left foot? For that man, shamefully, madly insolent, who heard petitions concerning the life of a consular man while wearing his slippers, had not been insolent enough unless the emperor had thrust his feet into the senator’s face.”

What, then, inflicted twenty-three wounds upon Caesar? Not only injured majesty, not the slaughter of so many citizens, not the pillaged treasury and seized fasces, but the fact that he did not rise before the senate and that he forced his feet upon a senator’s kiss. And so those through whom he conquered and to whom he had given life rose up against him.

But by contrast behold the dispositions toward Alexander, the Roman emperor. Herodian narrates thus: “When the appointed day arrived, after he had performed the customary sacred rites for his departure, he left Rome, with the senate and the whole people conducting him, looking back repeatedly and weeping. Nor was there anyone among the people who looked upon him departing with dry eyes, since he had the whole multitude desirous of him, having been raised by them and having administered the empire most modestly for so many years.”

The principal cause, therefore, is hatred. For all exult with joy at the punishment of a proud human being. And God himself in a certain manner taunts him.

For τὸ νεμεσητικόν, indignation, is implanted in all human beings; Aristotle in Book II of the *Ethics* calls it ἐπαινετόν, praiseworthy, and places it in the middle in relation to ἐπιχαιρεκακίαν, malicious joy. For indignation bears it ill that prosperity has been conferred upon an unworthy person; but whoever grows insolent in prosperity appears unworthy of felicity. Whoever vaunts himself from a lofty place is judged worthy to fall from it.

§ 6. The third evil of arrogance is the subtlety of the vice. For in a marvelous manner, while it is avoided, it is sought. And so it insinuates itself into all the virtues and attempts to withdraw their foundation so that the whole structure may fall. Thus humility is also the remedy of all the vices. By this means, however, the commonwealth is overturned under the appearance of the good and honorable. For when the proud perform certain great things and things useful in appearance, because ambition and desire for glory, not reason, draw them, they thereafter turn these things against their friends. Those bodies of the commonwealth are not great but swollen, destined to fall by their own bulk and to burst. Pride is the head of the vices: it presses upon all and commands all. And what is done is called virtue until the whole pus erupts.

§ 7. The commonwealth is sustained and ruled by wisdom. Nothing is more closely joined to wisdom than humility, nothing more opposed to it than ambition, which, among all the passions, has this property: it makes men the most foolish. For it is a certain drunkenness of the arrogant which does not leave them even when sober. For the Spirit of God, the spirit of wisdom, descends into a humble soul--beautiful in its own eyes and in God's eyes; he despises one that is exalted. "Where pride has been, there shall also be insult; but where humility is, there shall also be wisdom." Proverbs 11:2. Pride therefore turns kings away from wisdom. And they sin especially in this, that they consider themselves wise. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

Not only princes but philosophers, the instructors of princes, have been blinded by pride. For concerning them too this saying was bandied about: *τῶν φιλοσόφων οὐδὲν ἀφιλοσοφώτερον*--nothing is more foreign to philosophy than the philosophers themselves. Anaxippus spoke more gently: philosophers are indeed wise in words, but in reality are *ἀνοήτους*, senseless. And so many expelled the philosophers: Lysimachus and Antiochus from the whole kingdom; the Romans expelled Alcibiades and Philiscus, "Epicurean pigs," and at one time all sophists, as the Messenians and others also did. And what one would especially marvel at: from Attica herself, Sophocles by his own *ψηφίσματι*, decree, removed the same men.

Saint Chrysostom explains the cause of their folly on Romans 1:22:

μέγα τι περὶ ἑαυτῶν φαντασθέντες, καὶ οὐκ ἀνασχόμενοι ταύτην ἐλθεῖν, ἣν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτοῖς, ἐβαπτίσθησαν τοῖς τῆς ἀνοίας λογισμοῖς.

"Having imagined some great thing about themselves and not enduring to enter by that way by which God commanded them to enter, they were immersed in thoughts of madness."

But that mad wisdom is especially censured by which they were led to infect the world with superstitions. For although they did not believe in the divinities, they bewitched wretched nations with fear of them, and boasted that they were doing this wisely, as though for keeping peoples in their duty. Thus speaks one of their wise men, Cicero, in Book I of *On the Nature of the Gods*: "Who was ever so blind in contemplating things that he did not see that these human forms were transferred to the gods either by some design of wise men, so that they might more easily turn the minds of the unskilled from depravity of life to the worship of the gods, or by superstition, so that there might be images which, by venerating them, they might believe themselves to approach the gods themselves?"

But in this wisdom their folly most manifestly betrayed itself. For by that way they taught impunity for every crime. Since it was easy for anyone to despise gods of wood and clay, they then fashioned gods made according to their own judgment and steeped in their own vices, so that they might sin more freely by the authority and exhortation of the divinities and, consecrating to them the shameful acts of their own crimes, might judge themselves made holy by impurity itself.

Princes and magistrates outstripped this unwisdom of the philosophers by the most insane and ambitious rashness and folly, as though with white horses. For when they saw that the right of making gods had been given to the commonwealth, they especially bestowed this benefit upon themselves. "Should I doubt that there are gods," says Gaius, "when I make gods?" By this pride they destroyed themselves and the commonwealth. From this it also followed that they admitted no counsels and that no one dared to put forward truths. But without counsel no city can be ruled.

§ 8. Humility is magnanimous; pride belongs to a small mind and, if we wish to judge rightly, is childish. It is a great thing to be small in one's own mind. There is no need of arguments for this: children, when praised, are transported by joy

[Printed page 190]

and do not conceal that passion; they even boast of their affairs of their own accord, and in this matter the simplicity of an innocent age delights us. But if adults or old men do the same things, we judge them not indeed children, yet

nevertheless childish. Never is greater laughter aroused on the stage than when some Pyrgopolinices trumpets his battles, because an altogether ridiculous thing is seen: so childish a spirit in so vast a body and in such an array of arms.

The ancients very wittily laughed at Menecrates, who required no other payment from those whom he had healed--whose number was enormous--than that they should call him Jupiter. A childish deed: for all, in return for the benefit conferred upon themselves, were compelled to laugh at the wretched man. How mad and childish was the pursuit of Psaphon the African, who trained talking birds bought at a great price to say, "Psaphon is a god." That most wretched man did not see that the affair could not remain hidden; next, that the birds would fly away even to the pathless places of the forests and would proclaim their master's commendation among mountains and woods with vain zeal, or, in their new liberty, would shake off the old song.

A child defeated in a sportive contest wails; the victor exults, because a little matter either depresses a small spirit or raises it on high. In the arrogant--that is, in the grand and therefore ridiculous--there is no other childish prudence or magnanimity: all are occupied with little things. If you suddenly catch a young man curling his hair, arranging anklets, or attending to other *καλλωπίσματα*, adornments, he blushes because he understands that it is contrary to decorum, and because *μικρόψυχον τῶν περὶ τὸ μικρὸν ἐπιμέλειαν*--the care expended upon small matters--is a sign of a small and degenerate spirit.

§ 9. The greatest praise, therefore, is not to act for the sake of praise. It is the childish error of those who think that love of praise is a virtue. For he sees more soundly, says Augustine in Book V, Chapter XIII of *The City of God*, who recognizes that love of praise is also a vice. This did not escape the poet Horace, who says:

You swell with love of praise; there are sure expiations

Which, if you read the little book purely three times, will be able to restore you.

And in a lyric poem, to repress the lust for ruling, he sang thus:

You shall rule more widely by subduing an avid

Spirit than if you join Libya to distant

Gades and each Carthaginian serves one man.

Nevertheless, those who do not restrain their more shameful lusts by the faith of piety, by obtaining the Holy Spirit, and by love of intelligible beauty, are at least better when restrained by desire for human praise and glory--although they are not yet holy, they are less shameful. Even Tullius could not dissemble this in the same books which he wrote *On the Republic*, where he speaks about forming the prince of the city, whom he says must be nourished upon glory, and consequently recalls that his ancestors did many marvelous and glorious things through desire for glory.

