

CRISTINA GUCCIONE

A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS
OF MACHIAVELLI'S *THE PRINCE*:
MANSFIELD, SKINNER AND CONNELL

All those, who have engaged in translating Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1513), have always met interpretative difficulties which derive from the linguistic features of the text. The general purpose of this study is to analyse how its most recent and authoritative English translators – Harvey C. Mansfield (1998 [1985]), Quentin Skinner & Russell Price (1989 [1988]) and William J. Connell (2005) – have overcome the linguistic and terminological issues involved in dealing with Machiavelli's work. To achieve this aim the Italian literature on Machiavelli's style (Chiappelli 1952, Pontremoli 2001, Scavuzzo 2003, et al.) has been considered the basis of this research, whilst the three authoritative target texts have been compared paying particular attention to the common source text consulted, among others, by all of them: *De Principatibus* edited by Casella & Mazzoni (1929). The latter is a part of Machiavelli's collected works entitled *Tutte le opere di Niccolò Machiavelli* by Mazzoni and Casella (henceforth Casella) and it was the critical edition on which most twentieth-century comments were based.¹

The relationship between source-text and target-texts has been studied following the methodology of 'translational stylistics' outlined by Kirsten Malmkjaer (2003;2004). According to Malmkjaer, while a literary text is a creative one whose author exercises a series of free and unconstrained choices among the options offered by a given language system, this is not the case with translations whose architect commits himself «to creating a text that stands to its source text in a relationship of direct mediation as opposed to being subject to more general intertextual influences» (2004:15). On the basis of these assumptions, 'translational stylistics' analyses translated texts from the point of view of a writer-oriented study, considering the relationship between source and target texts central and searching for answers to the question why, given a certain source-text, its translation has been shaped by a translator in a particular way.²

¹ In the introductory note to their translation, Skinner and Price indicate Bertelli's *Il Principe* (1968) as the main source-text of reference, but they also quote Casella. Since between Bertelli and Casella there are very slight differences, this analysis refers to Casella's *De Principatibus* which was the main source-text of both Mansfield and Connell.

² Many stylistic analyses consider the question of «how the text affects a reader» closely related «to the question of *how* the writer seeks to express various concepts» (Malmkjaer 2004:14). These analyses are reader-oriented because they aim at explain-

The comparison among the three translations has been carried out following the methodology outlined by Baker (2000) who suggests to compare two or more contemporary translations of the same source-text, if this is possible, in order to capture the translators' characteristic use of language and the linguistic habits of one translator compared to the others.

By combining these two methods,³ the final goal of this article is not to evaluate whether one translation is better or worse than another, but to highlight the translators' stylistic patterns which have not necessarily been carried over from the source-text or the target-language, concluding the paper with explanations on the potential motivations which might persuade a translator to diverge from the style characterizing Machiavelli's *The Prince*.

The first paragraph of the paper outlines the spread of Machiavelli's works in the British Isles and the consequent stereotypes ascribed to his figure for a long time. The second paragraph, divided into three sections, introduces *The Prince* by Mansfield, Skinner-Price and Connell focusing on their scientific contribution towards Machiavelli, their presentation of the author to the readers of *The Prince*, the structure of their work and the aims sketched out in the prefaces to their translations. The third part deals with the syntactic patterns, the cohesive devices and the terminology that distinguish the translations of three extracts taken from *The Prince* for this analysis.

The final part of the paper, the *Appendix*, contains the three extracts from the texts of Mansfield, Skinner-Price and Connell respectively. The passages were mainly chosen for their thematic importance and belong to chaps. XIV, XV and XVII in which Machiavelli deals with human nature and gives advice on the 'art of governing' providing examples that should be imitated or avoided.

1. *An outline on Machiavelli's reputation in England*

It is well known that *The Prince* by Machiavelli is not only a masterpiece at the basis of modern political science, but also an Italian literary work rich in artistic value. Since the first circulation of manuscripts and later printed copies, the book has travelled all over

ing how some characteristics of the text affect the reader disregarding the reasons that induced the writer to shape the text as he did (Short 1994; Werth 1999; Semino & Culpeper 2002 all quoted in Malmkjaer 2004:14). On the other hand, writer-oriented stylistic analyses aim at explaining «not only *how* the text means what it does, but also *why* a writer may have chosen to shape the text in a particular way to make it mean in the way that it does [...] although it is also always necessary to consider the extent to which a language system at a given point in time enables writers to make certain choices which may not be available at other times» (Ibid.).

³ The main difference between Malmkjaer's translational stylistics and Baker's approach is the different emphasis given to the source text. Concentrating on the translators' style, Baker pays only secondary attention to the influence that some aspects of the source text can exercise over the translators' linguistic choices.

Europe giving rise to a long-running political debate, and to literary and linguistic analyses both in its original and foreign versions.⁴

Sixteenth century Italy witnessed an increase in the production of vernacular literary works of the highest cultural level, that led to a gradual substitution of Latin with Italian promoting the spread of the Italian language abroad and the standardization of Italian specialized terminology. Machiavelli was among those first intellectuals who chose to write their works in dialect, although Latin was still the main vehicular language of Italian culture.⁵ In particular he adopted a Florentine rich in Latinisms, that did not aim at ennobling the text, but recalled the fifteenth century chancery writing characterized by the presence of Latin and vernacular forms (Marazzini 2002). Although this linguistic process was in its early stages and the vernacular still suffered the disadvantage of limiting the foreign circulation of Italian literature, the name of Machiavelli entered the British Isles at the end of the sixteenth century. His comedies were translated and performed in theatres, his political works gave rise to pro-or-con pamphlets, so much so that two conflicting currents started debating on *The Prince* and on *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livy* (1519). According to those English intellectuals, who presumably read *The Prince* in Italian, Machiavelli was an important political theorist e.g. Bacon defended the Florentine secretary in *Advancement of Learning* (1605), Spenser adopted his maxims in *View of the State of Ireland* (1633), Harrington refers to him as the only political scholar of his time in the *Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656). On the contrary, all those who read translations of *The Prince* or who were influenced by anti-Machiavel libels (e.g. Gentillet's famous *Contre-Machiavel* 1577[1576])⁶ classified the Italian author as being synonymous with all hateful political actions (Praz 1942). As a matter of fact, the many misinterpretations of Machiavelli's thought and above all the many representations of the 'furfante machiavelliano' in the Elizabethan theatre led the name "Machiavel" to acquire a negative meaning – together with its derivative "Machiavellian" – intriguer, and unscrupulous schemer using dishonest tricks in order to achieve his goals (OED, *Machiavel* and *Machiavellian*).

⁴ For further information on the first manuscripts and printed copies of Machiavelli's *De Principatibus* see the critical editions of Lisio (1924 [1899]) and Inglese (1995:LIII-LIX). On the genesis and structure of *The Prince* see Sasso (1980 I:327-477).

⁵ As Devoto (1986:270-271) pointed out, if Machiavelli's works had not been under a ban, he would immediately have been considered the ancestor of Italian literary prose. For further information on the linguistic question in Machiavelli's time and contemporary considerations on his language see Scavuzzo (2003).

⁶ The *Discours sur les moyens de bien gouverner et maintenir en bonne paix un royaume contre Nicolas Machiavel le florentine* was completed by the French Protestant Innocent Gentillet in 1576. It was one of the most influential attacks on Machiavelli, translated into English as *Discourses against Machiavel* in 1577 by Simon Patericke and printed in 1602. For further information on Machiavelli in England see Raab (1965), Procacci (1995:213-251). On the origins of *Machiavellismo* see Firpo (1969).

If the scientific approach dealing with principalities was Machiavelli's greatest contribution to political science, his main fault, given the times in which he lived, was the conscious separation of politics from the moral principles on which Christianity and most ancient philosophies had centred themselves. Furthermore, if *The Prince* presented a ruler ready to use immoral means to gain or keep power, in Machiavelli's day the treatises on the subject were known as 'mirrors of princes' and «advised rulers to be just, merciful, and generous, and to use these qualities in winning the love and the affection of their subjects» (Connell 2005:5). As a consequence, in 1559 the Catholic Church formally banned Machiavelli's writings, and in 1572 Protestants considered his ideas the cause of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of the French Huguenots.

The taint on Machiavelli's name persisted for so long that the original English association between his name and the clever use of immoral methods still exists both in ordinary and political English-language as well as in other languages where the bad connotation of "Machiavel" and "Machiavellian" entered as a semantic borrowing. Today the name and the thought of Machiavelli are no longer universally considered threats and the concept of "Machiavelli's black legend", once widely held in England, has lost ground. For a long time critics have been unanimous not only in recognizing the scientific approach of Machiavelli to politics, but also in reading *The Prince*, first of all, as a realistic vision of politics or a treatise on Political Science.

