

DISCOURSE BOUNDARY CREATION

Edited by

Peter Carravetta

BORDIGHERA PRESS

DISCOURSE BOUNDARY CREATION
(LOGOS NOMOS POIESIS)

A *Festschrift* in Honor of Paolo Valesio on his 70th birthday
Held at Stony Brook University, April 23, 2010

Edited by
Peter Carravetta

BORDIGHERA PRESS

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013956388

Sponsored by
The Alfonse M. D'Amato Chair in Italian and Italian American Studies at
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794 USA

© 2013 by Peter Carravetta & authors

All rights reserved. Parts of this book may be reprinted only by written permission from the respective authors, and may not be reproduced for publication in book, magazine, or electronic media of any kind, except for purposes of literary reviews by critics.

Printed in the United States.

Published by
BORDIGHERA PRESS
John D. Calandra Italian American Institute
25 West 43rd Street, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10036

SAGGISTICA 10
ISBN 978-1-59954-036-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

ix Peter Carravetta

ESSAYS

- 1 Teodolinda Barolini, *Toward a Dantean Theology of Eros: From Dante's Lyrics to the Paradiso*
- 19 Peter Carravetta, *History, Empire, and Political Reason: Campanella and the Dawn of Modern Europe*
- 55 Alessandro Carrera, *The Logic of Poetic Genealogy: On Paolo Valesio's "The Dark Flame"*
- 76 Andrea Ciccarelli, *Abroad and Beyond: Paolo Valesio and the Empty Nest*
- 91 Ernesto Livorni, *Poetry, Dialogue, Silence*
- 116 Mario Moroni, *The Continuous Meditation / The Meditation Continues*
- 119 Alessandro Polcri, *L'imprendibile (note per un ritratto di Paolo Valesio)*
- 131 Lucia Re, *"Più che l'amore:" d'Annunzio's Bitter Passion and Mediterranean Tragedy*
- 148 Laura Wittman, *Undefended Communication*

TESTIMONIALS

- 169 Gian Maria Annovi
- 175 Patrizio Ceccagnoli
- 178 Luigi Fontanella
- 183 Erin Larkin
- 185 Michael Palma
- 187 Graziella Sidoli
- 195 Contributors
- 200 Conference Program
- 204 Index of Names

HISTORY, EMPIRE, AND POLITICAL REASON
CAMPANELLA AND THE DAWN OF MODERN EUROPE¹

Peter Carravetta
Stony Brook University

Cosa il mondo non ha che non si muti,
Né che del suo mutarsi non si doglia...

[There is nothing in the world that does not change,
And of this change the world feels the pain...]

T. Campanella, *Poesie filosofiche* (73.8)

La filosofia contempla la ragione, onde viene la scienza del
vero; la filologia osserva l'autorità dell' umano arbitrio,
onde viene la coscienza del certo.

[Philosophy contemplates reason, from which we derive
abstract knowledge of what is true. Philology observes that
of which human choice is the author, from which we
derive awareness of what is certain]

G.B. Vico, *Principi di scienza nuova*
(1744; I,ii,x; *New Science*, § 138)

...una tale critica retorica ricerca in tutti i testi...i temi più
brucianti che costellano la lotta (la lotta primariamente
simbolica) per assicurare posizioni di potere.

¹ A shorter version of this paper was first read at the Renaissance Society of America annual conference, in Chicago, April 5, 2008. It was subsequently further developed and read, in conference format and titled "Eclipse of the Sun: Campanella and the Rhetoric of History," at the 34th annual convention of The Society for Utopian Studies, in Wrightsville Beach, NC, Oct 31, 2009. It is the first half of a study on Campanella's thought. A Spanish translation of the present text appeared in *Despalabro* (Madrid), 2012, Vol. VI, pp. 45-60.

[...such rhetorical critique seeks in all texts...the most problematic topics that inform the (primarily symbolic) struggle to gain positions of power.]

P. Valesio, *Ascoltare il silenzio* (1986, p. 171)

I

The publication of Tommaso's Campanella's *The Spanish Monarchy* and *The French Monarchy* in 1997 in one volume,² edited by the indefatigable Germana Ernst and with facing translations in French, provided the spontaneous yet necessary critical locus to consider how the thought of the Calabrian monk evolved during a forty-year period, which comprises the majority of his life's work and experiences, including of course the prison years between 1600 and 1627. Against the background of his tenacious though evolving belief in the possibility of a Universal Monarchy based on natural religion, yet under the leadership of the pope, Campanella's two treatises open a window into late XVI century world politics and the early Modern European conceptions of power and hegemony, as well as afford us the possibility to study the role church and empire were to play in the unfolding of Western history. This was a time of great strife among religious denominations as well as, more broadly, between religion and science, and counter-reformation politics versus growing secularization. Campanella has often been considered a belated humanist whose ideas were soon to be swept away by the consolidation of absolute monarchies, the Treaty of Westphal, mercantilism, and the spread of European influence outside of Europe and the Mediterranean. And yet, I believe that that is a reductive assessment owed in part to latent XIX and early XX century historio-

² Campanella, Tommaso. *Monarchie d'Espagne et Monarchie de France*, ed. by G. Ernst, transl. by N. Fabry and S. Waldbaum (Paris, puf, 1997). See also the earlier, shorter edition, *La Monarchia di Spagna*, ed. by G. Ernst (Napoli, Istituto Superiore per gli Studi Filosofici, 1989).

graphical conceptions of social evolution, progress, and periodization. My interest in looking at these texts resides *not* in terms of what they did not foresee – the Enlightenment, the French revolution and the rise of nation-states – which is typical of the linear retrojection of a teleological imperative whereby the history of ideas ought to be narrated in a nearly logical, consequential “march of progress.” Rather, I would like to examine these two little studied major works in terms of what they might still tell us, heirs of the postmodern critique of precisely these later developments, about the critique of political reason, the reframing of empire and the birth pangs of proto-nation-states, the then new internationalism and globalization, the forces that may or may not be channeled in structuring a society, and the recent thinking of the possibilities of empire in the XXI century.³

II

First, however, we need a note about the actual texts under consideration. Up until about a decade ago it was believed, on the authority of scholars of the rank of Luigi Amabile and Luigi Firpo, that *The Spanish Monarchy* (hereafter SP) was written in 1600, immediately *after* Campanella’s incarceration for the insurrection of the previous year that took place in Calabria. This view in a sense explained or partly justified the adamant philohispanic tenor of the text, considered a sort of panegyric to the greatness of Catholic Spain which might have had the unstated but hoped for result of softening the Viceroy when sentencing came up. But continued philological spade work by Germana Ernst, aided also by subtle stylistic and historical analyses, has demonstrated that, first, there were two versions of the *Monarchy*, one short-

³ I should also add, to better contextualize the theoretical horizon within which I am reading Campanella, that this paper is part of a larger project on Humanism, which revolves around the construction of social space, the role and primacy of free will in human endeavors, and the rhetoric of power.

er one written between June, 1593, and September, 1595; and one larger one, which is the one printed in the puf edition in 1997, written upon his presumably definitive return to Stilo in 1598.⁴ This alone, writes Ernst in the Introduction citing in support Campanella’s letters, should exclude the thesis about the “instrumentality” of the treatise. (xvi) The work appeared in print during the author’s lifetime in Germany in 1620 and then again 1623, but with many interpolations.

The French Monarchy (hereonafter FM) on the other hand, was written a year *after* his arrival in France in 1634. The philosopher-prophet had to flee Rome – where he had finally been cleared of all charges in 1629 – in incognito, under false name, in the autumn of 1634, because he was once again in the cross hairs of the Holy Office on account of a former student of his who had been accused of heresy and in his deposition had mentioned Campanella’s name. In France, where he was already well known and was well received,⁵ he could finally attend to the revision and publication of his immense production. Yet, driven as he was by prophetic vision all his life, he couldn’t abstain from participating in the current affairs, in a city that saw the emergence of Richeleau as the great manipulator of an ascending French hegemony aimed primarily at creating a wedge between the two trunks of the Hapsburgs. We will return to this stage of his *engagement* further down.

