

ELIE KEDOURIE MEMORIAL LECTURE

The Crescent and the City of the Sun: Islam and the Renaissance Utopia of Tommaso Campanella

NOEL MALCOLM

Fellow of the Academy

I

TOMMASO CAMPANELLA'S THIRTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY on 5 September 1599 was the last day of freedom he would enjoy for nearly twenty-seven years. He was in hiding, at a friend's house, near his native town of Stilo in Calabria, and he must have been aware that his situation was desperate. A conspiracy to overthrow Spanish rule in Calabria—a conspiracy in which he had played an active role, becoming in some ways its intellectual leader—had become known to the authorities early in the previous month. Two infantry companies, under the energetic commander Carlo Spinelli, had landed nearby on 17 August, and had immediately begun seizing the ring-leaders and hunting down their followers. On 6 September Campanella was betrayed by a friend, arrested, and imprisoned. At the end of the following month he was one of 156 prisoners who, chained in pairs, were marched to the little port of Bivona, put on galleys, and taken to Naples. When these vessels entered the harbour of that city, they had four prisoners hanging from their yard-arms; two more were quartered on deck, within sight of the quay. Clearly, the Spanish authorities were taking this insurrection very seriously indeed.

Read at the Academy 28 May 2003.

Proceedings of the British Academy, 125, 41–67. © The British Academy 2004.

Campanella was in danger twice over. Not only had he been identified as a rebel by the civil powers; he was also wanted by the Roman Inquisition, on grave charges of heresy. For Campanella had already been in trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities for many years. As a young Dominican friar, with a strong personality, restless curiosity and tremendous intellectual energies, he had first come under suspicion because of his involvement in naturalistic philosophical circles in Naples in the early 1590s; in 1594 he had been arrested in Padua and taken to the Inquisition's prison in Rome, where he was tortured and required to make an abjuration 'de vehementi'—the charge being one of a 'vehement suspicion' of heresy. This time, in 1599, Campanella was not sent back to Rome; the Spanish authorities refused to give up their prisoner, and constituted instead an ecclesiastical tribunal in Naples. But the dangers were just as great in either place: since he was a heretic who had abjured his heresy once, any conviction of heresy now would make him a relapsed heretic—for which the punishment was death. Hence Campanella's famous resort to the only solution left to him, the one thing that would preserve his life: pretending to be completely mad. He kept this up for fourteen months; at the end of that period, forty terrible hours of continual torture, on 4 and 5 June 1601, failed to break through his pretence, and so his life was spared. He would spend the next twenty-five years of it in prison.¹

No sooner was his life secured than he began, torrentially, to write. A succession of works on politics, metaphysics, physics and theology poured from his pen. Some were probably reworkings of texts which he had composed before the Calabrian revolt—for example, his great treatise on contemporary geopolitics, the *Monarchia di Spagna*.² Others seem to have grown out of the materials he had compiled in his defence, such

¹ For valuable summaries of these events see L. Firpo, 'Tommaso Campanella', *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 17, 372–401, esp. 375–80; G. di Napoli, 'L'Eresia e i processi campanelliani', in N. Badaloni et al., *Tommaso Campanella (1568–1639): miscellanea di studi nel 4° centenario della sua nascita* (Naples, 1969), pp. 169–258, esp. pp. 176–227; J. M. Headley, *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World* (Princeton, NJ, 1997), pp. 3–5, 19–49. The indispensable presentation of most of the surviving evidence relating to the 1599 conspiracy and the subsequent trial is L. Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella: la sua congiura, i suoi processi e la sua pazzia*, 3 vols. (Naples, 1882–7). Key documents are printed (and usefully annotated) in L. Firpo, *Il supplizio di Tommaso Campanella: narrazioni, documenti verbali delle torture* (Rome, n.d. [1985]).

