

# FROM "STATE" TO "FREE STATE"

## The meaning of the word 'Republic' in Western Europe and America

from JEAN BODIN to JOHN ADAMS

by William R. Everdell © 1987

### I

What does the word "Republic" mean? That sovereign term in eighteenth century political thought, the common property of Montesquieu and Marat, of John Adams and Daniel Shays, of Swift and Rousseau, of Hume and the Jesuits in the Americas, has been used since with an ambiguity so poetic and an abandon so blithe that not even constitutional lawyers seem to know what it means. France established a "first republic" (of five) in 1792, the United States in 1776, Hungary in 1848 and again in 1945, China in 1912; yet today the word, though not uncommon, is problematical in every western language and in not a few non-western ones. It is obviously not one of those metaphors that science defines so well, nor is it a term in which poets have taken great interest. Lawyers and courts often fix the meanings of less universal terms, but only two United States courts seem yet to have tested "Republic", despite its prominence in constitutions old and new. The precise fixing of this word has been left since its invention to historians and to what we now call political scientists. Perhaps it is no wonder that it has become so protean, contradictory and lately nearly empty of meaning. A former Solicitor-General of the United States was recently heard to complain that although "a Republican form of Government" was guaranteed in Article IV of the United States Constitution, he had no idea what it meant.<sup>1</sup>

In the United States, America's first lexicographer, Federalist propagandist Noah Webster, gave the definition "representative democracy" essayed in 1787 by James Madison in *Federalist* 10. All his successors there have followed suit, though Webster himself admitted, somewhat plaintively, that his definition seemed to leave out Athens and Rome.<sup>2</sup> Nor is it very helpful to define "republic" through "democracy", which has a surer history and etymology than "republic" but problems of its own. In 1790, John Adams wrote that "there is not in lexicography a more fraudulent word" than republic.<sup>3</sup> Years later in retirement, Adams, who had done so much to found the American Republic and had tried all his life to define the creature, threw up his hands and wrote that he had never known what republic meant and never expected to.<sup>4</sup> Actually, Adams had once known with all the assurance of a Harvard graduate. In 1775 and 1776 he had written that according to Aristotle, Livy and James Harrington, the "definition of republic is an empire of laws and not of men".<sup>5</sup> In 1787 he found the definition that he proposed in 1789 to Roger Sherman. "In the first place, what is your definition of republic? Mine is this: *A government whose sovereignty is vested in more than one person*".<sup>6</sup>

I think Adams was close in 1776 and (for 1987) exactly right in 1787-89; but Adams, as he so often managed to do (with the help of American historiography), avoided getting his due by undercutting his own argument. I think, too, that Adams's definition was not a metaphysical construct but a thoroughly empirical and historical one, like Aristotle's definition of *politeia*. Adams knew his history much better than American provincials were then given credit for. While ambassador to England he had, in fact, written a massive history of the western republics of the past published in 1787, just in time to be in the hands of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention. The present paper is, in a sense, a late filial footnote to this book, *Defence of the Constitutions of the United States of America*, on the two hundredth anniversary both of its publication and of the drafting of the federal constitution itself, to which the *Defence* added its mickle, and which remains, astonishingly, the supreme law of the United States.<sup>7</sup>

For Adams to be wrong in his definition, the one who must be right is Jean Bodin, that polymathic genius of the sixteenth century, who believed that a republic was nothing more than "a just government of several households and of what they hold in common with the power of sovereignty".<sup>8</sup> Nothing more, in other words, than what we would call a state, under any "just" government, however monolithic or monocratic. Bodin published his definition in 1576, the year that both Calvinists and Catholics in his native France were calling for a withdrawal of obedience from their apparently lawful king, and the "Republic" was convulsed with civil war. Bodin's definition of republic, together with his definition of sovereignty as indivisible, was found useful by the succeeding generations of Frenchmen who put civil war behind them by setting up absolute monarchy. Until Bodin's countrymen, two centuries later, put an end to the thousand-year Capetian Reich, Bodin's views were challenged in France only by stray publications and restless political minorities.

If such an ambiguous term has such historic uses, then it will pay richly to get the connotations of the word "Republic" clear. With them we instantly acquire both a sensitive indicator of seventeenth and eighteenth century political thought, and one of its more effective political instruments. It will also show, in that head-spinning way that pleases deconstructionists and analytical philosophers, the extent to which what is fondly called political science resolves itself into issues of semantics and etymology. Investigating the term with the methods of the history of ideas has been and will no doubt continue to be rewarding. Work in the area so far includes energetic lexicography, some very considerable books by Zera Fink, Caroline Robbins, Felix Gilbert, Lois Schwoerer, Nannerl Keohane, Yves Durand, Claude Nicolet, and of course J.G.A. Pocock, not to mention my own book, chapters in Quentin Skinner's standard history, articles by Adams, Appleby, Kenyon, Kerber, Kramnick, Shalhope and Banning, and a remarkable and oddly obscure article by no less than Herbert Marcuse.<sup>9</sup> It will not escape students that much of this ground was most thoroughly covered by Pocock, who was after larger game than mere etymology. I can only plead that Pocock, too, uses the word *republic* when the texts he studies are *not* using it, a practice that can both confuse the reader and be untrue to the evidence.

However, the subject is very far from being exhausted. The Adamsite, or revolutionary meaning of the word republic was set in the late 17th and early 18th century, well before John Adams. Adams borrowed it from Johnson's dictionary. Johnson was recording the usage of Addison, Montesquieu and Hume. That usage, in turn, emerged out of a long convoluted, and somewhat arcane prehistory, which began long before Bodin and which involves events and writings from Italy and Germany as well as from France and England. Bodin's definition, which held sway for nearly a century, was a precise formulation of the usage seen in Cicero, Augustine, and the Middle Ages, and one which had been fathered on Aristotle by translation. Adams's goes back to the political language of the Italian city-states which predated Bodin and narrowly survived him. In this paper I shall try to construct a narrative history of *res publica* and its descendants, based on close analysis of its usage in four distinct periods leading up to the French Revolution. We shall consider the classical-medieval stage first, followed by the humanist. Third we must consider the contribution of religious war and an odd convergence of Calvinist and Jesuit. Fourth and last, we map the slow failure of the Bodin synthesis and the revival of the words *republic* and *republican* first in England and subsequently in France between 1649 and 1690.

The method is to try to measure the word in the context in which it

is found, determining, if possible, the extent to which it excludes monarchy, or any other form of one-man rule. For example, the mere apposition, "princes and republics", is not sufficient to imply mutual exclusion of monarchy and republic, and is usually meant in a diplomatic sense, as a way of including all sovereign nations (as we would say now) in a phrase. Very rarely, we may find an extended, dictionary sort of definition, like Bodin's or Adams's, of the sort we might now take for granted in a work on political theory. Aristotle's own definition, as we shall see, is frustratingly ambiguous. The best of the pre-modern definitions, besides that of Bodin, may be the one on Thomas Floyd's *Picture of A Perfit Commonwealth* in 1600. "A Commonwealth", he began. "is a living body compact of sundry estates and degrees of men; this body is composed of two sorts, (soul and members). The soule is the King or supream governour. This word Common wealth is called of Latine word, *Respublica, quasi res populica*, the affaires of the people: which the latines call the Government of a commonwealth, or a civill societie, and is termed of the Grecians a politicall government, derived of the Greeke word *polutia*, which signifieth the regiment and estate of a citie, disposed by order of equitie, and ruled by moderation of reason"<sup>10</sup>

Several results of this investigation may help to redirect historical attention. One is that Machiavelli's definition of *republica* is very original and premature, and that the word gives a further clue to the old question of the chronological relation of *The prince* to the *Discourses*. Another is that the modern, or Adamsite definition of *republic* is clearly in use in both France and England by 1650, forty years before the standard historical dictionaries have placed it. Another is that Locke's famous *Second Treatise* contains ironies both intended and unappreciated. Still another is the implication of the fact that Montesquieu, though he followed Bodin with admiration and care in so much, abandoned him on his definition of republic, using the term as early as 1721 exactly as Adams later defined it, to refer to any state regime that was not a monarchy. Finally, among its more disconcerting results is that the republicans of around 1700, in Europe if not in America, may not quite fit the image of projectors of "classical virtue" that recent United States historiography has been insisting on. The great revolutionary word of 1776-1799 implies pluralism and popular sovereignty as much as it does virtue.

## II

We must be careful here. If the word *republic* is not fraudulent, as Adams said, it is certainly slippery, perhaps a classic case of fixing the unfixable or, in the memorable phrase, nailing jelly to a wall. Our problems begin with the original Latin word which leaves us in considerable doubt what "thing" (*res*) is meant or in what sense that thing is "public" (*publica*). There is, for example, no doubt that *respublica* bears the sense of "just" government that Bodin carried over into the French *republique*. No doubt, either, that this meaning is the essential forerunner of Harrington's "empire of laws and not of men". It is both respectable and early, found first in that part of Cicero's political writings known to the eighteenth century (*De legibus*) and in the part unknown until 1820 (*De re publica*) which was nevertheless quoted forcefully by Augustine in his *City of God*.<sup>11</sup> The only way *res publica* could refer to an unjust government lay in the fact that Rome had consistently referred to itself as a *res publica*; and since Rome had been the only state in the West for so long, *res publica* could mean, simply, whatever government there was. An even more general meaning, if not the most general of all meanings of *res publica*, occurs not only in Cicero but earlier in attempts to render in Latin the *politeia* and *politeuma* of Herodotos, Plato, Aristotle, Polybios and their fellow Greeks. That is, as Plutarch summarised it later, not only the political system of a society or social body, but its whole way of life, or constitution.<sup>12</sup> This was, in fact, the sole and tentative means by which the Latin word became attached to the much older and incomparably more precise Greek debate on basic political terminology, which continued after Cicero with Plutarch and Dio Cassius. Until Cicero, it seems, the Romans took little interest in that kind of talk. Even after him they neglected it.

After Augustine there arose another general but quite different meaning. "Res publica" appeared in capitularies in the very early

middle ages with the meaning of public (meaning the king's) land or treasury, metaphorically the king's second body – even his bride.<sup>13</sup> That meaning remained penumbally to confuse the later middle ages, for whom republic acquired the interesting sense of an immortal legal body, a corporation or *universitas*. Both meanings are in the forefront of a phrase like *respublica Christiana* used for Christendom or the church. Still later, needing a word for state before the word "state" had evolved to mean anything more than status or statutory authority, medieval writers adapted "res publica" to mean any polity considered entire, regardless of its form, close but not identical to the old sense of *politeia*. This sense lasted a long time, as we shall see. It was still the norm in England when Thomas Smith published *De Republica Anglorum* in 1572, and it was powerfully revived by Jean Bodin in 1576.

At the very end of the medieval period the enlarged solidarities of the fifteenth century assigned a new resonance to the words *natio* and *patria*, whereupon *respublica* was reassigned to cover the concept of a nation's form or a fatherland's common law.<sup>14</sup> This, too, lasted a long time, and was still attached to the anglo-saxon equivalent term *commonweal* or *commonwealth*, when Elyot and Lupset used it extensively in works published just before and just after the English Act of Supremacy.<sup>15</sup>

## III

Nevertheless, the Middle Ages, especially in Italy was fertile in city-states. We are now accustomed to using the word republic to describe 13th century Florence, Milan, and Genoa, even Bruges and Basel. That the word *res publica* was not applied to them exclusively then, and was used just as often for the kingdom of France, the duchy of Burgundy, or the Church, seems largely the result of Augustine's insistence in *City of God* that Cicero's *res publica* was simply a "just government" of a people (*populus*) with a common love or interest.<sup>16</sup> The domestication of Aristotle in the thirteenth century, however, did provide another possibility and that possibility requires careful examination.

The book, of course, is Aristotle's *Politics*. Augustine had not read it, knowing no Greek. It was first written back into the western tradition by Aegidius Romanus and Albertus Magnus, who was Thomas Aquinas' teacher. When Aquinas took it up, in his *De regimine principum* in about 1250, this difficult text, arriving in sloppy translation, began to cause difficulties. One of Aristotle's workhorse terms in the *Politics* and *Nichomachean Ethics* was *politeia*, roughly meaning how things work in a *polis*, the general term for the form of any state.<sup>17</sup> Aristotle had, however, insisted on using *politeia* in a second, more precise and technical sense to mean the third of the three famous classical forms of the state: monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. As we know, Aristotle thought *demokratia* to be a bad thing, a sort of mob-rule. So he added this second *politeia* to his list and suggested that this was the proper word for a state in which the people, though sovereign, obeyed the law and tolerated elements of the two other kinds of rule. In Sinclair's translation, the key passage from *Politics*, Book 3, runs as follows: "There are besides democracy and oligarchy two constitutions, one of which aristocracy – is generally included in the list of four – monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, aristocracy. The other makes a fifth on that list; it is called the name which is common to them all, for we call it *politeia*, polity".<sup>18</sup> The temptation to translate this word into Latin as *res publica* would become irresistible by 1600, and when that happened the continued tension of the two meanings in Aristotle's book would be built automatically into the old Latin word.

Aquinas did not, as it happens, translate *politeia*, either as *res publica* or anything else. What he did do was draw an important and influential distinction between constitutions, based on Aristotle's ambiguous term, "polity". In *De regimine principum* he called government (*regnum, imperium*) "regale" if it was plenary and "politica" if it was limited. As a result the adjective, "politic" or "politique" came into several western languages with the meaning of "constitutional".<sup>19</sup> In about 1300 one Tholommeo of the Italian commune of Lucca wrote a continuation of Aquinas' work in which the distinction of "politic" and "regal"

was broadly extended with examples. France, said Tholommeo, was "regale", but England, ancient Israel and Rome are "politicae". Tholommeo also viewed the Roman Republic after 509 BC as an "aristocracy" and ancient Athens and modern Italian city-states as "polities", using Aristotle's term precisely in the sense of limited democracy.<sup>20</sup>

Tholommeo then went on to make a further category, whose importance for our study was still very great three centuries later. (Tholommeo of Lucca's work was still being published in the Netherlands in 1630). Because both aristocracy and polity "involve plurality, these two types compose the political as distinguished from the regal or despotic lordship, as the Philosopher explains in the first and third books of the *Politics*."<sup>21</sup>

Medieval political and legal thought, in other words, continued to use *res publica* in the general Augustinian sense of a good state, but there was, at the same time, considerable movement toward ideas which would categorise and explain the actual practice of a divided Empire (*imperium romanum*) and independent monarchies like France and self-governing cities like Lucca or Florence. Attaching the word *res publica* (rather than the alternative *civitas*) to some of these cases was the work of the fourteenth century.