2.1 *Harvey Mansfield's translation*

As scholars and professors, Mansfield, Skinner and Connell thought of translating *The Prince* to provide students and scholars with a new English-language version supplemented with explanatory notes and critical introductions in which they directly or indirectly explain their opinions on Machiavelli without neglecting his bad reputation within the ordinary and scientific communities.

Harvey C. Mansfield Jr. became professor of Government at Harvard University in 1962. Known for his generally conservative opinion on political issues, he has studied and written on the major political philosophers i.e. Aristotle, Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, Edmund Burke and Alexis de Tocqueville. He is also the author of *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders* (1979;2001), *Florentine Histories* (1988), *Machiavelli's Virtue* (1996) and co-translator of Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy* (1998).

Two editions of *The Prince* by Mansfield Jr. have been published, the first in 1985 and the second in 1998 (Chicago University Press). The 1985 edition consists of an *Introduction* (pp. vii-xxiv), *A Note on Translation* (xxv-xxvii), *The Prince* text (3-105) and the *Appendix* re-

ferring to Machiavelli's letter to Francesco Vettori (December 10, 1513). Instead, the 1998 edition – presented as the «definitive version of *The Prince*, indispensable to scholars, students, and those interested in the dark art of politics» (Mansfield 1998:back-cover) – also provides an updated bibliography, a chronology of Machiavelli's life, a map of sixteenth-century Italy, a substantial glossary of all important words, their occurrences, alternative translations and revisions to the translation itself.

Mansfield describes *The Prince* as the most famous and also the most infamous book on politics ever written. And giving briefly the main reasons for Machiavelli's infamy, he underlines at once that «in explicit contradiction to the reaction of most people to Machiavelli as soon as they hear of his doctrines, Machiavelli was not 'Machiavellian'» (ibid.:viii). He recommends the reader not to pay attention to the various excuses that most scholars have given for Machiavelli, because they make him less interesting.

Besides being the editor, Mansfield is also the only translator of his Machiavelli's *Prince*. In *A Note on Translation* (pp. xxv-xxvii), he expresses his intention to make the translation «as literal and exact as is consistent with readable English» and goes on to explain his choice as follows:

Since I am convinced that Machiavelli was one of the greatest and subtlest minds to whom we have access, I take very seriously the translator's obligation to present a writer's thought in his own words, insofar as possible. It did not seem to me my duty, therefore, to find a rough equivalent to Machiavelli's words in up-to-date, colloquial prose, and to avoid cognates at all costs. For example, I am not embarrassed to translate *provincia* "province" and *patria* "fatherland" because these English words are perfectly intelligible even though they are not the expressions we would use today. It is worthwhile trying to retain the connotations of those words as Machiavelli used them, as well as trying to avoid the connotations of their modern equivalents, such as "nation". With this intent in translation, I have tried to retain some flavor of Machiavelli's style by preserving his favourite expressions and some of his crowded sentences and difficult grammar. If the result seems a little old-fashioned, so it should. Machiavelli's text will live without our help, and it will die if we suffocate it with the sort of hospitality that allows it to live with us only on our terms. (Mansfield 1998:xxv)

Therefore, Mansfield's main goal is to respect Machiavelli's style as far as the English language allows him to, although the translation could appear old-fashioned. He has chosen, for example, to represent repetitions recognizing that Machiavelli used words or phrases several times in close proximity to highlight the importance of the concepts and notions dealt with. On the other hand, he had to make a choice when translating certain referentially-ambiguous pronouns and he has indicated «in the notes the occasions on which Machia-

velli departs from his usual familiar “you” and addresses a formal or plural “you”, a “you” who is asked to see, consider, or think something» (ibid.:xxvi). As regards the source text, he mainly followed Casella, adopting some appropriate and necessary variants as well as profiting from *The Prince* by Leo Paul Alvarez (1980).

2.2 *Quentin Skinner and Russel Price’s translation*

Quentin Skinner was Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University until 2008 when he moved to Queen Mary, University of London. In conformity with the attention to the ‘languages’ of political thought carried out by the ‘Cambridge School’, Professor Skinner has articulated a theory of interpretation based on the ‘speech acts’ of specific individuals in writing works of political thought (Skinner 2001:123-153;2009). Counted among the most authoritative English scholars on the history of political thought, he has dealt with political writers such as Machiavelli, Thomas More, Thomas Hobbes and more recently John Milton, James Harrington and Algernon Sydney.

Unlike Mansfield’s work, *The Prince* by Quentin Skinner is the result of a combined work between him and Russell Price who is the author of several articles on Machiavelli. The first edition, published in 1988, was reprinted in 1989 and with a few minor exceptions the second edition is much like the previous one.⁷ The book is presented as «a major English-language version» supervised by Skinner and providing students with «the most accurate and accessible translation» by Russell Price. The latter is also responsible for the notes to the text (pp. 3-91), the Appendices (93-113), the *Biographical Notes* and the *Indexes*. The book includes an *Editor’s note* (vii), the *Introduction* (ix-xxiv) in which Skinner analyses the structure of *The Prince*, a *Translator’s note* and a chronology of the *Principal events in Machiavelli’s life* (xxv-xxvii). There are two kinds of biographical notes, the first – coming before the text of *The Prince* – concerns Machiavelli, the second – following *Appendix A and Appendix B* – deals with the historical figures mentioned in the text and in the footnotes of *The Prince*.

Appendix A, entitled *Letters relevant to The Prince*, includes the famous letter to Vettori in which Machiavelli describes his life after retirement (10 December 1513), two lines of the letter of Vettori to Machiavelli in which *The Prince* is mentioned (18 January 1514) and finally the English version of Machiavelli’s letter to Giovan Battista Soderini (1506) in which the Florentine secretary anticipates some

⁷ *The Prince* by Skinner and Price has been reprinted nineteen times since the 1989 updated version. As Price writes on page xxxv, the most important corrections regard his *Translator’s note* (pp. xxxii, xxxiv), and p. 13 note e, 41, 50, 58 note d, 89 note c and 108.

themes of his *Prince*.⁸ The more interesting *Appendix B*, entitled *Notes on the vocabulary of The Prince*, gives indications of how Price translated most of the key-terms characterizing the text, «designed to enable the more curious reader to grasp better the complexities and ambiguities of these terms, and the idea that they denote» (Skinner-Price 1989:100).

With regard to the *Introduction*, Skinner outlines the structure of *The Prince* and highlights Machiavelli's rejection of the values expressed in Renaissance books and consequently his rejection of some ancient treatises whose precepts frequently influenced the former.⁹ Finally, he concludes his presentation stating that the description of Machiavelli as a cynical writer cannot be associated with *The Prince* as a whole. Nevertheless,

the work – he writes - is passionately driven forward by a sense of what must realistically be said and done if political success is to be achieved [...] it was there [*The Prince*] Machiavelli first presented, with matchless clarity and force, his basic assumption that rulers must always be prepared to do evil if good will come of it. In doing so he threw down a challenge which subsequent writers on statecraft have found it almost impossible to ignore (Skinner-Price 1989:xxiv).

Skinner's *Introduction* is followed by the *Translator's note* (pp. xxxii-xxxv) in which Price explains that he tried to provide an accurate and readable translation by not hesitating to break up some long sentences and divide the text into more paragraphs. Furthermore, presenting Machiavelli as a writer who rarely uses rhetorical flourishes, whose prose is not verbose and whose tautologies are often apparent, Price admits that Machiavelli is not an easy writer to translate. He tried to overcome all the linguistic difficulties in different ways, providing the reader with explanatory linguistic foot-notes and clarifications on the vocabulary in appendix B. Price also informs his readers that Machiavelli uses many images that are often difficult to render satisfactorily in English, although they contribute to increasing the artistic value of *The Prince*. And since the translation is addressed primarily to students, he has decided to translate «as many of these metaphors as possible, even if they do not always read very well in English» (ibid.:xxxiv).

As regards the source text adopted, among the numerous versions and manuscripts consulted he followed the one «that seems most suited to the contents» (xxxv) taking mainly into account the work by

⁸ All the three documents are preceded by a brief introduction on their importance. Only in the comment on the letter to Soderini does Price specify that he has translated the text referring to Franco Gaeta's editions of Machiavelli's *Lettere* (1961;1984).

⁹ Skinner refers above all to Seneca's *De Clementia* and Cicero's *De officiis*. See also Skinner (1981;2002).

Bertelli (1968) without disregarding Lisio's critical edition (1924 [1899]) and Casella's text (1929).

2.3 *William Connell's translation*

William J. Connell, professor of history, holds the Joseph M. and Geraldine C. La Motta Chair in Italian Studies at Seton Hall University (New Jersey), and he is director of the Joan and Charles Italian Institute. He is author of numerous books and articles on Italian history and like the above-mentioned researchers, he is counted among the most illustrious English-language scholars of the Italian Renaissance.