² The traditional dating of this work to 1598 (based on Campanella's own comments) was doubted by Luigi Firpo (see his *Ricerche campanelliane* (Florence, 1947), pp. 189–203, dating it instead to 1600), but is supported by Germana Ernst (see her edition of T. Campanella, *Monarchie d'Espagne et Monarchie de France*, tr. N. Fabry and S. Waldbaum (Paris, 1997), 'Introduction', pp. xv–xvii) and Vittorio Frajese (see his *Profezia e machiavellismo: il giovane Campanella* (Rome, 2002), esp. pp. 36, 53–7).

as the *Articuli prophetales*, a millenarian treatise which expanded on the reasons he had given for believing that a great ‘mutazione’ would occur in 1599 or 1600.³ And what became the most famous of them all, *La città del sole* [hereafter: *The City of the Sun*], written probably in 1602, was almost a retrospective manifesto for the revolt—an idealised representation of the sort of perfect, rational, and hierocratic state that Campanella had been hoping to establish in the mountains of Calabria.

Given the conditions in which he was composing these works, Campanella was largely dependent on the great stock of texts and arguments stored in his extraordinarily capacious memory. As a result, a complex web of recurrences and re-workings of the same ideas can be traced throughout the corpus of his writings. Yet at the same time there are some striking contrasts, the explanation of which has preoccupied and troubled Campanella scholarship for generations. On the one hand we have the rationalistic, naturalistic Campanella, whose *City of the Sun* presents an ideal society untouched by Christian faith or practice; on the other hand we have the passionate commitment to Christian revelation in the *Articuli prophetales* and in the huge *Theologia*, as well as a long treatise (*Quod reminiscentur et convertentur*) on the conversion of Jews, Muslims and heathen to Christianity. On the one hand we have Campanella’s constant denunciations of ‘Machiavellians’ as the worst enemies of religion; on the other hand there are the policy recommendations put forward in his *Monarchia di Spagna*, which were viewed by contemporaries—not unreasonably—as some of the most outrageously Machiavellian proposals ever committed to paper. (His advice to the King of Spain on how to subjugate the United Provinces was swiftly and gleefully published by anti-Spanish activists in the Netherlands.)⁴ And, finally, we have on the one

³ For the final text (written probably in 1607–9), see T. Campanella, *Articuli prophetales*, ed. G. Ernst (Florence, 1976); for the original nucleus see the ‘Secunda delineatio defensionum’ of early 1600, printed in Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 3, 489–98, and in Firpo, *Il supplizio*, pp. 129–75.

⁴ On the history of the *Discorso sui Paesi Bassi*, an adaptation from ch. 27 of the *Monarchia di Spagna* which was later published in Dutch, Latin and German translations, see L. Firpo, ‘Appunti campanelliani XXII: un’opera che Campanella non scrisse: Il “Discorso sui Paesi Bassi”’, *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana*, 31 (1952), 331–43, and J. M. Headley, ‘The Reception of Campanella’s *Monarchia di Spagna* in Spain and the Empire’, in J.-L. Fournel et al., *Tommaso Campanella e l’attesa del secolo aureo* (Florence, 1998), pp. 89–105, esp. pp. 93–4, 98. On Campanella’s declared hostility to Machiavelli see P. Caye, ‘Campanella critique de Machiavel. La politique: de la non-philosophie à la métaphysique’, *Bruniana & campanelliana: ricerche filosofiche e materiali storico-testuali*, 6 (2002), 333–51, and G. Ernst, “‘Falsa ragion di stato ti nutrica’: contro Machiavelli e i politici”, in her *Il carcere, il politico, il profeta: saggi su Tommaso Campanella* (Pisa, 2002), pp. 103–32. The best study of Machiavelli’s influence on Campanella is Frajese, *Profezia e machiavellismo*, esp. pp. 58–80.

hand Campanella's role as an anti-Spanish rebel, and on the other hand his authorship of treatises—before the revolt, apparently, as well as after it—urging the King of Spain to extend his rule to the entire world.