§ 10. But how great a danger is approached while that most powerful passion is nourished--which passion does it flee? From this it comes about that all seek the fame of virtue, few seek virtue itself, and sometimes no one does. Although desire for glory sometimes has a good outcome, although it restrains enormous vices, although it is to the profit of the commonwealth, it is nevertheless dangerous and does not cease to be an evil. Otherwise drunkenness, lust, avarice, and envy itself would also have to be praised. For the drunken, through lack of judgment, cast themselves into dangers from which the sober cannot emerge. Lovers, the envious, and the avaricious, agitated by the furies of their vices, have often rendered great services to the commonwealth. The folly of the lowest common people is profitable to many; those vices must not therefore be tolerated. For although pride sometimes subdues other passions, more often it arouses them.

Calamitous was the pride of Sesostriis, king of Egypt, who

Drove Pharian chariots with the necks of kings.

Who drove Xerxes into so cruel a war? Who, before him, Cyrus? And after Cyrus, Alexander? What but desire for glory drove others? So that they might be praised by a few, they destroyed entire nations by extermination.

There is a difference, as Saint Augustine admonishes in Book V, Chapter XIX of *The City of God*, “between desire for human glory and desire for domination. For although it is easy for him who delights too much in human glory also willingly to affect domination, nevertheless those who desire the true praise, albeit of human affairs, take pains not to displease those who judge rightly. For there are many good things in morals concerning which many judge rightly, although many do not possess them; and through those goods of morals they strive toward glory, command, and domination. Concerning them Sallust says, ‘But that man strives by the true way.’ But whoever, without desire for glory, by which a human being fears to displease those who judge rightly, desires to dominate and command, for the most part seeks to obtain what he loves even through the most manifest crimes. Accordingly, he who desires glory either strives by the true way or certainly contends by deceits and fallacies, wishing to appear good when he is not. And therefore, for one who possesses virtues, it is a great virtue to despise glory, because his contempt for it is in the sight of God but is not disclosed to human judgment.”

§ 11. Joined, therefore, to that danger is the fact that they think there is a good in the vice. For he who, from love of praise, has cut down an enemy and borne wounds in front will also, lest he be compelled to yield to citizens, not shudder at a butchery of citizens; indeed, for his own triumph he will force all into dangers. All history teaches that most wars began from desire for glory and the lust for ruling, and that civic contests arose from ambition.

§ 12. I have demonstrated that anger is deadly to a city and at the same time have shown that it generally arises from pride. Those whom praises inflate and make swollen, censure casts down if they cannot avenge themselves, and drives into rage if power to avenge an insult has been granted. Wretched is the lot of a human being who is raised up by the flattery of those who praise him, contracted in spirit and made to totter by the rashness of those who censure him.

Clidemus the Athenian, victor in a sportive contest, while being crowned by his companions, died submerged in the sweetness of glory. I think it a disgrace that he was an actor and the victor in an actor’s contest; but he valued the victory so greatly that through its sweetness he expelled his soul. Chilon the Spartan, while embracing his son who had won at Olympia, breathed out his soul through joy. Tertullian, *On the Soul*, Chapter LII. So great was the force of joy in Sophocles and the tyrant Dionysius that, upon receiving the token of victory in tragedy, they ceased to live. Pliny, Book VII, Chapter LIII.

Place so great a love of praise in a prince, in a senate. What crimes will not be committed for the sake of obtaining it? Add admonitions, censures, refusals, insults: will not those for whom a foolish little glory was dearer than life judge these annoyances more grievous than death? Hence come those disasters of cities, when a little utterance of another’s malignity casts those greedy for praise down from the state of virtue and impels them to destroy the commonwealth. Golden is Augustine’s sentence: “Just as humility profits those who serve, so pride harms those who rule.” *The City of God*, Book V, Chapter XV.

§ 13. The virtue of humility is pleasing and beautiful in all; in kings and pontiffs it is divine. For one placed on high not to think high things is difficult; not

[Printed page 191]

to look down upon inferiors from on high is a miracle. To few does that felicity fall, that they should not be destroyed by the appearance and opinion of felicity. Amid so many acts of obedience and blandishments, mortality--of itself inclined toward self-flattery--is rarely sufficiently cautious. A prince has no cause, but many occasions, for pride.

Gaius at the beginning conducted many things modestly, so that the conscript fathers ordered them to be read every year. No training is so firm that desire for command will not tear it away. Alexander had, says Valerius in Book VIII, Chapter XV, “a breast insatiable for praise.” When Anaxarchus, his companion, reported on the authority of his teacher Democritus that there were innumerable worlds, Alexander said: “Alas, wretched me, that I have not yet

obtained even one!” The possession of glory which suffices for the dwelling-place of all the gods was narrow for a human being.

But that praise belongs properly to Christian princes; for those examples which are brought forward from pagans do not exhibit constant virtue. Sardanapalus placed upon his tomb an *ἀποκρότημα*, that is, two fingers making a snapping sound as though by striking one another, by which he might show that all things, even the greatest, were not worth an as, but were a sound flying past. Porus, when defeated, renounced the royal name, but retained pride and ferocity. Nor was it great humility in Croesus that, when placed upon the pyre, he confessed that he could fall from felicity. Nor was Gilimer the Arian more modest, who, when led in triumph, said more than he felt: “Vanity of vanities, and all is vanity.” Catholic princes pronounce this when they approach kingdoms. For it does not belong to great prudence, when you have fallen, to confess that you had not stood with a stable step.

Humility, therefore, belongs properly to Christians, just as the use of the name in that signification belongs properly to them. Augustine on Psalm 31 says: “This water of the confession of sins, this water of humiliation of heart, this water of a salutary life which casts itself down, presumes nothing concerning itself, and proudly attributes nothing to its own power--this water is in none of the books of foreigners: not in the Epicureans, not in the Stoics, not in the Manichees, not in the Platonists. Wherever even the best precepts of morals and discipline are found, nevertheless this humility is not found. The way of this humility flows from no other source; it comes from Christ. This way is from him who, although he was high, came humble. For what else did he teach by humbling himself, having become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross? What else did he teach by paying what he did not owe, so that he might free us from debt? What else did he teach when baptized, who committed no sin; when crucified, who had no guilt? What else did he teach but this humility? Not undeservedly does he say: ‘I am the way, and the truth, and the life.’”

§ 14. There are indeed very many things in which the modesty, submission, and obedience of Catholics--which is the mother of humility--is shown. For kings and nations obey their pontiffs and sacred councils. Prostrate upon the ground, they confess their sins, undergo the punishment imposed, and submit their conscience to another’s judgment. How arduous this is both the heretics teach, who cast off this part of Christianity, and the magistrates in China, who, because they judge this unworthy of their majesty, come with greater difficulty to the Christian religion.

But the marvelous humility of Christian princes has often appeared. Philip the Arab, who seized the empire by cruelty and parricide, an art then customary, and did not reign without blood, was excluded from the communion of the pious by Fabian; covered with dirt and squalor, he stood as a suppliant to the priest in the order of penitents. He sought entrance into the Church not by strength or gifts but by tears. Eusebius, Book VI, Chapter XXVII.

The great Theodosius--as Theodoret, Book V, Chapter XXVII; Augustine, *The City of God*, Book V; Sozomen, Book VII, Chapter XXIV; and the letters of Ambrose are authorities--avenged an injury inflicted by the Thessalonians with an unjust slaughter when he ordered certain persons to be killed indiscriminately. Ambrose barred him from entrance to the temple, and the emperor obeyed; falling at the pontiff’s knees, he offered himself for any satisfaction whatsoever. Thereafter, admitted to the society of Christians, without royal adornment and prostrate with his whole body upon the ground, he wept--a true and magnanimous imitator of David.