III

Subdivided into 32 chapters, SM belongs to the literature of didactic counsel to a Lord or Ruler and was written in an

⁴ On the over thirty codices of *The Spanish Monarchy* reviewed by De Mattei, the great majority state in the proem that they were written in 1598, “in questo mio conventino di Stilo.” Cf. Rodolfo De Mattei, *Studi Campanelliani*. (Firenze, Sansoni, 1934), 57-81. See also the “Note philologique” by G. Ernst (1997), 607-15

⁵ Cf. Michel Pierre Lerner, *Tommaso Campanella en France au XVII siècle*. (Napoli, Bibliopolis, 1995), 9-90.

effort to advise and warn on matters of government, on how to attain or keep power, and to explain the sense of more abstract principles and values. It makes ample use of historical facts as *exempla* to convey a point, and in a way, during the century in which rhetoric yields to method as the legitimate approach to knowledge,⁶ it is simultaneously very rhetorical and very methodic. That it was also written to curry favor from the powerful – in this case, the King of Spain, although Philip II died precisely in September 1598 – was the custom of the era, a practice which has deep roots in Humanism, and which with Machiavelli reaches its apex.

Campanella states right from the beginning that the causes of human principalities are three: God, prudence and opportunity, which when taken together are called destiny (*fato*). He then offers a paradigmatic example: The Monarchy of Christ gave its followers the prudence of the snake (positively embodied by the apostles and the pope), and the opportunity to take advantage of a situation (which consisted in knowing how to capitalize on timely events, “*del tempo*”). Example furnished here is what happened with the subdivisions of the Roman Empire and the tragic end of the monarchy of the Jews. And yet, moving from historical philology to philosophy, we soon read that it is the last two terms of the triad that matter most: Human affairs – *le cose umane* – whether good or bad, if known by us, are due to prudence, if not, they are called fortune, chance or fate:

⁶ Cf. Neil Gilbert, *Renaissance Concepts of Method*. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1963); Walter J. Ong. *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1958). Matters were a bit more complicated regarding the proper reading of history and its impact on jurisprudence. See for example Julian H. Franklin, *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1963). On the ontological and pragmatic links between method and rhetoric, see now Peter Carravetta, *The Elusive Hermes. Method, Discourse, Interpreting* (Aurora (CO), Davies Group, 2012).

“History, Empire, and Political Reason”

Come ritrovare una cosa a uno che l'andava cercando è
senno e prudenza, e a un altro che non badava né la sapea,
è caso o fortuna. (SM 4)⁷

As we move to ch. 2, on “La cagioni dell’Imperio spagnolo,” (10-12) we learn that, though God is the first and last mover of all, and has rewarded the Spanish for their 800-year struggle against the Moors, it is *human agency* that makes and undoes empires, and the book will soon read as a *realist approach* to an understanding of the forces that shape human destiny. In line with a rhetorical strategy that can be perceived in other early humanists, for instance in Lorenzo Val-la and Pico della Mirandola, and without having to challenge the authenticity of these authors’ deepest belief in the Supreme Being, God is soon left out of the equation, becoming a regulatory principle or ideal of transcendence that can actually accommodate – again in line with Pico – believers from other religious faiths, including Muslim and Jews.⁸ More broadly, though, interactions in human history are subject to the interplay mainly of *prudenza* and *occasione*.

At this juncture we must introduce a necessary external frame of reference inasmuch as, judging not only by these two loaded lexemes, but also by the stylemes and the structure of logical deductions in the remaining chapters, it becomes soon clear that, as one critic observed, Campanella

⁷ “It is like when someone finds something he was looking for already, we call it wisdom and prudence, whereas when someone finds something that he neither knew about nor paid attention to, we call it chance or fortune.” Except where indicated, all translations are my own.

⁸ The second time in his life that Campanella got into serious trouble with the Holy Office, when he was in Padua, in the early 1590’s, was owed to the fact that he befriended a Jewish scholar and that, according to testimony furnished to the accusers, he conversed “da ebraizzante” (“as a Jew sympathizer”), raising the suspicions of local religious authorities. We should not forget that this is the high point of the Counter-Reformation, and mere suspicion of heresy was punishable by torture or death.

may have had a copy of Machiavelli's *The Prince* and of the *Discourses* close at hand when he wrote SM.⁹ We will turn to the importance of this hypothesis in more detail further down, but we must bear it in mind as we progress.

What are the reasons behind Spanish greatness that afford them the possibility of becoming the ultimate Universal Monarchy? Placed against the tapestry of history, Campanella argues that in the past Goths, Longobards and the French won empires with lances and horses, and before them the Romans with swords, but now that the Spanish through their long struggles have acquired the support of the Church – who rewarded them by bestowing upon their leadership the title of Catholic King – and developed *astuzia*, they won their empire also thanks to superior weapons, like the *archibugio*, the early flint rifles or blunderbuss, and the printing press! Apart from this clear-headed understanding of the transforming power of technology, he closes in on the fact that opportunity played its role when the two great families of Castile and Aragon joined together, and when the Genoese, who had put their own seafaring traditions at the service of the Spanish crown, discovered a New World for them – “l'invenzione del nuovo mondo.” [“the invention of the New World”].¹⁰ – But there is more, for at that particular juncture

⁹ Cf. Vittorio Frajese. *Profezia e machiavellismo. Il giovane Campanella*. (Roma, Carocci, 2002), 58-83, especially 67-9.

¹⁰ The expression “Invention of the New World” is particularly salient when in *our* era so many books, whose aim is to undermine the Enlightenment and XIX Century notion of foundations and the transcendent origins of nations and people, bear titles such as: Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger's *The Invention of Tradition*, Mudimbe's *The Invention of Africa*, Ali Jimale Ahmed's *The Invention of Somalia*, Alain Dieckhoff's *L'invention d'une nation. Israël et la modernité politique*, Roberto Martucci's *L'invenzione dell'Italia Unita* and so on. Clearly the major influence here has been Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983). But steeped in the humanist tradition, coming up with “in-venire” was for Campanella a natural gesture, which can fruitfully be juxtaposed to the notion of dis-covery, employed for centuries. Besides the 1596 *Poetica*, available in Latin only after 1638, Campanella also wrote a still unpublished *Rhetori-*

in history, the French, the Germans, and the English, owing to their internicine religious strife, were “depressed,” meaning in deplorable condition, so the only, though formidable, task for the Spanish crown was to knock down – “abbattere” – the Turkish empire, and the world would be theirs, emulating what Alexander had done with the Persians and Rome with Carthage.

We have to read Campanella’s text carefully to appreciate how he seems to be operating at two or more levels at the same time. Although the heading for ch. 3 states that the first cause of empire resides in God, the opening sentence reads as follows:

All nations have learned that chance (occasione) and human prudence (prudenza umana) alone are not enough to either acquire things or govern, inasmuch as we can see that in specific cases the will may be free to choose (l’arbitrio è libero nel volere), but not in matters of doing and feeling, for we can all think that tomorrow one goes to sow and another to court and some hunting and some traveling, and so on, and then there comes a thunderstorm the next morning which will upstage what prudence commanded, and no one will do what his will tells him, but will act according to what the fated occasion will allow. Whoever can subject the prudence of the will to superior causes will however somehow succeed. (SM 14)¹¹

ca: cf. Luigi Firpo, “Introduzione” to Tommaso Campanella, *Poetica* (Roma, Reale Accademia d’Italia, 1944): 62-63.

¹¹ “Ogni nazione ha conosciuto che la prudenza umana sola con l’occasione non basta all’acquisto delle cose né al governo, poiché vediamo nelle cose particolari che l’arbitrio è libero nel volere, ma non nel fare e nel patire, con ciò che sia questa sera tutti pensiamo per dimane chi ad andare ad arare, chi alla corte, chi a caccia, chi in viaggio, etc., ecco che sul mattino verrà una pioggia, e guasterà tutti i consigli della prudenza, e nessuno farà secondo il suo arbitrio, ma secondo l’occasione fatale permetterà. Ma chi saprà supporre la prudenza dell’arbitrio alle cause superiori, riuscirà a suo modo.” (SM 14).