Modern scholars have dealt with these disparities in various different ways. One school of thought, represented by the great nineteenth-century scholar Luigi Amabile, sees the authentic Campanella as an out-and-out exponent of Renaissance naturalism, a philosophical and political radical, and supposes that all the later expressions of loyalty to Spain, to the Papacy, or indeed to Christianity, were merely simulated. The opposite view, represented by Giovanni di Napoli, sees Campanella as a more or less consistent and orthodox upholder of Catholic universalism.⁵ And between these two extremes there are interpretations (for example, those of Romano Amerio and Luigi Firpo) which assume that Campanella stated his opinions sincerely, but that those opinions did undergo real changes—from an early naturalism or deism to a later acceptance of Catholic orthodoxy.⁶

The problems of interpretation are huge and multiple; the materials over which they arise include not only Campanella's voluminous writings, but also all the documentation of the revolt and subsequent trial—allegations, witness statements, and so on. I cannot hope to provide, in the course of one short lecture, a proper solution to all these problems (or even a fully detailed solution to any one of them). What I want to do is merely to follow one particular clue, a thematic thread that runs through much of this material. For I believe that it can in fact lead us towards a much clearer understanding of some of the central issues in Campanella's life and thought: the aims of his rebellion in 1599, the significance of his *City of the Sun*, and the whole relationship between naturalism and supernaturalism in his thinking. That clue, that thread, is the theme of Islam, the Ottoman system, and Ottoman power.

⁵ See Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*; G. di Napoli, *Tommaso Campanella: filosofo della restaurazione cattolica* (Padua, 1947), esp. pp. 137–46, and 'Tommaso Campanella e l'unità della sua teoresi politica', *Sapienza: rivista internazionale di filosofia e di teologia dei Domenicani d'Italia*, 22 (1969), 27–114. One of the best recent studies broadly supports Amabile's view of Campanella's early radicalism, but argues that Campanella was already engaged in simulation in the 1590s: Frajese, *Profezia e machiavellismo*, esp. p. 22.

⁶ See R. Amerio, 'Il problema esegetico fondamentale del pensiero campanelliano nel terzo centenario del filosofo', *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica*, 31 (1939), 368–87, and *Il sistema teologico di Tommaso Campanella* (Milan, 1972); L. Firpo, 'Introduzione', in his edition of T. Campanella, *Tutte le opere*, i (Verona, 1954). For a valuable survey of modern interpretations see V. G. Galati, 'Il pensiero politico di Tommaso Campanella e i giudizi discordanti della storiografia dell'ultimo secolo', in Badaloni *et al.*, *Tommaso Campanella*, pp. 351–81.

II

Of all the curious features of the Calabrian revolt in 1599, none is more puzzling, or more striking, than the fact that its leaders had tried to co-ordinate their plans with an attack by Ottoman forces. The three key figures here were Campanella, his fellow Dominican Dionisio Ponzio, and the prominent local landowner Maurizio de' Rinaldis. One day in June 1599, when some Ottoman ships were anchored near Reggio Calabria, de' Rinaldis had taken a boat out and parleyed with the Ottoman commander, Murat Reis, asking for military help; according to de' Rinaldis (under later interrogation by the Spanish authorities), the idea of this initiative had come from Ponzio and Campanella.⁷ The request was transmitted to Istanbul, where it caught the interest of the admiral of the entire Ottoman fleet, Cigalazâde Yusuf Sinan pasha; that it should attract his attention was not surprising, as he was himself an Italian, originally Scipione Cicala, who had been captured as a boy, had converted to Islam, and had enjoyed an immensely successful career in the service of the Sultan.⁸ Indeed, the conspirators must have known of his special interest in the region: only in the previous year, Cicala had brought the Ottoman fleet to Calabria in order to visit his own mother, who was still living in Messina.⁹ Further negotiations between the conspirators and Cicala must have followed, possibly involving a group of Calabrian 'renegades' (converts to Islam) in Istanbul. An agreement was made that he would bring thirty ships, 3,000 soldiers and one hundred artillery pieces to support the revolt; he would arrive on 10 September 1599, and would send galleys close to the shore to exchange an agreed set of signals with the rebels. Cicala did in fact keep his promise: the signals were sent, both on the 10th and again three days later.¹⁰ But there was no response; by 10 September, all the leading conspirators were already under arrest.