Nor was the submission of Otto less, who, because Crescentius had been killed by hanging contrary to the faith pledged him, at the command of Abbot Romuald exacted from himself the punishments for the violated covenant. For he traveled barefoot from Rome to Mount Garganus in Apulia, afflicted his body throughout Lent by the roughness of haircloth, and lay upon mats. Thus Peter Damian in the *Life of Romuald*.

Henry II, king of England, according to the testimony of Neubrigensis, received blows publicly with his shoulders bared. Notable is his declaration: “I do not flee Christian discipline. Decree what you please; I shall devoutly embrace and execute the decree.” He did no otherwise than he said: casting off his royal garment, he stood in the order of public penitents and submitted himself naked to ecclesiastical discipline.

I judged it worthwhile to relate these public examples; there are more private ones among all Christian magnates. For all both accuse themselves of their sins and not only hear the admonitions of their priests but also cheerfully undergo those punishments which the priests impose for the expiation of offenses. This one thing is the most effective remedy against the deceitful and sweet poisons of flatterers--a remedy which is always ready at hand from humility. Otherwise, just as the healthiest bodies most easily drink in the corruption of poison, so the pestilential breath of flattery most swiftly infects the spirits of kings.

Behold for yourself Justinian, more a founder of laws than a cultivator of justice, whom Tribonian, a despiser of every religion, filled with so great a vanity that he hoped he would be immortal, as Suidas reports.

§ 15. The mind of Canute was different; concerning him see Lipsius, *Monita Politica*, number VIII. There is a notable lesson in modesty from the king of the English. When he was besieged by flatterers--that is, courtly ravens--and they extolled his lot and said that all things served him and were turned at his nod and countenance (these are the words of the Annals), he suppressed the foul flattery thus. While they watched, he placed the royal seat on the seashore in the very approach and flow of the sea. Then he said: "You, sea, are under my dominion, and the land on which I sit is mine. I command you and declare that you must not rise upon my land or drench the limbs or garment of your lord with moisture." He had spoken; the sea maintained its course, came forward, washed over him, and then withdrew. "Behold," he said, "how I command all things! Let all who inhabit the earth know that the power of kings is vain and false, and that one alone is worthy of that name who truly possesses command over heaven, earth, and sea." Nor did this modesty remain within words. In every action he displayed himself such, and thereafter he did not admit the crown upon his head.

There remain very many examples of Christian humility. For many great princes, laying aside the diadem, returned not only to private life but even to one that was poor and despised by the world. Such, says Bozius in Book XI, Chapter IX of *On the Signs of the Church*, were Emperor Lothair, son of Louis the Pious, in the year 855; Hugh, king of Provence; Ratchis of the Lombards, in 750; Sigismund of Burgundy, in 413; Bamba of Spain; Vermundus of Castile; Ramirius of Aragon; Sigisbert of Northumbria; Sebbi of England; Eltheredus and Chemeredus of Mercia; Alfridus and Afridus of Northumbria; Offa and Iua of England; Ceolulfus and Egbertus of Northumbria; Henry IV of Denmark; Carolomannus

[Printed page 192]

of Alemannia; Trebellius of Bulgaria; and Casimir of Poland, who thereafter, at the command of the Roman pontiff and overcome by the entreaties of his subjects, received the governance of the kingdom again.

Here we omit innumerable princes who daily do this: casting aside the highest honors among mortals, they do not disdain, among humble communities of religious, to subject themselves to the obedience of otherwise obscure superiors, compelled by no terror of enemies nor cast down by stupor and inertia of mind. Among the Greeks this was done by the emperors Anastasius II, Theodosius III, Michael Rangabe, Michael IV, Isaac Comnenus, and Manuel Palaeologus; and among our own by the kings Svatopluk of Moravia and Solomon of Hungary. How great a spirit did they show in resigning their principate, and how far did they differ from the boastful and most frivolous dispositions of pagan kings, who, from eagerness for triumph and for the sake of fruitless leaves, brought the safety of their citizens into peril. Even now, many sons of kings, princes, nobles, and powerful men live in the most laborious and poorest religious orders and in the most abject offices, more humbly than they formerly lived among the pagans in power and honor.

§ 16. Many things can induce all men, and especially leading men, to moderation and submission of spirit. First, indeed, because they are human beings. Philip the Macedonian judged that sufficient for subduing pride. For every morning, before he undertook anything, he ordered a boy to announce: ἄνθρωπος εἶ--"You are a human being." Would that he had wished to persuade his son Alexander of this; after conquering the Persians, Alexander disowned his father and preferred to be called the son of Jupiter. But the human being is an animal both most wretched and most

proud. They rule human beings, but are human beings. When dead, they will be trampled by many. Before their judge, without a bodyguard, without a diadem, they will tremble.

Timoleon, the avenger and preserver of Sicily, when after the expulsion of the tyrants he was held in great honor and even love, adorned such distinguished achievements with modesty and protected them. Probus writes in his life: “Nothing insolent or vainglorious ever issued from his mouth. Indeed, when he heard his praises publicly proclaimed, he never said anything other than that in this matter he especially gave and rendered thanks to the gods: that when they had determined to restore Sicily, they had wished him above all to be the commander.”

§ 17. Next, he ought to beware excessive and ceremonious honors. Those things belong to barbarous and proud nations, concerning whom Tacitus writes in Book XIV: “To one accustomed, of course, to foreign pride there was no knowledge of us, among whom the right of command has force while empty things are passed over.” Both others and, most accurately, Nicolas Trigault describe the arrogance of Chinese magistrates and of the others who live by the examples of princes, and their many empty cares over salutations and duties; they pass almost all their time in empty things. Hence come many errors, enmities, contempts, and contentions, while in ceremonious civility they are more fastidious than is right and judge it an inexpiable offense to have erred in trifles. The Christian commonwealth labors not a little in these matters, while spirits are puffed up by splendid titles, retinues, and precedence in seating, and are easily driven to rivalry and hatreds.

Let it come into the mind of all how glassy and fragile felicity is. He who just now, as Priam, appeared fortunate in barbaric gold and fifty sons soon

Lies a vast trunk upon the shore.

§ 18. Nor are the fates of cities gentler. Human felicity is trusted badly: when it is at its best, it falls. That which befell the old man Democrates befalls them. When, out of breath, he climbed the citadel, he said that he breathed much but had little strength. Frequent, noisy, and laborious breathing is a sign of a departing life; nor should any commonwealth promise itself long duration in which impulses greater than the powers of nature shake the afflicted body.

§ 19. Finally, let those whose authority is greater undertake certain things which in appearance are abject and unworthy of magnates. That action has great force for bringing inferiors back to modesty. Nothing is more effective. The Lord and Savior taught that neither divinity nor humanity subsisting in a divine hypostasis is defiled by humble birth and offices. “So great,” says Augustine in Tractate LV on John, “is the usefulness of human humility that even divine sublimity commended it by its own example, because a proud human being would perish forever unless a humble God found him. For the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which had perished.”

Before the Lord, the prophet and king David, a type of the Lord, also made a profession of humility. 2 Kings 6:21: “‘As the Lord lives,’ he says, ‘I shall play before the Lord, who chose me rather than your father and rather than all his house, and commanded me that I should be leader over the Lord’s people in Israel. And I shall play, and I shall become more abject than I have become, and shall be humble in my own eyes; and with the maidservants of whom you have spoken, I shall appear more glorious.’ Therefore no son was born to Michal, the daughter of Saul, to the day of her death.”

“Behold,” says Gregory in Book XXVII of the *Moralia*, “he whom the Lord singularly preferred to all despises himself by submitting himself to the Lord, equating himself with the least, and displaying abject things. He does not call the power of the kingdom back to mind; he does not fear to become cheap in the eyes of his subjects by dancing; he does not recognize himself as preferred in honor to others before the ark of him who had given the honor. Before God he did cheap things, even the lowest, so that by humility he might make firm those brave things which he had done before human beings. I do not know what others think of his deeds; I marvel more at David dancing than fighting. For by fighting he subjected his enemies, but by dancing before the Lord he conquered himself.”