Superior causes can be nature's or God's will, but there is no immanence sought here, rather, he will look for those causes that may reveal the historical unfolding of a Messianic monarchy, as he will write in the 1606 book by that title. Later, he will demonstrate that without the Christians' deity the ancient empires *had to* fall, whereas in recent history, he argues, "unfolding" of the past was more clearly designed, going from Rome to Byzantium to France and finally to Spain, in short, there seemed to be a human *telos* acting in or through history. And despite the fact that as a millenarian he prophesied shattering revelations by the year 1600, the possibility open to the crown of Spain to achieve the universal monarchy were linked to religious, moral, and ethical responsibility. There is an implied emphasis on *human agency*. In the same breath he in fact reiterates that there are different ways of seeking or understanding God, for instance, philosophers might search in nature or, like Pythagoras, seek God through numbers, while the Hebrews did it through their prophets, and the Romans through their spirits. One cannot but think of how much this is in the trajectory sketched by Pico's syncretism. He finally arrives at the notion – which had long been a major *topos* in allegorical interpretation – that one must recognize the angel – the messenger – who travels through historical time from empire to empire, from people to people, transforming the tutelage of and abeyance to the Supreme Being into a search for patterns, guiding forces, and linguistic traces.

A case can be made that in some ways Campanella is here proleptically looking at Vico's *New Science*. But he is actually more of a realist than the Neapolitan philosopher, perhaps more in line with Thomas Hobbes and, in our day, Carl Schmidt. He goes on to manifest this in ch. 4, where the achievements of ancient empires and monarchies are juxtaposed to the achievements of Spain, the Hapsburgs specifically, and where he systematically inserts concrete references

concerning which other existing powers the crown should ally itself with, taking advantage of the fact – important for our understanding of the next book we will examine, – that France *has had* this opportunity in the Christian era but had squandered it. Passing sweeping historical judgment was not alien to these early historiographers. On the strength of his deductions, the Calabrian monk finally suggests that the Monarch, “the King of Kings,” should seek to have the pope himself crown him Emperor, thus relocating at the same time the political center of the Holy Roman Empire from Austria-Germany to Spain, by now considered the new *caput mundi*. In a sense trusting in predestination, which as a believer he had to include in his sociopolitical analyses, Campanella makes it clear that Spain has now a golden opportunity to achieve, and consider itself, the universal Christian monarchy. Yet in the passage cited there is also present, as suggested, an awareness of the relative autonomy of *human agency*, which can be characterized as a balancing act between what one is ready to do, and what one can actually do in the face of unforeseen circumstances: a realist must also be an opportunist, and in the chess game of *Realpolitick*, that is a necessary, crucial trait.

Here we are again in Machiavellian territory, for Campanella clearly understood that religion is the glue of societies, and that no political power can be achieved without having the church as an ally. From ch. 5 onward, the argument turns in fact to political philosophy in order to explain the differences between his vision of history and that of the Florentine. The second cause of the rise of empires is *prudenza* (36) which, consistent with his Telesian roots and the philosophy of the senses, is rooted in nature: “and who is guided by nature cannot lack in prudence, as we can see with plants, ants, wasps, cranes and fishes, whereby men often learn to govern from these realms.” (ib.) And here comes the explicit reference:

It should be borne in mind however that *prudenza* is different from *astuzia*, which some call *ragion di stato*, because, first, *prudenza* accords with the first cause, which is God, and is therefore mindful of prophecies and the divine sciences in order to foretell the future. Second, *astuzia* is concerned only with taste and one's own brain, calling itself wisdom... *prudenza* is magnanimous and looks to things to find a greater truth, *astuzia* is pusillanimous and in order to appear magnanimous ends up in arrogance (superbia); without a scale of values (*scala di virtù*) it aspires to greatness while focusing on meaningless minutiae. *Prudenza* shows clemency and truthfulness, *astuzia* is cruel and adulatory. (SM 36)

In short, the wily seek and execute lowly tricks and fraud against the people in order to debase and debilitate them, aiming to satisfy primarily themselves, as the “empio Machiavello” (38) holds, whereas the prudent is concerned with and respects the customs of the people. Hence he becomes stronger in conquest as befits the audacious, like Columbus, Alexander, and Caesar. The prudent ruler is definitely liberal, capable of generosity and appropriate firmness (*giusta severità*), even while deploying useful and loving lies (*inganni amorosi*).

Is Campanella's juxtaposition of *astuzia* and *prudenza* proof he was so naïve as not to have learned anything from Machiavelli? Not quite, although in order to get by the censors, after his third brush with the Holy Office – he was on trial and then jailed in Santa Maria sopra Minerva in 1597 – he had to make his anti-Machiavellism very explicit. Yet in the same chapter, when it comes to the practical aspect of doing politics, he is clearly echoing *The Prince* and in part *The Discourses*.¹² According to Campanella, once he acquires a

¹² Cf. the thorough analysis of this complex relationship in John M. Headley, *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World* (Princeton,

reign a King should be generous but not prodigal, in order to avoid being taken for granted by the populace; on the other hand, he should not rob and disrespect his subjects, as Caligula did. Moreover, the King should fear “mutabilità della fortuna,” the unpredictability of chance, but in other cases he should not be too confident, like Charles V, who failed as a just King because he used the same audaciousness in conquering as in maintaining his reign. Concerning the military, Campanella writes that severity must be exercised to keep the soldiers bound to duty, and a King should modulate the aftermath of military victories otherwise disobedience and mutiny may ensue, as happened to Tiberius in Germany; soldiers moreover should not be insolent and plunder, otherwise a victory turns to defeat, as happened to Corradino Svevo with respect to Charles d’Anjou. Above all, after a conquest, a ruler should take care to satisfy the people, otherwise they divide and turn to foreigners for support, as happened to the Carthaginians after the first Punic War, and to Ezzelino, to whom “Padua shut its gates,” and Nero, who was declared an enemy by the “patria” of which he was the prince. (40)

Other examples abound, and at the level of *method* of historical analysis the Dominican monk is not ever so far off the field disclosed by the Florentine secretary. Yet what sets them apart emerges at a *theoretical* level, especially there where the grounding ethos, the conception of man’s essence, and the finality of political power are concerned. Machiavelli’s *ragion di stato*, that great discovery that introduced a brutal realism in the analysis of power acquisition and management and set political science toward what much later would be called the autonomy of the political, is in SM coun-

Princeton University Press, 1997), 180-96, a chapter which was previously published as an article with the title “On the Rearming of Heaven: The Machiavellism of Tommaso Campanella,” in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49 (1988), 387-404.

tered by the *ragione politica* (44). On the divergence between Campanella and Machiavelli, John Headley wrote:

Apparently horrified by Machiavelli's total subjection of religion to the principle of utility, the Calabrian prophet, gazing northward, sees that in those kingdoms the *politici* have made religion a suit or hat that can be changed at will. Yet while rejecting this Machiavellian view of politicized religion, Campanella himself affirms religion's political utility, although on a different basis. He insists that no community can last a day without religion; in fact the social necessity of religion is axiomatic for Campanella. As the very soul of the political, religion exercises a natural magic in uniting members of a community.¹³

In Campanella's own words:

Perché la religione o vera o falsa sempre ha vinto quando ha credito, perché lega gli animi, onde pendono i corpi e le spade e le lingue, che sono strumenti d'imperio. (MS 44)¹⁴

And in a truly prophetic – these days we would say proleptical – assertion, he writes that “Giammai imperio più certamente rovinó che col mutare della religione, se l'istorie ben

¹³ John Headley, *Tommaso Campanella, cit.*, p. 187.