#### IV

The most influential jurist and political thinker of the fourteenth century is often said to be Bartolus of Saxoferrato, who was given Perugian citizenship and taught in that Italian commune from 1343 to his death in 1357. Through his many works runs an increasing legal recognition of the *de facto* sovereignty of cities like Perugia.<sup>22</sup> In addition he wrote short treatises on tyranny (*Tyrannidis sive de tyrannia*), on the regimes of city-states (*De regimine civitatis*), and on the Guelfs and Ghibellines (*De Guelfis et Gebellinis*) all in the 1350s. Though all anticipate the civic humanist "republicanism" of the next century, only the last uses the word *res publica*. However, this is a telling use. Bartolus is discussing the right of resistance to tyrants by a party or faction, and he finds it lawful, in his words, "against those who would destroy the *res publica* and bring it into servitude to themselves."<sup>23</sup> (Emerton, 278) Bartolus, together with his student Baldus and contemporary Marsilius of Padua, shows how the word *res publica* was positioned to move in the direction of polyarchy, or complex rule by many.

Gathering the available meanings at the outset of the Renaissance, we can summarise them as follows: the Ciceronian common or public interest, the Augustinian just state, the Aristotelian (number one) form of state, and the Aristotelian (number two) mixed or constitutional state with popular sovereignty. Nearly every actual use, however, is Ciceronian and lies near one of two close poles. In one, *respublica* means a civil society, Christendom as a whole or any sub-society, and its common life, the form of the "body politic". In the other, *respublica* means the *universitas*, the society considered as a single agent in the society of other relatively autonomous collective agents. Neither of these two poles of meaning implies any particular form of government. Indeed, it might be said particularly of the second that it argues the necessity of monarchy – a bit like Americans who are arguing this year that the United States can relate to other nations only through its president. As the fourteenth century drew to a close, the idea that a republic might automatically mean the absence of monarchy was simply not available to Europeans, no matter how often it was said that an (Augustinian) *res publica could not exist under tyranny*.

Even Coluccio Salutati, the great humanist chancellor of Florence and scourge of Giangaleazzo Visconti, agreed with Aristotle that monarchy was best and found himself unable to use the word *res publica* anti-monarchically. In *De tyranno* (1400), he wrote that "the form of state which Caesar represented inclined not to tyranny but to a *res publica*"; and, going further, asked the indignant question, "Is there no such thing as a *res publica* under a single rule? Was there no *res publica* at Rome so long as it was under kings?" (Emerton, 108).

This fact makes quite clear just what the contribution of Renaissance humanism was. More than thirty years ago, Hans Baron pointed out the central importance of Leonardo Bruni and his generation to the self-understanding of Florence and her sister cities. We need only add that Bruni's language is no less symptomatic than his arguments, and that he and other civic humanists used the words *respublica* and *republica* for the first time in modern history in the sense of a state without a king. They drew, of course from Aristotle, Plutarch, Livy and the other classics, but at least one of them, Machiavelli, went even further than the classical authors in excluding monarchy from the conceptual shadow of the word *republica*. If it is not fatuous to call Bruni the Masaccio of civic humanism, then Machiavelli should be called its Michaelangelo.

Bruni's *Laudatio florentinae urbis*, which Baron famously dated to 1403-04, uses *res publica* tellingly some 36 separate times. What he meant by the word is obscured by an otherwise helpful English translation by Benjamin J. Kohl. Kohl uses the English word *republic* only five times, while substituting "city", "Florence", "it", "here", "state", "government", "nation" and "community" for the other 31.<sup>25</sup> Bruni used the word *res publica* more precisely to mean the whole that is governed by the Florentine magistrates; that which practices civic virtues, creates institutions, and has a harmony among its parts. This is Ciceronian. There is no doubt that Bruni uses *res publica* to mean the state as a unit making foreign commitments, and certainly he can and does use words like *urbs*, *oppidum*, *civitas*, *natio*, *patria*, *populus*, *regnum* and *imperium*, for concepts akin in meaning; but the key use of *res publica* for Bruni was to designate that which was overthrown by Julius Caesar – the old king-free Roman constitution.<sup>26</sup> A year earlier, Bruni put this same *res publica* into a speech of Niccolò Niccoli attacking Dante and Salutati's *De tyranno* for putting the two Bruti, Tarquin's enemy and Caesar's murderer, in Limbo and deep Hell respectively.<sup>27</sup> Bruni's bracketing of the Roman *res publica* between the fall of Tarquin in 509 and the rise of Caesar in 50 BC may be the earliest modern instance of this historiographical distinction, which is now not only standard but also one of the principal pegs fixing our modern meaning of republic. Moreover, Bruni makes clear in his translation of Aristotle's *Politics* and in the essay he wrote in Greek on the Florentine system (c1430) that he has taken over the classical equivalency between *res publica* and *politeia*.<sup>28</sup>

We know that Bruni's influence was limited by the fact that he never attained the contemporary fame of Salutati and none of his work was printed or translated until the nineteenth century, but in Florence it provided an exemplary norm. It was confirmed not only by other humanists like Biondo and Bracciolini, but even by newly published classics like the *Annals* and *Histories* of Tacitus and the *Catiline* and *Jugurthine War* of Sallust.<sup>29</sup>

#### V

Humanist language was, of course, not popular language, and we should not overlook another development of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries: the development in the vernacular of the term *repubblica* to mean a state where there is not only no prince but where the whole people are thought of as the sovereign. Evidence is problematical and slim, but if we may accept the well-known French text called the *Memoirs of Boucicault*, the Pisans could call on the Genoese in 1410 in these revolutionary terms: "Do better, take the lordship away from your king (Charles VI of France) and kill Boucicault and all his Frenchmen and live in a republic like us".<sup>30</sup> Again, Florence gives some of the best evidence. Dino Compagni in the 1270s described Florence only as the "commune", Gregorio Dati in the 1390s referred to his sovereign as "popolo e commune", but Luca Landucci, at the time (1494-1512) of what is now often called the Second Florentine Republic, was already using "governo popolare" and "vivere popolare" as a description of the regime.<sup>31</sup> Once the word *repubblica* became attached, in the manner of Aristotle's second *politeia* 2, to these early vernacular equivalents for the Greek *demokratia*, even the rise of the despots in Italy could not bring back the old words.

This brings us to Machiavelli and Guicciardini. It will not surprise anyone to learn that in this small etymological area, as in so many greater ones, they took the largest step forward. It was Machiavelli and Guicciardini who attached *repubblica* to *governo popolare* and to the old Greek concept of *demokratia*. It was also these two, especially Machiavelli, who pushed the Italian word *repubblica* further into anti-monarchical territory than anyone before the French Revolution.

In 1512, in the *Discorso di Logrognò* on what he, like Landucci, called *governo popolare*, and in his earliest *Ricordi*, Francesco Guicciardini had already begun attaching the word *repubblica* to "rule by the many", the classical third form of state.<sup>32</sup> The Second Florentine Republic fell on September 1 that year, and Guicciardini's friend Machiavelli probably began working on the *Discourses on Livy* not long after. In the *Discourses* we can actually observe the shift at close quarters. Early in his first book, Machiavelli used *repubblica* as a general term for all states. "I say, like others who have written of *republiche*, that they are of three kinds, namely, *Principato* (of or by a prince), *Ottimati* (by the best), and *Popolare* (by the people)."<sup>33</sup> But by the time he had reached discourse 16, he was apologising for "speaking sometimes of a *repubblica* and sometimes of a prince (*principato*)".<sup>34</sup> In number 17, he was talking of the relation of a leader to a people, and clearly finding a difficulty Salutati had never experienced in describing an executive as maintaining or controlling a republic (*tenere forma di repubblica*). In 18 he is considering whether a person or persons can hold a corrupted people in self-government (*mantenere uno stato libero*) and he shifts from *repubblica* to *stato libero* or "free-state".<sup>35</sup>

If it is indeed the case, as Chabod argued, that Machiavelli broke off writing the *Discourses* in order to write *The Prince*, it may be precisely here that he did so, for all subsequent sections of the *Discourses* use *repubblica* to mean a state without either a prince or hereditary landowning aristocrats. Meanwhile (if it is indeed "meanwhile") Machiavelli wrote in the very first sentence of *The Prince* that all past states had been, not monarchies, aristocracies, or democracies, but "either monarchies or republics".<sup>36</sup> This new, dichotomous usage, which grows stronger from one end of his book to the other, seems to me to be of pivotal importance to the influence of Machiavelli as a seminal political thinker — particularly his recent historiographical incarnation as a republican thinker; but the massive literature seems not yet to have discussed it.<sup>37</sup>

It is true, of course, that Machiavelli did not entirely follow through with his dichotomy. Great tension remains in his use of his new *repubblica*. In one celebrated passage, he writes that for the last two hundred years his beloved Florence had "not had a state that could truly be called a *repubblica*". That would have been news to Bruni, but Machiavelli seems only to have meant to bring to the republican concept the "justice" and "good order" which Cicero and Augustine had insisted on and which Guicciardini occasionally reproached him for finding only in Rome.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, calling all states either "monarchies or republics", would suggest placing the classical "aristocracy" among "republics"; Machiavelli seems almost to preclude that option in Book I, discourse 55. "Where there are gentlemen (*gentiluomini*)", he says, "in my opinion a *repubblica* cannot be established".<sup>39</sup> Yet throughout Book III, he insists that a proliferation of excellent leaders is the hallmark of a *repubblica*. To avoid a contradiction and confront the Venetian example, he defines *gentiluomini* as landed aristocrats who live idly, a class which, he says, is not only compatible with monarchy but indeed makes monarchy (*principato*) inevitable. To sum up, the Machiavellian *repubblica* is a state constitutionally organised to maintain a steady level of justice, energy, and virtue over time, and which, without a king or hereditary aristocracy, lies under the sovereignty of its entire citizenry, and is governed in rotation by groups of many of its leading citizens.

Viewed alongside such a Roman standard, Florence was a distinct disappointment, and Machiavelli may well have written *The Prince* in a despairing effort to move his beloved city quickly forward through the despotic stage of the old classical cycle so that a new and more satisfactory *repubblica* might emerge at last from the wreckage. Whatever his motives, Machiavelli's works

were all launched into the sea of print by 1532, with immediate and uninterrupted appeal, and they have carried the most extreme humanist definition of republic with them ever since.

Princes and despots took over almost every city but Venice during the 15th and 16th centuries, but Machiavelli's *repubblica* did not disappear. The association of *repubblica* with *demokratia* or popular rule ("governo popolare" or "vivere popolare") as found in Landucci, does not last much beyond the fall of the Second Florentine Republic in 1512; but the more moderate Aristotelian association with popular sovereignty is clear in Contarini's famous book on Venice, written in 1523-24, in Donato Gianotti's on Florence, printed in 1531, in Gianotti's work on the Venetian constitution, printed under the Venetian Gianmichele Bruto's editorship in 1571, in Bruto's own Latin treatise on Florence printed in 1562, and in Felice Figliucci's *De la Politica, Overo Scienza Civile Secondo la Dottrina D'Aristotile*, printed in 1583.<sup>40</sup>

As for the key concept that *repubblica* cannot be ruled by one, or by a monarch, it is clear in Francesco Patrizi's *Della historia dieci dialoghi* and *De institutione Reipublicae* printed in 1560 and 1578, Paolo Paruta's *Della Perfezione della vita politica* of 1571 and 1579, Giovanni Botero's *Relazioni universali* of 1593, and a sentence in Campanella's *La Città de Sol*, written in 1602.<sup>41</sup>

And most of these, beginning with Machiavelli himself, were translated. Each translation has its importance, but especially those of Machiavelli, Contarini, Patrizi and Botero. Machiavelli's key concept of *repubblica* entered French as *republique* in 1544 and 1553, Spanish as *repubblica* in 1555, Latin as *res publica* in 1570 and 1581, Dutch as *republijck* in 1615, and English as *commonwealth* in 1636 and 1640.

Contarini's slightly less anti-monarchical concept was not even first printed in his native Venice but instead in Paris in 1543. This Latin edition was followed within the year by an elegant French translation, while the English translation had to wait until 1599. Guicciardini's *Ricordi* saw their first printing in France in 1576. Patrizi was put into English in 1574, Botero in 1601, 1603 and 1608.<sup>42</sup> Paruta was not translated, but his view was that there were two kinds of *republiche*, "degli ottimati" and "di molti", the few (and best) and the many. Monarchies were something else. Similarly, Paruta's Italian *Discorsi politici* in 1599 describes Rome "sotto nome di repubblica" as a state ordered by laws allowing true rule in which many magistrates had freer power than a single prince.<sup>43</sup>

In English, Contarini's *commonwealth* is a mixture of rule by the one, the few, and the many; and as such, is acknowledged to have had a considerable effect on English thinkers' developing view of their own constitution.<sup>44</sup> The English version of Patrizi's *De institutione Reipublicae*, the 1579 *A Moral Method of Civile Policie . . . of the institution, state, and government of a common Weale* is that "the life of a Civill and well instituted common weale is to be thought far more safer than of everie Prince". It also includes an early version of Harrington's "empire of laws": "That is counted the beste Common weale wherein not every man that listeth or the more parte doe beare auctoritye, at ye Becke and Checke of wyll, but that common weale wherein the Lawe onely shall beare a swaye".<sup>45</sup>

The 1599 translation of Patrizi's *Dieci dialoghi* takes off from Aristotle's six forms of governments in pairs of good and bad (probably from the *Nicomachean Ethics*). Since these are translated into English as "a Kingdome, a Tyrannye, the rule of many good men, the rule of few, mightye in power: a common welth, and the rule of the base sorte of people", a *common welth* becomes the good form of democracy. Such states don't have princes, lords, kings or tyrants, but "Magistrats".<sup>46</sup>

Botero's little guide to world politics required an addition to its title between 1601 and 1603. The second edition includes the word *Common-weales* in addition to "kingdomes". All this helps to explain why, when John Florio publishes his Italian-English Dictionary in 1598 and 1611, we are not surprised that his definition of *repubblica* includes a "free state", going farther, as we shall see, than contemporary English usage.<sup>47</sup>

The steady beat of translations from the Italian, however, was not enough to bring the Machiavellian, much less the modern meaning of republic into French and English. For most northern humanist writers *res publica*, *republic* and *republique* remained completely contained within scholarship and legalese. As we have seen, Thomas Elyot and Thomas Starkey in the 1530s were using *publike weal* and *commonwealth* in an entirely Ciceronian, even an Augustinian sense.<sup>48</sup> Thomas Smith was using the same word in the same way in *De Republica Anglorum* in 1572, Richard Hooker in 1599, and Thomas Floyd, as we have seen, in 1600. No less than James I used the then pedantic equivalent, *Republicke*, in the Ciceronian sense in 1598 and 1603.<sup>49</sup> Though Aristotle's *politeia* number 2, with its idea of sovereignty of the people, made steady gains, marked by the celebrated French translation of the *Politics* by Louis Le Roy in 1568, and though anti-monarchical trends never ended in this age of royal power, no sixteenth century writing in either monarchy suggests that a *res publica* could be thought of essentially as kingless.<sup>50</sup> On the contrary, in 1560, Guillaume Postel was able to refer to the *Republique* of the Turks, a monarchy already proverbially absolute and tyrannical to Europeans.<sup>51</sup> In this process, the growing fashion for Contarini's Venice, with its princely and lifetime (but elective) dogeship, did not help.