The Prince by Connell is more recent than Mansfield and Skinner's translations. It was published in 2005 for the first time and consists of three parts. The first part is divided into a *Preface* (pp. v-viii), *A Note about the Text and Translation* (ix-xiv), an introduction, entitled *The Puzzle of The Prince* (1-34), and three maps of Italy in Machiavelli's time. The second part includes *The Prince* text (39-123). The third part collects the English-language version of the most important letters and documents related to *The Prince* e.g. the first prefaces to the work (125-189), *A Niccolò Machiavelli Chronology* (190-2) and finally the section *Questions for Consideration* (193-4) properly studied and included for class discussions.

Connell opens the *Preface* asking the question «Why produce a new edition of Niccolò Machiavelli's *Prince*?». The answer is to enable beginners «to understand how Machiavelli's *Prince* profoundly disturbed people in the past» (Connell 2005:v). According to him, most of the English translations of *The Prince* have been made by literary scholars or political theorists who have had «little familiarity with the historical circumstances and the writing practices of the Florentine chancery where Machiavelli worked as secretary from 1498 to 1512 before writing *The Prince*» (Ibid.).

Implying that translations have often given different interpretations of Machiavelli's work, Connell writes that he has aimed at providing a translation as true as possible to the sense of *The Prince*'s original prose. He has attempted to restore the integrity of Machiavelli's style «in a new, more readable English translation» since the Florentine secretary was «a powerful and innovative writer» (ibid.:ix) whose *Prince* «is unique in the Western tradition because it was the first to argue explicitly that good government requires the skilful use of cruelty and deception to continually take what belongs to others» (ibid.:3).

Connell explains the main issues characterizing Machiavelli's work adding a brief overview on the previous translations of *The Prince*. Since the Florentine secretary uses many words – *virtù*, *libertà*, *stato*, *fortuna* – being aware of their past meanings (in both Ital-

ian and Latin) and imbuing them with new meanings, one of the main problems relating to the translation is Machiavelli's lexicon. Consequently:

The desire to determine in a precise way what Machiavelli meant when he used these or other key terms has resulted in a number of useful studies and glossaries. And, reminiscent of Renaissance controversy over translation *ad verbum* and *ad sensum*, the fascination with Machiavelli's vocabulary has encouraged many scholars to follow one of two divergent paths when translating *The Prince* into English (Connell 2005:ix).

As a matter of fact, among the three scholars, Connell is the only one who underlines the divergent approaches carried out by English scholars when translating *The Prince*, by mentioning the works of Mansfield and Skinner-Price. In Connell's conception, one approach has tried to accommodate Machiavelli's variable meaning of some words by translating the same Italian word (e.g. *virtù*) with different English words according to the context. The disadvantage of this first approach is that «the English reader loses contact with Machiavelli's careful manipulation of meaning-laden words in the original Italian» (ibid.:x). For this reason, translators usually provide the translation with notes on the vocabulary such as in Skinner and Price's version or place the Italian word in brackets after the various English renderings as in Wootton's translation (1995, quoted in Connell 2005:x). Another approach, going by the name of "literal" and followed by Mansfield, de Alvarez, Codevilla (1997) and Connell himself, usually translates «the important recurring Italian terms with single English terms where sense allows to [...] The advantage of the literal method is that the English reader gains closer access to Machiavelli's original, and he or she is less dependent on the translator's hidden choices» (Connell 2005:x).

Nevertheless, Connell underlines that Machiavelli's literal translators have been too devoted to his nouns often neglecting grammatical issues such as articles, pronouns and participles. As a matter of fact, the correct rendering in English of these important aspects may allow the reader to understand Machiavelli's historical idioms better. «In this regard – writes Connell – the 'literary' translators of Machiavelli have tended to do a better job than the 'literal' ones» (Ibid.).

Finally, in the paragraph '*The Italian Text*' Connell presents his Machiavelli's *Prince* as the first English version to benefit from Italian scholars' recent contributions on the original text (e.g. the valuable but not universally accepted critical edition by Giorgio Inglese [1995]). He has, however, based his translation on the text by Casella (1929) without neglecting some proposals by Giorgio Inglese or his critic Mario Martelli (1997) and the commentary of Jean-Louis Fournel and Jean-Claude Zancarini in their recent French translation (2000).

3. Discussion

As already stated in the introduction, this analysis is based on three extracts taken from *The Prince* edited by Casella. Their selection is no reflection on the thematic importance of other passages of Machiavelli's masterpiece, since they were chosen after consulting a widespread bibliography on Machiavelli in search of the most quoted parts of *The Prince*.

The method with which Machiavelli treated the political subject in *The Prince* has been classified as 'dilemmatic' or, using the definition given by Russo (1975 [1949]:69), as a *ragionamento a catena* ('chain reasoning', the term is explained below) that not only was innovative at Machiavelli's time, but it was to characterize all the following modern scientific prose. In the dilemmatic process, the author presents the reader with two evident options taken from the reality and always clearly opposed to each other. In this way, after analysing all the possible situations, he allows the reader to easily understand what the better solution is by avoiding the wrong models (Chiappelli 1952).

At the level of macro-discourse functions Machiavelli's declarative sentences are mainly classifiable as statements used to convey information on the reality and directives used to instruct the new prince on what to do. From a stylistic-syntactic point of view, when the author introduces the subject matter he is going to deal with or records facts such as in chapter I:

Tutti gli stati [...] sono o repubbliche o principati. E' principati sono, o ereditari [...] o e' sono nuovi. E' nuovi, o sono nuovi tutti [...] o sono come membri aggiunti allo stato ereditario ... (Casella 1929:5).

he tends to avoid subordination in favour of coordination.¹⁰ On the contrary, when giving advice he treats the reasons and the effects of rulers' behaviours (e.g. in the second part of *The Prince* mainly characterized by 'chain reasoning') the hypotactic structure of the utterance prevails: many causative, relative, temporal and consecutive clauses are subordinated to a small number of main clauses whose concepts are linked to each other as a chain (viz. each clause is the expression of an independent concept that follows on from the previous one). Another stylistic-syntactic characteristic of *The Prince* is the frequent use of passive constructions rather than the more direct active forms. The main subjects of Machiavelli's argument (the prince, the people, the enemy etc.) are often set in a passive syntactic position in the clause. To give an example, in chapter XIX when the Florentine secretary refers to Commodo (180-192 A.D.):

¹⁰ Chiappelli calls Machiavelli's tendency to coordination: 'Fenomeno del principalismo' (1952:40-44).

And since he [Commodo] was hated by one side [the people] and despised by the other [the soldiers], he was conspired against and killed (Connell 2005:102).¹¹

he sets the prince (Commodo) in a passive syntactic position omitting the agents of «*fu conspirato*» and «*[fu] morto*» which are the people and the soldiers. With regard to this aspect Chiappelli (1952:45) retains that by preferring the passive construction Machiavelli aimed at underlining the inevitability of the actions which were not the personal choices of the subjects and the necessity for the addressee to act in one way rather than another.

This “necessity”, obtained through the combination of the syntactic-stylistic elements, is also explicitly confirmed by the frequent use of verbs like *debbe*, *debbono*, by expressions like *sono forzati*, *di necessità conviene che*, *è necessario che*, *bisogna*, *sempre*; by terminology (*spegnere*, *ruinare*, *stato* etc.) or finally by referring to historical examples of present and past rulers (ibid.:44-5).¹²

3.1 From *Quod principem deceat circa militiam*

The first excerpt is taken from chapter XIV in which the prince is advised on how to act concerning military matters in order to maintain his state or to acquire new territories.

Excerpt 1

[1.1] *Debbe, adunque, uno principe non avere altro obietto né altro pensiero, né prendere cosa alcuna per sua arte, fuori della guerra e ordini e disciplina di essa ; perché quella è sola arte che si aspetta a chi comanda; ed è di tanta virtù, che non solamente mantiene quelli che sono nati principi, ma molte volte fa gli uomini di privata fortuna salire a quel grado; [1.2] e, per adverso, si vede che e' principi, quando hanno pensato più alle delicatezze che alle armi, hanno perso lo stato loro. E la prima cagione che ti fa perdere quello, è negligere questa arte ; e la cagione che te lo fa acquistare, è lo essere professo di questa arte.*

[1.3] *Francesco Sforza, per essere armato, di privato diventò duca di Milano ; e' figliuoli, per fuggire e' disarmi delle arme, di duchi diventarono privati ; [1.4] Perché, intra le cagioni che ti arca di male lo essere disarmato, ti fa contennendo : la quale è una di quelle infamie dalle quali il principe si debbe guardare, come di sotto si dirà (Casella 1929:29).*¹³

¹¹ Source text: «Ed essendo odiato [Commodo] dall'una parte e disprezzato dall'altra, fu conspirato in lui e [fu] morto» (Casella 1929:39).