¹⁴ “Because whether true or false religion has always won when people believed in it, because it binds the souls, from which depend the *bodies*, the *swords* and the *languages*, which are the instruments of empire” (my emphasis). Developed further down, this trichotomy appears both in *The City of the Sun* and the *De Politica*. The book that makes his anti-Machiavellism explicit is *L'ateismo trionfato*, written between 1605 and 1607, but which he had to rewrite in Latin, with strong emendations, in 1631, because deemed too Pelagian, and too “soft” on Protestant theology. See the review of the publication of the earlier Italian edition by Edward Gosselin in *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (Summer 2005): 589-590.

si leggono.” (46)⁵ We cannot but think, of course, of the fate of the historically recent socialist or communist states that sought to abolish religion altogether. But that’s another topic.

IV

The notion of *ragione politica*, apparently not as useful to the achieving and maintaining a single state, is crucial instead to a Monarchy made up of several princedoms or, by extension, to an Empire which subsumes many kingdoms, principalities, duchies, counties, and so on. Campanella’s universalist ecumenical mind-set understands political reason as the capacity to work on at least *two levels at the same time*: on the one hand, power requires endorsing belief (of the extant or dominant religion) and the language (but not necessarily the arms) required to protect one religion against another. Yet on the other it must recognize the need to resort concretely to the use of arms when it comes to conquering and annexing a different country of the same faith. Again, he provides ample documentation for his thesis. Against the separation of powers and the idea, championed foolishly (“scioccamente”) (48) by Dante – and, we might add, Marsilius of Padua, Lorenzo Valla, and the whole tradition of anti-decretalists, – that the Pope should just tend to the souls and the *decime*, Campanella holds that, in the real world, the prophet *must be armed*, and that the papacy is the central socio-political power which can galvanize Europe. Aware that his are no longer the days of Alexander VI or Julius II, *ragione politica* demonstrates that there is always someone ready to take up arms to support the Pope, even should the Pope not have arms of his own. In fact, he argues, some may be driven by zeal, as countess Matilda did against emperor Henry (Arrigo), others by discord or jealousy, as the Vene-

⁵ “Properly read, history will reveal that when religions change empires fall.”

tians did against emperor Fredric, and others still for both reasons, as did Pepin and Charlemagne, who united to fight for the Pope against Longbards, Saracens and others (46): fighting for the premiership of the pope is the politically advantageous position to assume.

V

From this point on, the lesson to impart to the Spanish royals is clear: "the King must declare himself dependent on the Pope," (50) while essaying to "propose marvelous things, which make the King of Spain admirable in matters of religion, prudence, valor and prophecy, because where these things occur, there the empire will lean." In addition, since these *grandi cose* must occur "under the auspices of the Italian empire, which today is German, it is clear that he must take it over, a feat possible only through the Pope, who can damn the three Protestant heretics who threaten Rome." (54) As we will see, and announcing what will be the core of the *The French Monarchy* 35 years later, it is on Italian soil that the struggle to attain a Universal Monarchy must be waged. Further on in the 1598 text he advises on the necessity to elect a Spanish Pope, preferably from the Austrian branch, and that other concerted efforts should include sending cardinals to the New World, install two or three religious sages in all administrative positions, confer to Domenicans, Franciscans "and others" all high offices, and further that in time of war all captains should have a religious counselor (56, 58).

In ch. 8, having reiterated that "it is proper of prudence to take advantage of opportunity" (66), Campanella writes down a list of matters the King should attend to, almost like a memo with Do's and Don't's, and then goes on to sketch, in ch. 9, all the noble traits this glorious leader of the Christian Monarchy should display. But it is in light of the above glossed *ragione politica*, and in order to avoid "ruin," that he

advises the monarch to carry this out slowly and, again, *prudently*,¹⁶ by resorting to such public legislation as changing the names of the months, timetables, vary the habits of the populace, introduce new observances in religious practice, in short, make science and religion permeate the tenor and activities of the kingdom, so that the final effect will be, as elsewhere declared and repeated, both to Christianize *and* to Hispanize. Campanella here exhibits an astounding insight into population control, government craft, and the timely deployment of ideologhemes, which we might reasonably compare to contemporary state-sponsored programmes, agencies, schools, propaganda and techniques for social behavior modification.

This general plan has made some scholars, such as Francesco Clemente, see a direct connection between *SM* and *City of the Sun*, which is a defensible position,¹⁷ we might add,

¹⁶ Although further down, in chapter XVI, as he gets more and more specific about the actual history of Spain and the misgoverning of foreign lands, he does get carried away on Machiavellian wings, sounding like he is giving advice to a chief of staff on how to carry out an occupation: “che quando si occupa paese strano di religione e di dominio, si debba spopolare e trasmigrare le genti facendole schiave, e battezzare i figli o farne serraglio o mandarli nel Mondo nuovo, e mandare una colonna dei tuoi, e un governatore fedele e prudente. E questo si dovea fare in Tunisi da Carlo V....” However, as we saw above, his political realism shows also when he states that matters are to be handled differently when the religion is the same: “quando poi si occupa paese strano di dominio, ma non di religione, non si deve spopolare né mutar legge, ma presidiarlo e mandar i supremi ufficiali dei tuoi, e i bassi ufficiali siano del popolo del paese, e a poco a poco mutar le leggi loro nelle tue, però più strettamente o largamente secondo il clima comporta.” (154)

¹⁷ Cf. Francesco Clemente, “Fra realismo politico e vocazione utopica. *La Monarchia di Spagna* di Tommaso Campanella,” in *Segni & Comprensione* (Univ. del Salento) Anno XXII (Nuova Serie), N. 64, gennaio-aprile 2008:103-25. Yet in chapter 30, dedicated to the “altro emisfero, cioè del Mondo novo,” Campanella vacillates between harsh *political realism*, which demands that Catechism be taught in the Amerindians’ language but also that, in populating these lands (apparently he was unaware that millions had already died of diseases spread by the Europeans), the Spaniards avoid killing them while enslaving non-converts, “as the Ro-

but only up to a point, since the latter was written in his darkest hour, in 1602, perhaps in fear of death following the torture. Nevertheless, if there exists a thematic link between the socio-historical analyses of *SM* and the theoretical speculations of *City of the Sun*, then we have to take a short detour and a leap ahead in time in order to see if and how it is developed further. This can be done by recalling that the triad *language, sword and wealth* remains fundamental in Campanella's political thought, as he reiterates in his *De Politica*, which is a volume from his larger *Realis Philosophia*, published in Frankfurt in 1623 but written much earlier, some sections around the time he composed *The City of the Sun*, and a more detailed draft, with the title *Aforismi politici*, sometime before 1611. We can assume that this is a definitive version of his political ideas insofar as he oversaw its publication in 1637 while in Paris.¹⁸ Here we read that when it comes to power (*il potere*): "It appears that what is most useful is language in order to acquire, arms in order to defend, and wealth in order to maintain (*conservare*)." (113) Earlier in this canonical text on politics, he had written that, at the theoretical level, "The primalities (It. *primalità*, Lat. *primalitates*) entail activities which are distinct as to their essences. Power (*Potenza*) is what can do [or has agency], Wisdom (*Sapienza*) is what knows, and Love (*Amore*) is what loves or wants...and there is therefore difference between right,

mans did;" (348) and a sort of *enlightened socialist monarchy* not averse to *using* church personnel: "The third union is that of goods, wherefore I believe that the King should divide all the occupied lands among those who do not practice war and respect agrarian laws, which is to say to all Africans and Indians who have been brought there. And the King ought also make sure that no one among them, except for the priests, own anything, but that everything belong to the crown, so that from time to time he can distribute the fields and other offices, in guise that in the end they have but love for the sovereign who hands these gifts." (*ib.*)

¹⁸ Cf. Tommaso Campanella, *De Politica*, ed. by Tommaso Cesaro (Napoli, Guida, 2001:9-20). The chapter titled "Language, sword, and wealth" is on pages 113-33.

dominion, and benefit.” (49) Further down, in ch. 8, he writes once again:

Three are the means by which to acquire, maintain and govern kingdoms: language, sword and wealth. Language, to be sure, is the instrument of religion and prudence, that is, of the deeds (beni) of the souls. The sword is instrument of the body and its goods. Wealth is the province of fortune, which is useful to the body and only secondarily to the soul. (103)