The historical discipline was remade in 16th century France. One of the lawyers who remade it was Nicolas de Grouchy; but his analysis of the ancient Roman constitution, published in 1555, used *res publica* with almost comic ambiguity. In the Roman *Res publica*, he wrote, the people should be thought of as having sovereignty (*omne imperium, omnem maiestatem*); yet he described this same *Res publica* in the same paragraph as a combination of three kinds of *Reipublicae*, which he gives in the Greek (of Aristotle, certainly, and probably Polybius): *basileia*, *aristokratia* and *demokratia*.<sup>52</sup> Such work may well have been on the mind of Grouchy's fellow lawyer, Jean Bodin, when he began writing his diatribes against the jargon of "mixed government" in his *Methodus* of 1566.<sup>53</sup>

Guillaume de la Perriere in *Le miroir politique* of 1567 used Aristotle's list of state forms from the *Nichomachean Ethics* (*aristokratia*, *basileia*, *timokratia*, *oligarchia*, *demokratia*, *tyrannis* — a bit like Plato's) instead of the one from the *Politics*.<sup>54</sup> Like Grouchy, he also gave them in Greek. The *Ethics*, we may conclude, led to less confusion than the *Politics*, but not much. To all six of his constitutions la Perriere applied the same term, *republique*, Aristotle's *politeia* 1, which reduced the word to a simple synonym for *civitas* or state.<sup>55</sup> Louis Le Caron's *Dialogues* of 1556 illustrates what may be the principal influence of Plato, whose *Politeia* first saw print in 1513. Translated as *Res Publica*, its title came to mean to readers either simply "state" or, more interestingly, "ideal state", what More had produced in *Utopia*, and Louis Le Caron meant by "une parfaite Republique".<sup>56</sup>

The most passionate "republican" among northern humanists was surely Etienne de la Boetie, but his use of the word *republique* was entirely Ciceronian.<sup>57</sup> In *Discours sur la servitude*

was entirely Ciceronian.<sup>57</sup> In *Discours sur la servitude volontaire*, written between 1546 and 1555, long before the Huguenots published it in the religious wars, he asks two revealing questions: whether the other kinds of *republique* are better than monarchy or whether monarchy belongs in the ranks of *republiques* at all, since "it is difficult to believe that there is anything public in this government, where everything belongs to one".<sup>58</sup> Answering such a question might one day have led to a Machiavellian usage of the word, but to ask it rhetorically implied a classical-medieval one. Certainly, La Boetie hated kings, but, as Nannerl Keohane has pointed out, he hated their creatures more, and his critique of monarchy was fundamentally aristocratic.<sup>59</sup> As we shall see with Sidney more than a century later, one can be what we would now call a republican without ever using the word *republic* as a modern republican would.

Indeed, in France the fate of the word *republique* was for two

centuries bound up with the nobles in their long seesaw struggle with the crown. This meant that to flourish in France *republique* would have had to shed some of its democratic Italian baggage, and that not one but both of the two classical alternatives to monarchy would have somehow had to come under the definition of republic. This never quite happened, even to rebel Calvinist nobles in the 16th century; though in England, as we shall see, something like it occurred in the next century.

Calvinism, of course, began in the independent republic of Geneva and its unique church organisation took as much from the circumstances of a Renaissance free city as it did from the *Acts of the Apostles*. The Calvinist organisation, moreover, quickly became an anti-monarchical revolutionary cadre in the belly of Leviathan. In the late sixteenth century, though we lately prefer to speak of gentry and peasants, historians must point to Calvinists as instrumental in damaging royal authority in France, replacing it in Scotland; and overthrowing it completely in the Netherlands. One might expect to see this radicalism reflected in their use of the word *republique*; but it wasn't.

The Huguenot "monarchomachs", enemies of kings, were at no time in the sixteenth century described as *republican*. Nor did they, or anyone else describe their great opponents, the Catholic monarchomachs, as republican. In fact this word did not yet exist in any language, even Italian. Both parties flirted with and occasionally praised tyrannicide, both approved of the (ultimate) sovereignty of the people; but neither pushed the word *res publica* as far as Machiavelli had in the first sentence of *The Prince*. Nor did they use the word in any stronger sense than Aristotle's *politeia* 2. Take, for example Francois Hotman's *Francogallia* of 1573. This famous Huguenot attack on Catholic kings and unconstitutional monarchy was read right down to the eighteenth century. It did not use *res publica* in Machiavelli's sense, but instead in the second Aristotelian sense. France is a *Res publica* where the *populus* is sovereign, he says, but it is always governed by a king.<sup>60</sup> Though uneasy enough, perhaps, to appeal to the Roman writer Sallust in support of this meaning, Hotman uses it throughout *Francogallia*, even in celebrated passages where he endorsed the French people's (meaning the elite's) right to make kings (*ius regem constituendorum*) and its right to resist and overthrow them.<sup>61</sup> In his view, apparently, they could not overthrow a tyrant without choosing a king to replace him. A monarchomach was not a republican.

The best known of the Catholic monarchomachs was Juan de Mariana, and he used the word *res publica* just as Hotman had. In *De rege et regis institutione* (1599), Mariana defined the word exactly along the lines of Aristotle's *politeia* 2, a state with ultimate popular sovereignty which was distinguished from democracy in that it used aristocracy and monarchy to institute its magistracies.<sup>62</sup> Mariana devotes an entire chapter (VIII) to the question of whether the king (*rex*) or his *res publica* was supreme, eventually deciding that neither or both were, depending on the circumstances. In the following chapter he argued that the law was superior to the king.<sup>63</sup> The reader familiar with the literature of political science will recognise all these thinkers as belonging to a canon called "constitutional monarchists"; but, having examined their use of the word *res publica*, he or she may be more willing to set them in other lines of development as well.

Calvinists challenged monarchy by advocating that it be limited, and that theoretically the people were sovereign, but Calvinists who stayed out of politics may have had an ultimately larger effect on the meaning of *res publica*. They did this by joining the intellectual opposition to Aristotle and to the scholastic method with which Aquinas and others had associated him in the Middle Ages. An important leader of this movement, and an important Calvinist, exerted, in France and especially in England, a powerful influence on philosophical methodology. This was, of course Pierre de la Ramee or Petrus Ramus, the French translator of Plato's *Republic*. His most remarkable contribution was the method of repeated dichotomy, dividing a field of objects of thought into two mutually exclusive parts until a desired category had been reached and precisely described.<sup>64</sup>

Something like this method is now commonplace in computer

programmes with their binary logic. The importance of Ramus's method for political thought is that in favouring dualities over trinities it tended to destabilise the classical commonplace (at least as old as Herodotos) that all states were ruled either by one, by the few, or by many. Ramism favoured instead the analysis that states were ruled either by one or by more than one, in other words that aristocracy and democracy must belong in one category, monarchy in the other.

I would like to be able to offer conclusive evidence for this insight, and hope in the future to do so; but here I can only report negatively that he did not use his razor on Plato's political trinities in his translation of the *Politeia*. I can, however, do more than point to the striking relationship between Ramist method and Adams's 1787-89 definition of republic. In Johannes Althusius's *Politica Methodice Digesta* of 1603, the method of dichotomies is inescapable and its results exactly what might be expected. According to Althusius, a state must have one of two forms: monarchy or polyarchy. Polyarchy, in turn, has two forms: aristocracy and democracy. If he had turned the word *res publica* to mean polyarchy rather than simply "state", Althusius might have found himself cited by Adams as his earliest authority.<sup>65</sup> Praise of Ramus and evidence of Ramist dichotomies in political terminology may also be found in Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*, that favourite book of the English Calvinists, in 1614.<sup>66</sup>

The Calvinist federal hierarchy of synods elected from below might have provided an excellent example of republican organisation for anyone disposed to see it, but except for an occasional prowl by James I, no one was yet applying political concepts to the organisation of churches within a state. What was happening was the emergence of a new political science to better describe functioning federative political systems like Poland, the Empire, Switzerland and the war-torn Netherlands. A principal figure here was the same Johannes Althusius who pioneered the Ramist approach to political definitions. Althusius, like Polybios and unlike Plato, admired mixed governments of all kinds, including confederations like the Empire in which he lived.

It is not that none of these trends survived. It was that Bodin's great work, *Six livres de la Republique* overrode everything. As is well known, Bodin's work was one of the first great triumphs of something we would now call historical scholarship. It was intimidatingly comprehensive in its grasp, not only of the rapidly enlarging field of secular history, but also of the increasingly prestigious one of classical learning. Second, it was powerfully clear and logical, Cartesian as we might say, in its central arguments. The concept of sovereignty in Bodin simply excluded mixed government as a solecism; so that the whole effect of Aristotle's analysis of state forms became obsolete and Polybios's emphasis on the resistance of complex constitutions to decay — *anakyklosis* — was dispensed with.<sup>67</sup>

Third, it was the most useful single work on politics and law in the hands of religious moderates trying to find a political solution to the civil wars. Its authority was as unique as that of the *Esprit des lois* would be two centuries later. As France moved towards absolute monarchy under the stress of assassination and religious war, Bodin's definitions of *republique* and *souverainete* simply swept the field, and translations of the work ensured that cognates of *republique* would enter every European literary language.

## VII

Contrary to the almost universal belief of us *dix-huitiemistes*, it was the Puritan Revolution that finally brought back Machiavelli's use of *republic* to mean a state without a king. Up until then, it seems, the two connotations of popular sovereignty and of just and complex order were enough in tension to prevent this from happening. A rather neat example of how Ciceronian language continues in full revolution is Lord Brooke's exhortation to his roundhead soldiers in 1643, in which he referred to "that great commonwealthman of the Romans, Cicero".<sup>68</sup>

The need for a new word only became acute in February, 1649,

after the trial and execution of Charles I. In 1647, *commonwealth* is rare and *republic* nonexistent in the Putney debates which all concern "settling the kingdom". "Kingdom", *commonwealth*, and "nation" are nearly synonymous. But with the abolition of "monarchy" on 7 February, 1649, the words "monarchy" and "kingdom" both became unusable for supporters of the revolution, except to refer to history. On the 11th, there was even a law which replaced "King" in legal documents with "keepers of the Liberties of England", and there are numerous less formal instances of the replacement of "kingdom". *Commonwealth* or *free-state* is, of course, more commonly used than *republic* and *commonwealth's-man* seems to force out *republican*, but three are there by 1650, all four by 1659, in the rhetoric of the English Revolution.<sup>69</sup>

Perhaps the earliest is *Commonwealthsman*, spelled in this way in one of the earliest Leveller pamphlets of 14 June, 1647, and used to mean an enthusiast for (more) liberty.<sup>70</sup> *Republic* is the last to appear. William Walwyn's pamphlet, *A Manifestation . . .* of 14 April, 1649, contains the word in the satisfyingly unambiguous clause "even when the Monarchy is changed into a Republike".<sup>71</sup> May 19 brought the Act of Parliament declaring England "a Commonwealth or Free-state", upon which the word *Free-state* is almost immediately turned against the Parliament by a Leveller attack.<sup>72</sup> *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 12 June refers to the "new device of the Republic". *Moderate Intelligencer* in early July reports unhappily that these days "if you say, 'Caesar or nothing', they say, 'a republick or nothing'".<sup>73</sup> On 6 November a viscount writes his father, an earl, that the Swiss "ministers . . . publicly give God thanks for the establishment of the republic".<sup>74</sup> Diplomatically, England is quickly styled "the Republic of England"; such was the title demanded of the Venetian ambassador by Master of Ceremonies Sir Oliver Fleming in 1651.<sup>75</sup>

In January, 1650, Parliament settled on "The Commonwealth of England" as the subject of oaths of allegiance, "as it is now established, without a king or House of Lords", and this is (probably not intentionally) about as close to Machiavelli's *republica*, his *stato libero* of the *Discourses* I:19ff with neither king nor gentlemen, as anyone had come so far. Marchamont Nedham, Parliament's publicist, knew exactly how close, and wrote in *The Case of the Commonwealth of England Stated* that "to our present case Machiavelli speaks very aptly . . . a nation which hath cast off the yoke of tyranny or kingship, for in his language they (tyranny and kingship) are both the same thing".<sup>76</sup> Nedham also completed the circle of Aristotelian influence by translating *politeia* 2 as "free state".<sup>77</sup> The modern meaning of republic had arrived. Once King Charles was dead, the only question was whether the older meanings would return if monarchy were to be restored.

This is the question that makes the Cromwell episode interesting to the republic-hunter. Did Cromwell the monocrat subscribe to the old idea of republic, the new idea, or (like most contemporaries) a bit of both? How would his regime have been different if the ideas had been?

Bulstrode Whitelocke records two conversations with the dictator in November and December, 1651, in which Cromwell makes it clear that a mixed monarchy was not, in his mind, a republic.<sup>78</sup> Perhaps Cromwell chose a mixed monarchy, and this is why he emerged with the old royal regent's title of Lord Protector. To this there was what must be called a republican opposition, which included, to name a few, Whitelocke, Ludlow, Sidney, and "William Allen" (who seems to have been Sexby) who had a pamphlet printed in 1657 that advocated killing tyrants and aimed at Cromwell.<sup>79</sup>

It will be asked, what was Thomas Hobbes doing? *Leviathan* was published in 1651 and so was Hobbes's own translation of his *De Cive* of 1642. Neither uses *republic*. In fact, Hobbes seems to actually avoid it. Perhaps he thought it was politically loaded, or that it wasn't quite English. *Commonwealth*, which he does use, appears in both *De Cive* and *Leviathan* used very much in the Bodin sense, which Hobbes may have absorbed during his years in Paris, of ordered state. *De Cive* is of particular interest because it is Hobbes's own translation from his prerevolutionary Latin.



where the word for state in general is *civitas*. Hobbes begins by translating this as “city” (“monarchy is no less a city than democracy”), but in chapter 10 he switches to “commonweal”.<sup>80</sup>

It may be one of the foundations of Hobbes’s extraordinary originality that he started with a Bodin sense of the word *republic* and stubbornly struggled to hold on to it during the Civil War. Even afterwards, in *Behemoth* (written in 1668), Charles II’s old tutor was still, with one exception, using *commonwealth* in the old sense to analyse the history of the Puritan Revolution. The nearest he came to the term *republican* was to describe Cicero and Seneca as “anti-monarchics”. Interestingly, Spinoza took the same rearguard action. Though he loved his *respublica*, the Netherlands, in the posthumous *Tractatus Politicus* of 1677-78 he used *civitas* for state in general, and *respublica* (uniquely, as far as I can see) for policy or affairs of state.<sup>81</sup>

Also in 1651, John Milton published his first *Defense*. It was in Latin and represents a sort of compromise between the new and the old meanings of *res publica*. Milton recorded in his commonplace book, in a mix of Italian and Latin, the impact of reading Machiavelli in the original around this time; and in at least three of these references he opposed monarchy to *respub*. Most of the time in the *Defensio* his word means a (good) state without a king, but not always. According to Milton, when the Jews chose King Saul, God allowed their republic to be changed from being administered by many to by one (“ab uno a pluribus respub. administraretur”). It should, of course, be noted that for Milton whatever government the Jews might have must be approved by God, and a government approved by God was what Augustine had implied in his discussion of *res publica* in *City of God*. In 1654, Milton’s *res publica* was unambiguously modern in the *Defensio secunda*, where Milton writes that the “attack which I, in a republic (*Respublica*), am seen to make against kings (*Reges*), you, in a kingdom (*Regno*) . . . do not dare to make against the republic (*Rempublicam*)”.<sup>82</sup>

Other uses of *commonwealth*, *commonwealthman*, *res publica* and *republic* that seem unambiguously modern (or Machiavellian) can be found in 1652 (Winstanley, John Selden in Nedham’s translation), and in 1653 (R. H.). In fact, all the uses I have been able to find are modern until the publication of *The Commonwealth of Oceana* in 1656.