¹² Moreover Chiappelli (1952) identifies Machiavelli's tendency to give some terms such as *spegnere*, *ruinare*, *stato*, *repubbliche* a peculiar scientific meaning on one hand, and his more subjective and affective stylistic tendency on the other.

¹³ Casella does not divide the chapters of *The Prince* into paragraphs. Each excerpt is here divided into sections (1.2, 1.3 etc.) to facilitate the analysis.

Going from the first line of the chapter to the historical example of Francesco Sforza, the passage counts 177 words in Casella's text and consists of short clauses mainly organized in hypotactic and parhypotactic structures,¹⁴ except for the sequence of the first utterance ([1.1]: «Debbe adunque uno principe non avere altro obietto [...] fuori della guerra e ordini e disciplina di essa») where three main clauses are coordinated through copulative conjunctions. The parhypotactic relation is identifiable in the second part of the first sentence (1.1) where the causative clause «perchè quella è sola arte» comes before «ed è di tanta virtù» which is the main clause. It also recurs in the last part of the excerpt in which another causative (1.4) «perchè intra le cagioni che ti areca di male lo essere disarmato» is subordinated to the following main clause «la quale è una di quelle infamie».

Since, according to Machiavelli, a prince should always think and act as a warrior not to incur the consequences illustrated by the historical example of the Sforzas, this necessity is explicitly underlined by the modal verb *debbe* (1.1). The passage also presents Latin forms (*per adverso*, *negligere*, *contennendo*), literary and terminological variations (*adunque*, *professo*), a figure of speech (hyperbaton: *intra le cagioni [...] di male*) and finally (for the comparative goal of this analysis) two keywords of Machiavelli's: *virtù* and *stato*.

Looking at the translations, whereas Mansfield and Connell respect Machiavelli's syntactic organization of the sentences reproducing them faithfully in English, Price is the translator who mainly moves away from the source-text presenting unusual linguistic habits if compared with the others. In the first excerpt, for example, he seems to aim at more expressive conciseness. Not only does he create independent sentences, but he also eliminates two relative clauses introducing anaphora and nominalization or, otherwise, he clarifies the function of some subordinate clauses. After linking the first causative with the three main clauses he substitutes Machiavelli's «quella è sola arte che» (Mansfield and Connell's «for that is the only art which») with a more synthetic expression: «for this pertains». In the latter, the anaphoric pronoun (*this*) should stand for the expression «*war, its methods and practices*» that in Machiavelli's text is expressed by the word *arte*:

A ruler, then, should have no other objective and no other concern, nor occupy himself with anything else except war and its methods and practices, *for this pertains* only to those who rule. And it is of such effi-

¹⁴ In Italian there are three main possibilities of relation in a sequence of clauses: parataxis, hypotaxis and juxtaposition. Para-hypotaxis is the fourth possibility of relation (not accepted today), assigned to Old Italian by Sorrento (1950:27) who describes the phenomenon as a dependent clause followed by its main clause. See also Serianni (2006:533-34).

cacy that it not only maintains hereditary rulers in power but very often enables men of private status to become rulers (Skinner-Price 1989:51).

As a consequence, to avoid repetitions, Price translates the word *arte*, that appears three times in the source-text (1.1;1.2), only twice. Furthermore, in the second sentence, the translator converts the relative clause «quelli *che sono nati principi*» (translated word by word by both Mansfield and Connell) into the noun phrase «hereditary rulers».

Finally, in the last sentence, coming before the example of Sforza, the translation of the relative clause («e la prima cagione *che ti fa perdere quello* è negligere questa arte») by Price is the following: «The main reason *why they lose it* is their neglect of the art of war» which allows us to note that the relative clause post-modifies the head of the noun phrase and is therefore subordinated to the head noun and not to the main clause in toto. Also, the introduction of «why» explicitly signals the causative function of Machiavelli's relative clause, whereas Mansfield and Connell furnish a more literal translation: «and the first cause that makes you lose it is».

As regards the hyperbaton (1.4) «intra *le cagioni che ti areca di male* lo essere disarmato, ti fa contennendo»,¹⁵ Mansfield recognises the stylistic device and decides to eliminate it by restoring the normal word order: «For, among the other *causes of evil* that being unarmed brings you, it makes you contemptible». Price, maintaining Machiavelli's meaning, changes the original phrase completely. He mediates the stylistic effect by considering it to be a piece of additional information which he puts in brackets: «for being unarmed (apart from other bad consequences) results in your being despised».

On the contrary, Connell tries to reproduce the hyperbaton by introducing an unusual English sentence construction which at first sight is not very fluent: «For, among the other reasons that being unarmed does you evil, it makes you contemptible».

As regards the discourse functions and modality the three translators qualify the function of *debbe* in different ways. According to Chiappelli (1952:46) in the source-text the explicitly expressed necessity – («*debbe* uno principe non avere altro oggetto [...] dalle quali uno principe si *debbe* guardare») – states the writer's judgement that what is said is the logical conclusion of experiences already known or observed. So, we may refer to it as a "logical necessity". In this respect, Mansfield translates *debbe* with *should* in both cases: «a prince should have no other object [...] the prince should be on guard against»; Price translates the first *debbe* with *should* and the second

¹⁵ The hyperbaton is stylistic device in which the normal word order is not respected. It aims at highlighting specific words (Beccaria 1994). According to normal word order, Machiavelli's phrase would be: «intra *le cagioni di male* che ti areca lo essere disarmato».

with *must*: «A ruler, then, should have no other objective [...] against which a ruler must always guard»; Connell, unlike Price, translates the first with *must* and the second with *should*: «Thus a prince must have no other object [...] the prince should guard himself».

If we consider the different speech acts expressed by these two English modals, we will learn that *should* is used to give advice; *must* is used to give orders. *Must* can mean an epistemic necessity or imply a sense of obligation, whilst *should* expresses the same basic modality of ‘necessity’ and ‘obligation’ involving the writer’s authority, but unlike *must* it does not imply that the speaker is confident that his recommendation will be carried out. So, on the basis of these assumptions we can deduce that by using *must* instead of *should* the translators have interpreted Machiavelli’s *debbe* as expressing an epistemic necessity or obligation.

Price explains his switching of the two modals in his glossary under the entry *necessità* in which he writes that, since Machiavelli’s verb *dovere* sometimes means to be necessary, he has at times translated the frequently used third person singular form, *debbe*, with ‘must’ though more often, interpreting it as being less strong, he has used ‘should’ (Skinner-Price 1989:108). Reading *The Prince* it can be noted that Mansfield translates *debbe* with *must* only nine times out of its sixty-eight occurrences in the source-text, Connell uses *must* thirty times, concentrating it above all in chapters XII, XIX, XXI and XXII, whilst Price uses *must* thirteen times and, unlike the other translators, he sometimes renders Machiavelli’s *debbe* with *will* or *would* e.g. «afterwards he [the prince] will have no reason to fear them» (chap. IV, *ibid.*:16); «he [the prince] would do well not to worry about being called miserly» (chap. XVI, *ibid.*:56).

In conclusion, unlike Price and Connell, Mansfield is the only translator who has constantly used *should* instead of *must* perhaps intending to underline that Machiavelli aimed at giving suggestions to the prince, and implying that these suggestions acquired the value of precepts if the prince wanted to achieve the desirable scope.¹⁶

As regards the translation of the terms *virtù* (1.1) and *stato* (1.2), it is well known that the mediation of Machiavelli’s key terms from Italian into other languages has always given rise to much research and numerous articles on the subject,¹⁷ so much so that, as above referred to, both Mansfield and Connell highlight this aspect in their prefaces. Coherently with their statements in the preface, Mansfield and Connell use the corresponding English equivalents *virtue* and

¹⁶ On the differences between *should* and *must* see Quirk et al. (1985:227).