Most modern writers on Campanella, while accepting the existence of this Ottoman dimension to the revolt, have played down its significance, treating it as little more than a desperate piece of opportunism on the

⁷ Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 1, 172; cf. also the account of this meeting in an anonymous 'relazione' written at Reggio Calabria in October 1599, printed in L. Firpo, 'Appunti campanelliani', *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana*, 41 (1962), 364–404, here p. 396.

⁸ On Cicala see N. Jorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 5 vols. (Gotha, 1908–13), 3, 184–5; M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, 'Cigala-zâde', *İslâm ansiklopedisi*, 13 vols. (Istanbul, 1940–86), 3, 161–4; G. Benzoni, 'Scipione Cicala', *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 25, 320–40.

⁹ J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 10 vols. (Budapest, 1827–35), 4, 301; Benzoni, 'Scipione Cicala', pp. 330–1.

¹⁰ Benzoni, 'Scipione Cicala', pp. 331–2; Firpo, 'Appunti campanelliani' (1962), p. 391.

conspirators' part. It has also been noted that, in his first self-exculpatory statement to the Spanish authorities, Campanella claimed that he had been against involving the Ottomans; and in a later letter to Pope Paul V, he claimed that he had made false admissions about the 'negoziò di turchi' under interrogation merely to save his life.¹¹ (On the other hand, several other witnesses declared under examination that Campanella had boasted to them that he had sent an emissary to Cicala.)¹² As for the accusation, made at the start of the formal proceedings of his heresy trial, that he had claimed that 'Turkish doctrine' (i.e. Islam) was better than Christianity, this has been dismissed by one modern authority as 'insubstantial'.¹³ And yet the picture which emerges from the interrogations of many of the participants in these events suggests that Campanella, together with several other conspirators, did have an interest in Islam and the Ottomans that went beyond the requirements of mere tactical expediency. One witness, a Dominican, said that when Giulio Contestabile (one of the conspirators) visited Campanella in his friary, Campanella had told him to take whichever he preferred of the portraits hanging on his wall, whereupon Contestabile had taken that of the Sultan, Mehmet III. Another friar recalled Campanella questioning Muslim slaves about their practices, and praising some of their religious ceremonies. Maurizio de' Rinaldis said that he had heard Campanella speaking well of 'the Turks' on many occasions; the procurator fiscal was summarising multiple testimonies when he stated that 'Campanella dared to say that the way of life of the Turks [sc. Muslims] was better than Christianity'.¹⁴ It certainly appears that Campanella's co-conspirator and fellow-Dominican Dionisio Ponzio shared that opinion, since, after his escape from prison in October 1602, he travelled to Istanbul, converted to Islam, and took up residence in Cicala's house: the Venetian envoy in Istanbul reported Ponzio's boast that there were 300 people in Calabria, some of them men of note, who were Muslims at heart, and that Campanella would soon escape from prison and join him in the Ottoman capital.¹⁵ And although

¹¹ Firpo, *Il supplizio*, pp. 61–2 ('dichiarazione' of 10 Sept. 1599); T. Campanella, *Lettere*, ed. V. Spampinato (Bari, 1927), p. 14 (letter to Paul V, 13 Aug. 1606).

¹² Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 3, 133, 134, 138.

¹³ For the accusation see Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 3, 471; for the dismissal, Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*, p. 47.

¹⁴ Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 3, 230, 254, 311 ('Campanella ausus fuit dicere quod modus vivendi turcharum sit melior lege Christiana'), 337.