Nothing is more pleasing among the common people than honor shown to the wretched with modesty. Alfonso, king of Aragon and likewise of Sicily and Naples, at that time most powerful, saw a muleteer imploring aid, whose ass laden with flour was stuck in the mud. He dismounted from his horse and, exerting himself with all the strength of his body, pulled out the beast of burden. This deed was so pleasing to the peoples of Campania that many cities joined themselves to him and preferred to admit the government of a modest, civil, and humble prince rather than to claim a proud liberty. Nor is there in truth any danger that majesty will be depressed by true humility: love compensates for all things. Nothing is more pleasing to the common people than that their labors be valued by magnates. If a magnate is insulting toward anyone, he is loved by no one.

§ 20. The last point is that those who are in dignity should have modest, affable, and truly humble ministers. It is an intolerable servitude for brave and noble men when a prince must be approached through the disdain of flatterers; when a minister intercepts or detains the benefit which they have received from the prince; when another must be petitioned after the prince. But this matter must be discussed specifically. For out of one hundred ministers of princes who are greatly in favor, you will scarcely find ten whom either pride or avarice has not shaken out of the court, after they have first made the prince hated.

[Printed page 193]

CHAPTER XX

Magnanimity Ought to Be Commended to the Commonwealth, and Especially to Magistrates

§ 1. I have said that humility is the virtue of a great spirit, while pride belongs to a small and childish one. The magnanimous man holds nothing to be great unless it is truly great. Humility, by a true estimation, disdains all things that swell with a false and human greatness. Pride judges rashly concerning greatness and ardently desires the things which have appeared great. Thus children leap for joy at the splendor of a new garment, at anklets, and at a little feather; they esteem highly houses of clay, a reed horse, a little cart drawn by mice, and their rattles. The magnanimous man judges to be playthings whatever pride pursues with great zeal. We must therefore speak about this virtue and the things connected with it and accompanying it. For that consideration contributes very greatly to the safety of the commonwealth, and I do not know whether in any other kind vices so quickly deceive us beneath the appearance of virtue.

§ 2. Magnanimity is a virtue which is concerned with great things, a virtue of the spirit inclining it toward great and heroic works. Aristotle's definition in Book IV, Chapter III of the *Ethics* is customarily suspect to Christians:

δοκεῖ δὴ μεγαλόψυχος εἶναι ὁ μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξιῶν, ἄξιος ὢν.

“He appears to be magnanimous who considers himself worthy of great things and is worthy.” For he who falsely judges himself to deserve great things is foolish. But however the Philosopher understood it, his definition can nevertheless be understood so that he may not appear to force pride upon us under the name of magnanimity.

Certainly Saint Thomas, *Summa Theologiae* II-II, Question 129, Article 3, replies to the fourth objection: “It must be said that in a human being there is found something great which he possesses from the gift of God, and some defect which belongs to him from the weakness of nature. Magnanimity therefore causes a human being to judge himself worthy of great things according to consideration of the gifts which he possesses from God; thus, if he has great virtue of spirit, magnanimity causes him to tend toward perfect works of virtue. The same must be said concerning the use of any other good, for example knowledge or external fortune. Humility, however, causes a human being to reckon himself of little worth according to consideration of his own defect. Likewise, magnanimity also despises those who are high insofar as they fall short of the gifts of God. For it does not esteem those who are high so greatly that it does anything indecent for their sake. But humility honors others and esteems superiors insofar as it beholds something of God's goods in them. Hence it is said of the just man in Psalm 14: ‘The malignant man has been brought to nothing in his sight,’ which pertains to the contempt of the magnanimous man; ‘but he glorifies those who fear the Lord,’ which pertains to the honor of the humble man. And thus it is clear that magnanimity and humility are not contrary, although they appear to tend toward contraries, because they proceed according to different considerations.”

It is therefore easy for a Christian prince to join humility and magnanimity. For when contempt extends to an insult against God, it must be avenged. Elijah was contemptuously summoned to the tyrant in 4 Kings 1:9. “Man of God, the king has commanded that you come down,” said the captain of fifty, undoubtedly prepared to inflict force upon him if he refused. But Elijah, a magnanimous judge of his own dignity, in which the glory of the divine majesty was concerned, answered and said to the captain of fifty: “‘If I am a man of God, let fire come down from heaven and devour you and your fifty.’ Fire therefore came down from heaven and devoured him and the fifty who were with him.

“And again he sent to him another captain of fifty and his fifty. He spoke to him: ‘Man of God, thus says the king: ‘Make haste; come down.’” Elijah answered: ‘If I am a man of God, let fire come down from heaven and devour you and your fifty.’ Fire therefore came down from heaven and devoured him and his fifty. Again he sent a third captain of fifty and the fifty who were with him. When he had come, he bent his knees before Elijah, prayed to him, and said: ‘Man of God, do not despise my soul and the souls of your servants who are with me. Behold, fire came down from

heaven and devoured the first two captains of fifty and the fifties who were with them; but now I beseech you to have mercy upon my soul.’ But the angel of the Lord spoke to Elijah, saying: ‘Go down with him; do not fear.’ He therefore arose and went down with him to the king.”

Elijah judged himself worthy of honor, and divine justice approved his judgment. If Aristotle understood this, he spoke with truth itself; but if not, he was led away by the common error of the philosophers.

The force of magnanimity is therefore discerned in every virtue, yet it is distinguished from every virtue. Each virtue is perfect in its own kind. Justice is the constant will to render to each his own, and this in great and small things. It will despoil no one of a denarius or of a talent; it will restore a cottage and a kingdom with the same equity. Religion is the guardian and exhorter of heroic poverty, obedience, and chastity. But these and the other virtues have a special moral worth and beauty from their own objects and circumstances, toward which they constantly impel the spirits in which they have settled.

It is the office of magnanimity to be occupied within the kind of all the virtues and to regard the formal objects of them all, yet in such a way that it makes them material for itself, as they are accustomed to say. Heroic was the chastity of that young man who, bound softly upon a bed of roses, bit off his tongue, spat it into the face of the wanton harlot, and drove her away by a miracle of chastity. But heroic chastity was moved by the beauty of temperance as by the formal character of its object. Magnanimity, however, was also an impelling cause toward so noble a deed, because it regarded it as great and arduous, and because it judged this fitting for a Christian spirit, a spirit nurtured by heavenly grace and a candidate for martyrdom. The formal object of magnanimity, therefore, is the greatness of the works itself. Aristotle rightly says:

μεγαλοψυχία οὖν κόσμος τις εἶναι τῶν ἀρετῶν.

“Magnanimity therefore appears to be a certain ornament of the virtues.” Consequently, no one can be magnanimous without the other virtues.

§ 3. Magnanimity moderates the appetite for honor. First, it prevents men from doing the greatest works, most worthy of honor, out of regard for human glory, and from ceasing to cultivate virtue if there is no hope of honor. For the magnanimous man will save a human being even in darkness and will not desire that deeds worthy of praise be put into the public records, but will desire virtue itself to be his reward. The magnanimous man will not be moved even by disgrace. “There is no surer proof of greatness than that nothing can occur by which you may be provoked.” Seneca, *On Anger*, Chapter VI.

Yet for the sake of a great honor he will undertake the greatest works--for the honor of which it was said:

Your friends are exceedingly honored;

[Printed page 194]

Their principality is exceedingly exalted.

The magnanimous man values divine honors highly: not with the sacrilegious ambition with which the pagans raved, and in our age the kings of Japan, but those which God alone has determined to confer, with an immense weight of glory, upon those by whom he is loved. But if it is pleasing to recognize and approve a magnanimous commonwealth, prince, or senate, you will consult Aristotle in Book IV, Chapters VII and VIII of the *Ethics*.