No one could be more of a classical republican — or more classically a republican — than James Harrington, whom John Adams remembered in 1775 defining a republic as “a government of laws and not of men”.<sup>83</sup> But Adams’s memory was not quite accurate, and the mistake is revealing. What Harrington really wrote was that “Government . . . is the *Empire of Lawes* and not of *Men*”, adding later that it was Aristotle’s and Livy’s “assertion that a common-wealth is an Empire of Lawes and not of Men”.<sup>84</sup> Harrington was, of course, a mixed government man, a republican unafraid of a properly limited king or executive, and sanguine about the uses of aristocracy, views close to those that Adams came to represent. In Harrington’s view, which he italicized for emphasis, “*Whether a Common-wealth be Monarchical or Popular, the freedom is the same*,” and he defined *commonwealth* in several ways in *Oceana*, all of them Aristotelian rather than Machiavellian. “Common-wealths in general be Governments of the Senate proposing, the people resolving, and the magistracy executing”, was one. Another was “A Common-wealth is nothing else but the National Conscience”. The variety he called an “equal Common-wealth” (that recommended by Sprigge and Milton in 1659) was, he thought, the best and most durable. It was a “Government established upon an equal Agrarian, arising into the superstructures or three orders . . .” The man said at the time to be the only one in England who “knew what a republic was” still used the word *commonwealth* in an Aristotelian sense.<sup>85</sup>

Perhaps this helps to explain why Harrington and the bright young Harringtonians found it so much easier to accept the Restoration than the radical “commonwealthsmen”. One of the latter, in 1657, defined a *Common-wealth* as a union of families living under a government that it or God has chosen. Cicero and Augustine are invoked to add justice to the definition, and Sophocles is quoted to prove that “Tyrannie . . . loses that name,

and is actually another thing”, and to recommend tyrannicide. It is in thinking like this that *commonwealth* retains its radical character, even when given an old-fashioned definition; but it is clear that the friends of kingless government were fewer as the Restoration approached.<sup>86</sup>

As for the enemies of the commonwealthsmen, they seem to have been the ones who invented the word *republican*, from Prynne and Butler in 1659-60 to L’Estrange in the 1680s. It began as their term of abuse, fully 32 years before the first citation in the *OED*. Prynne’s *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause* gives that logorrheic Presbyterian a very important place in the history, not of republican thought, but of republican semantics. In it, he uses the word *Republic(k,ck,ke)* to refer to England under Richard Cromwell, and to England from 1649 to the Protectorate. It is the contrary of “Monarch” and of “Elective Kingdom”, and the equivalent of *free-state*, of an “Oligarchy”, and of any state without a king.<sup>87</sup> Prynne’s *Republicans* in 1659 and 1660 include the leaders of the Rump, the Independents, the Anti-Protectorate party, Marcus Brutus, Jesuits, Hollanders, and the Thirty Tyrants of Athens, all of which means that he is not only the first to use the word *republican*, he is also the first to use *republic* to include aristocratic tyranny — or any kind of tyranny.<sup>88</sup> Samuel Butler’s uses are similar, less extensive, and funnier, as befits the author of *Hudibras*. Butler may also have been, in 1662, the first to put the relationship between republicanism and Calvinist church movement into verse: “*Presbyterie* does but translate / The Papacy to a *Free State* / A *Common-wealth* of Poperie / Where ev’ry Villane is a See”.<sup>89</sup>

For twenty years and more after the Restoration, this kind of mutual recrimination is all that keeps the words *republic*, *republican* and *commonwealthsman* alive. This is almost the case with *republic* and to a lesser extent with *commonwealth*. The only other continuous use of these words seems to have been in diplomacy and geography, to distinguish the small surviving non-monarchical states of Europe from the large monarchies that were so much more usual. We can see this best in the development of the French word *republique*, which we left under the magistracy of Jean Bodin.<sup>90</sup>

## VIII

French lexicographers find only one use of the Machiavellian *republique* between Bodin and the Furetiere dictionary of 1694, the publication in 1620 of the *Memoires* of Boucicault, reporting the 1410 exhortation of the Pisans to the Genoese, “vivez en republique comme nous”. To this one might add Louis Le Roy’s distillation of his lifetime of learning, *De la vicissitude ou varieté des choses en l’univers* of 1575. Le Roy’s judgment that republics are more grateful to meritorious citizens than monarchies is that of one of the French kingdom’s greatest scholars who seems nevertheless to have gone hungry often. We should also note a fairly clear use by the apostate protestant Remond in 1605 and a much more ambiguous one by Jean de Brebeuf, a Jesuit missionary in Canada in 1636. Classical scholars whose Society had produced apologists for tyrannicide, Jesuits saw republics among the Hurons and created them among the Itati of Paraguay. There may be other, less ambiguous uses of our word among their records, but at least one, in 1653, about the “regime republicain” of the Hurons suggests, not Jesuit ideas, but the effect of a failed revolution called the Fronde.<sup>91</sup>

The Fronde brought anti-absolutists briefly out of hiding, and *republique* out of its Bodinian shrine. The *Mazarinades* record what Le Tellier and Mazarin, in a conversation of 21 August, 1650, recalled as a demand of the people for a *republique*. One asked, on 11 February, 1649, “Quel droit a le Parlement . . . de mettre main au gouvernement de l’Etat? Sommes-nous en quelque Republique?” — are we in some kind of Republic? And there are other references, all more than thirty years before the citations in Robert and Walther von Wartburg, making it clear that *republique* and *republicain* had quite suddenly come into use to mean non- and anti-monarchic. What never happened in the

fevered literature of religious war in the 16th century, happened in the political struggles of the 17th.<sup>92</sup>

Did this require the direct influence of the Commonwealth of England? Perhaps. The timing is precise, and Philip Knachel has detailed the genuine English connection with the uprising in Bordeaux. Knachel also found at least two instances of the use of *republcain* to describe the Frondeurs in 1652 and 1653 in the Conde manuscripts at Chantilly. Hobbes's translator, Samuel Sorbiere, seems to have used the word in a letter to Courcelles on 1 July, 1652. Since the usage we are measuring seems to disappear from French from the establishment of Cromwell's dictatorship to 1676 (though there is an ambiguous use in the manuscript of Cyrano's *Histoire comique*), the reasoning may be sound.<sup>93</sup>

In France, even more than in England, the usage was short-lived. The few suggestive uses of *republique* between 1653 and 1675 are ambiguous, either historical, or based on the diplomatic distinction. Jean (or John) Chardin, who wrote up his travels in the absolute monarchy of Persia, and published them in both his native France and his adopted England, used *republique* without exception in talking about the Italian free cities. Louis Moreri's *Le grand dictionnaire historique* of 1674 begins "la nouvelle republique" in Rome with Brutus. Nicolas-Abraham de la Houssaye Amelot had been a French ambassador to Venice, and he returned with a diplomatic, not to mention a Venetian, sense of our word that stands out considerably in the Age of Louis XIV. Clearly, the great power of which the French were subjects had relations with many states that were not only less powerful but also stubbornly and survivably different. The great enemy, the United Provinces of the Netherlands, for example, the Republic of Venice, the Swiss Confederation, and the Republic of Geneva were all named in Amelot's 1675 *Histoire du gouvernement de Venise* in a political glossary at the end; and if one adds up the categories (or dichotomizes them), a *republique* includes aristocracy and democracy, but not monarchy. Amelot, moreover, was a translator of Machiavelli and familiar with the career of Boucicault.<sup>94</sup>

Meanwhile in England both *commonwealth* and *republic* were losing some of their revolutionary connotation in the years following the Restoration; but they continued to be used occasionally in more neutral contexts. We hardly know whether the partisan nouns, *Commonwealthsman* and *republican*, lost any strength because they all but disappeared from print between 1660 and 1671. All I have been able to find is the memo of a conversation with Charles II in Ashcraft's new study, reporting that around the time of the signing of the Secret Treaty of Dover in 1670, Charles II called Holland a refuge whose destruction would hurt "the Commonwealth faction in England".<sup>95</sup> Old revolutionaries and regicides survived their defeat, many in New England, the Netherlands and Switzerland; but they seem not to have described themselves in either the enemy's terms or their own.

I cannot help wondering if this was not a bit like the fate of the words "hippie" and "radical" in the United States in the 1970s. In any case, something the ex-revolutionaries still called the "good old cause" took a new lease on life in 1678, that well-known period in British political history called the "emergence of parties". Those who are not political historians may welcome a review. The initial issue was the attempt by some political leaders to "exclude" the Catholic heir to the throne, James, Duke of York, from the succession; and their excuse was the by now traditional left-wing anti-Catholicism of the British populace, fanned into fury by the apparently false report of a Catholic plot. Partisans of the Exclusion Bill, led by Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, came to be called Whigs, and their opponents, Tories; and in a bewildering decade-long series of political actions, legal and treasonous, public and clandestine, the regime of the restored Stuarts was brought to an ignominious end. Almost immediately, the new rulers and their Whig supporters ran into similar opposition from the Tories which lasted until the roles were reversed in 1701.

In chronological order, this series of events is called the Popish Plot, the Exclusion Parliaments of 1679 and 1680, The Third

Exclusion Parliament, or Oxford Parliament, of 1681, the trial and exile of Shaftesbury in 1681, the Rye House Plot of 1683, the Monmouth Rebellion, or Western Rising, of 1685, and the Glorious Revolution of 1688. After the Revolution came the Standing Army Controversy (also called the Paper War) in 1697-99 and the impeachment of the Whig ministers in 1701. Each of these gave rise to a voluminous literature in an England of many, relatively free, presses. The literature, in turn, shows a steady increase in the use of the terms *Commonwealth*, *Republic*, *Commonwealthsman*, and *Republican*, including particularly interesting uses by John Locke and Jonathan Swift.

In 1671, we find both our partisan terms in Samuel Parker's *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Polity*. In 1675, Shaftesbury gives a speech in Parliament warning of a "Democraticall Republique", and leading to the suspicion that he was in favour of one. In 1677, we find a very Machiavellian *republic* in the English translation of Amelot de la Houssaye's book on Venice. As soon as the Exclusion Crisis begins, however, unless my search has been skewed, the tempo rises. In 1679, the *Republicks* of Italy were mentioned in a pamphlet on foreign policy. In 1680 John Maxwell made the assumption, which neither Hotman nor Bodin would have made, that sovereignty of the people by contract is "antimonarchical". On 11 December of that same year, Nathaniel Lee put a self-described *commonwealth's man* who did not "naturally love kings", on the London stage. His *Lucius Junius Brutus* (actually about Marcus Brutus) was closed by the government on 12 December.<sup>96</sup>

In 1679, Filmer's *Patriarcha* had had its first, long posthumous, publication, and in 1681, James Tyrrel made the first printed reply to it, while Locke and Sidney began to think out their own, more famous ones. Tyrrel was careful in his preface to overstate the accusations against him, that he was a *commonwealthsman* who "wanted to set up a democracy amongst us". 1681 also saw the publication of *Brutus* (Lee, the frustrated playwright settled for a quarto instead of a production), and of the extended Harringtonian tract, *Plato Redivivus*, by Henry Neville. On 13 April that year, with the Third Exclusion Parliament meeting at royalist Oxford, Charles II's new publicist, Cavalier veteran Roger L'Estrange, debated his weekly called *The Observer* which tarred the Whigs as *Common-wealths-men* and "antimonarchical sectaries" from the first issue to the last. In November came Dryden's great satire on Shaftesbury, Exclusion, and "the General Cry Religion, Common-wealth, and Liberty" in *Absalom and Achitophel*, the victory piece of the Tories after Shaftesbury's trial.<sup>97</sup>

In January, 1682, White Kennett described the contract theory of government as a "Republican" notion. John Evelyn described the *London Gazette* as *republican*. John Northleigh, a prolific Stuart publicist who used the word often, described as "republican designs" efforts to limit the king's power and bring the regime "near . . . to the nature of a commonwealth". Dryden in *The Medall* used the word *Republique* twice, the second time to draw the parallel dear to James I that presbyterian church government was "Republic Prelacy". A pamphlet that I have not been able to date exactly, but is probably from 1682, talks of those who would have "the Monarchy made dissolvable into a *Republick* upon his Majesty's Death". Clearly the words were being bandied as if there were indeed republicans about who wished there to be no king in England. If there were any such republicans, they were few and circumspect; but the fact remains that the accusation of wanting no king was applied to the Whigs by Tories precisely through the words we have been studying.<sup>98</sup>

When a plot against Charles II actually transpired in 1683, one of the victims of the royal revenge was, in fact, a republican straight out of the Tories' fearful imagination. Algernon Sidney's manuscript reply to Filmer, which was instrumental in his conviction and beheading and did not see print until 1698, made it clear that he thought England or any nation could do without any monarch at all. Later memoirs called him *republican*, but there is no evidence he said it of himself.<sup>99</sup> His ideal government, as it emerges from the *Discourses*, was nothing more radical than the "mixed government" familiar since the rediscovery of Aristotle and Polybios, which he referred to as a *commonwealth*. He was,



however, aware of the new resonance of that word since 1649 and by saying “that all the regular kingdoms of this world are commonwealths”, he was in reality arguing that the best “kings” were mere magistrates, and, conversely, that a king who tried to be more was a tyrant to be resisted by force.<sup>100</sup> Sidney’s mild judgment, “if I should undertake to say, there never was a good government in the world that did not consist of the three simple species of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, I think I might make it good”, may have been in Adams’s mind when he praised Sidney and like writers in his *Thoughts on Government* and said that they proved “that there is no good government but what is republican”.<sup>101</sup> Though the words *republic* and *republican* are absent from Sidney’s work, history does not need to go much further before the implication is irresistible.