¹⁵ L. Firpo, 'Una autoapologia di Campanella', *Rivista di filosofia*, NS, 2 (= 32) (1941), 96–110, here p. 110 (n.); Benzoni, 'Scipione Cicala', p. 335. Ponzio was later killed by a Janissary with whom he had had a casual argument: see G. C. Capaccio, *Il forastiero: dialogi* (Naples, 1634), p. 505.

there is no evidence to suggest that Campanella had changed his inner beliefs to those of a Muslim, there is one odd piece of evidence that he did at least try to change people's outward appearance: one of the conspirators stated that Campanella had introduced a new sort of dress for his followers, consisting of a white tunic and a piece of headgear that was tied like a Turkish turban.¹⁶ (The white tunics recur in the text of the *City of the Sun*; the turbans, not surprisingly, are omitted.)

III

The degree or intensity of Campanella's interest in Islam and the Ottomans may have been unusual (one wonders how many other friars kept portraits of the Sultan in their cells), but there were plenty of reasons why people at this time and place should have been interested in such matters. Muslims were a small but visible part of society in southern Italy—slaves, mostly captured in the Mediterranean by the Knights of Malta, and sold in the large slave market at Messina.¹⁷ Raids by the Ottomans, and by their protégés, the Barbary corsairs, were a frequent occurrence; as recently as in 1594 a major expedition by Cicala had led to the sacking of the city of Reggio Calabria (apparently out of pique at being refused permission to visit his mother).¹⁸ But in any case, no one with a serious interest in politics, war and current affairs could ignore the Ottoman Empire, which had grown spectacularly in the previous hundred and fifty years. Lepanto was not a turning-point (the Ottoman navy had quickly recovered its strength), and the battle of Mezö Keresztes in 1594 had shown that the Ottoman army was still capable of inflicting crushing defeats on Habsburg forces. In retrospect we can see that some of the seeds of Ottoman decline were already present in Ottoman government and society, and that the empire had more or less reached the limits of its territorial expansion; but the privilege of such hindsight was not available to Western Europeans at the time. They feared the seemingly inexhaustible

¹⁶ Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 3, 139 ('un coppolicchio legato à modo di turbante di Turcho'). For the significance of the white tunics see Revelation 19: 14, 'And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean', and the comments in T. Campanella, *La prima e la seconda resurrezione. Inediti: Theologicorum libri XXVII–XXVIII*, ed. and tr. R. Amerio (Rome, 1955), pp. 114–16.

¹⁷ See A. Riggio, 'Musulmani in Calabria convertiti al Cristianesimo', *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania*, 18 (1949), 45–59.

¹⁸ Benzoni, 'Scipione Cicala', p. 327.

power of this great enemy, and they sought to understand the grounds of its success—the military, political, social and religious factors that might account for both the expansion and the apparent stability of Ottoman imperial rule.