¹⁷ For the study of the word *virtù* in Machiavelli according to the scholars dealt with in this research see Price (1973), Skinner (1981;2001;2002), Tully (1988). Mansfield’s opinions in contrast with Skinner (1996:6-52). See also Fournel-Zancarini (2000).

state in the excerpt here analysed.¹⁸ On the contrary Price translates *virtù* with *efficacy* and *state* with *power*. As far as the word *virtù*¹⁹ is concerned, once again the reasons for Price's different renderings can be found in the note on vocabulary: in his opinion of context, in Chapter XIV Machiavelli uses *virtù* metaphorically in the sense of 'efficacy' denoting material objects («the knowledge of, and skill in, military matters is 'of such virtue' that it enables hereditary rulers to maintain power and 'new men' to become rulers) (ibid.:104). In other words, according to Price and Skinner's interpretation of the passage, Machiavelli gives the old word *virtù* (from the Latin *virtus*, *virtutis*) a new meaning involving a semantic extension of the term which, usually denoting human qualities, was there applied to denote material objects (the art of war) in the sense of «power to effect the object intended» (OED, *efficacy*).²⁰

3.2 From *De his rebus quibus homines et praesertim principes laudantur aut vituperantur*

The second excerpt is taken from chapter XV and regards the part in which Machiavelli informs the reader that one further question still needs to be treated: how a prince should conduct himself towards allies and subjects. Although many scholars before him have dealt with the same issue, Machiavelli alerts the reader on his intent to repudiate the whole tradition of thought on the subject since he finds the previous discussions unrealistic. From a thematic point of view, the extract is also important because it shows Machiavelli's opinion on human nature and it anticipates that – if necessary – to maintain his power a prince should be prepared to act not in conformity with the standard morality.

Excerpt 2

[2.1] Resta ora a vedere quali debbano essere e' modi e governi di uno principe con sudditi o con gli amici. [2.2] E perché io so che molti di questo hanno scritto, dubito, scrivendone ancora io, non essere tenuto pro-suntuoso, partendomi massime, nel disputare questa materia, dagli ordini degli altri. [2.3] Ma sendo l'intento mio scrivere cosa utile a chi la intende, mi è parso più conveniente andare drieto alla verità effettuale della cosa, che alla imaginazione di essa. [2.4] E molti si sono imaginati repubbliche e principati che non si sono mai visti né conosciuti essere in vero;

¹⁸ Both Manfield and Connell underline the translation of Machiavelli's key terms in their prefaces. For the equivalence between *virtù* and 'virtue' see OED, *virtue*, II s.v. 9 d. On Mansfield's remarks see Mansfield 1996 and 1998:6n. On Connell's remarks see 2005:x.

¹⁹ For the rendering of *stato* and translators' explanations see Mansfield (1998:5n2;1996) Skinner (1989:102; 2002:284) and Connell (2005:40n7).

²⁰ This kind of metaphor, that Dardano names *transfert lessicale*, shows how a term can change its meaning according to the context in which it is used.

[2.5] perché egli è tanto discosto da come si vive a come si dovrebbe vivere, che colui che lascia quello che si fa per quello che si dovrebbe fare impara piuttosto la ruina che la preservazione sua: perché uno uomo che voglia fare in tutte le parte professione di buono, conviene rovini infra tanti che non sono buoni. [2.6] Onde è necessario a uno principe, volendosi mantenere, imparare a potere essere non buono, e usarlo e non lo usare secondo la necessità (Casella 1929:30).

The excerpt consists of 175 words in Casella's version and presents a hypotactic structure and many deictic elements that guarantee its cohesion. We mainly find personal deictics: the first person pronoun (io) referred to the author himself (see 2.2), the appellative (chi) referred to the reader (see 2.3), the third person pronoun (egli) referred to the prince (the addressee) (see 2.5); and textual deixis through which, as above-mentioned, the author shows his intent and introduces the next topic he is going to deal with «*resta ora a vedere [...] ma sendo l'intento mio*» (see 2.1).

It also contains a Latin syntactic construction represented by the verb *dubito* followed by the negative infinitive *non essere* and expressions from Machiavelli's style such as «mi è parso» that often recurs in the text and the well-known saying (2.3) «*verità effettuale della cosa*» (Scavuzzo 2003:56). Another aspect worthy of being mentioned here is the particular construction of the first causative clause in the second-last sentence of the excerpt : (2.5) «perché egli è tanto discosto da come si vive a come si dovrebbe vivere». In modern Italian this sentence may be clarified as follows: “come egli vive è tanto discosto da come egli dovrebbe vivere”,²¹ since «come» (the way in which) is the subject of «è tanto discosto». From a semantic point of view, the excerpt is also interesting because it contains some of those terms that Chiappelli has considered Machiavelli's technical terms, such as *ruina*²² and its antonym *preservazione* (2.5).

With few slight differences translators have rendered Machiavelli's passage from Italian in English respecting the syntactic structure of Machiavelli's sentence. The most faithful are always Mansfield and Connell who try to recreate Machiavelli's organization of the sentence as far as the English language allows them to. For example in the first unit («*Resta ora a vedere quali debbano essere e' modi e governi di uno principe con sudditi o con gli amici*») they maintain Machiavelli's subjects: «it remains now to see the *modes* and *government* of a prince should be with subjects and with friends» (Mansfield); «it remains therefore to see what should be the ways and the conduct of a prince, whether with his subjects and with his allies» (Connell). On

²¹ The sense is: how men live is so different from how they should live. For further explanations see Inglese (1995:102n5).

²² The *ruina* is one of the bad consequences from which all Machiavelli's precepts aim at keeping away. Chiappelli (1952:53-55) has also noted that in many sentences Machiavelli put the words in an order that underlines the term *ruinare*.

the contrary, Price changes the subject by translating: «It remains now to consider in what ways a ruler should act with regard to his subjects and allies».

Price again shows a tendency to carry out changes in the translation of the above-quoted first causative clause belonging to the penultimate sentence of the excerpt:

[2.5] perché egli è tanto discosto da come si vive a come si dovrebbe vivere, che colui che lascia quello che si fa per quello che si dovrebbe fare impara piuttosto la ruina che la preservazione sua ... (Casella 1929:30).

If Mansfield translates Machiavelli word by word:

[S1] for it is so far from how one lives to how one should live that he who lets go of what is done for what should be done learns his ruin rather than his preservation (Mansfield 1998:61).

and Connell adds the element 'distance' and changes the last part introducing two verbs instead of the nouns 'ruin' and 'preservation' as follows:

[S2] For there is such a distance from how one lives to how one ought to live that he who abandons what is done for what ought to be done learns what will ruin him rather than what will save him (Connell 2005:87).

Price transforms the causative into a main clause and makes the concept clearer to the English reader, introducing the connective adverb 'However' which allows him to link the sentence with the previous part (emphasizing its dependence):

[S3] However, how men live is so different from how they should live that a ruler who does not do what is generally done, but persists in what ought to be done, will undermine his power rather than maintain it (Skinner-Price 1989:54).

Furthermore, the above fragments show that vocabulary is the main aspect that diversifies the three translations. In the examples, Price translates the Italian *principe* with the more generic word 'ruler' (S3). In his glossary, he explains that he has considered the wide reference that the word *princeps* had in Latin translating it with 'ruler' of a monarchical type (one who may rule a principality, a kingdom, a monarchy or also an empire) (ibid.:102-3).²³ This translation of *principe* into 'ruler' perhaps allows Price to omit the word *governi* (be-

²³ Price translates *principe* with *prince* only twice: «States thus acquired are either used to living under a prince or used to being free» (1989, I:5) and «However when cities or countries are accustomed to living under a prince» (1989, V:18).

longing to the two-part phrase «modes and government») that he replaces with another super-ordinate word (the hyperonym 'way'). Nevertheless, the main interesting vocabulary translation regards the maxim (2.3) *realtà effettuale della cosa*. If Mansfield and Connell translate it with 'effectual truth of the thing', Price deems it necessary to be more explicit by translating '*realtà effettuale della cosa*' with its periphrasis «what really happens». In this respect, Connell quotes the maxim «andare dreto alla verità effettule della cosa» in the preface, focusing on some misinterpretations of the idiomatic phrase "andare dreto a" (to go after). The translator has noted that Atkinson, Mansfield and Wootton gave *dreto* the meaning of *diretto* (direct) instead of rightly considering it as the Tuscan abbreviation of *indietro* (behind).

Finally, the technical term 'ruin' and its antonym 'preservation' (2.5) are also examples of divergence among the three translations. Mansfield follows Machiavelli's text: «[one] learns his ruin rather than his preservation»; Price uses another periphrasis «[the ruler] will undermine his power rather than maintain it»; Connell transforms the grammatical category of 'ruin' into a verb, and conceives *preservazione* in the sense of 'to save' rather than 'maintain': «[he] learns what will ruin him rather than what will save him».

3.3 From *De crudelitate et pietate; et an sit melius amari quam timeri, vel e contra*

The third excerpt is taken from chapter XVII in which Machiavelli focuses on the vice of cruelty, evaluating whether it is better for a prince to be loved than feared. He concludes that the new prince cannot avoid being considered cruel if he wishes to maintain his power. The passage follows the author's example on Cesare Borgia and the statement of Dido from the *Aeneid* of Virgilio (I, 563-4). It concerns the reasoning on whether it is better to be loved than feared and ends with Machiavelli's logical deduction that for a prince it is better to be feared than hated, if he cannot acquire love.