A full-blown rebellion occurred two years later in June and July of 1685. John Northleigh wrote of its defeat as *The Triumph of Our Monarchy, over the Plots and Principles of Our rebels and Republicans*. The indefatigable L’Estrange crowed that there would be “no more . . . confederates for a Republic”, though two years later he was warning again of “republican conspiracy”. He did well to correct himself. Among writers on the rebel side who survived the Monmouth Rebellion were Andrew Fletcher, Robert Ferguson, John Wildman, and, if we may follow Ashcraft, John Locke. They remained confederates for limited monarchy, and advocates of revolution, always defending themselves against the charge of being republicans.<sup>102</sup>

As we know, their day came in 1688, and soon after, Locke published his *Two Treatises of Government*, both probably written earlier. The circumspection that seems now to have obscured Locke’s radicalism is evident in the *Treatises* in many ways. His use of the word *commonwealth* now adds another, and incidentally adds a bit of evidence to confirm the judgment that the *Treatises* were composed long before 1688. In the first *Treatise* Locke uses *commonwealth* in the same way as Sidney. He forces Filmer’s argument to the *reductio* that “all commonwealths are nothing but downright monarchies” instead of only some of them. Then he forks him with the converse: “or else they were a commonwealth and then where was monarchy?”<sup>103</sup> The object is to exclude from the category *commonwealth* any absolute monarchy, or even any strong one. This is not new, for, as we have seen, an Augustinian definition of *res publica* could exclude tyranny on the grounds of injustice and an Aristotelian one could do the same on the grounds of disorder. All Locke has done with the word is what Sidney did, melding absolutism and tyranny.<sup>104</sup>

In the *Second Treatise*, however, Locke begins to ironize on the word *commonwealth*. “I crave leave to use (it)”, he writes, “in that sense I find it used by King James the First; and I take it to be its genuine signification; which if anybody dislike, I consent with him to change it for a better”. One appreciates Locke’s neat way of avoiding the charge that the *commonwealth* he meant was the commonwealth of 1649. Later, he mines James I for even more humour, citing that theoretician of absolutism as authority for the proposition that kings must obey the law, and quoting a Catholic Scot whom James refuted to “prove” that the king is the head of the *corpus reipublicae*, or “body of the commonwealth”.<sup>105</sup>

Without causing Locke much trouble, a pamphlet of 1705 called his a “republican scheme”. When it saw print in 1690 Locke’s language was already old, his circumspection no longer needed. That was the year that one “B.E. Gent”, published *A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew*, the first political dictionary. He defined *Republican* as “a Common-wealths-man”, *Whiggs* as “The Republicans or Common-wealths-men, under the name of Patriots, and Lovers of Property; originally the Field Conventiclers in the West of Scotland”.<sup>106</sup> The year before, 1689, we find John Evelyn describing “Republicans who would make the Prince of Orange like a state-holder”. The OED’s citation is from 1691. Radical local Whig politicians were being called “stiffe Republicans . . . sedulous to promote atheisme” and talking “violently for it” in “coffy houses” in 1693. In 1701, parties changed, and John Toland remarked that “Tories” had become “downright Republicans”, a switch noted in reverse by Addison in 1716.<sup>107</sup>

*Republic* was now, I think, influenced by *republican*, almost a “back-formation”, (as lexicographers say) in English. I take the decade after 1688, to borrow a phrase, to be the Machiavellian moment in the history of the English word *republic*, because I can find no uses after that date which do not denote a state that has either no single chief executive, or else a highly limited and elected one. Even Swift was using it in this way in his first great satiric pamphlet of 1701.<sup>108</sup>

Moreover *commonwealth* may be observed to have recovered its 1649 meaning in the essays of the ministerial “Trimmer”, Halifax, in 1688 and 1694. In 1697 the conservative poet, Matthew Prior, commented that radical Whig opponents of a standing army (like Fletcher and Trenchard) offered two “Extreams: A Commonwealth, or else King James”. In John Toland’s 1698 edition of the *Memoirs* of the old commonwealthman Ludlow, the officers’ agreement of 1659 is altered from the original so that the word *commonwealth* is even more exclusive of monarchy than it had been in 1659. Toland’s Ludlow had agreed that the government not be “altered from a Commonwealth, by setting up a King, single person, or House of Peers”. The actual agreement was on seven principles “in order to the conservation of this Commonwealth”.<sup>109</sup>

Walter Moyle used both the non-monarchical *republic* and *commonwealth* in his *Essay on the Constitution and Government of the Roman State*, written in 1699. The title itself illustrates the growing modernity of political language; *republic* had finally ceased to mean “state”, even in the most familiar of its historical contexts. 1701, the year the Tories impeached the Whig ministry, Daniel Defoe published his *True-Born Englishman* with its neat and clearly pregnant pun: “Titles are shadows! Crowns are empty things! The Good of Subjects is the End of Kings”. In 1701 Jonathan Swift published his early masterpiece, a satire on the party struggle disguised as an essay on Greek and Roman history. Here again, the words *commonwealth* and *republic* are equivalent and unlike the same words in the writings of Swift’s master, Temple, they both exclude monarchies. By implication, England, too, is no monarchy since impeachment is republican. Joseph Addison, who unlike Swift remained a Whig, has the same usage in the *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy* in 1703 and in the *Spectator* of 1711. In 1707, a conservative writer, one Henry Gandy, even used the word *Republick* in its new sense while discussing Aristotle’s preference for monarchy in the *Ethics*.<sup>110</sup>

## IX

By 1721, with the publications of John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, *republic* in England had come to rest, meaning something close to monarchy by default, or monarchy severely limited. An “arrant Republican . . . that is, one who is against all Monarchy” was rare. Those who opposed the king’s government, even Tories like Bolingbroke, were bound to get called *republicans* by their enemies, implying that they were against kings and suspicious of government generally. This domesticated the word, in the same way that British politics became domesticated in this period. Only artisan radicals, like Thomas Paine in 1776, remembered the near equivalence of *republican* and leveller or democrat that had been part of the word before the 1690s.<sup>111</sup>

In France, something similar began to happen. Dissidents, particularly Huguenots, grew in numbers, were recognised, and labelled with the word *republicain*, denoting, more and more inescapably, opposition to any monarchy. Thus the marquis de Duras in 1676 wrote exasperatedly of “cet esprit republicain” to Louis XIV’s war minister. Adjectival uses in English are equally more partisan and less intellectual. Duras must mean insurgency, dissent, or what the French might now call “l’esprit rouspeteur”.<sup>112</sup>

Such usage goes back, in French, to the pro-monarchists in the Fronde, and it goes on in the same vein. Richelet’s *Huguenot Dictionnaire*, published in Geneva in 1679 (and printed in Rouen in 1719), defines a *republicain* as “Reipublicae studiosus, qui a l’esprit de Republique. Qui n’aime point l’etat monarchique”. He defines *Republique* as “Respublica. Mot general qui veut dire *Etat*

*libre* qui est gouverne par les principaux du peuple. pour le bien commun de l'Etat", adding a poem by De la Vigne opposing *Republique* to "grands Rois".<sup>113</sup>

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes raised the stakes of dissidence in France. Ponchartrain in Louisiana implemented the government's ban on Huguenot colonists by saying, "le roi n'a pas chasse de son royaume les heretiques pour en faire une republique". Richard Simon wrote that Huguenot writings tended to "etablir des Republiques". Indeed, Huguenot exile Pierre Jurieu's *Lettres pastorales* of 1689 proposed a political theory much like Locke's, to justify the Glorious Revolution, popular sovereignty and a sort of passive resistance to Catholic kings. His rival, Pierre Bayle, also used the word *republicain*, meaning a political egalitarian dissident in a letter of 1691. In his emerging *Dictionnaire critique* in 1691, 1692 and 1695, Bayle used the word *republique* in a serious, Machiavellian sense, stronger than the rather bantering *Republique des lettres* coinage, immortalised in his journal of 1683, would suggest. One sentence found under "Hobbes", appears again under "Pericles", with *republicain* simply replaced by "democratique".<sup>114</sup>

Antoine Furetiere's *Dictionnaire universel*, published in the Netherlands in 1690, was a good deal more explicit, and more generous to republicans. In the article "Libre", he defines an *etat libre* like Machiavelli's *stato libero* and Nedham's *free-state* as "une Republique gouvernee par des Magistrats elas par des suffrages libres" like those of the Greeks and Romans. *Republique* he defined as an "etat populaire", a democracy (Landucci's "governo popolar"). As for a *Republiquain*, he was "passione pour la Republique . . ." a lover of his country's liberty like the Brutuses and Catos. Peoples with a "genie republiquain", like the Genoese, find it difficult to accustom themselves to "gouvernement monarchique".<sup>115</sup>

Furetiere's second edition came out in 1694. The Academie francaise dictionary of that year described a *republicain* as "mutin, seditieux, opposees a la monarchie". That drew the lines very nicely between the ins and the outs in France. The words did not disappear this time, and the lines did not move. When Montesquieu began his literary career *republique* had acquired its antimonarchical meaning for good, and any use of it was bound to be somewhat tendentious, even in the Regency.<sup>116</sup>

This, then, is one of the many subtexts of Montesquieu's famous *Lettres persanes*, which delighted and twitted the Parisian reader in 1721. Drawing on Chardin's description of Persian despotism, Montesquieu reversed the Bodin term and the Bodin attitude toward monarchy in the mind of his Persian visitor. Monarchy, says Rhedi, writing home, "est un etat violent, qui degenee toujours en despotisme ou en republique". In a subsequent letter, Rhedi speculates on the origins of this strange "gouvernement republiquain" in Europe, born of the love of liberty and hatred of kings among the Greeks and carried on by the Romans and Franks.<sup>117</sup>

Montesquieu never changed his mind about what a republic was, even after he finally studied Bodin and Machiavelli. He followed it in the 1724 *Dialogue de Sylla et d'Eucrate*, and in 1734 in his essay on the rise and decline of Rome. It is impossible for him to have found it first in England during his famous visit of 1729-31. Much more likely is it that his *republique* was the result of a back-formation from *republicain*, similar to what happened in England. We may have the earliest example of this in the Jesuit *Dictionnaire de Trevoux* of 1704, which makes a nice symmetry with one of the last uses of the old word by an antimonarchical Jansenist in 1717.<sup>118</sup>

In 1748 Montesquieu put the modern *republique* unequivocally into the foundations of his vast masterpiece, *De l'esprit des lois*. His is thus the first great work of political science to divide the forms of state into monarchical, despotic, and *republicain*, instead of some variation on the Greek triad. Rule of the few and rule of the many became in Montesquieu nothing more than sub-categories of *republicain*. Though it has not really been recognised, there was nothing like it, except Althusius's idea of "polyarchy". It is a considerable step in political semantics when

Montesquieu asserts, in his own quotation marks, "le gouvernement republicain est celui ou le peuple en corps, ou seulement une partie du peuple, a la souveraine puissance; le monarchique, celui ou un seul gouverne, mais par des lois fixes et etablies; au lieu que, dans le despotique, un seul loi et sans regle, entraine tout par sa volonte et ses caprices".<sup>119</sup>

Montesquieu's counterpart in England was David Hume. He was a greater philosopher and, as we know, not so prominently placed in the development of eighteenth century political thought as others. His great originality was in his theory of political obligation based on habit and association of ideas, and many think of him, correctly, as a Tory historian with unpleasant things to say about revolution and radicalism. Nevertheless, Hume, who had gone to France as a young man in 1734, written his masterpiece there in three years, and met Montesquieu, was bold and clear in his adoption of the new definition of *republic*. It is implied in the brief political sections of the *Treatise on Human Nature* (Book III, 1740), and it is inescapably explicit in the first volume of the *Essays, Moral and Political* in 1741. The English "mixed form of government . . . is neither wholly monarchical nor wholly republican", wrote Hume in "Of the Liberty of the Press", devoting a second and separate essay to deciding what the proportions were.<sup>120</sup> In his *Essays* of 1742, an additional contribution equates *republic* with a "free state" ruled by the "few" or the "many", repeatedly contrasting it with "monarchies" of two kinds, "barbarous" and "civilised". It is tempting to conclude that Hume's three categories were conceived in the presence of the three nearly identical categories of the *Esprit des lois*, yet to be printed.<sup>121</sup>

In 1755, Samuel Johnson began publishing his great *Dictionary*, the first with etymological documentation. Johnson defines a *republic* as "a government of more than one". His citation is from Addison, possibly the *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy in the Years 1701, 1702, 1703*, certainly the *Spectator*, but it is only an instance; the utterly succinct formulation of nearly a century of development belongs entirely to Johnson, with perhaps a small assist from Lockean epistemology.<sup>122</sup>

Adams, who had read Machiavelli early, and would continue to wrestle with this word *republic* for a lifetime, found Johnson's definition while working on the reply to Paine, Franklin, Price and Turgot that became the *Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*.<sup>123</sup> It suited him perfectly. Aristocracy, which he had always thought inevitable, and which he had provided for in the 1780 constitution of Massachusetts, was included by this definition. So were complex constitutions generally, especially those which balanced the classes or otherwise resembled the mixed government of Polybios; such systems he had always favoured. Popular rule, the freeholder franchise, or the supremacy of democratically elected legislatures, which was what Paine in 1776 and Price in 1778 had meant by "republican government", were included too, of course; and thus Adams found it possible to disapprove of the Pennsylvania constitution of 1776 on grounds other than it was unrepublican. Neatly too, though Adams was careful not to say it baldly, Johnson's "government of more than one" could include limited monarchies like the British.

It did more. Strictly applied, it excluded only tyranny and absolute monarchy where the king was *legis absolutus* — above the law. It thus included all states that Adams would have recognised as just in the Ciceronian-Augustinian sense; and neatly affirmed the old Harringtonian insight that had charmed him in 1775, an "empire of laws". Adopted by a man of fundamentally conservative temperament, mistrustful of human nature and wary of people en masse, but a man who nevertheless called himself a *republican*, its meaning was bound to stabilise. The word still means, primarily in every European language, the absence of kings and tyrants, dictators and despots, and one-man rule of every description, even the unlimited power of a democratically elected executive. So powerful was the modern meaning, even before the Revolution, that in Kenrick's *English Dictionary* of 1773 (otherwise largely cribbed from Johnson's) there is an entry which is the exact converse of Bodin's so that "state" is defined as "a republic; a government not monarchical".<sup>124</sup>

At this point Adams may help us approach from a different angle the question that has dogged American historiography for nearly twenty years now. How central to republican ideology is "classical virtue" or public-spiritedness? Does this word *republic*, especially in the hands of an old curmudgeon like Adams, really imply virtue and class deference? How much?

The fact is that these aspects of Adams's thought about republican government were already old-fashioned, and much grief fell to Adams for not excluding aristocracy from his conception as he had excluded monarchy. To the learned, the old meaning of *republic* might continue to act as an undertow on the new; but to most people who used the word, it was by 1750 no longer a technical term of philosophy or classical studies, even less a term from Italian Renaissance politics. *Republican* and *commonwealthsman* — no less *republican* — had meant radicals opposed to kings and to deference since the words had been invented in 1643-49. *Republic*, *commonwealth*, and *republique* to these people now meant a (relatively) egalitarian society with "democratic" government. It was with these words that Americans baptised the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1776, the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1778, with its motto "Sic semper tyrannis", and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for which Adams wrote the constitution in 1780.<sup>125</sup>

For the French revolutionaries, especially Robespierre and Saint-Just, the *republique* demanded virtue, classically defined; but the most important implication of the word was that the kings were gone. The thousand-year monarchy given its philosophical underpinnings by Jean Bodin's backward-looking definition of *republique*, had come to an end, at the will of the people. *Res publica* was now, especially in French, the people's thing.