Bearing in mind the content of *De Politica* can cast light both on the earlier *Spanish Monarchy* as well as the later *The French Monarchy*. Returning to SM, Campanella is very clear and concrete about a number of sociohistorical issues that impacted on the lives of peoples and governments. His attention to detail leaves no stone unturned. He remarks on the necessity to lower taxes in order to have the population appreciate and applaud the Monarch – “perché nessuna cosa nuoce più al Re che l’odio de popoli,” (XVII, 176) –; then on the comparisons of how the Turks and the Spanish have handled the creation of empire, (XIX, 208) explicating in what ways the Spanish government has been found wanting in realizing its quest for Hispano-Christian hegemony (254); he then stresses the need to curtail the power of barons, especially in the South of Italy (118), perhaps thinking of the perverse feudalism rampant in his native Calabria! Finally, from chapter 21 to 30, the thinker moves on to a country by country analysis of their political structure and social and religious habits, the techniques required to conquer or bring them into the Monarch’s sphere of influence, discusses comparatively the then existing power blocks of the Euro-Mediterranean area, closing with a chapter on the new world (ch. 31), which is explicit about how the Spanish are mismanaging it, and one on navigation (ch. 32), which makes the case for the cruciality of sea power to world do-

minion. A politically prophetic highlight is his having understood that Holland was the Achille's heel of the Spanish empire, as it effectively turned out to be, and that the only real competition was France, to which he dedicates one of the longest chapters. In the Appendix (364-66), perhaps by then aware that Philip II was dying or had died, he expresses the hope that such an enlightened leader may soon come again to realize his vision.

Throughout the 164 pages of the original edition, at key moments Campanella restates his grounding belief that, after the prime mover, the ultimate wealth for the Monarch resides not in gold but in people, (156, 158, 346) that the most important instrument for empire-building is language, and second is the sword – “*primo instrumento d'imperio è la lingua, e il secondo la spada;*” (190) and that on the basis of historical, prophetic, and astral knowledge, Spain is destined to achieve the universal Christian Monarchy.

VI

Well, it did not quite turn out that way, as he dramatically learned in the ensuing three decades trying to survive in various dungeons in Naples' forbidding castles. When we turn to *The French Monarchy* (FM), we know that 37 years have passed and the world picture is now quite different. Religious antagonism has increased with the spread of Calvinism, both the Church and the Spanish empire have become more odious reactionary powers, new power blocs such as the Bohemians, the Swedes, and the Dutch are on the rise, and less than a year after Campanella arrives in Paris France is plunged in The Thirty Year's War on the side of the Lutherans in order to weaken the Spanish Empire's mires on the Holy Roman Empire, itself caught in unmentionable

strife among tens of warring factions.¹⁹ There is no doubt that upon close analysis Campanella’s writings after 1634 have lost some of their religious fervor, and that his support for the Church is really motivated more by pragmatic ends than by missionary zeal. After all, had not Church authorities – under four different popes²⁰ – kept him confined for a total of 31 years in various dungeons? His faith must have been both strong and lucid to see the total separation between God and man, and he can definitely be considered a participatory voice in the evolution of secularization, if only we bring into the critical horizon his other more philosophical writings: for he saw no ontological difference between the emerging scientific and rationalistic currents – think of his *Apologia per Galileo* of 1616 – and the search for truth that his own brand of naturalism allowed *even within* a transcendent, non-mythological conception of the divinity.²¹

VII

Campanella had begun to champion the cause of a unified France with a discourse, of which we have no extant text, on the taking of the castle of La Rochelle in 1628, in which he bemoaned the disagreements between the King and his mother Marie de Médicis, and which saw the latter side with the King’s younger brother Gaston d’Orléans. In 1632 he wrote a dialogue, *Dialogo politico tra un Veneziano, Spagnolo e Francese circa li rumori passati di Francia*, in which,

¹⁹ The war between France and Spain continues beyond the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, until 1659, when France emerges as the *de facto* strongest power in Europe.

²⁰ I am excluding the 27-day reign of Leo XI in 1605. The popes who had a direct impact on Campanella’s life were Clement VIII (1592-1605), Paul V (1605-1621), Gregory XV (1621-1623), and of course Urban VIII (1623-1644).

²¹ See also his *Compendio di filosofia della natura*, ed. by G. Ernst and P. Ponzio (Santarcangelo di Romagna, Rusconi, 1999), composed around 1613 according to L. Amabile, and after 1619 according to L. Firpo. For details, see the “Introduzione” to this volume by Ponzio, 5-19.

speaking through the Venetian, he upholds the politics of Cardinal Richelieu,²² and once again makes a case for the cruciality of Italy in the geopolitical and military power-play between Spain and France. Concerning the role of Italy in European struggles, Campanella had stated similar views already in his 1607 *Discorsi ai Principi d'Italia*, except that the King who should have intervened, consistently with what we saw he believed in the text of the SM, was to be the King of Spain. This time, Campanella makes the case for France, for as we saw the scenario had radically changed. Early in 1635 he intervenes once again but in a different literary form, composing *Aforismi politici per le presenti necessità di Francia*, in which he very plainly states that the tricephalus Spanish colossus needs to be brought down, and that France ought to claim its rightful place as the leading Monarchy on the way to achieving the Universal Monarchy of God. Once again, he reiterates that Italy must be thought of as the fulcrum, or the theater, for such a shift in European and Christian domination. He explains the allegory as follows: the Spanish Monarchy has three heads, one which represents its essence, located in Germany, the second embodying its existence, situated in Spain, and finally a third which reveals its prowess (*va-leur*) residing in Italy.²³ Elaborating on the image, he claims

²² Richelieu was instrumental in quelling domestic squabbles, abolished political rights to the Protestants, besieged the Huguenots at La Rochelle, and led an army into Northern Italy to slow down Spanish advances in the region. He survived an attempt at dismissal in 1630. As the first “Prime Minister” in the modern sense of the word, he was acutely aware of the growing power of the Hapsburgs (in the person of Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II) during the ongoing war in central Europe (what later became known as “The Thirty Year’s War”). He persuaded the Swedes to attack the emperor and secretly financed them. This was the scenario when Campanella reaches Paris.

²³ Cf. Tommaso Campanella, *Sur la mission de France*. Transl. by Florence Plouchart-Cohn (Paris, Editions Rue d’Ulm, 2005), 85. This book – to which I referred in the paragraph above – contains, in their French titles, the *Dialogue politique entre un Vénétien, un Espagnol et un Français à propos des récents troubles de France* (9-82), *Aphorismes politiques en faveur des*

that it is difficult to beat the Spanish without attacking the head bearing its acknowledged valor, that is, its Italian vice-royalty, with its baronates and garrisons throughout the peninsula, which is effectively what keeps the other two heads standing. To this end, and in order to attack its “essential” core, namely its German presence and interests, it becomes crucial to play up to the Pope: “Seul le pape, incité et soutenu par le roi de France, peut abattre la tête de l’essence de cette monarchie.”²⁴

In this incendiary pamphlet in which he rips Spain apart and incites the French to remember that Europe was first united under the Charles the Great, the Christian Emperor who kept Islam at bay and effectively began the process of Christianization of the continent, Campanella leverages history, national stereotypes, the balance of power in the central European states, and then recalls that the rise of the Spanish monarchy has been too rapid for it not to be in immediate danger of collapsing, inasmuch as

elle a occupé en cent ans plus de pays que ne le firent les Romains en sept cents ans; on peut donc estimer qu’elle est désormais en déclin.²⁵

In May 1635, switching rhetorical approach, he writes a *Documenta ad Gallorum nationem*²⁶ in the first person, becoming Carolus Magnus *lui-même*, and who as the spiritual “père de la France” returns to instruct his descendants and explain

nécessités présentes de la France, (83-97) *Advertissements à la nation française* (105-45), and the *Discours politique en faveur du siècle présent* (157-80). For in-depth analyses on the meaning of Campanella’s francophile position, see in this volume Plouchart-Cohen’s “Postface” (187-249) as well as the above cited – footnote 3 – Pierre Lerner, *Tommaso Campanella en France*.