Excerpt 3

[3.1] Nasce da questo una disputa: s'egli è meglio essere amato che temuto, o e converso. [3.2] Rispondesi che si vorrebbe essere l'uno e l'altro; ma perché egli è difficile accozzarli insieme, è molto più sicuro essere temuto che amato, quando si abbia a mancare dell'una de' dua. [3.3] Perché degli uomini si può dire questo generalmente: che sieno ingrati, volubili, simulatori e dissimulatori, fuggitori de' pericoli, cupidi di guadagno; e mentre fai loro bene, sono tutti tua, offeronti el sangue, la roba, la vita, e' figlioli, come di sopra dissi, quando il bisogno è discosto; ma quando ti si appressa, e' si rivoltano. E quel principe che si è tutto fondato in sulle parole loro, trovandosi nudo di altre preparazioni, rovina; [3.4] perché le amicizie che si acquistano col prezzo, e non con grandezza e

nobiltà di animo, si meritano, ma le non si hanno, e a' tempi non si possono spendere. E gli uomini hanno meno rispetto a offendere uno che si facci amare, che uno che si facci temere; perché l'amore è tenuto da uno vincolo di obbligo, il quale, per essere gli uomini tristi, da ogni occasione di propria utilità è rotto; ma il timore è tenuto da una paura di pena che non ti abbandona mai.

[3.5] Debbe nondimanco el principe farsi temere in modo che, se non acquista lo amore, che fugga l'odio; perché può molto bene stare insieme essere temuto e non odiato; il che farà sempre, quando si astenga dalla roba de' sua cittadini e de' sua sudditi, e dalle donne loro (Casella1929:32).

Counting 255 words in Casella's text, the excerpt is another example of Machiavelli's dilemmatic process in which the hypotactic structure of the sentence prevails. Short utterances, expressing single concepts, are linked to each other as a chain and depend on the starting issue (3.1).

The dilemmatic process is highlighted by three contrastive clauses introduced by the conjunction *but* (3.2;3.3) and one introduced by the adverb *nondimanco* (3.5). Through these clauses, Machiavelli adds a new datum that is in contrast with the previous one: «ma perché egli è difficile accozzarli insieme [...] ma le [amicizie] non si hanno [...] ma il timore è tenuto da una paura di pena [...] Debbe, nondimanco el principe».

From a stylistic point of view, we find two synonyms joined by a conjunction («simulatori e dissimulatori»), one climax i.e. the ascending series of words (*el sangue, la roba, la vita, e figlioli*) whose value, intensifying step by step, gives force to Machiavelli's significance, a recurring expression of Machiavelli's idiomatic language (*fondato in su*), some aspects of the spoken language: «*in modo che, se non acquista lo amore, che fugga l'odio*». From a semantic point of view, there are Latinisms (*converso, tristi*) and technical expressions (*a' tempi*).

Looking at translations Price changes Machiavelli's construction of the second phrase from impersonal («rispondesi») to personal («my view is»), adding a deictic (*my*) that highlights the author's point of view. Perhaps, in this way Price aims at conveying to his addressee that the author is expressing a new concept which differs from the traditional thought on the subject.²⁴

Later on, Price again moves away from the source-text when he translates the concept expressed by the second contrastive clause as follows:

²⁴ According to Skinner, in considering whether it is better for a prince to be loved or feared in chapter XVII Machiavelli alludes directly to Cicero's *De officiis* (II, 7, 23-24) moving however away from the Latin rhetorician. See Skinner (1989;2002).

But when you are hard pressed, they turn away. A ruler who has relied completely on their promises, and has neglected to prepare other defences, will be ruined, because friendships that are acquired with money, and not through greatness and nobility of character, are paid for but not secured, and prove unreliable just when they are needed (Skinner-Price 1989:51).

He changes the contrastive clause from active into passive without mentioning the agent (i.e. *the need*), whilst both Mansfield («but when it is close to you») and Connell («but when it comes close to you») maintain Machiavelli's anaphora and, above all, Machiavelli's emphasis given by the word *bisogno* (3.3). Moreover, Price prefers to be more explicit rather than faithful to the source-text when translating the expression «trovandosi nudo di altre preparazioni» as follows: «and [the ruler] has neglected to prepare other defences». He disregards the causative function of the clause and above all Machiavelli's figurative use of the word *nudo* which means lacking military defences. Nevertheless, introducing the term 'defences' (instead of 'preparation') we cannot deny that the translator makes the author's message clearer.

In Price's translation of the third passage, we can note another habit of his: the tendency to conciseness when he translates (3.5) «perchè può molto bene stare insieme essere temuto e non odiato». Whereas Mansfield and Connell translate «because being feared and not being hated can go together very well» and «for being feared and being not hated may exist together very well» respectively, Price translates «for it is perfectly possible to be feared without incurring hatred» and, in this respect, he seems to give absolute value (using 'perfectly') to Machiavelli's expression 'molto bene', even if this value is mitigated by the association of 'perfectly' with 'possible'.

As regards the climax, unlike the others Price aims once again at explicitness in mediating Machiavelli's stylistic device. Paying attention to the translations of the climax and the whole of Machiavelli's phrase ([3.3] «e mentre fai loro bene, sono tutti tua, offeronti el sangue, la roba, la vita e figlioli»), we can note that Mansfield translates Machiavelli omitting the intensifying *tutti* («they are yours, offering you their blood, property, lives, and children»), Connell translates word by word («they are wholly yours, offering you their blood, their property, their life, their children»), Price clarifies what Machiavelli has left implicit adding the idea of devotion expressed by «sono tutti tua» on one hand and he uses the expression «would shed blood» (instead of «to offer blood»), involving the meaning of killing by violent means (OED, *shed*, s.v. 7a) on the other: «they are all devoted to you: they would shed their blood for you; they offer their possessions, their lives and their sons». In this way, Price reduces the effect given by Machiavelli's climax ([they offer] blood, property, life and children) and just reproduces a slight emphasis introducing the mood maker

‘would’ that even if it expresses the hypothetical meaning of the main phrase, it also implies that the speaker recognizes that it may well exist or come into existence.

Conclusion

The analysis of the relationship between the three target-texts – by Mansfield, Skinner-Price and Connell – and their source-text by Casella has shown that the English-language translators mediated Machiavelli’s *The Prince* in different ways. Both Mansfield and Connell have carried out what is basically a *literal* translation by transferring the syntactic structures and the vocabulary of the source language as far as possible to the corresponding structures and vocabulary of the English language. In particular the extracts here considered reveal that in order to achieve a faithful rewriting of the original text, Connell – more than Mansfield – has sometimes consciously reproduced some figures of speech in an unusual English form (e.g. the translation of the hyperbaton in exc. 1).

Unlike Mansfield and Connell, from a stylistic point of view Price (and consequently Skinner) has been less faithful to the source-text. If Mansfield and Connell have reproduced Machiavelli’s shifting style insofar as possible and have rendered his key-terms (such as *virtù* and *stato*) with their English equivalents (*virtue* and *state*), on most occasions Price has moved away from the stylistic characteristics of the source-text and has translated the same key term in different ways depending on his notion of context.

In the light of Translational Studies, their translations of *The Prince* in English may be explained through two approaches, deriving from the reflections of scholars on the contentious concept of equivalence (i.e. the relationship between source and target text). Both Connell and Mansfield have adopted a functional translation strategy (Nord 1991). Mansfield has combined “functionality” with “loyalty” by respecting at the same time the purpose that Machiavelli’s text was intended to serve and the needs of his English-language readers. Unlike Mansfield, Connell has however «foreignized» the target-text more than the former, exercising an ethno-deviant pressure on those aspects which make the foreign text linguistically different. He has reproduced Machiavelli’s idiomatic language (even to the detriment of the English reader) and he has enriched the target-text with historical footnotes and related documents useful to provide students with starting points for class discussion. Price has adopted a «domesticating» translation method (Schleiermacher 1813; Venuti 1995) exercising an ethnocentric reduction of the source-text in the direction of the target-language, so much so that his translation is very different from the others.

The comparison of the three translations has shown that Price's target-text is characterized by linguistic options which are independent of the style of Machiavelli and also independent of differences between source and target language. He sometimes tends to conciseness (e.g. the nominalization of the relative clause in exc. 1, the noun phrase «hereditary rulers» instead of the phrase «those who are born princes») or to explicitness by expressing the implicit function of some clauses (e.g. the causative value of the relative in exc. 1) and by using periphrasis (e.g. «what really happens» instead of «effectual truth»), or also he tends to hyperonymy (e.g. *ruler* instead of *prince* in exc. 3). Moreover, unlike Mansfield and Connell, Price applies a mediation of Machiavelli's key terms (e.g. *virtù* is rendered by 'ability', 'prowess', 'courage', 'efficacy' etc.) that is shaped by a specific methodological approach.