As far as virtue went, the *Republicans* who gave the name to Jefferson's party in the 1790s thought to have demonstrated sufficient public spirit by plunging into politics and turning rascals out. They did not understand their *Republic* to be the complex representative democracy, lexicologised by Noah Webster out of Madison's *Federalist* 10, and fearfully designed to checkmate factions of the propertiless. Instead, as Thomas Paine put it in *The Rights of Man*, "the government of America, which is wholly on the system of representation, is the only real republic in character and practice that now (1791) exists. Its government has no other object than the public business of the nation, and therefore it is properly a republic" because "a republic . . . with respect to form . . . was the simple democratical form" which America adapted to a large territory by means of a system of representation.<sup>126</sup> This is the last state of the word in America, except for some scholarly types on the right. In other words, as the *Straight-out Harrisonian* was among the first to say in 1840, "the word Democrat is synonymous with that of Republican".<sup>127</sup>

## FOOTNOTES

1. Wade H. McCree, "On the Bicentennial of the Constitution", 92nd Street, Y. N.Y., 26 February, 1987. The U.S. Supreme Court has held a *republic* to be "the state" (*State v. Harris*, 2 Bailey (SC) 599), a state whose "administration is open to all citizens" (Toullier, *Droit civil francais* I, 28 and n., 202, note), and a government "of the people" (In re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 35). Oregon holds it to be a government by "representatives chosen by the people" (*Kadderly v. Portland*, 44 Or. 118, 742 p. 710).
2. Noah Webster, *Dictionary* (1828), NY: Johnson Reprint, 1970, article "Republic".
3. Adams to Samuel Adams, 18 Oct. 1790 in *The Works of John Adams*, ed., Charles F. Adams, Boston, 1851ff., VI, 415. But he tried to define it anyway. *Ibid.*, pp. 420-21.
4. Adams to Mercy Warren, 23 July, 1807 Massachusetts Historical Society 5th ser. IV, 1878.
5. Adams, *Novanglus*, 6 March, 1755, in *The Papers of John Adams*, Cambridge MA: Harvard U. Press, 19, II, 314 and *Thoughts on Government*, January, 1776 in *Works of John Adams*, VI, 415.
6. Adams to Roger Sherman, 17 July, 1789, *Works* VI, 437.
7. Adams, *Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America* in *Works*, VI, p. 10.

8. Jean Bodin, *Six livres de la Republique* (1576) in Bodin, *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale*, tr., Richard Knolles (1606), ed., Kenneth D. McRae, Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1962.
9. The following is a short list of contributions to the issue. Adams, Willi Paul, "Republicanism in Political Rhetoric before 1776" in *Political Science Quarterly*, 85 (1970) 397; Appleby, Joyce, "What is Still Republican in the Political Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson?" in *William & Mary Quarterly*, 39 (1982), 287-309; Appleby, "Republicanism in Old and New Contexts", in *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 43, February, 1986, 20-34; Appleby, ed., "Republicanism" in *American Quarterly* 37 (1985); Ashcraft, Richard, *Revolutionary Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government* Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1986; Bailyn, Bernard, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Harvard U. Press, 1967; Banning, Lance, "Republican Ideology and the Triumph of the Constitution, 1789 to 1793" in *WMQ*, 3rd ser., 31 (1979); Carrithers, David W., "Montesquieu, Jefferson, and the Fundamentals of Eighteenth-Century Republican Theory" in *The French-American Review*, 6 (1982) 160-88; Durand, Yves, *Les Republiques au temps des monarchies*, Paris, PUF, 1973; Everdell, William R., *The End of Kings: A History of Republics and Republicans*, NY: The Free Press, 1983; Fabre, Jean, "Stanislas Leszczynski et l'idee republicaine en France au XVIIIe siecle" in *Lumieres et Romantisme*, Paris, 1963, pp. 131-149; Fink, Zera S., *The Classical Republicans*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern U. Press, 1945; Gilbert, Felix, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1965; Gribbin, William, "Rollin's Histories and American Republicanism" in *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 29 (1972), 611-622; Guenee, Bernard, *States and Rulers in Later Medieval Europe*, tr. J. Vale from *L'Occident au 14e et 15e siecles*, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985; Hinsley, F.H., *Sovereignty*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1986; Jacob, Margaret, *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1981; Kenyon, Cecilia M., "Republicanism and Radicalism in the American Revolution: An Old-Fashioned Interpretation" in *WMQ* XIX (1962), 168; Keohane, Nannerl O., *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1980; Kerber, Linda, "Republican Revisionism" paper delivered at the AHA Annual Meeting, NY, 1982; Kramnick, Isaac, "Republican Revisionism Revisited" in *AHR*; Lyons, J.C., "Concept of the Republic in French Life of the 16th Century" in *Roman review*, 1930; Mager, "Republik" (article) in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Lexikon der historischen Sprache in Deutschland*; Marcuse, Herbert, "Republic" (article) in *Encyclopaedia Americana*; McCracken, David, "Republican Rhetoric: The Politics of Junius" in *Enlightenment Essays*, 6, no. 2 (1975), 40-51; Morante, Regine Ann Markell, "Democracy" and "Republic" in *American Ideology, 1787-1840*, Columbia University PhD Diss., 1971; Nicolet, Claude, *Idee republicaine en France, 1789-1924*, Paris: Gallimard, 1982; Peterson, Paul, "The Meaning of Republicanism in *The Federalist*" in *Publius* 9 (1979); Pocock, J.G.A., *The Machiavellian Moment*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1975; Raab, Felix, *The English Face of Machiavelli*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965; Riemer, Neal, "The Republicanism of James Madison" in *Political Science Quarterly* 69 (1954); Robbins, Caroline, ed., *Two English Republican Tracts*, Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1969; Schwoerer, Lois G., "No Standing Armies!" *The Antimilitary Ideology in Seventeenth Century England*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1974; Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1981; Shalhope, Robert E., "Toward a Republican Synthesis: The Emergence of an Understanding of Republicanism in American Historiography" *WMQ* 3rd ser., 29 (1972), 49-80; Shalhope, Robert E., "Republicanism and Early American Historiography" *WMQ* 3rd ser., 39 (1982), 334-356; Shoemaker, Robert W., "Democracy" and "Republic" as Understood in Late Eighteenth Century America" in *American Speech*, 41 (1966), 83-95; Skinner, Quentin, *Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1978; Smith, Bruce James, *Politics and Remembrance: Republican Themes in Machiavelli and De Tocqueville*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1985; Smith, James Morton, "The Transformation of Republican Thought, 1763-1787" in *Indiana Historical Society Lectures, 1969-1970*, Indianapolis, IN: IHS, 1970; Sperber, Hans & Travis Trittschuh, *American Political Terms: An Historical Dictionary*, Detroit, MI: Wayne State U. Press, 1962; Stourzh, Gerald, *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government*, Stanford, CA: Stanford U. Press, 1970; Vetterli, Richard & Gary Bryner, *In Search of the Republic: Public Virtue and the Roots of American Government*, Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1987; Walker, James, "Dissent and Republicanism after the Restoration" in *Baptist Quarterly* 8, no 5 (Jan. 1937), p. 277; Wartburg, Walther von, *Franzosisches Etymologisches Worterbuch*, Basel: Zbinden, 1962; Wiecek, William M., *The Guarantee Clause of the U.S. Constitution*, 1972; Witt, Roland G., "The Rebirth of the Concept of Republican Liberty in Italy" *Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, Florence, 1971; Wood, Gordon S., *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787*, Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina Press, 1969.
10. Floyd, *Picture of A Perfit Commonwealth*, London, 1600, facs. ed., NY: Da Capo, 1973, pp. 1, 3.
11. Augustine, *City of God*, ed., David Knowles, NY: Penguin, 1972, Book 2, ch 9, 2:21, 2:42, 5:18, 19:21, 19:24. Augustine's importance in the transmission and alteration of the Roman meaning of *res publica*, from the Middle Ages to Samuel Butler (c1660) is profound and so far unexamined.

- Plutarch "Politika paragelmata (Praecepta gerenda reipublicae)", and "Peri monarchias kai demokratias kai oligarchias (De unius in republica dominatione, populari statu, et paucorum imperio)" in *Moralia* 48, 58. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press (Loeb), 19.
- 13 Guenee, Bernard, *States and Rulers in Later Medieval Europe*, tr. J. Vale, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985, pp. 4-5. Cf Charles de Grassaille, *Regalium Franciae libri duo*, Paris, 1545 (MS ca. 1538).
- 14 *Ibid.*
- 15 Thomas Elyot, *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531), 2v, ed., S.E. Lehmberg, London, 1962, I:3, 161-162 and II:443; Thomas Starkey, *Dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset*, ed., K.M. Burton, London: Chatto & Windus, 1948.
- 16 Augustine, *City of God*, 2:21, 19:24, 20:21-24.
- 17 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1160a31-b16; *Politics*, 1280b38-1281a3, 1295a40, 1263b36-37, 1276a8-b15, 1273a39-b1, 1278b6-15, 1295a40-b2, 1264a24-1266b38, 1277a12-b32, 1283a3-42, 1288a6-b4, 1289a10-25, 1292b11-21, 1297a14-b34, 1323a14-1342b34.
- 18 Aristotle, *Politics*, Book 4, ch. 7, tr., T.A. Sinclair, NY: Penguin, 1962.
- 19 For example, John Ponet (or Poynt), *Short Treatise of Politicke Power*, Strasbourg, 1556.
- 20 Fholommeo of Lucca, *De regimine principum* II:8, IV:1 in Ewart Lewis, ed., *Medieval Political Ideas*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954, pp. 292, 297.
- 21 *Ibid.*, VI:1 in Ewart Lewis, ed., *Medieval Political Ideas*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954, pp. 297-98.
- 22 Leo Mucha Mladen, "Bartolus the Man" in *Machaut's World*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 314 (1978).
- 23 Bartolus, *De Guelfis et Gebellinis* in E. Emerton, ed., *Humanism and Tyranny*, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964, p. 278.
- 24 Salutati, *De Tyranno* in E. Emerton, ed., *Humanism and Tyranny*, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964, p. 108.
- 25 Bruni, *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* in Hans Baron, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni*, Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1968. English translation by Benjamin J. Koh in R.G. Witt & Kohl, eds., *The Earthly Republic*, Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1978.
- 26 Bruni, *Laudatio*, p. 245, 247, 262.
- 27 Bruni, *Dialogues to Pier Paolo Vergerio (ad Petrum Paulum Istrum I & II)* in *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* ed., E. Garin, Milan, 1952, tr. in D. Thompson & F. Nagel, eds., *The Three Crowns of Florence*, NY: Harper, 1972.
- 28 Brunt, *Peri tes ton Phlorentinon politeias*, ed., C. E. Neumann, with German tr., Frankfurt-am-Main, 1822.
- 29 Baron, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni*, pp. 66-69, Poggio Bracciolini, *Defensiuicula contra Guarinum Veronensem* (c1435), Giannozzo Manetti, *Laudatio Ianuensium* (c1436), Flavio Biondo, *Decades de inclinatione Romani imperii* (1440-53).
- 30 "faites mieux, ostez la seigneurie a vostre Roy, et tuez Boucicault et tous ses Francois, et vivez en republique comme nous, et soyons tous unis comme freres vous et nous, et vous ne ferez que saiges . . ." *Le livre des faits du bon messire Jean le Maingre, dit Boucicault*, Paris, 1620 in C. Petitot, ed., *Collection complete des memoires relatifs a l'histoire de France*, Paris: Foucault, 1819, v. 7, p. 129. This writer of uncertain identity uses *cite* for Genoa and Milan, and *seigneurie* for Genoa and others, both fields and independent states. He mentions Lycurgus and the empire (*seigneurie*) of Sparta.
- 31 Luca Landucci, *Diario fiorentino*, Florence: Studia Biblos, 1969.
- 32 Guicciardini, *Ricordi* Q<sup>1</sup> & Q<sup>2</sup> numbers 2, 4, 5, 11, 14, 22, 25, edizione critica, R. Spongano, Florence: 1951, tr., Mario Domandi, *Maxims and Reflections*, Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1965; Guicciardini, *Dialogo e Discorsi del Reggimento di Firenze*, Bari, 1932.
- 33 Machiavelli, *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*, Milan: Rizzoli (BUR), 1984, Book I, Discourse 1, p. 64.
- 34 Machiavelli, *Discorsi*, I:16, pp. 103-104.
- 35 Machiavelli, *Discorsi*, I:17, p. 108, I:18, pp. 108, 111.
- 36 Machiavelli, *Il Principe* I in *The Prince and Discourses*, tr., Luigi Ricci, NY: The Modern Library, 1950, p. 4.
- 37 I have not found it in Pocock, Gilbert and Raab (For fuller references, see note 9, above), or in Federico Chabod, *Machiavelli and the Renaissance*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1958, and Ridolfi, *Vita di Niccolo Machiavelli*, Rome, 1954. I am still looking.
- 38 The reference to Machiavelli is implied in Guicciardini, *Ricordi* C, number 110, ed., Emilio Pasquini, Milan: Garzanti, 1984, p. 136.
- 39 Machiavelli, *Discorsi* I:55, p. 176.
- 40 Francesco Guicciardini's *Ricordi* were first printed as *Piu consigli e avvertimenti in materia di re publica e di privata*, Paris: Morello, 1576. The second edition was *Concetti politici*, Venice: Bertano, 1578. Both contained the "popular state" concept of republic, as did Luca Landucci, *Diario fiorentino*, Florence: Studia Biblos, 1969. Sources for the others are: Gasparo Contarini, *De magistratibus et republica Venetorum Libri V* (MS 1523-24, Paris, 1543), in *Thesaurus antiquae Italiae*, Leyden, 1722, vol V, Pt I (cf. fols. 31-5C-6E), and its French translation, *Des Magistrats, & Republique de Venise*, Paris, 1544 (Bouwisma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty*, pp. 145ff); Donato Giannotti (b. 1492), (Bouwisma, 154ff); Giannotti, *Discorso sopra il fermare il governo di Firenze* (MS 1527), 1st ed., Florence, 1770, in *Opere politiche*, ed., Furio Diaz, Milan: Marzorati, 1974, "E perche una specie di repubblica semplice e sola, si' come la popularita, o lo stato degli ottimati, o il principato di un solo, non puo contentare se non un desiderio solo; perciò e necessario comporre insieme tutte e tre le dette specie di repubblica" (I, 157); *Libro della Repubblica de' Viniziani o de la repubblica de' Viniziani*, (MS, 1529; Rome, 1540, 42, 64, Lyon, 1569, & Venice, 1564, 1572 (Bruto's edition), 1591, 1630, 50, 78) in *Opere politiche*, ed., Furio Diaz, Milan: Marzorati, 1974; Giannotti, *Trattato della Repubblica Fiorentina libri quattro*, Venice, 1531 in *Opere politiche*, vol I, Milan: Marzorati, 1974 ("quando i molti sono capi de reggimento e sequitano la pubblica utilita, chiamasi la loro amministrazione propriamente repubblica" (p. 194) "tre altri sorti di repubbliche: perche il regno, se si corrompe, diventa tirannide; lo stato degli ottimati, potenza di pochi; la repubblica, popularita", (p. 195), cf. also p. 198); Gianmichele Bruto, *Florentinae historiae libri VIII*, Lyon, 1562, ed. S. Gatteschi, Florence, 1838 (cf II:150-176). In the service of Stephen Bathory, Bruto wrote sketches of Polish history in 1576 that first saw print in 1827, and a humanist *Historia* of Hungary in 1572-76 that was not published until 1863-76! Felice Figliucci, *De la Politica, Overo Scienza Civile Secondo la Dottrina D'Aristotile. Libri otto*, Venice, 1583.
- 41 Francesco Patrizi, *De Institutione Republicae (The Founding of a Republic)*, Bordeaux, 1578; Patrizi, *De Institutione Reipublicae*, Paris, 1585; Patrizi, *Della historia dieci dialoghi ne quali si ragiona di tutte le cose appartenenti all'istoria, & all'osservaria*, Padua, Venice, 1560; Patrizi, *Relazioni, Paolo Paruta (1540-98), Della Perfezione della vita politica . . . libri tre*, Venice, 1571, 1579 in *Opere politiche*, 2v, Florence: Le Monnier, 1852 (cf below note 43); Giovanni Botero, *On the Causes of the Greatness of Cities*, 1st ed. in Italian, Rome, 1588; Botero, *Della Ragion di Stato libri dieci*, Venice: Gioliti, 1589, tr., George A. Moore, Chevy Chase, MD: Country Dollar Press, 1949. Botero's first sentence is Bodinian: "The stato is a firm dominion over people". See also pp. 38-41, 43; Tomasso Campanella, *La Citta del Sol*, Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1981, pp. 36, 70.
- 42 Francesco Patrizi, *Livre tres fructueux . . . de la chose publique Paris, 1520*; Patrizi, *The True Order and Methode of wryting and reading Histories (Della historia dieci dialoghi)*, tr. T. Blundevill, London, 1574; Giovanni Botero, *The Traveller's Breviat, or an historical description of the most famous kingdoms in the World*, tr. I.R., London, 1601 (pp. 19, 40, 126, 150); Botero, *The Traveller's Breviat, or an historical description of the most famous kingdoms and Common-weales in the World*, London, 1603 (pp. 88, 99, 1-5-106); "Patrizi", *Relations of the most famous kingdoms and common-weales thorough the World* (actually Botero's *Relazioni universali* . . . , 1593), tr. R. Johnson, London, 1608. See also Gianotti, *De Republica Venetorum*, 1st Latin ed., Leyden, 1581.
- 43 Paulo Paruta (1540-98), *Della perfezione della vita politica Opere politiche*, Florence: Le Monnier, 1852, vol I, pp. 390, 393, 395. Paruta's view that there are two kinds of *republike*, "degli ottimati" and "degli molti" is on p. 391. Yves Durand, *Les republiques au temps des monarchies*, Paris: Presses universitaires, 1973, p. 49; Paruta, *Discorsi politici . . . Di principi e di Repubbliche Antiche e Moderne* . . . Venice, 1599 in *Opere politiche*, vol II, pp. 1, 7. See also Paruta, *Discorsi* nos. 8, 9, 13, 14, 15.
- 44 Gasparo Contarini, *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*, tr. Lewes Lewkenor (from Italian with help from the Latin "original"), London, 1599, pp. I:A2-A3, I:D2, I:C2-C3.
- 45 Francesco Patrizi, *A Moral Method of civile Policie contayninge a learned and fruitful discourse of the institution, state, and government of a common Weale (De Institutione reipublicae)*, Abridged tr. R. Robinson, London, 1579, pp. 1, 2, 6.
- 46 Patrizi, *The true order and Methode of wryting and reading Histories*, "according to Aristotle" (p. Cii) "Magistrats of common weales" (p. Ciii).
- 47 For Botero, see above, note 42. John Florio, *New World of Words*, London, 1598 and *Queen Anna's New World of Words* (1611), facsimile ed., Menston, Yorks: The Scolar Press, 1968, article "Republica, reppublica . . . a common-wealth, a free state, the weale publike".
- 48 Elyot, *Boke of the Governour* (cf. above, note 15), I:3, I:161-62, II:443, Starkey, *Dialogue* (cf. above, note 15), pp. 23, 24, 39, 56, 61, 169-70.
- 49 Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum*, 1572, ed., L. Alston (from the 1583 ed.), Cambridge, 1906, p. 46; Richard Hooker (Locke's "judicious Hooker"), *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book V (1599ff), ed., A.S. McGrade & B. Vickers, NY: St. Martin's, 1975. Thomas Floyd, cf. above, note, Charles C. McIlwain, ed., *The Political Works of James I*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1916, p. 19 (*Basilikon Doron*, 1598), pp. 66-67 (*The Trewe Lawe of Free Monarchies*, 1598, 1603).
- 50 Louis Le Roy, *La Politique d'Aristote*, 1568, tr. as *Aristotle's Politiques or Discourses of Governemnt*, London, 1598. Werner Gundersheimer, Le Roy's biographer, found the following note in a