First: **μεγάλων ἑαυτὸν ἄξιοι, ἄξιος ὢν.** He considers himself worthy of great things, being plainly worthy; for he who is worthy of middling things measures himself by his own foot and is modest, not magnanimous. This has been said truly concerning honor. If you consider the thing itself, all ought to emulate the most excellent greatness and degree of virtue. Next, if all are willing to consider the state and condition by which they are Christians, they can judge themselves worthy of honor, because right deeds and successes--**κατορθώματα**--are gifts of God, not of human

strength. Therefore humility, which despises one's own vileness, and magnanimity, the candid and grateful recollector of divine benefits, do not conflict.

Second: he rejoices moderately and according to right reason in great honors offered with reason by good men. He despises small honors and those bestowed by the common people. He will not rejoice in honor or praise because it is a vain and fragile thing; and just as a vine is not rendered more fruitful by praise, neither is the spirit of the man praised. For he labored for virtue, not for glory; accordingly, he does not desire his deeds to be published. Nevertheless, he rejoices because it is useful to the public that the deeds of the virtues be celebrated: it calls many weak men back from vices, stimulates the imperfect toward virtue, and indeed gives many a source from which to seek examples. The Apostle Paul rejoiced in the desire, weeping, and emulation of the Corinthians, 2 Corinthians 7:7, and in Chapters XI and XII he deservedly and rightfully boasts. He neglects the honors of the common people because they are not given by judgment and customarily are poured more profusely upon the vicious. He knows that those who praise are the worst kind of enemies. He knows that flatteries are more artfully contrived amid great hatreds and contempt. Cato, rejected from the praetorship, played ball in public on the same day. Others, when they heard themselves praised by the people, feared that they had perhaps unwittingly admitted something evil.

Third: οὔτε εὐτυχῶν περιχαρὴς ἔστιν, οὔτε ἀτυχῶν περίλυπος. He is neither raised up by felicity nor excessively saddened by adversities. Because he is not driven by a light impulse, a great tree is not overturned even by a whirlwind; a reed trembles at every breath. This is that

Virtue ignorant of a sordid refusal,

Which shines with honors unstained,

And neither takes up nor lays down the axes

At the judgment of the people's breath.

He is greater than calamity and greater even than prosperous circumstances. The Romans presented some appearance of magnanimity; for, defeated in the battle of Cannae, when Hannibal approached the city, they could not endure any mention of peace. And certainly in a conquered people it was a great proof of virtue that they publicly thanked the consul by whose rashness the disaster had occurred because he had not despaired of the commonwealth. Urban VI was remarkably magnanimous. When seditious Romans broke into his palace with arms, he put on the vestments of his dignity and presented himself with great authority to the sight of the enemy; by asking, "Whom do you seek?" he not only dispelled the danger but brought the rioters back to concord and obedience.

Fourth: οὐκ ἔστι μικροκίνδυνος. He does not deign to enter danger for small things. He will not seek riches across the sea, will not be hired into the battle-line for pay, nor give his soul for sale for a little money. Those whom a small thing calls into dangers have small spirits. As easily as children weep from slight sadness, so easily do they fight amid slight danger. That μικροκινδύνευσις, risking danger for trifles, removed a great part of the nobility of Europe, especially of France, while beneath the appearance of high birth it incites the frenzies of challenges and duels.

Fifth: neither is he φιλοκίνδυνος, a lover of danger. He does not love danger. Those whom martial trumpets, horns, and shouting carry off into death imitate the magnanimous man, as do those who without reason expose themselves to dangers. This was formerly censured in many who, from desire for martyrdom, offered themselves to the torments and savagery of the pagans. It belongs to brave men to despise death more than to hate life. He who goes to meet danger and does not first consider what sort it is is more like a beast than a human being. He is courageous who, after the cause and difficulty have been considered, encounters dangers either for a just and honorable reason or certainly from necessity. Such ought both princes and citizens to be. For those who are borne into dangers by impulse and rashness alone, unless they conquer in the first heat and charge, grow faint with delay and are turned into headlong flight. But those who undertake the matter with deliberation are brave precisely because they experience nothing unexpected in the work itself, nor do they repent of their counsels.

Sixth: **μεγαλοκίνδυνος δὲ, καὶ ὅταν κινδυνεύῃ, ἀφειδῆς τῷ βίῳ, οὐκ ἄξιον ὄν πάντως ζῆν.** “He offers himself to great dangers and in the midst of danger is prodigal of life, as though it were not worthy to live in every manner.” I prefer to render it thus rather than with the interpreter: “As though it were altogether unworthy for him to live.” For the magnanimous man does not judge himself unworthy of life, but judges it unworthy to live in every manner. David avoids a fraternal contest in the camp but advances undaunted against Goliath.

Here the fortitude and great spirit of all the martyrs is described. It shines forth even in this: not only did they endure those things, which belongs properly to fortitude, but they did not even pour forth prayers, did not pray for postponement of punishment or acceleration of death, and held groans and cries within their power. For they thought that the nobility of martyrs ought not merely to be brave and tolerant of pain, but also magnanimous, free amid torments, and taunting tyrants. Hence those sayings, “Turn me and eat,” and innumerable others, by which **σεμνοπρέπεια**, the majesty of magnanimity, was expressed.

Traces of that virtue are discerned also among the nations. Anaxarchus cried that they should pound the sack of Anaxarchus in a mortar, by this saying more illustrious than by his whole life. Pompey, when he was being killed, covered his head lest he contaminate his triumphs by an indecorous groan or cry. Amid so many wounds Caesar took care **εὐσχημόνως πεσεῖν**, to fall becomingly. Aristotle therefore said most beautifully that magnanimity is the ornament of all the virtues, for it most powerfully adorns even the supreme act of fortitude itself. Common sense teaches us how great this is. We are moved by the last

[Printed page 195]

words of the dying more than by the recollection of death itself; for if they are courageous, we grieve at the so unworthy ends of such men.

Seventh: he is accustomed to confer a benefit and blushes to receive one, because the latter belongs to an inferior, the former to a superior, while a great spirit refuses to be under obligation.

Eighth: hence he also forgets benefits, not because he is ungrateful, but because he compensates for them with greater ones. And he ought not remember a benefit he has given.

Ninth: he does not readily ask others for anything, both because it diminishes liberty and because, since he esteems human affairs little, he needs few things. Diogenes, when the option of asking was given and freely pressed upon him, asked Alexander not to stand in the way of his sunning himself: with a proud contempt for the king, not a magnanimous one. For the Cynic himself could have moved out of the king’s shadow if he loved the sun’s rays so immoderately. And so I hold the contrary opinion: a magnanimous man will ask for great things, and he will not count it among evils to be bound to another by the bond of gratitude. If, however, he judges the diminution of liberty an evil, let him reckon it among evils to be despised.

It was no less glorious for Dio Chrysostom and the hermits to intercede for the Antiochenes than for Theodosius to mitigate the punishments. With great spirit Saint Gregory placed himself before Attila raging against Italy and did not fear that he might owe a benefit to a most cruel tyrant; rather, he wished provision to be made for the safety of so many peoples. He will therefore seek great things when reason seeks them; he will by no means seek small things to another’s contempt, as Diogenes did like a buffoon.

Tenth: **πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ εὐτυχίᾳ μέγαν εἶναι.** He conducts himself greatly among those who are in dignity or whose circumstances are very prosperous, but moderately among those of middling station. Aristotle gives the reason: because it is difficult to rise above the powerful and **σεμνόν**, magnificent, but easy to surpass those of middling station. Therefore to conduct oneself magnificently and boast among the former is not ignoble; among inferiors it is troublesome and hateful.

That rule, not rightly perceived, brought death to Antisthenes, Aristotle’s high-born disciple, as his teacher had foretold him. Nothing is more dangerous than **σεμνύνεσθαι**, conducting oneself splendidly, among magistrates and

nobles in a city. For it arouses enmities and envy, and among princes contempt and frequently hatred. As it belongs to a prudent man to avoid these things, so it belongs to a magnanimous man to despise external splendor. Let him maintain this alone: that he not consent to the vices of the powerful, not flatter, and not lose liberty in stating his opinion. I shall say more about boasting, that false imitator of magnanimity, when I have instructed courtiers and counselors.