Popular beliefs about ‘the Turks’, as reflected in (and fortified by) chapbooks and sermons, might represent them as diabolical figures, embodiments of ferocity and lust; and the popular understanding of Islam might still be cluttered with the detritus of ill-informed medieval anti-Muslim polemics. But for any interested member of the reading public, by the latter part of the sixteenth century, a whole body of information and analysis was available, provided by authors with first-hand knowledge of the Ottoman world. That knowledge was acquired in two different ways: some of the authors were former captives, who had spent years in Istanbul or elsewhere, acquiring some knowledge of Turkish and seeing Ottoman society from the inside, while others were visitors, whether scholarly or diplomatic, for whom observation had been part of the *raison-d’être* of their trip. In the first category the most important writers were George of Hungary (or of Transylvania: ‘Septemcastrensis’), who had been captured at Sebeş, had spent twenty years as a slave, and whose *Tractatus de moribus, conditionibus et nequitia Turcorum* was first published in 1481; Bartholomeus Georgewitz [Djordjević], from southern Hungary or Slavonia, who had spent thirteen years as a captive, and whose *De turcarum ritu et caeremoniis* was published in 1544; Luigi Bassano, from Zadar, who had been captured in c.1530 and returned in 1541, publishing his *I costumi, et i modi particolari de la vita de’ Turchi* in 1545; and Giovanni Antonio Menavino, from Genoa, who was captured by corsairs in 1505, and published his *Trattato de’ costumi et vita de’ Turchi* in 1548. All of these works went through many editions; and there were also popular compilations, such as Francesco Sansovino’s *Dell’historia universale dell’origine et imperio de’ Turchi* (1560), in which most of them were reprinted. The key accounts by diplomats and travellers, on the other hand, were mostly written by Frenchmen—this was a consequence of links forged by the pro-Ottoman policy of François I and his successors. These authors included Antoine Geuffroy, whose *Estat de la court du grant Turc* was published in 1542; Pierre Belon, who accompanied the French ambassador in 1547 and published his *Les Observations* in 1553; Nicolas de Nicolay, a member of a subsequent French mission, whose *Les Quatre Premiers Livres des navigations* was published in 1568; and the scholar, Arabist and visionary religious universalist Guillaume Postel, whose *De la République des Turcs* was published in 1560. One other

important text was produced by a Habsburg diplomat: the *Epistolae* of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, published in two instalments, in 1581 and 1589, and frequently reprinted thereafter.

In every case, these writers expressed an underlying hostility to the Turks (which could be extremely bitter in the case of the former captives), and a fundamental disapproval of Islam. But their writings were based not on blind prejudice but on observation—even if they sometimes misunderstood what they observed, and even though they did occasionally borrow material or arguments from previous writers. And what emerged, overall, from this body of writings was a coherent and quite detailed picture of a well-ordered society and state—a society which was not only efficiently administered, but which also embodied virtues that seemed to be comparatively lacking in Western Europe.

One of the things that most impressed these writers was Ottoman military discipline. George of Hungary commented on the extraordinary silence and order that reigned in the Ottoman army camp; Busbecq, likewise, wrote that in the camp ‘Everywhere order prevailed, there was perfect silence, no quarrels, no bullying . . . no drinking, no gambling.’¹⁹ Georgewitz, Menavino and Postel all remarked on the absence of stealing by soldiers, even from the local population when on campaign.²⁰ The explanations offered by these authors for these striking features of military life included the influence of Islam (in the prohibition of drinking and gambling); a general ethos of sobriety, simplicity, good order and the lack of luxury (for example, in dress); severe and peremptory justice (the punishment of theft); and, above all, military virtue, instilled by strict and thorough training. All writers commented on the system of the *devşirme* (boy-tribute), and on the way in which the youths thus removed from their parents could be moulded into Janissaries loyal only to the Sultan.

Another positive feature of Ottoman life on which most writers commented was the administration of justice. Georgewitz was struck by its impartiality; Menavino was impressed by the sheer speed with which justice was meted out by the ‘cadi’ (judge).²¹ Postel expressed his admiration for the ‘diligence de Iustice’ of the Ottomans, declaring that ‘it makes me ashamed to describe such great diligence in a people who have been

¹⁹ C. T. Forster and F. H. B. Daniell, eds., *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq*, 2 vols. (London, 1881), 1, 288.

²⁰ B. Georgewitz [‘Giurieuch’, ‘Georgieuch’], *De turcarum ritu et caeremoniis* (Antwerp, 1544), sig. D2r; G. Postel, *La Tierce Partie des orientales histoires, ou est exposée la condition, puissance, & revenu de l’Empire Turquesque* (Poitiers, 1560), pp. 31, 47.