²⁴ *Sur la mission de France*, 85.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 87.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 105-45.

to his fellow citizens why Richelieu's politics is the best course to follow in international affairs.

VIII

Thus, when we turn to *The French Monarchy*, we fairly anticipate his arguments.⁷ Still convinced that the Pope must be a "sacerdote armato" (FM 378) he appeals to historical evidence to prove that the French have ruled as long as piety in politics and the "arts" of the Church were adequately respected and manifested. Then he avers once again that a Universal Monarchy can be perceived as having come close to be realized over time in what appears to be a linear conception of history and, if we stretch it a bit, as constituting what Immanuel Wallerstein would call a "world system." Campanella returns upon the earlier SM to claim that he was not wrong in his thesis whereby Spain was pre-destined to be the one Monarchy to achieve the Universal Christian Monarchy he believed in, it is just that the Spanish crown missed its opportunity to do so, sort of "messed it up," having failed for a number of reasons, among which he lists faulty political strategies and atrocious crimes committed everywhere, (390) including the New World.

It is therefore France's turn to champion his cause, and their first order of the day must be to seek a true alliance with the Pope and fight to dethrone the Hapsburgs, thus reconstituting a new social and political equilibrium in Europe. He then spends nearly fifty pages to demonstrate why the star of Spanish power is declining, making recourse, though less so than in most of his earlier writings, to astrology to shore up his argument. In the 12 articles that make up ch. 7 Campanella goes meticulously yet forcefully through all the misguided actions of the Spanish, from unwarranted

⁷ As Plouchart-Cohn observed, *op. cit.*, 223, Campanella's writings of this period tend to be repetitive and in some cases entire sentences reappeared in the four opuscles as well as in FM.

marriages to shameless cunning, from deploying “foreign troops” to creating a visible drop in social values, from failing to act according to the golden rule of “prudence” and “art” (422) to relying on the genius of other people – engineers from Italy and Flandres, navigators from Genoa, Italian military captains, etc – thus showing, over time, what he termed their servile mentality, propensity for trickery, and a feigned and bigoted religiosity. He writes: “li Spagnoli si servono di Dio e della fede cattolica romana, ma non servono a Dio, né alla fede,” (426) [“The Spanish make use of God and of the Roman Catholic faith, but they do not serve either God or the faith.”]. He repeats that Charles V had a chance to stop the Lutherans on their tracks and failed to do so, (498) that he threatened the Pope himself and in so doing exposed the Church to growing instability, fostered the growth of an increasing number of heretics, and in the process lost forty states!

Here, once again, appears the Cerberus-like personification of the Austrian empire as a three-headed monster, which failed to Hispanize the reign through carefully conferred vassallages or by not encouraging inter-ethnic marriages. In ch. 8 the philippic against Spain continues with a battery of arguments aimed at showing that the “*Monarchia austriaca spagnolizzata*” should finally relinquish its quest to control the Holy Roman Empire and cede the historical mission to a joint partnership between the Pope and the King of France. Not forgetful of his earlier more explicit though as we saw partly masked Machiavellism, he is confident that fear of the common enemy, the Turkish tyranny, would probably see Catholics and heretics fight side by side, a prevision which turned out to be true when France declared war on Spain. Extrapolating in terms of the development of a European identity above the political, religious and ethnic differences *within* Europe, this follows the ancient (initially Greek) pattern of a Europe versus Asia syndrome,

which relies on necessary distrust of the Other in order to shape one's overarching cultural identity.²⁸

Showing that his analyses are not ranting propaganda but rooted in what at the time were accepted topics in public discourse, Campanella does not desist – we might say, courageously – from pointing out that the French have to deal with their own intrinsic problems. Citing an earlier work of his, now lost, titled *Cosmographia*, he claims that the French have been and can be again the best, but also the worst, people to dominate the world. Basically, he is saying that they should “get their act together,” for if they do not succeed in replacing the Spanish to achieve the Universal Monarchy, it is probably due to some endemic cultural or ethnic trait, such as were parleyed loosely but effectively even through the following century. Thus we read of how the French often are impatient, disobedient, brawling, rebellious. Yet consistent with what we already saw as his capacity to turn *prudenza* at the service of *occasione*, the Dominican monk holds that these characteristics can be turned into a positive set of national traits because, by juxtaposition, as the Spaniards are typically slovenly in their actions, so the French are impulsive and quick, and this can translate into a great asset in the domain of military policy.

In the final part of this rich and revealing text, Campanella returns to his favorite strategy of arguing from history, reminding his interlocutor that in the past it was the Pope who granted the right to Spain to make an empire, and that

²⁸ The notion that Europe is intrinsically different from the Middle and Far East, in effect a sort of paleo-Eurocentrism, originates with Herodotus when he discusses the alliance of the Greek city-states to fend off the Persians, has been held by Federico Chabod, *L'idea di Europa* (Bari, Laterza, 1957 [1944 & 1948]); Denys Hay, *Europe. The Emergence of an Idea* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1968 [1957]); and Henri Mendras, *L'Europe des Européens* (Paris, folio, 1997). See also the article by Peter Carravetta, “La questione dell'identità nella formazione dell'Europa,” in Franca Sinopoli, ed., *La letteratura europea vista dagli altri* (Roma, Meltemi, 2003), 19-66.

he can thus take that privilege away. (532) He shows his earlier perspicuity in making explicit suggestions in policy that would ensure the King of France capillary control of his subjects by gaining control of key offices, for example, by strategically placing French officials in the hierarchy of the Holy Office Commissary, in each Congregation, in the Office of the Clerk of the Index, and in the more dispersed Vicariats. From this he turns yet again, much as Dante and Machiavelli had done earlier, to the cruciality of Italy as the theater of future geopolitical events. As in SM, here again he does a nation by nation analysis of the distribution of power in continental Europe, but in FM he goes beyond, sketching a region by region and city-state by city-state analysis of all the power blocks distributed along the peninsula, illustrating their strategic value, suggesting how to bring them into the fold of a bilateral Rome-Paris alliance, and even what the King should say to their leaders to make this alliance palatable. Rehashing his belief, now become a political principle, that it is acceptable for the Pope to wield temporal power, he strongly suggests that if the French would divide the Spanish possessions among the Italians themselves, the Italian princes would stand to gain so much that they would be ready to side with the French, (538) a strategy that would be most successful in the case of Naples. (548) This would ultimately crown France as the *de facto* superpower in Europe.

IX

What, in conclusion, can we say of Campanella's understanding of world history and his conception of empire at the dawn of Modern Europe? First of all, it must be acknowledged that Campanella the unrestrainable prophet, utopist, and missionary was also a true and proven realist when it came to political analysis, as his application, both covert and explicit, of some Machiavellian insights clearly demonstrates. But it is important to point out the profound differences as well.

Although Machiavelli is credited with being the first thinker of Italian Humanism whose sociopolitical theory is no longer based on what the world *should be*, but on what *it is or has actually been*; and although he is also in line with earlier Humanists, beginning with Dante, that there should be a net separation of powers between Church and Empire, with the latter regulating all mundane affairs and the former simply the spiritual world; in the end one might perceive in both *The Prince* and the *Discourses* a sort of “nostalgia for an earlier age when a basic religious fervor infused civil society with greater fear, reverence, and natural discipline,”²⁹ which was sadly lacking at the end of the XV century. Besides, that age was also marked by a growing individualism and an exacerbated public illegitimacy of the political process, and the Florentine never tired of excoriating representatives both secular and religious for their self-interest and wickedness. In a way, having ontologically separated religion from politics, he could now only understand religion in an ontic, instrumental way.