- 1579 letter from Gabriel Harvey to a friend: "You shall litle finde open either Bodin de Republica or Le Royes Exposition upon Aristotles Politiques". (Gundersheimer, *The Life and Works of Louis Le Roy* quoted in Keohane, p. 87).
- 51 Postel. *De la Republique des Turcs*. Poitiers: E. de Marnef, 1560.
  - 52 Nicolas Gruchius. *De Comitibus Romanorum libri III*. Paris: Vascosan, 1555, p. 3, quoted in McFarlane. *Buchanan*, London: Duckwork, 1981, p. 404.
  - 53 Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, ed. & tr. B. Reynolds, NY: Norton, 1969. Cf especially, chap. 6 and pp. 158, 159, 166, 168f, 172f, 179. Here Bodin sketched the definitions of sovereignty and of *respublica* which would dominate his *Six livres de la Republique* ten years later.
  - 54 Guillaume de la Perriere. *Le miroir politique*. Paris, 1567.
  - 55 de la Perriere. *The Mirrour of Policie*. London, 1598, p. 3.
  - 56 Louis Le Caron. *Dialogues*. Paris, 1556, p. Le Caron also uses the rather rare French equivalent of the English *commonwealth*, la *chose-publique*.
  - 57 La Boetie. *Discours sur la servitude volontaire in Oeuvres politiques*, ed. F. Hincker, Paris: Editions sociales, 1971, p. 42.
  - 58 *Ibid.*
  - 59 Keohane. *Philosophy and the State in France*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1980, pp. 96-97.
  - 60 Hotman. *Francogallia*, ed. R.E. Giesey, tr. J.H.M. Salmon. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1972, p. 146.
  - 61 *Ibid.*, pp. 204, 242.
  - 62 1599 Juan Mariana (1536-1623), *De Rege et regis institutione libri III*. Toledo, 1599, tr. G.A. Moore, Chevy Chase, MD: Country Dollar Press, 1948. Chapter five gives six kinds of government. "What is spoken of as a *res publica* in the proper sense exists when the whole people participate in the government, with the limitation that the more important honours and offices are entrusted to the better men, the lesser, to the others, as befits the worth and merit of each. Then, that which is called democracy exists when in a government of the people office is given promiscuously, and without selection, to the greater, the lesser and the middle group", p. 135.
  - 63 *Ibid.*, chap. VIII.
  - 64 Walter J. Ong. *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1958) documents this enormous influence. Ramus's dichotomies began to be published in 1543 and 1546. In 1568-70, he lectured in the Rhineland.
  - 65 Althusius. *Politica methodice digesta* (1603), ed. & tr. F.S. Carney as *The Politics of Johannes Althusius*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1964, chap. 39, p. 195 and p. 200. Althusius's rejection of the dichotomy of "regnum" and "respublica" is based on Augustine and is found in chapter 9, pp. 61-62.
  - 66 Raleigh. *History of the World*, chap. 6:2, in *Selected Writings*, ed. G. Hammond, NY: Penguin, 1984, p. 258.
  - 67 Jean Bodin. *Six livres de la Republique* in Kenneth D. McRae, ed. Bodin. *Six Books of a Commonweale* (1606), tr. Richard Knolles, Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1962. "Republique est un droit gouvernement de plusieurs mesnages, & de ce qui leur est commun, avec puissance souveraine". (p.1B8-10) "souverainete . . . la puissance absolue & perpetuelle d'une Republique". (p. 84H6-7) "citoyen: qui n'est autre chose en propres termes, que le franc subject tenant de la souverainete d'autrui". (p. 47A5).
  - 68 Robert E.L. Striver, II. *Robert Greville, Lord Brooke*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1958, p. 68, quoted by Pocock. *Machiavellian Moment*, p. 371.
  - 69 J.P. Kenyon, ed., *Stuart Constitution*. Cambridge U. Press, 1966, p. 328 and no. 90, p. 324, no. 92, p. 339.
  - 70 *Gold Tried in the Fire* (14 June, 1647), in A.L. Morton, ed., *Freedom in Arms. A Selection of Leveller Writings*, NY: International Publishers, 1975, p. 118.
  - 71 William Walwyn et al. 4 *Manifestation from* (14 April) in *Ibid.*, p. 250.
  - 72 Kenyon. *Stuart Constitution*, p. 328; *The Levellers (Falsly so called) Vindicated* (1649) in Morton, *Freedom in Arms*, p. 316. "Martiall Monarchie more cruell . . . then England ever yet tasted of, and that under the Notion of a Free State, when as the People had no share at all in the constitution thereof . . ." (p. 314), "conquest-Government" (p. 315), "(they) stile this the First Year of Englands Freedom, intitule their Government a Free State, and yet none more violent, bloody and perverse enemies thereto; for not under pains of death, and confiscation of lands and goods, may any man challenge and promote those rights of the nation" (p. 316).
  - 73 *Mercurius Pragmaticus* 12 June, in Bulstrode Whitelocke. *Memoirs*, III, p. 135 quoted by Antonia Fraser, *Cromwell*, NY: Dell, 1975, p. 352 *Moderate Intelligencer* 5 or 12 July, *Ibid.*, p. 377
  - 74 Philip, viscount Lisle to Robert, earl of Leicester, 6 November 1649, in *Sidney State Papers*, (Sidney, *Discourses*, NY, 1805, I, 79).
  - 75 Fraser. *Cromwell*, p. 471.
  - 76 Kenyon, ed. *Stuart Constitution*, no. 93, Marchamont Nedham. *The Case of the Commonwealth of England Stated* (1650), ed. Philip Knachel, Charlottesville, VA: U. of Virginia Press, 1969, p. 62 (Machiavelli, *Discorsi*, I:16).
  - 77 Nedham. *Case of the Commonwealth*, p. 123.
  - 78 In 1650 Andrew Marvell wrote in *An Horatian Ode upon Cromwel's Return from Ireland* "Nor yet grown stiffer with Command But still in the Republick's hand" (lines 81-82). The Cromwell-Ludlow conversation in Ludlow, *Memoirs* I, 244 is quoted in Fraser. *Cromwell*, NY: Dell, 1975, p. 461. The Whitelocke-Cromwell conversations in Whitelocke, *Memoirs*, III, 372, 462f is quoted in Fraser, pp. 460, 477.
  - 79 "William Allen". *Killing noe Murder* in Olivier Lutaud. *Des Revolutions d'Angleterre a la Revolution Francaise*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1973.
  - 80 Hobbes. *Philosophical Rudiments* (tr. of *De Cive*, ed., S.P. Lamprecht, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949, p. 67, 68, 149, 161 "Commonweal" replaces "city" with "commonwealths" as the plural on pp. 122, 126, 128, 129, 132, 136, 142, 144, 146.
  - 81 Hobbes. *Behemoth*, ed. F. Tonnies (1889), London: Frank Cass, 1969, pp. 156, 158. Spinoza. *Tractatus Politicus* in *Opera*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters, 1928, vol III, p. 278. Spinoza must be the only one who ever translated Machiavelli's *republica* in the *Discorsi* (III:1) as *imperii*, but he did this in Caput X of the *Tractatus Politicus*. Margaret Jacob has, I think, followed her radicals in finding too much in his use of the word *respublica* in the preface to Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologo-Politicus* of 1670. Cf Jacob. *The Radical Enlightenment*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981, p. 51-52.
  - 82 John Milton *Commonplace Book* quoted in Felix Raab. *The English Face of Machiavelli*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964, p. 220; Milton, *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio in Works*. New Haven, CT: Yale U. Press, v4, pt 1. "What was but lately the strongest of realms (*potentissimi regni*) and is now being a commonwealth so much the stronger (*nunc reipub. eo potentioris*)" (p. 311), "'Bees have a king (*regem*)' . . . the others, as you affirm, have republics (*respub.*)" (428). "*ab uno an a pluribus respub. administraretur*" in *Works*, NY: Columbia U. Press, vol VII, pp. 76-77.
  - 83 Cf of above, note 5.
  - 84 Harrington. *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, ed., S.B. Liljegen. Heidelberg: Carl Winters, 1924, pp. 2, 11.
  - 85 *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 27 William Sprigge. *A Modest Plea for an Equal Commonwealth*. London, 1659.
  - 86 (Edward Sexby), *Killing noe Murder* in Lutaud. *Des Revolutions d'Angleterre*, p. 376-77, 383-84.
  - 87 William Prynne. *The Re-Publicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, London, 1659. The pamphlet is rare, and details may be appreciated. "Republicans" is unhyphenated in the half-title. It begins by accusing "Apostate Republican, and Sectarian Members of the late long Parliament, Army, and their confederates to blow up, subvert, destroy" (p. 1) "new Athenian Republican Tyrants (worse than the worst of all our Kings) (the Rump, 1653) (Cromwell a) *Cesar or Emperour*" (p. 3) "their new *Republick again old and new Republican Members . . . over-voted in the House . . . (1658) reviving their former Commonwealth* purposely to set aside their young Protector, or to reduce him and the *Republick* too under their own *pristine Wardship . . . dissolved the long Parliament*" (p. 3) "metamorphose our *Old Kingdom* into a new infant *Republick. Oligarchy* under themselves alone . . . faithfull to them and their *new-minted Republick*, without a *King or House of Lords*" (p. 4) "erection of their new *Free-state . . . but this is only Good Old Cause* they now extoll . . ." (pp. 4-5) "their *Good old cause and Republick*" (p. 5) (quoting from Campanella, *De Monarchica Hispanica*, c. 25, p. 204) "Ut Angliam in formam Reipublicae reducant, in imitationem Hollandorum; to reduce England into the form of a *Common Wealth*, in imitation of the *Hollanders . . . to destroy our King, Monarchy*, and turn it into a *Republike*, or else into an *Elective Kingdom*" (p. 5).
  - 88 Prynne. *Op. cit.*, pp. 1, 3, 5, and Prynne. *Conscientious, Serious Theological and Legal Quaeres* . . . London, 1660, pp. 9, 18, 19, 20.
  - 89 (Samuel Butler), *Two Speeches Made in the Rump Parliament*, London, (1659). (*Works*, III, Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1928, p. 306); (Butler), *A Speech Made at the Rota*, London, 1660 (*Works*, III, pp. 324, 327); Butler, "Government" (c1661) in *Saunders & Miscellanies*, ed. Rene Lamar, Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1928, p. 251; Butler, *Hudibras* I, London, 1662, lines 1201-1204. Butler also published a satire under Prynne's name, "William Prynne" *Mole Asinaria*, London, MDCLVIX, which quotes "Austin" (Augustine) on "Commonwealth or Kingdom" being a larcenocracy without "law" (*Works*, III, p. 300).
  - 90 According to Archdeacon Echard & Bishop Kennet, the former minister, Henry Vane had "so much of republican rancour, that it was impossible for him to live in quiet under any semblance of a monarchy". (Sidney, *Discourses*, NY, 1805, 1.61). Tory poet Abraham Cowley wrote in *A Discourse By Way of a Vision* in 1661. "But I see you are a Pedant, and Platonical Statesman, a Theoretical Common-wealths-man, an Utopian Dreamer" (*Essays, Plays and Sundry Verses*, ed. A.R. Wallen, Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press,