²¹ Georgewitz, *De turcarum ritu*, sig. D3v; Menavino, *I cinque libri*, p. 54.

proclaimed wicked [by us]: it is this diligence that, undoubtedly, makes them rule, conquer and keep their conquests as they do'. He also attributed the speed and honesty of their judicial procedure to the absence of lawyers: 'there', he wrote, 'they have no lawyers to put false appearances on things'.²²

Another common theme was the equality and meritocracy of Ottoman society, in the absence of a hereditary nobility. George of Hungary emphasised that officials were promoted 'according to proven virtue', not according to birth, 'From which it follows that all the magnates and princes of the whole kingdom are like office-holders, not lords or owners of estates . . . And hence it follows that in the Sultan's realm, although there is an innumerable mass of people, no contradiction or resistance can arise; they act like a single person in all things.' Postel made a similar point about promotion based on merit, and Busbecq waxed rhapsodic about it: 'Among the Turks, therefore, honours, high posts and judgeships are the rewards of great ability and good service . . . This is the reason that they are so successful in their undertakings.'²³ The point was made (by Belon, among others) that the Ottomans' concept of nobility was different—and, in obvious ways, superior. It was on the strength of such reports that Jean Bodin remarked, in his *Six Livres de la République*, that 'the Turkes almost alone of all other people measure true nobilitie by vertue'.²⁴

Also given great emphasis in these accounts was the theme of welfare—both private charity and public provision. Georgewitz praised the 'imarets' (public kitchens that dispensed food to paupers and travellers); Menavino devoted three pages to imarets and 'hans' (inns, at which, he noted, a traveller would be given food and lodging for three days, free of charge); and Bassano commented on the higher standards of private and public hygiene, noting that there was organised street-cleaning, describing the 'hamams' (public baths) in great detail, and arguing that the Ottomans' hygiene provisions led to a lower incidence of infectious diseases.²⁵ Postel spent eight pages describing their hospitals, imarets and

²² G. Postel, *De la République des Turcs: & là ou l'occasion s'offrera, des moeurs & loy de tous muhamedistes* (Poitiers, 1560), pp. 36 ('là n'y a nuls Aduocats, pour desguiser matieres'), 127 ('me facent honte de reciter vne si grande diligence en gens proclamés meschants: ce qui les fait sans nulle doute ainsi regner, conquerir, & garder').

²³ Postel, *De la République des Turcs*, p. 121; Forster and Daniell, eds., *Life and Letters of de Busbecq*, 1, 154–5.

²⁴ J. Bodin, *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale*, tr. R. Knolles (London, 1606), p. 44(G).

²⁵ Georgewitz, *De turcarum ritu*, sig. C1r; Menavino, *I cinque libri*, pp. 48–50; Bassano, 'Costumi . . . de' Turchi', in F. Sansovino, ed., *Historia universale dell'origine et imperio de Turchi* (Venice, 1568), fos. 48–52, 65v, 66v.

hans, and lamenting the fact that private charity was much greater among Turks than among Christians; Geuffroy grudgingly declared that ‘The only good thing about them, if there is any at all, is that they are charitable, and great founders of hospitals.’²⁶

Several of these authors commented on the role played by Islam itself in supporting these social and political arrangements. Postel declared at one point that the behaviour of the Turks was more influenced ‘by religion and fear of God, than by fear of the laws’.²⁷ This was an argument with some potentially awkward implications, however: if these social arrangements were better in various ways than those of Christian society, might that not mean that the religious beliefs supporting them were in some ways better too? None of these writers, needless to say, would take the argument that far. They did dismantle some of the more absurd medieval misconceptions about Islam, and in the process they showed that it was in some ways closer to Christianity than had been previously thought: Bassano noted, for example, the Muslim veneration of Jesus, and Geuffroy claimed that ‘they say the Pater noster like us, translated into Arabic, almost word for word’.²⁸ In other ways, too, they made it appear closer to reason or natural law: in Menavino’s list of the eight Muslim ‘commandments’, the third was described as follows: ‘it is based on reasons that are natural in themselves—namely, that you should not do to anyone what you would equally not want done to yourself’.²⁹ But the general depiction of Islam was as a miserable parody of a religion—a parody, to be precise, partly of Christianity and partly of Judaism—concocted by an impostor, Muhammad, for his own purposes. Here there was a long-standing tradition of Christian polemic to draw on, devoted to the analysis of various aspects of Islam as devices cleverly invented by Muhammad to extend his own power. Thus, for example, the ban on drinking wine was aimed at military efficiency; the allowance of polygamy was to motivate men to join him; the divine fatalism he preached was