On the other hand, as we hinted throughout, above and beyond his own personal conception of Christianity, Campanella understood that religion, as the very word implies, is a linking, cementing force among people in any given society, and it would be anathema to suggest, as the avatars of *ragion di stato* from Machiavelli to Richelieu to Hobbes and beyond have too often believed, that it can be either abolished, removed, or played upon as if just another sociopolitical entity, such as city-states, entitlements, principalities, nations and even empires. Proleptically looking to *Vico's New Science*, Campanella understands religion as a primordial force in society, indeed as founding the community. As he observed in *Discorsi universali del governo ecclesiastico per fare una gregge e un pastor*,

²⁹ Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*, op. cit., 194-5.

And this [the political capability of the Papacy working among Christian princes and states] did not understand the very astute Machiavelli, who admires the stability of the papacy...When the Pope will be the Lord of Italy he will also be Lord of the world; but he must [first] make sure he tries every possible way to attain this end.”³⁰

The statement points to a deeper understanding of the social role of religion and its binding power in keeping communities together and make them act in a more or less homogeneous or socially cohesive way. The evolution of this extended belief becomes the epistemological grid of that culture. The validity or better truth of the process becomes evident less than two centuries later when the erupting nationalisms all around Europe understood that a people’s dominant religion is a major and integral part of their social identification, together with language, specific customs, rituals and a set of collective habits,³¹ establishing their cultural unconscious, so to speak, fueling the rhetoric of national or ethnic identities. Campanella’s observations will resonate not much later with Thomas Hobbes’ *Leviathan*, in the several chapters dedicated to Ecclesiastical Common-Wealths (Pt III, ch. 35, 39, 42 et infra), both on the issue of the structure and functioning of religion as an institution, and as a dynamic fluid force which binds citizens together. The allegiance and support of the people – or, later, after 1789, the citizens, – can be manipulated through the rhetorical use of various symbolisms, including clearly the religious one, and in fact must be admin-

³⁰ Cited in Headley, *cit.*, 192-3n. “Questo [...] non conobbe l’astutissimo Machiavello, che si ammira della stabilità del papato...Quando il Papa sarà signore d’Italia, sarà anche del mondo; però deve procurar ogni via di arrivar a questo.”

³¹ Cf. Athena Leoussi, ed. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism* (New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Publishers, 2001); and Anthony Smith, *Theories of Nationalism* (New York, Holmes & Meier, 1983)

istered, justified and, if necessary, coerced, but cannot be dispensed with.³²

X

Our discussion here could continue with a chapter on the ideological context within which Campanella lived, specifically by identifying and comparing him with authors he could have possibly read. We know he was an insatiable reader, but though he still managed to get books during his continuous 27 years in jail, we can't possibly speak of his personal "library," other than inferring it from his letters and citations (often incorrect because from memory).³³ Still, living under Aragonese rule, had he read Alonso de Castrillo? Were the *Comunidades* an inspiration for his failed "revolution" in Calabria in 1599, which caused him inhuman suffering for the rest of his life? How much of La Boëtie, of Bodin, of Sepúlveda, of Suárez did he know of and had assimilated?³⁴ A broader interpretation of the originality of

³² Cf. *Leviathan*, Pt II, ch. 18: "for there is no Covenant with God, but by mediation of some body that representeth Gods Person. Indeed the "Spiritual Good" is pre-eminent even above "Temporall" ones." (cf. also Pt II, ch. 17) Earlier, in the section "Of Man," Hobbes establishes that there must be a relativistic dimension to morality, and the ultimate role of reason is not so much to find the truth but to devise ways of getting on in the world. In ch. 5 he writes: "For Reason ... is nothing but Reckoning (that is, Adding and Subtracting) of the Consequences of general names agreed upon, for the making and signifying of our thoughts..." But thoughts are always connected to something else.

³³ Here of course one must rely on the indefatigable work carried out by Luigi Firpo and Germana Ernst, whose discovery, redaction and commentary on innumerable texts unknown to previous generations have created the premises for more objective approaches to his labyrinthine production. See E. Baldini. *Luigi Firpo e Campanella* (Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 2000); and Germana Ernst. *Tommaso Campanella* (Bari: Laterza, 2002).

³⁴ This is particularly relevant when it comes to the growing discussion, at the time, of the religious and legal status of the Amerindians; cf. J.A. Fernández-Santamaria, *The State, War and Peace. Spanish Political Thought in the Renaissance 1516-1559* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,

Campanella’s political thought would have to engage the entire XVI century,³⁵ where against the twin watersheds represented by Luther and the Council of Trent, we witness a long tortuous reflection on breaking the stronghold of the One, the Unitary order of the inherited classical and then Christian middle ages, and the appearance of a more fragmented, dis-harmonious, borderline heretical mind-set. Bruno and Galileo were tried by the Church for different reasons, yet Campanella would sing the first by seeing the multiple worlds as still coherent with the transcendent unity of creation, and the second when he defended the creative scientific imagination of the individual, and the right to make discoveries based on sensory data, something he had learned from his first ideal master, Bernardino Telesio. But this task has to be postponed to another time and place.

In closing, we must recall the hermeneutic principle whereby interpretation cannot ignore the social reality of the interpreter. At a time when in the course of the last three decades of the Twentieth-century we saw the explosion of postmodern critiques of cultures as unstable entities, artifi-

1977), esp. pp. 220-236. For questions pertaining to law, see the above cited Julian Franklin (footnote 21). But see also Roland Crahay, *D’Erasmus à Campanella* (Bruxelles: Editions de l’Université de Bruxelles, 1985) and his observations on the “utopia” of the Hutterites.

³⁵ As I finished this study, I learned of the appearance of Jean-Louis Fournel, *La cité du soleil et les territoires des homes. Le savoir du monde chez Campanella* (Paris, Albin Michel, 2012), a magisterial work, which I was happy to learn lends strong support to what I have developed here. Of course Fournel’s far-ranging and profound study explores other topics, among which is a reading of *The City of the Sun* as a political treatise, not as escapist literature, in-depth analyses of how the New World impacted on Campanella and thus on his perception of the “World-System,” and thalassocracies in general, and the centrality of Italy in the understanding of the rise of Modern Europe *even after* the opening up of the Atlantic. A key aspect, in tune with developments in critical historiography of the past quarter of a century, is reading Campanella’s thought as a “geosophy.” No future study on Campanella can ignore Fournel’s work. I have reviewed it for *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 66, no. 2 (Summer 2013): 594-596.

cially if often cynically created, and even intrinsically detached from reality by way of the dominant technological enframing of social intercourse that make and shape our very identities, as well as the rise of conservative, media savvy, politically connected right wing groups and conservative organizations such as churches and philanthropies, political action committees, and so on,^{*} the reflections of a thinker such as Campanella on a, *mutatis mutantis*, similar world chessboard can illuminate us not only on what was peculiar of his era, but also on what appears to have cogency and validity today as well. Adapting Immanuel Wallerstein's term, the two *Monarchies* by Campanella can be used to situate a radical passage in the cultural unconscious of the Early Modern World System, and reassess the range and complexity of how many factors – linguistic, military, sociological, and above all symbolic – must interplay to describe and explain the fluid yet heterological character of an age. Campanella claimed to be a Roman Catholic believer his entire life, but his exhortations to the King of Spain in his youth, and then to the King of France in his later maturity, complemented by accurate observations of the habits and desires of people from different parts of the known world, suggest three provisional conclusions. First, that *ragion di stato* ought to be replaced with *ragione politica*. Hence the reason why we must go back and see how many of his contemporaries had understood, before Hobbes, that governments are made by *human*, not divine, choice, and sovereignty must make the individual a participant, a meaningful agent struggling to attain what will evolve into the social contract. Second, that in view of this, language, as discourse, plays a central role not only in theorization, but in the actual pragmatics of running a state, of shaping policy, of persuad-

^{*} For a critical history of the various schools of thought that mark the postmodern age, see my study *Del postmoderno. Critica e cultura in America all'alba del duemila*. (Milano, Bompiani, 2009).

ing people, in effect stressing dialogue, debate, and diplomacy before we turn to warfare: the word before the sword was, paraphrased, one of Campanella’s maxims. Third, that when rulers or governments must turn to arms, there needs be the double recognition that force must be applied carefully and that of all possible existing institutions the Church – or any specific other denomination in the decades that followed – is a key player and must be considered as such. By saying this we recognize that, in terms of *realpolitik*, the much theorized division of powers between State and Empire which was such a key element in Dante, Marsilius of Padua, Pico della Mirandola and Machiavelli, cannot be realized in any pure or transcendent manner, and cannot be enforced on principle alone, despite the later, Enlightenment-inspired American and French constitutions. Campanella understood that the Church was an effective temporal power, but at the same time that religion is a primary binding force in any society and will have a direct impact on the cohesion (or dissolution) of any given social group. Given the all-too-often nefarious record of theocracies, the movement toward keeping civil and religious institutions separate is understandable, but it will never be an easy task, as anthropological, psychological, and above all community belief in some form of supernatural deity remains an essential component of the “city of human beings.”