Eleventh: this especially belongs to a great spirit, as the same Aristotle admonishes: *ὕπηρετεῖν προθύμως*--to serve others with a ready spirit. Charity does this toward a brother, humility toward a lord, magnanimity because it is arduous and difficult, but honorable, to be for the advantage of all. For a courageous man is a public good. Francis Xavier thought in a dream that he carried an Ethiopian upon his shoulders, and afterward he did no otherwise, embracing all India, Japan, and China in his spirit. His bed in the hospital was beside the man who was sick most dangerously.

Twelfth: he is slow to act unless a great matter requires speed. For he makes little of small things, does not leap at losses, and does not hurry counsels, but rules and orders. The highest things are not agitated by winds; the stars always hold the same course and do not tremble when it thunders. The majesty of a well-constituted commonwealth hears of dangers without commotion--indeed sees and undertakes them.

Thirteenth: the remaining traits are more guarded: to be *φανερόφιλον* and *φανερόμισον*, to have love and hatred in the open; not to live according to another's judgment; to conceal one's affairs from the people; not to marvel; to forget injuries; not to speak eagerly about human beings; not to dwell upon praises; not to be querulous; to prefer to possess honorable rather than profitable things. These things are in a great spirit and joined with heroic fortitude.

Magnanimity and fortitude are nevertheless not the same. Fortitude moderates fear and boldness by reason and steels one against death and torments. Magnanimity readily undertakes in every virtue whatever is proposed as great, noble, lofty, and difficult.

Confidence, or trust, is the companion of magnanimity; supported by firm hope, it provides a ready spirit in great affairs short of the danger of death. It is not broken by any difficulties. It surmounts thirst, hunger, labors, and the angers of the powerful made harsh against splendid undertakings. Patience fights against sadnesses arising from difficulties. Security excludes fears. Constancy, perseverance, and longanimity, when hope is deferred and the difficulties of labors, exiles, and prisons endure, maintain the purpose. No less do they strengthen the spirit against miseries, blandishments, and the prayers of relatives, children, and spouses, so that it may not be drawn down from its greatness by any force.

§ 4. The foremost enemy of magnanimity is *μικροψυχία*, pusillanimity: when someone imagines that the things which right reason counsels ought to be undertaken or done are too great, and his own powers unequal to so great a mass; when he flees as though from some great thing the honor of which he is worthy and which he ought to undertake. It is a grave vice and the ape of humility, from which it departs very far. For humility esteems honor and glory lightly; pusillanimity judges most badly in two matters: it both distrusts its own faculties and gifts and does not place hope in God, and it esteems those things which are not great far too greatly. When this occurs in a grave matter which imposes an obligation, the crime is manifest.

Holy men fled honors; very many bishops were created against their will--to such a degree that someone said: "Certainly he is unworthy of the priesthood unless he has been ordained unwilling; necessity alone excuses him and votes in his favor." But one thing is flight from honors through contempt for them, which humility effects; another is when they are esteemed excessively lofty, which pusillanimity effects. We see that those same men who, unwilling, were drawn to episcopates by the holy violence of the Church most fiercely defended in those episcopates their right and dignity even at the peril of life, as Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others did.

But pusillanimity belongs to few. Presumption, ambition, and the appetite for vain glory oppose magnanimity just as they oppose humility. They have overturned very many commonwealths and, unless I am mistaken, will overturn very many in the future.

I call that presumption by which a proud man, through harmful ignorance of his own faculties, undertakes works greater than his powers. They seek lofty things, they seek things that will harm them, and with Phaethon they fall from great

[Printed page 196]

attempts. Trajan, after he had carried his arms through the East almost to India and had undertaken an ambitious voyage, striving to equal Hercules and Liber, again lost provinces acquired by many labors and much blood. God is accustomed to cast down that arrogance by an unexpected destruction. Isaiah 16:6: “We have heard the pride of Moab; he is exceedingly proud. His pride, his arrogance, and his indignation are greater than his strength. Therefore Moab shall wail to Moab; all of it shall wail.”

Ambition arises from pride, yet it is vainer than the very elation from which it is born. For pride fervently desires excellence itself contrary to the prescription of right reason. Ambition, a most wretched thing, burns with desire for honors; but honors are testimonies of excellence. All history teaches how many seek honors greater than their due, or seek them on account of false goods or evils, or seek them with crime; and the world overthrown in turn teaches it. This matter was treated in the chapter on humility.

Vain glory arises from the same root and does not differ greatly from ambition. We are treating the appetite for excellence, not the opinion of excellence itself and the praise in which fame also consists, but **κενοδοξία**, or the implanted desire of the soul by which glory is sought. He who is **κενόδοξος**, vainglorious, is also ambitious. For he who has placed felicity in the proclamation of another’s voice and desires himself to be esteemed from that, not from conscience, also judges it right that he be honored by the bestowal of magistracies, the conferral of dignities, genuflection, and ceremonies. How much evil vanity has introduced I have already shown above. For first it assails others and then its own authors.

Ἀλαζονείας οὐτις ἐξέφυγε δίκας.

No one escapes the punishments of boasting.

It is no less a disgrace for virtue to serve glory than to serve pleasure. Next, this very thing belongs to a small spirit: to seek glory, that is, the most uncertain and fragile thing of all. It is a delicate thing. Most people report what they do not know; they nevertheless cause the lover of glory, while he himself knows that they err, to believe those who do not know--or to rejoice as though he believed them.

CHAPTER XXI

Charity, the Queen of All the Virtues, Ought to Be Esteemed Most Highly in the Commonwealth

§ 1. I have now led forth the chorus of the virtues; the whole company descends into the orchestra of the commonwealth, to be imbibed by minds, not by eyes. If those precepts of the virtues seem to you either long or too numerous, love the commonwealth, love the citizens: you have now fulfilled them all. There is no surer art of ruling than to love one's subjects. If, therefore, there is no leisure to unfold all the pages of Scripture, hold fast to charity, and in it you will find all knowledge. Augustine, Sermon 39 *On Time*: "For the fullness of the law is charity." It is the supreme mystery of faith and the treasure of the Christian faith. It is the highest worship of God; it contains all things; it is the principal good of man and the token of the Christian, the foundation of peace, the bond of unity, without which not even the virtues themselves are pleasing; more excellent than all the gifts of God, at once the pillar and summit of holiness, the death of crimes, the life of virtues. If it is present, no great art is needed. Whoever has loved the commonwealth and its citizens as sacred things is sufficiently versed in politics. Charity is ingenious in devising benefits; by its own nature it is suited to governing men.

At first nations lived without laws and without a judge; they entrusted themselves to the charity of one man, not to his power. There were not so many precautions of ruling; rather, children were as though in the power of parents: under the leadership of charity men commanded and obeyed. From this, flattery devised a form of address of the highest honor, so that it might call princes fathers of the fatherland. For they judged a name of love greater than a name of majesty.

Society cannot remain safe except by love and the preservation of its parts. Seneca, Book 2 *On Anger*, chapter 31: if the members disagree, if the neighboring member snatches away the nourishment of another and, after the other has been crushed, grows beyond due measure, a monster is born from a beautiful body. The safety of his fellow citizens ought to be as dear to each man as his own. Wherever a battle line is discordant, it is open to the enemy. A commonwealth is very like a triumphal arch suspended in a lofty vaulting: that mass cannot be bound together by iron or mortar; its parts sustain one another by mutual agreement. Stone holds stone; the prince rises above them like the crown of the vault and is supported by them all; unless all are joined to him, they fall. Love, therefore, and love alone, holds together and strengthens a polity. Gifts cannot do this; blandishments cannot do it. If you have enticed any men by gifts, when hope has ceased, love will be dissolved; if someone's greed has wrung out harsh words, the fruit of blandishments will end in anger. Let mutual love remain as the cement of a great building, and let that which the pagan said remain: "May God love you just as you love us." Pliny, in the *Panegyric*. Let the prince certainly persuade himself that all his subjects are making this prayer. Let him live and reign in such a way that, with a tranquil and secure mind, he can utter that prayer in the sight of God. Girt with weapons and an executioner, he can terrify; he cannot compel men to love.