- 1906, pp. 368, 373). Andrew Marvell observed in 1669: "Commonwealthmen flock about the town" (*Works*, 2:290-292)
- 91 Louis Le Roy, *De la vicissitude ou variete des choses en l'univers*. Paris, 1575, tr. Brebeuf, *Relation de ce qui s'est passe dans la Nouvelle France en l'annee 1636*, Part II, ed., Theodore Bestermann, Geneva: Droz, 1957, p. 138; P. Bressant, *Relation* . . . , 1653, "le regime republicain des Hurons" quoted by Yves Durand, *Les republicques au temps des monarchies*, Paris, p. 10.
- 92 "Le roi veut que le parlement sorte de Paris" (11 February) in Moreau, ed., *Choix de Mazarinades* (2762) I, p. 192; "Les souhaits de la France a Monseigneur le duc d'Angoulesme" (11 January) in Moreau, ed., *Choix de Mazarinades* (3700) I, p. 86; "Les interets et motifs" Paris, 1649, p. 7-8. Philip A. Knachel, *England and the Fronde: The Impact of the English Civil War and Revolution on France*. Washington, DC: Folger Library, 192, quotes additionally Moreau's numbers 1719 (p. 100) and number 2970 (p. 94). The *Le Tellier Mazarin conversation* is in *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- 93 On the Fronde see Loyd Moote, *The Revolt of the Judges*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1971, p. 280. C. Moreau, ed., *Choix de Mazarinades & Sal Alexander Westrich, The Orme de Bordeaux*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1972. The Conde manuscripts are quoted in Knachel, *op. cit.*, p. 200. Sorbier to Courcelles in Sidney, *Discourses on Government*, NY, 1805, vol I, p. 46; Cyrano de Bergerac, *Histoire comique des etats et empires de la lune* (1657), ed. W. de Spens, Paris: 10/18, 1963, pp. 85, 151-52.
- 94 Chardin, *Le couronnement de Souleimaan*, Paris, 1671, *Voyages en Perse*, Paris, 1671, *The Travels of Sir John Chardin into Persia and the East Indies*, London: Moses Pitt, 1686, pp. 4, 7, 12; Louis Moreri, *Le grand dictionnaire historique*, vol I, Lyon, 1674, articles "Athenes", "Brutus"; Abraham-Nicolas Amelot de la Houssaye, *Histoire du gouvernement de Venise*, Paris: Leonard, 1675 (2nd ed. 1685), pp. 1, 2, 21, 606, 621, 624; Amelot, tr., Machiavelli, *Le Prince*, Paris, 1683; Amelot, *Examen de la liberte originaire de Venise*, tr. de l'italien, Ratisbon: Aubri, 1684 (pub. with *Histoire due gouvernement de Venise*, 1685), pp. 1, 106.
- 95 Tanner MS 44, fol. 202, in Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press, 1986, pp. 28-29.
- 96 Samuel Parker, "A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Polity", 1671, in Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 46; Shaftesbury to the House of Lords in *State Tracts Charles II*, p. 59 (Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, p. 415); Amelot (te) de la Houssaye, *The History of the Government of Venice*, London: John Starkey, 1677, pp. 17, 300, 312; John Maxwell, *Sacro-Sanctia Regum Majestas: or the Sacred and Royal Prerogative of Christian Kings* (1644) reprinted, London, 1680, pp. 75, 137 (Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 298); Nathaniel Lee, *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1680), ed. John Loftis, Lincoln, Neb: U. of Nebraska Press, 1967, II:iii, p. 27, IV:27-66, pp. 62-3, IV:242.
- 97 James Tyrrell, *Patriarcha non Monarcha*, 1681. He denies he is a "commonwealthsman" or someone who wishes to "set up a democracy amongst us" (Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 251) "Absolute propriety in things . . . arises from compact in a commonwealth" (p. 49, Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 255); Henry Neville, *Plato Redivivus*, London, 1681 (1698, 1742, 1758, 1763) in *Two English Republican Tracts*, ed., Caroline Robbins, Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1969. Neville uses the word "state" to mean "Estate" and the classic trio, "monarchy, aristocracy, democracy." His word *commonwealth*, though not applied historically to England, is applied to Venice and to old Rome before Caesar. Another republican without the word.
- Sir Roger l'Estrange (1616-1704) *The Observer* no. 1, 13, (*Selections from the Observer*) (1681-87) Los Angeles, CA: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1970, pp. 10, 12, 15, 16; *The Observer* 30 July, 21 October, 7 December?, 1681 "According to our antimonarchical sectaries all by native right are equally born with a like freedom" (Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 298). l'Estrange wrote that it was "of the very essence of a commonwealth to reduce all degrees to a parity. For as titles and honours are incident to kingship, so also are equality of place and birth to democracy." l'Estrange, *Interest of Three Kingdoms*, 1681?, p. 7, cf. also pp. 5-6, 9, 12 (Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 240-241); Dryden, *Absalom & Achitophel* I, lines 289-92. Cf also lines 614-15.
- 98 White Kennett to Codrington, 11 January, 1682, Lansdowne MS 960, fols 45-48 (Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics*, p. 225); John Northleigh, *The Parallel: or, the New Specious Association of an Old Rebellious Covenant*, 1682, p. 21; Dryden, *The Medall*, London, 1682, lines 247, 301; *Some Reflections on a Discourse, called Good Advice to the Church of England & c. in State Tracts*, 1692?, facs, ed. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1973, p. 371. Also in 1682 John Evelyn called the *London Gazette* "republican" (Evelyn, *Diary*, IV:614n).
- 99 Gilbert Burnet says Sidney was "stiff to all republican principles, and such an enemy to every thing that looked like monarchy, that he set himself in a high opposition against Cromwell when he was made Protector" (*History of My Own Times*, Oxford, 1833, v2, p. 351, folio ed., 1734?, p. 535). John Toland, in his introduction to the *Discourses*, also called him a "republican" (Algernon Sidney, *Discourses on Government*, ed., Toland, NY: Lee, 1805, vol I, p. 16). Trenchard agreed in 1721 (see below, note 111) and so did Adams in 1776).
- 100 Sidney, *Discourses on Government*, ed., Toland, NY: Lee, 1805, I, p. 351; II, p. 138; I, p. 351; II, p. 138.
- 101 *Ibid.*, II, p. 138. Adams, *Thoughts on Government* (Jan. 1776) in *Works of John Adams*, VI, p. 415.
- 102 Charles Chenevix Trench, *The Western Rising*, London, Longmans, 1969, chaps 3, 4; John Northleigh, *The Triumph of Our Monarchy, over the Plots and Principles of Our rebels and Republicans*, London, 1685; L'Estrange, *The Observer* no. 80 (28 September, 1685) in *Selections from the Observer*, p. 32.
- 103 John Locke, *Two Treatises of Civil Government* (1690), ed. Thomas Cook, NY: Hafner, 1947, pp. 96, 106.
- 104 Locke, *Two Treatises*.
- 105 Locke, *Two Treatises*, pp. 187, 232-33, 239-40.
- 106 Republican schemes; B.E. Gent., *A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew*, London, 1690, articles "Republican", "Whigg".
- 107 John Evelyn, *Diary*, 15 January, 1689, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955, IV, p. 614. See also W. Atwood, *The Fundamental Constitution of the English Government* (1690), facs., Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1973, pp. i, xxi, Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's Descent into England*, 1689 and *A Plain and Familiar Discourse concerning Government, Wherein it is debated, Whether Monarchy or a Commonwealth be best for the People*, 1689 (in Lois Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689*, Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1981, pp. 157, 162); *Oxford English Dictionary*, article "Republican" (1691); Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis, Norwich, 27 November 1693, in *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux . . . to John Ellis, Sometime Under-Secretary of State, 1674-1722*, ed. E.M. Thompson, London Camden Society Pubs. XV, p. 162; (John Toland), *The Art of Governing by Parties*, London, 1701 (Feb), p. 28, in Swift, *A History of the Contests and Dissensions Between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens and Rome*, London, 1701, ed. Frank H. Ellis, Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1967, p. 5; Joseph Addison, *The Freeholder*, ed., James Leheny, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979, 30 March, 1716, p. 158.
- 108 Swift, *A History of the Contests and Dissensions Between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens and Rome*, London, 1701, ed. Frank E. Ellis, Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1967, pp. 83, 87, 90, 97, 99, 112.
- 109 Halifax, "The Character of a Trimmer" (1688) and "Rough Draft of a New Model at Sea" (1694) in *Complete Works*, ed. J.P. Kenyon, NY: Penguin, 1969, pp. 54, 55, 156-57, 159; Matthew Prior, "A New Answer to an Argument Against a Standing Army", London, 1697, John Toland, ed., *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* (1698), ed. C. H. Firth, Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1894, II, p. 172. For a clear use of the modern *commonwealth* in Roman history, see James Drake, *The History of the Last Parliament* (1702), in Ellis, ed., Swift, *op. cit.*, p. 209-211.
- 110 Walter Moyle, *An Essay on the Constitution of the Roman State* (MS 1699, London, 1726) in Caroline Robbins, ed., *Three English Republican Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1969; Daniel DeLoe, *True-Born Englishman* in G.A. Aitken, ed., *Later Stuart Tracts*, NY: Cooper Square, 1964, p. 141; Jonathan Swift, *A Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions . . .*, ed. Frank H. Ellis, Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1967, pp. 83, 87, 90, 96-99, 112; William Temple, *Works*, London, 1770, I, pp. 31, 42, 46; Joseph Addison, *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy in the Years 1701, 1702, 1703 in Works*, NY: Harper, 1859, III, pp. 317, 327, 367, 375-76, *The Spectator*, 10 March, 3 May, 8 May, 19 May, 30 July, 9 August, 17 August, 1711; (Henry Gandy), *Jure Divino: or, An Answer to All that Hath or Shall be Written by Republicans Against the Old English Constitution*, London, 1707, pp. 2, 5.
- 111 John Trenchard, *Cato's Letters* nos. 26, 27 (22-29 April, 1721), Thomas Gordon, tr. Tacitus, *Historiae*, London, 1728; Thomas Paine, *Common Sense* (1776), NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1973, pp. 16, 26, 38, 39.
- 112 Duras, 1676, quoted in Yves Durand, *Les Republicques au temps des monarchies*, Paris: Presses universitaires, 1973, p. 11. For the same use, see E.-F.-J. Barbier, *Chronique de la Regence et due regne de Louis XV* 1866, VI, p. 416 (July, 1752).
- 113 Pierre Cesar Richelet, *Dictionnaire*, Rouen, 1719, articles "Republicque", "republicain". Another example is the title of the anti-Huguenot pamphlet, *Avis sincere de M. Juriou . . . par lequel il fait voir que les plus savants et les plus eclaires Docteurs de cette Eglise ont toujours eu l'esprit Republicain et des sentiments opposees a la puissance absolue des Souverains et Monarques*, 1689?
- 114 Ponchartrain quoted in Durand, *Les republicques*, p. 70; Richard Simon to Fremont d'Abancourt, in *Lettres choisies de M. Simon*, I, 30 (Guy Howard Dodge, *The Political Theory of the Huguenots of the Dispersion*, NY: Columbia U. Press, 1947, p. 18n); Pierre Jurieu, *Lettres pastorales*, 15 April - 15 May, 1689, *Ibid.*, p. 58; Pierre Bayle to Constant, 29 January, 1691, *Ibid.*, p. 94n; Bayle, *Projet et fragments d'un Dictionnaire critique* (1692), Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970, pp. 205, 215; Bayle, *Dictionnaire critique* (1695-97), articles "Conon", "Henri IV". The twin sentences are found in the articles "Hobbes" and "Pericles", and the English translation (London, 1710) carries Bayle's terminology into English "republic" "republican", and "democratic".



- 115 Antoine Furetiere. *Dictionaire*. Paris. 1694, articles "Libre": "Republique": "Republicain"
- 116 *Dictionnaire de l'Academie francaise*, Paris. 1694, article "Republicain". Abel Boyer, the French translator of Addison's *Cato* (a pro-republican play where the word *republic* does not appear at all) put this into his French-English *Royal Dictionary* of 1699 and 1700.
- 117 Charles-Louis de Secondat, baron de la Brede et Montesquieu. *Lettres persanes* (1721), nos. 102, 131 in *Oeuvres completes*, Paris: Seuil, 1964, pp. 115, 132. See also no. 116, p. 124.
- 118 Montesquieu. *Dialogue de Sylla et d'Eucrate* (1724) in *Oeuvres completes*, p. 157; *Considerations sur les causes de la grandeur des romains et de leur decadence* (1734) *Ibid.*, p. 436, 450, 452, 458. Montesquieu read Machiavelli and found him to be, like Samuel, a disapprover of kings and a "grand republicain" in 1730. *Ibid.*, p. 409.
- 119 Montesquieu. *De l'esprit des lois* (1748) I:ii, 1-2 in *Ibid.*, p. 532.
- 120 Hume. *Treatise of Human Nature* (1740), ed., E.C. Mossner, NY: Penguin, 1985. III:x, pp. 607, 609; Hume. "Of the Liberty of the Press" and "Whether the British Government inclines more to Absolute Monarchy, or to a Republic" in *Essays, Moral Political and Literary*, ed., E.F. Miller, Indianapolis, IN: *Liberty Classics*, 1985, pp. 9-10, 12, 47-53.
- 121 Hume. "Of the Rise and Progress of the Arts and Sciences" *Ibid.*, p. 117-119, 126-27
- 122 Samuel Johnson. *Dictionary*, London: W. Strahan, 1765, articles "Republic": "Republican". See also Elizabaeth Hedrick, "Locke's Theory of Language and Johnson's *Dictionary*" in *Eighteenth Century Studies* 20:4 (1987).
- 123 Adams. *Defence*. III (1787) in *Works of John Adams*, 1851, VI, p. 10.
- 124 Kenrick. *New Dictionary of the English Language*, London: Rivington et al., 1773, articles "Republic": "Republican": "State: (3) The Community; the publick; the commonwealth — (4) a republick: a government not monarchical".
- 125 See my *The End of Kings: A History of Republics and Republicans*, NY: The Free Press, 1983, chap. 8.
- 126 Paine. *The Rights of Man*, NY: Penguin, 1984, pp. 178-79.
- 127 *Straight-out Harrisonian* 16 August, 1840 in Hans Sperber & Travis Tritschuh. *American Political Terms: An Historical Dictionary*, Detroit, MI: Wayne State U. Press, 1962.