Thus we have a paradoxical thinker. We should consider that, his declarations notwithstanding, Campanella was not really vying for a theocracy, not, at least, of the kind we have actual witness in historical memory. Although he appeals to the Pope in both treatises as the potential leader of Empire, he does so primarily because he correctly read the great sociological, psychological and often military capacity of the Pontiff to influence and impact the results of any political action, but nowhere does he state that the subjects ought to be converts or monks or priests, or “proto-comunists.” His constant problems with the Holy Office were caused by his

being too “liberal,” too catholic, too inclusive of people who may not have been declared members of the Catholic Church. The theocracy of *City of the Sun* should *not* be used as a term of comparison to demonstrate his theocratic leanings because its leaders and functionaries are supremely enlightened, as is the entire population, making the distinction a mere taxonomic exercise, a differentiation of roles and tasks. In fact in Tapobrana citizens live and act according to their *particular* talents or *natural* inclinations and possibilities. In the actual political, social, and theoretical analyses of Spain and France at the dawn of the Modern Era, Campanella understood that it was the *idea of a net separation of temporal and spiritual powers which was utopistic*, as the tensions and struggles created by the constitutions of modern democracies to all effects demonstrate. If anything, he advocates that the main concern for rulers, and legislators as well, ought to be to focus on *the reasons of the polis* – in today’s language, the needs of the citizens – much more than the reasons of either the faith or the state. These latter components, infrastructures or superstructures though they may be, must be seen as dialectically co-dependant, otherwise the supremacy of either in the name of autonomy and self-declared legitimation turns into totalitarianism, as we saw in post-Hegelian times with some Islamic theocracies, on the one hand, and variations of Fascism *and* of Communism on the other. Finally, the fact that he argued in support of two different, and historically competing and antagonistic, states within a relatively short period of time only serves to demonstrate that there is no such a thing as a universal principle of the supremacy or autonomy of either reason or faith. Nor can they be grounded on logical or transcendent (or, later, transcendental) principles, because *the political is essentially rooted in the actual transactions of the agents of the polis*, in its broadest acceptation, and what was good for a Spaniard in 1600 was probably not good for a Frenchman in 1635, and viceversa. In other words, Campanella anchors his political

philosophy on the cruciality of *discourse*, which gives voice to the three elements of his basic ontology, namely Power, Knowledge, and Feeling. In actual sociohistorical settings, what matters is the *reasoned* execution of *prudencia* in the face of *occasione*, all of which is significant or makes sense with reference to a *place*, a *circumstance*, a desire for *limited action*, and in view of a particular audience, or *public*, and within that to a specific conflict.³⁷ In this sense, the two treatises by Campanella show that the utopist we all know from high school was in reality a political realist, and one who had understood the fundamental truth that, though arms and deities must be accounted for and judiciously used or exploited, it is discourse, the interpersonal exchange that determines and embodies human interaction, the originary element that defines and shapes the human project.

(New York, January 2012; February 2013)

WORKS CITED

- Baldini, Enzo. *Luigi Firpo e Campanella. Cinquant'anni di ricerche e di pubblicazioni*. Pisa e Roma: Istituti e Poligrafici Internazionali, 2000.
- Campanella, Tommaso. *Sur la mission de France*. Transl. Forence Plouchart-Cohn. Paris: Editions Rue d'Ulm, 2005.
- _____. *De Politica*. Ed. Tommaso Cesaro. Napoli: Guida, 2001.
- _____. *Compendio di filosofia della natura*. Ed. G. Ernst and P. Ponzio. Santarcangelo di Romagna: Rusconi, 1999.
- _____. *Monarchie d'Espagne et Monarchie de France*. Ed. G. Ernst, transl. N. Fabry and S. Waldbaum. Paris: puf, 1997.
- _____. *La città del sole / The City of the Sun*. Transl. D.J. Donno. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1981.
- _____. *La Monarchia di Spagna*. Ed. G. Ernst. Napoli: Istituto Superiore per gli Studi Filosofici, 1989.
- Carravetta, Peter. *The Elusive Hermes. Method, Discourse, Interpretation*. Aurora (CO): Davies Group Publishing, 2012.

³⁷ The centrality of the pragmatic dimension to discourse is a key aspect of my longer theoretical work on method and interpretation, *The Elusive Hermes*, referred to above in footnote 6.

- _____. "Review" of J-L. Fournel. *La cité du soleil et les territoires des hommes*, in *Renaissance Quarterly*. Vol. 66, No. 2 (Summer 2013): 594-596.
- _____. *Del postmoderno. Critica e cultura in America all'alba del duemila*. Milano: Bompiani, 2009.
- _____. "La questione dell'identità nella formazione dell'Europa," in F. Sinopoli, ed. *La letteratura europea vista dagli altri*. Roma: Meltemi, 2003, pp.19-66.
- Chabod, Federico. *L'idea di Europa*. Bari, Laterza, 1957 [1944 & 1948].
- Clemente, Francesco. "Fra realismo politico e vocazione utopica. *La Monarchia di Spagna di Tommaso Campanella*," *Segni & Comprensione* XXII, 64 (2008): 103-25.
- Crahay, Roland. *D'Erasmus à Campanella*. Ed. Jacques Marx. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1985.
- De Mattei, Rodolfo. *Studi Campanelliani*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1934.
- Ernst, Germana. *Tommaso Campanella*. Bari: Edizioni Laterza, 2002.
- Fernández-Santamaria, J.A., *The State, War and Peace. Spanish Political Thought in the Renaissance 1516-1559*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Firpo, Luigi. "Introduzione" to Tommaso Campanella. *Poetica*. Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1944.
- Fournel, Jean-Louis. *La cité du soleil et les territoires des hommes. Le savoir du monde chez Campanella*. Paris: Albin Michel, 2012.
- Frajese, Vittorio. *Profezia e machiavellismo. Il giovane Campanella*. Roma: Carocci, 2002.
- Franklin, H. Julian. *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- Gilbert, Neil. *Renaissance Concepts of Method*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- Gosselin, Edward A. "Review" of Tommaso Campanella. *L'ateismo trionfato ovvero riconoscimento filosofico della religione universale contra l'antichristianesimo macchiavellesco*. 2 vols. Ed. Germana Ernst. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2004, in *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (Summer 2005): 589-590.
- Hay, Denys. *Europe. The Emergence of an Idea*. Edimburgh, Edimburgh University Press, 1968 [1957].
- Headley, John M. *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

“History, Empire, and Political Reason”

- _____. “On the Rearming of Heaven: The Machiavellism of Tommaso Campanella,” in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49 (1988): 387-404.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Leoussi, Athena, ed. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. New Brunswick (NJ): Transaction Publishers, 2001.
- Lerner, Michel Pierre. *Tommaso Campanella en France au XVII siècle*. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1995.
- Machiavelli, Niccoló. *The Prince*. Transl. Daniel Donno. New York: Bantam, 1966.
- Mendras, Henri. *L'Europe des Européens*. Paris: folio, 1997.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Smith, Anthony. *Theories of Nationalism*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World System*. New York: Academic Press, 1974. Vol. 2.