§ 2. The effect of charity is to fear for one's subjects, not to fear one's subjects; and happy is the commonwealth in which, without ceremony and with the mind as witness, the citizens pray for life for their magistrate--not because they fear a worse one, but because they desire no better one. This truly follows upon charity, because it commands all the virtues, disposes the services of all, indeed animates the virtues themselves. It is the expeller of all vices and the reconciler of the virtues. "Charity is patient," 1 Corinthians 13:4; "it is kind. Charity does not envy, does not act perversely, is not puffed up, is not ambitious, does not seek the things that are its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil, does not rejoice over iniquity, but rejoices together with the truth; it bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things."

Behold: what is scattered among many virtues, charity alone has gathered into a narrow compass, embracing within itself the worth of them all and the majesty of the virtues. Saint Gregory explained these things in Book 10 of the

Moralia, chapter 6: “Love of one’s neighbor is derived from two precepts, since it is said both through a certain righteous man: ‘See that you do not do to another what you hate to have done to you by another’; and Truth says through himself: ‘The things that you wish men to do to you, do you also to them.’ By these two commandments, namely, of each Testament, malice is restrained by one and kindness is bestowed by the other, so that each man, by not doing the evil that he does not wish to suffer, may cease from the work of harming; and again, by bestowing the good which he desires to have done to himself, may exercise himself out of kindness for the benefit of his neighbor. But assuredly, while these two are considered with solicitous attention, the heart is stretched toward innumerable services of the virtues, lest either the restless mind burn with desires to inflict the things which it ought not, or, relaxed by idleness, become sluggish in rendering the things which it ought.

[Printed page 197]

“For when it guards against doing to another what it is in no way willing itself to endure from another, it looks around itself with solicitous attention: lest pride raise it up and exalt the mind by casting it down even to contempt of its neighbor; lest ambition tear thought apart and, while expanding it toward seeking the possessions of others, constrict it; lest lust pollute the heart and corrupt it, subjected to desires, through unlawful things; lest anger exasperate it and inflame it even to the utterance of insult; lest envy gnaw it and, emulous of the good fortunes of others, consume it with its own flame. Again, when it considers that it should do to another those things which it expects to be done to itself by another, it assuredly weighs how good things may answer evil things, and better things answer good things; how it may show the meekness of long-suffering toward the insolent; how it may bestow the grace of kindness upon those languishing under the plague of malice; how it may unite the discordant by peace and gird the concordant for the desire of true peace; how it may distribute necessities to the needy; how it may show the way of rectitude to those who err; how it may soothe the afflicted by word and compassion; how it may restrain by rebuke those inflamed with desires for this world; how it may mitigate the threats of the powerful by reasoned argument; how, by whatever aid it has strength to supply, it may lighten the distresses of the oppressed; how it may oppose patience to those who resist without; how it may show discipline together with patience to those who grow proud within; how, toward the faults of subjects, meekness may so temper zeal that it does not enervate it from the pursuit of justice; how zeal may so burn for punishment that, nevertheless, in burning it does not cross the boundary of piety; how it may provoke the ungrateful to love by benefits; how it may preserve all who are grateful in love by services; how, when it cannot correct the evils of neighbors, it may be silent; how, concerning those things which can be corrected by speaking, it may fear that silence is consent; how it may so endure the things about which it is silent that it nevertheless does not conceal the poison of grief in the mind; how it may so extend hands of kindness to the malevolent that it nevertheless does not depart from the law of rectitude through favor; how it may bestow upon its neighbors all that it has strength to bestow, but, in bestowing these things, not be puffed up; how it may so fear the precipice of swelling pride in the good things which it shows that it nevertheless does not become sluggish in the exercise of good; how it may so distribute what it possesses that it attends to how great the liberality of the one who rewards is, lest, when it gives earthly things, it fear its own poverty more than is necessary and, in the offering of a gift, sadness obscure the light of cheerfulness.”

§ 3. Charity does not merely govern the actions of the other virtues; it especially sharpens and strengthens fortitude. Charity for fatherland and citizens brought it about that Gideon, with three hundred men, attacked innumerable forces of enemies, preferable to Leonidas not only in faith and piety but also in the good fortune of victory. Judges 7. Thus Samson alone fought against the Philistines, Judges 15. Thus Jonathan, with his armor-bearer alone, routed the camp of the enemy. David struck down Goliath. “For who is he,” he says, “who is this uncircumcised Philistine, who has dared to curse the army of the living God?”

Why should I recount Mattathias and Judas and his brothers? 1 Maccabees 2. “Woe is me,” says Mattathias, “that I was born to see the destruction of my people. To what purpose, then, do we still live?” And he rent his garments, and so forth. Indeed, this was the opinion of all nations: that one ought to die for the fatherland. Nor are distinguished

memorials of the Horatii, the Mucii, the Decii, and the Torquati lacking, although they are not without the errors of those times, which God despised.

The Spartans had cast the envoys of the Persians into wells, contrary to the law of nations, so that they might receive at the same time the earth and water which they demanded as the two signs of acknowledgment of royal servitude. When a pestilence afterward arose, the soothsayers reported that Talthybius, Agamemnon's herald, who was worshiped as a god at Sparta, had been offended, and that the shades of the Persians had to be appeased by the blood of citizens. They therefore proclaimed that, if anyone wished to die for the fatherland, he should report this to the ephors. Sperthias and Bulis at once presented themselves; having gone to Xerxes, they offered themselves as victims for the fatherland. But he, with great spirit, granted both pardon to the city and life to them, and even tried to retain them with him by immense promises. They answered him: "What thing, O king, do you judge to be of such value among us that it does not separate us from our fatherland, since, led by charity for it, we undertook so long a journey in order to die? And so may it be permitted to us through you to enjoy its sweetness, for which we have determined to expend our life." Great was their love of fatherland, firm not by impulse but by judgment, although an erring judgment; induced by it, they traversed a journey so great as others would scarcely undertake for the sake of life.

More bravely, Attilius returned for reverence for his oath; for charity toward his fatherland he took severe counsel against his own life. The mother of Cleomenes, the Spartan king, also acted with a manly spirit--if only perjury had been absent. When she saw that she, as a hostage, was obstructing a salutary peace, she informed her son that he should not omit an honorable thing beneficial to the fatherland on account of the body of an old woman. Nor did that mother love the fatherland less who killed her cowardly son: antiquity judged her *ἄστοργίαν*, her want of natural affection, worthy not merely of no punishment but even of praise, and commemorated the deed in verse:

Τὸν παραβάντα νόμους Δαμάτριον ἔκτανε μήτηρ,

Ἄ Λακεδαιμονία, οὐ Λακεδαιμόνιον.

His mother killed Demetrius for transgressing the laws--a Spartan woman, not a Spartan man.

Another struck down with a roof-tile a son who was returning and reporting the fate of his fellow soldiers. Eristhenes, after he had fought badly, was killed by starvation by his mother. Ovid, in the *Ibis*:

And, bound at the threshold of a dwelling, may you suffer hunger,

as he to whom his own parent gave the law of punishment.

Those things were barbarous; yet they loved their barbarous fatherland so much that they judged it right for it to be preserved by acts of parricide. Nevertheless, they judged this rightly:

Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐπαναγκαιότερον πατρίδος.