As a matter of fact, in addition to what Price himself wrote in his Preface to the translation, we can explain his individual linguistic habits by the fact that *The Prince* by Skinner & Price belongs to *The Cambridge Texts Series* whose publishers reproduce readily available texts of political theory by taking into account the intellectual context in which they had been formed, so much so that Skinner himself refers to the style of his translations as a "contextualized style".

APPENDIX

EXTRACT 1 - CHAPTER XIV

WHAT A PRINCE SHOULD DO REGARDING THE MILITARY

Thus, a prince should have no other object, nor any other thought, nor take anything else as his art but that of war and its orders and discipline; for that is the only art which is of concern to one who commands. And it is of such virtue that not only does it maintain those who have been born princes but many times it enables men of private fortune to rise to that rank; and on the contrary, one sees that when princes have thought more of amenities than of arms, they have lost their states. And the first cause that makes you lose it is the neglect of this art; and the cause that enables you to acquire it is to be a professional in this art.

Francesco Sforza, because he was armed, became duke of Milan from a private individual; and his sons, because they shunned the hardships of arms, became private individuals from dukes. For, among the other causes of evil that being unarmed brings you, it makes you contemptible, which is one of those infamies the prince should be on guard against, as will be said below. (Mansfield 1998:58)

HOW A RULER SHOULD ACT CONCERNING MILITARY MATTERS

A ruler, then, should have no other objective and no other concern, nor occupy himself with anything else except war and its methods and practices, for this pertains only to those who rule. And it is of such efficacy that it not only maintains hereditary rulers in power but very often enables men of private status to become rulers. On the other hand, it is evident that if rulers concern themselves more with the refinements of life than with military matters, they lose power. The main reason why they lose it is their neglect of the art of war; and being proficient in this art is what enables one to gain power. Because Francesco Sforza was armed, from being a private citizen he became Duke of Milan; since his descendants did not trouble themselves with military matters, from being dukes they became private citizens. For being unarmed (apart from other bad consequences) results in your being despised, which is one of those disgraceful things against which a ruler must always guard, as will be explained later. (Skinner-Price 1989:5)

WHAT THE PRINCE SHOULD DO CONCERNING THE MILITARY

Thus a prince must have no other object or thought, nor take any thing as his art save warfare and its institutions and training. For that is the only art that is expected of one who commands, and it is an art of such virtue that it not only maintains those who are born princes, but many times it makes men of private fortune rise to that rank. On the contrary, one sees that princes, when they have thought more about delicate things than arms, have lost their state. The first reason that makes you lose it is the neglect of this art; and the reason that makes you acquire it is your being proficient in

this art. Francesco Sforza, because he was armed, from being a private man became duke of Milan. His sons, because they fled the hardships of arms, from being dukes became private men. For, among the other reasons that being unarmed does you evil, it makes you contemptible, which is one of the infamies against which the prince should guard himself, as will be said below. (Connell 2005:84)

EXTRACT 2 - CHAPTER XV

OF THOSE THINGS FOR WHICH MEN AND ESPECIALLY PRINCES ARE PRAISED OR BLAMED

It remains now to see what the modes and government of a prince should be with subjects and with friends. And because I know that many have written of this, I fear that in writing of it again, I may be held presumptuous, especially since in disputing this matter I depart from the orders of others. But since my intent is to write something useful to whoever understands it, it has appeared to me more fitting to go directly to the effectual truth of the thing than to the imagination of it. And many have imagined republics and principalities that have never been seen or known to exist in truth; for it is so far from how one lives to how one should live that he who lets go of what is done for what should be done learns his ruin rather than his preservation. For a man who wants to make a profession of good in all regards must come to ruin among so many who are not good. Hence it is necessary to a prince, if he wants to maintain himself, to learn to be able not to be good, and to use this and not use it according to necessity ... (Mansfield 1998:61)

THE THINGS FOR WHICH MEN, AND ESPECIALLY RULERS, ARE PRAISED OR BLAMED

It remains now to consider in what ways a ruler should act with regard to his subjects and allies. And since I am well aware that many people have written about this subject I fear that I may be thought presumptuous, for what I have to say differs from the precepts offered by others, especially on this matter. But because I want to write what will be useful to anyone who understands, it seems to me better to concentrate on what really happens than on theories or speculations. For many have imagined republics and principalities that have never been seen or known to exist. However, how men live is so different from how they should live that a ruler who does not do what is generally done, but persists in what ought to be done, will undermine his power rather than maintain it. If a ruler who wants always to act honourably is surrounded by many unscrupulous men his downfall is inevitable.

Therefore, a ruler who wishes to maintain his power must be prepared to act immorally when this becomes necessary. (Skinner-Price 1989:54-55)

ON THOSE THINGS FOR WHICH MEN AND ESPECIALLY PRINCES ARE PRAISED AND CRITICIZED

It remains therefore to see what should be the ways and conduct of a prince, whether with his subjects or with his allies. And because I know that many people have written about this, I worry in writing about it too that I shall be held presumptuous, especially since in debating this material I shall depart

from the orders of the others. But since my intent is to write a thing that is useful for whoever understands it, it seemed to me more appropriate to go after the effectual truth of the thing than the imagination of it. And many have imagined republics and principalities that have never been seen or known to exist in truth. For there is such a distance from how one lives to how one ought to live that he who abandons what is done for what ought to be done learns what will ruin him rather than what will save him, since a man who would wish to make a career of being good in every detail must come to ruin among so many who are not good. Hence it is necessary for a prince, if he wishes to maintain himself, to learn to be able to be not good, and to use this faculty and not to use it according to necessity. (Connell 2005:87)

EXTRACT 3 – CHAPTER XVII

OF CRUELTY AND MERCY, AND WHETHER IT IS BETTER TO BE LOVED THAN FEARED, OR THE CONTRARY

From this a dispute arises whether it is better to be loved than feared, or the reverse. The response is that one would want to be both the one and the other; but because it is difficult to put them together, it is much safer to be feared than loved, if one has to lack one of the two. For one can say this generally of men: that they are ungrateful, fickle, pretenders and dissemblers, evaders of danger, eager for gain. While you do them good, they are yours, offering you their blood, property, lives, and children, as I said above, when the need for them is far away; but, when it is close to you, they revolt. And that prince who has founded himself entirely on their words, stripped of other preparation, is ruined; for friendships that are acquired at a price and not with greatness and nobility of spirit are bought, but they are not owned and when the time comes they cannot be spent. And men have less hesitation to offend one who makes himself loved than one who makes himself feared; for love is held by a chain of obligation, which, because men are wicked, is broken at every opportunity for their own utility, but fear is held by a dread of punishment that never forsakes you. The prince should nonetheless make himself feared in such a mode that if he does not acquire love, he escapes hatred, because being feared and not being hated can go together very well. This he will always do if he abstains from the property of his citizens and his subjects, and from their women; (Mansfield 1998:66)

CRUELTY AND MERCIFULNESS; AND WHETHER IT IS BETTER TO BE LOVED OR FEARED

A controversy has arisen about this: whether it is better to be loved than feared, or vice versa. My view is that it is desirable to be both loved and feared; but it is difficult to achieve both and, if one of them to be lacking, it is much safer to be feared than loved.

For this may be said of men generally: they are ungrateful, fickle, feigners and dissemblers, avoiders of danger, eager for gain. While you benefit them they are all devoted to you: they would shed their blood for you; they offer their possessions, their lives, and their sons, as I said before, when the need

to do so is far off. But when you are hard pressed, they turn away. A ruler who has relied completely on their promises, and has neglected to prepare other defences, will be ruined, because friendships that are acquired with money, and not through greatness and nobility of character, are paid for but not secured, and prove unreliable just when they are needed.

Men are less hesitant about offending or harming a ruler who makes himself loved than one who inspires fear. For love is sustained by a bond of gratitude which, because men are excessively self-interested, is broken whenever they see a chance to benefit themselves. But fear is sustained by a dread of punishment that is always effective. Nevertheless, a ruler must make himself feared in such a way that, even if he does not become loved, he does not become hated. For it is perfectly possible to be feared without incurring hatred. And this can always be achieved if he refrains from laying hands on the property of his citizens and subjects, and on their womenfolk. (Skinner-Price 1989:59-60)

ON CRUELTY AND COMPASSION, AND WHETHER IT IS BETTER TO BE LOVED THAN TO BE FEARED, OR THE CONTRARY

From the above a debate arises whether it is better to be loved than feared or the contrary. The answer is that one would want to be both the one and the other, but because it is difficult to join them together, it is much safer to be feared than loved, if one has to do without one of the two. For the following may be said generally about men: that they are ungrateful, changeable, pretenders and dissemblers, avoiders of dangers, and desirous of gain, and while you do them good they are wholly yours, offering you their blood, their property, their life, and their children, as I said above, when the need is far off, but when it comes close to you they revolt. And that prince who has founded himself wholly on their words, because he finds himself naked of other preparations, is ruined. For the friendships that are acquired at a price, and not with greatness and nobility of spirit, are paid for but they are not possessed, and when they come due they cannot be used. Men have less fear of offending one who makes himself loved than one who makes himself feared, since love is held in place by a bond of obligation which, because men are wretched, is broken at every opportunity for utility to oneself, but fear is held in place by a fear of punishment that never abandons you.