Nothing is more closely bound than the fatherland. Cicero, Book 1 of *On Duties*: the fatherland is the common parent of all, the most ancient and most sacred, which alone has embraced all the affections of all men. And in Book 1 of *On Ends*: the fatherland is dearer to us than we ourselves. It seemed to Plato, in Book 15 of *On Laws*, that the fatherland is mistress and goddess and must be consoled more than one's mother herself. And in the *Crito*: "Are you so wise," he says, "that you do not know that far greater honor must be paid to the fatherland than to parents, and that reverence for it ought to be more sacred, both among the heavenly ones and among mortals who are participants in any understanding at all; and that it must be obeyed and complied with, though harsh and morose, and whatever it commands must be done promptly and quietly, even if it commands that we be beaten, that we be bound with chains, that we be involved in war, and that we suffer wounds and death itself? Resistance must in no way be made, nor must the ranks be deserted: thus justice requires."

For this reason Codrus, Lucius Tubero, and innumerable others cast away their lives. Others restored the fatherland with great spirit. When, at the battle of Cannae, the Roman state had been brought to the utmost extremity and noble

young men, under the leadership of Metellus, were deliberating about deserting Italy, Scipio, by fear of death, compelled them to swear according to his words that they would never desert the fatherland. Deservedly, indeed: for charity casts fear outside,

[Printed page 198]

as Saint Ambrose says on Psalm 118: “In general, indeed, charity excludes fear: thus the soldier who loves the emperor does not fear wars undertaken for the emperor; thus the servant who loves his lord, although he is sent through uncertain and precipitous places, nevertheless despises all dangers through love of his lord, and, if anyone attacks his lord, he does not hesitate to offer himself; thus he who desires to see his children situated across the sea does not fear shipwrecks, enters the waves of the sea through charity for his children, and undergoes the uncertainties of a voyage, but his desires for his children lighten the fear of danger. How beautifully this is also said concerning the martyrs, who truly serve as soldiers for Christ, who, not fearing persecutions, claws, swords, and fires, offered themselves to hostile kings.”

Nor does that city fear an enemy--and, what very rarely is possible, not even a citizen--where charity guides the reins and makes the enactments of the laws salutary by equity and clemency. One bears the burdens of another and is not weighed down by the burdens.

Charity must also be shown to enemies, and especially in the same commonwealth, in which no one is an enemy to another except through private rivalry.

The love of citizens for one another and toward the prince is preserved best by equality of laws, by a sharing of calamities when they must be undergone, by fellowship in honors, by modesty, and by gentle manners. Finally--and this is the chief point--if the prince wishes to be loved, let him love, and let him so love that the commonwealth feels that it is loved. For charity is reciprocal and returns the exchange to one who loves. Moschus says well:

Στέργετε τοὺς φιλεῦντας, ἵν' ἡν φιλεῖτε, φιληθῇτε.

Love those who love you, so that, when you love, you may be loved.

If the people feel that they are loved by the prince, the senate, and the nobility, there is nothing so arduous that they will not do it for their sake; if the prince understands the fatherland's love toward him, he will strive with every force of his resources to benefit those who love him. And above all, he will not place trust in flatterers, informers, and swindlers, the bloodsuckers of the people. Rather, he will treat them as a father treats his children, and they in turn will obey him as children obey a parent, and they will not listen to seditious tribunes. For a father does not readily offer an ear to calumnies against his children, nor can accusers of a parent be heard by children without crime. Hence also the minds of subjects are joined more closely to one another, as though under one father. Their dissensions in the city are what wounds and convulsions are in the body; unless these are healed, they not only deform all beauty but also take away health and life.

§ 4. Nor will it be difficult for a Christian prince to love his subjects if he considers that they are loved by God, redeemed by the price of most sacred blood, and destined to be endowed with the heavenly city. If he also considers this: whatever benefit he has given to one of the least, Christ regards as received by himself; it is entered into the heavenly accounts. How many thousands can a prince benefit, and in each one merit favor from God? Charity has been commanded to all, but princes have immense material for it: great resources, supreme authority, and myriads who need their aid and protection.

§ 5. Charity for the fatherland must indeed be commended to all; but frequently private advantages are sought under that color and pretext. The *Constancy* of Lipsius exposes that disguise of many men--or the theatrical performance of a great part of them--in Book 1, chapters 8, 9, and 10. Nevertheless, the safety of the fatherland, that is, that condition of the commonwealth, ought to be the concern of every single person, and it is sweet to die for the fatherland. In one

body the several members care for the whole, for the safety of each is derived from the whole. Exiles teach how great that obligation truly is. Euripides, in the *Phoenician Women*:

Τί τὸ στέρεσθαι πατρίδος; Ἥ κακὸν μέγα;

Μέγιστον· ἔργῳ δ' ἐστὶ μείζον ἢ λόγῳ.

“Is it a great evil to be deprived of one’s fatherland?” “It is the greatest; in fact it is greater than in speech.”

Yet almost more men pass their lives outside their fatherland than within it; many things draw many men away from their fatherland either perpetually or at fixed intervals of time. Nevertheless, affection toward the fatherland remains, and certainly ought to remain, even in those far away. These are the words of Sinon, that is, of the little fox:

I am bound by no laws of the fatherland.

But he truly loves the fatherland who labors without advantage to himself, when in the common calamity his own threshold is not touched; who judges every region of the world to be a fatherland to the brave man, but judges that to be the fatherland to which we are all called, that is, heaven. Every land is exile; nevertheless, the laws of exile must be observed, so that the return to the fatherland may be easier. But enough of these things. The prince must be admonished of this again and again: that he should not wish his fatherland to grow with injury to others. That is not charity, but madness. It enjoys a moderate good more quietly; many deaths are expended upon great empires. Let this rather be done: that the inhabitants of every city may migrate to the true fatherland. If it alone surpasses the affection of a parent, let love be expended in seeking the highest good and felicity.

I end this chapter with Augustine’s letter to Bishop Nectarius, who was seeking intercession for his fatherland, that is, the colony of Calama, in which idolaters had killed some Christians and despoiled many. He answers thus in Letter 202: “That, with your limbs now growing cold in old age, your spirit glows with charity for your fatherland, I not only do not wonder at but praise; and I receive not unwillingly--indeed, even gladly--the fact that you not only retain in memory but also demonstrate by life and conduct that, for good men, there is no measure or end to consulting the welfare of their fatherland. Hence we would wish to have you yourself as such a citizen also of a certain fatherland above, in whose sacred love, according to our measure, we undergo danger and labor among those whom we counsel to obtain it: so that you would judge that there is no measure or end to consulting the welfare of that little portion of it which sojourns on this earth; becoming so much the better as you would first render the duties owed to a better commonwealth; destined to find no end to rejoicing in its eternal peace, since you would set for yourself no end to consulting its welfare amid its labors for a time.”

And a little afterward: “However near your age is to its end, you desire to leave your fatherland safe and flourishing. Let all those vain and insane things now be taken away; let men be converted to the true worship of God and to chaste and pious conduct. Then you will see your fatherland flourishing, not in the opinion of fools but in the truth of the wise, when this fatherland of your carnal generation shall have become a portion of that fatherland for which we are born not in body but in faith, where all the saints and faithful of God, after the wintry labors, as it were, of this life, shall flourish in unending eternity. It is therefore our concern neither to lose Christian gentleness nor to leave in that city an example of imitation pernicious to others. How we may do this, God will be present to aid, if he is not so gravely indignant with them. Otherwise, both the gentleness which we desire to preserve and the discipline which we strive to employ with moderation can be hindered, if something else pleases God in his hidden counsel--whether, in judging, he wills so great an evil to be punished with a severer scourge; or, being even more vehemently angry, he wills it to be unpunished for a time, if they are not corrected and converted to him.”

Therefore, just as provision is made for children and grandchildren so that the license by which they may perish is denied them, so also provision must be made for the fatherland, that it may flourish by virtue, piety, and justice; that it may not oppress other fatherlands by an unjust war or by fraud and separate itself from the true fatherland. For safety is imperiled as much by doing injury as by receiving it.