Nonetheless, the prince must make himself feared in such a way that, although he does not acquire love, he avoids hatred. For being feared and being not hated may exist together very well. And this he will always do if he abstains from the property of his citizens and subjects, and from their women. (Connell 2005:91-92)

Bibliography

- ATKINSON JAMES B., (ed.), 1976, *The Prince* by Niccolò Machiavelli, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- BAKER MONA, 2000, 'Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 12 (2), 241-266.
- BECCARIA GIAN LUIGI (ed.), 1996, *Dizionario di linguistica e di filologia, metrica, retorica*, Torino: Einaudi.
- BERTELLI SERGIO, (ed.), 1968 [1960], *Il Principe e Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*, Milano: Feltrinelli.
- BERTONI GIULIO, 1932, *Lingua e Pensiero. Studi e saggi linguistici*, Firenze: Olschki Editore.
- CASELLA MARIO, GUIDO MAZZONI (eds.), 1929, *Tutte le opere storiche e letterarie di Niccolò Machiavelli*, Firenze: Barbera.
- CONNELL WILLIAM J. (ed.), 2005, *The Prince by Niccolò Machiavelli, with Related Documents*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- DE ALVAREZ LEO PAUL S., (ed.), 1980, *Niccolò Machiavelli: The Prince*, Texas: University of Dallas Press.
- DEVOTO GIACOMO, 1986, *Storia della Lingua Italiana*, Milano: CDE.
- FIRPO LUIGI, 1969, "Le origini del Machiavellismo", *Pensiero Politico*, 2 (3), 337-367.
- FOURNEL JEAN-LOUIS, 2001, 'Frontiere e ambiguità nella lingua del *Principe*: condensamenti e diffusione del significato', in Alessandro Pontremoli (a cura di), *La lingua e le lingue di Machiavelli*, Firenze: Olschki Editore.
- FOURNEL JEAN-LOUIS, JEAN-CLAUDE ZANCARINI, 2000, *Machiavelli: Le Prince*, Paris : PUF.
- GAETA FRANCO, 1961, *Lettere*, Milano: Feltrinelli
- GAETA FRANCO, 1984, *Lettere*, Torino: U.T.E.T.
- INGLESE GIORGIO, 1995, *Niccolò Machiavelli, Il Principe*, Torino: Einaudi.
- LEFEVERE ANDRÉ (ed.), 1992, *Translation, History, Culture: a sourcebook*, London-New York: Routledge.
- LISIO GIUSEPPE, 1924 [1899], *Il principe di Niccolò Machiavelli*, Firenze: Sansoni.
- LISIO GIUSEPPE, 1957, *Il Principe – Niccolò Machiavelli*, Firenze: Sansoni.
- MALMKJÆR KIRSTEN, 2003, 'What happened to God and the angels?: an exercise in translational stylistics', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 15 (1), 37-58.
- MALMKJÆR KIRSTEN, 2004, 'Translational Stylistics: Dulcken's translations of Hans Christian Andersen', *Language and Literature: Journal of the Poetics and Linguistics Association* 13 (1), 13-24.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., (ed.), 1998 [1985], *The Prince by Niccolò Machiavelli*, University of Chicago Press, London – Chicago.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., (ed.), 1998, II ed., *The Prince by Niccolò Machiavelli*, University of Chicago Press, London – Chicago.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., 1979, *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders: a study of the Discours on Livy*, Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., 1988, *Florentine Histories; a new translation by Laura F. Banfield and Harvey C. Mansfield Jr.*, Princeton (New Jersey): Princeton University Press.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., 1996, *Machiavelli's virtue*, Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., 2001, *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders: a study of the Discours on Livy*, Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY C., NATHAN TARCOV, 1998, *Niccolò Machiavelli - Discourses on Livy*, Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY, 1996, "Machiavelli's «Stato» and the Impersonal Modern State", in *Machiavelli's Virtue*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp.281-289.
- MANSFIELD HARVEY, 1996, *Machiavelli's Virtue*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- MARAZZINI CLAUDIO, 2002, *La lingua italiana – profilo storico*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- MARIO MARTELLI, 1997, "Sette proposte per il testo del Principe", *Interpres*, 16.
- MCARTHUR TOM, 1996, *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, Oxford University Press.

- NORD CHRISTIANE, 1991, *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis* (transl. from German by C. Nord and P. Sparrow), Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- PISTONE SERGIO, 1983, *Machiavellismo*, in Norberto Bobbio, Nicola Matteucci, Gianfranco Pasquino (eds), *Dizionario di Politica*, Torino: UTET.
- PRAZ MARIO, 1942, *Machiavelli in Inghilterra: ed altri saggi*, Roma: Trumminelli.
- PRICE RUSSELL, 1973, "The senses of Virtue in Machiavelli", *European History Quarterly*, 3 (4), pp. 315-345.
- PROCACCI GIULIANO, 1995, *Machiavelli nella cultura europea dell'età moderna*, Bari: Laterza.
- PUPPO MARIO, 1965, 'Appunti sulla sintassi del Machiavelli' in *Rivista di cultura classica e medievale*, VII, 906-14.
- PUPPO MARIO, 1969, *Opere Politiche – Niccolò Machiavelli*, Firenze: Le Monnier.
- QUIRK RANDOLPH, SIDNEY GREENBAUM, GEOFFREY LEECH, JAN SVARTVIK, 1985, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London and New York: Longman.
- RAAB FELIX, 1965, *The English face of Machiavelli*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- RUSSO LUIGI, 1975 [1949], *Machiavelli*, Bari: Laterza.
- SASSO GENNARO, 1980, *Niccolò Machiavelli – Il pensiero Politico*, vols. I-II, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- SCAVUZZO CARMELO, 2003, *Machiavelli – Storia linguistica italiana*, Roma: Carocci Editore.
- SCHLEIERMACHER FRIEDRICH, 1813, *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzen*, English transl. by Lefevere A., "On the Different Methods of Translating" in Lefevere André (ed.), 1992, *Translation, History, Culture: a sourcebook*, London-New York: Routledge, pp. 141-166.
- SEMINO ELENA, JONATHAN CULPEPER (eds), 2002, *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- SERIANNI LUCA, 2006, *Grammatica Italiana*, Torino: UTET.
- SHORT MICK, 1994, 'Understanding Texts: Point of View', in G. Brown, K. Malmkjær, A. Pollitt and J. Williams (eds), *Language and Understanding*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 169-90.
- SKINNER QUENTIN, 1981, *Machiavelli*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SKINNER QUENTIN & RUSSELL PRICE (eds.), 1989 [1988], *Machiavelli The Prince*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SKINNER QUENTIN, 2001, *Dell'interpretazione*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- SKINNER QUENTIN, 2002, *Visions of Politics*, vol. II, Renaissance Virtues, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SKINNER QUENTIN, 2009, 'Making History: The Discipline in Perspective. Professor Quentin Skinner – Interview', *Storia e Politica* I (1), pp. 113-134.
- SORRENTO LUIGI, 1950, *Sintassi Romanza*, Milano-Varese: Cisalpino.
- TULLY JAMES, 1988, *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- VENUTI LAWRENCE, 1995, *The translator's Invisibility*, London-New York: Routledge.
- WERTH PAUL, 1999, *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*, Harlow: Longman.
- WOOTTON DAVID, 1995, *The Prince*, Indianapolis: Hackett.

Abstract

A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF MACHIAVELLI'S THE PRINCE: MANSFIELD, SKINNER AND CONNELL

Keywords: translational stylistics, Machiavelli, *The Prince*.

The Prince is counted among those political works which gave rise to modern political science. Linguists have shown how the writing technique, that makes *The Prince* a unique work, is one of the main instruments used by Machiavelli to persuade his addressee to adopt the political tactics he was recommending. On the basis of their Italian studies on *The Prince*, the paper analyses how Machiavelli's style was transferred from Italian into English in the most recent and authoritative English translations by Harvey C. Mansfield (1985), Quentin Skinner & Russell Price (1989 [1988]) and William J. Connell (2005). Three significant passages of Machiavelli's masterpiece and their translations have been examined following the methodological approaches of Malmkjaer (2004) and Baker (2000).

CRISTINA GUCCIONE
University of Palermo
Faculty of Political Science
Department of European Studies D.E.M.S.
cristina.guccione@unipa.it