²⁶ Postel, *De la République des Turcs*, pp. 56–63; A. Geuffroy, *Briefve description de la court du grant turc et ung sommaire du regne des Othmans* (Paris, 1543), fo. 4r (‘Tout le bien qui est en eulx, si aucun en y a, cest quilz sont charitables et grans fondateurs dhospitaux’).

²⁷ Postel, *De la République des Turcs*, p. 67 (‘par religion & crainte de Dieu, que contrainte de loix’). Cf. his comment, introducing his discussion of the judicial system, that in most countries of the world, justice depends on religion (p. 117).

²⁸ L. Bassano, *Costumi et i modi particolari della vita de’ Turchi* (Rome, 1545), fo. 11v; Geuffroy, *Briefve description*, fo. 3 (‘Et dient le pater noster comme nous, translâté en langue Arabique, quasi de mot a mot’).

²⁹ Menavino, *I cinque libri*, p. 17 (‘è fondato in ragioni per se medesime naturali; cio è, che ad alcuno non si faccia quello, che egualmente non uorresti, che fusse fatto à te stesso’).

intended to make his soldiers fearless in battle; and the promise he made of a sensual paradise (this was one of the favourite themes of all anti-Muslim writers) was a marvellously effective device to harness people's basest motives to the service of his will.

This way of viewing Islam as a device to gain and stabilise secular power was in keeping with the Paduan Aristotelian tradition of seeing all founders of religion as 'legislators', whose 'laws' were to be analysed in purely human, political terms. The tradition was of course potentially subversive—radically so—where its application to Christianity was concerned; but there could be no complaint about its application to Islam. And during the sixteenth century it was also fortified by the influence of Machiavelli's arguments about the role of religion as a useful device to facilitate the introduction of new 'ordini'. As he put it in Book 1 of the *Discorsi*, 'Nor in fact was there ever a legislator who, in introducing extraordinary laws to a people, did not have recourse to God': while Machiavelli's favourite example was Numa Pompilius, who claimed to have received instructions from the nymph Egeria, the same principle seemed to apply equally well to Muhammad, who claimed to have received revelation from the Angel Gabriel.³⁰

By the final decades of the sixteenth century, a popular genre had arisen in which authors analysed and listed the causes of Ottoman success; visible in these writings is not only an attempt to process the information provided by the earlier first-hand accounts of Ottoman life, but also a willingness to employ the Machiavellian and Paduan Aristotelian analysis of the political role of religion. Thus the Genoese writer Uberto Foglietta, in his posthumously published *De causis magnitudinis imperii turcici* (written in c.1580), wrote that religion performed a 'double function', divine and political, and that this was understood by all founders of republics: military success depended, he observed, on obedience and discipline, 'and the foundation of each of these things is religion'.³¹ René de Lusinge, presenting his own analysis of Ottoman success in 1588, noted that all founders of states base their rule on 'some pretext of religion', giving the examples of Numa Pompilius and Lycurgus; he explained that although Islam was intrinsically weak (because its doctrines were absurd),

³⁰ *Discorsi*, I.11 ('E veramente mai fu ordinatore di leggi straordinarie in uno popolo che non ricorresse a Dio'): N. Machiavelli, *Opere*, ed. R. Rinaldi (Turin, 1999–), 1, 495.

³¹ U. Foglietta ['Folieta'], *De causis magnitudinis imperii turcici, & virtutis ac felicitatis Turcarum in bellis perpetuae*, 2nd edn. (Leipzig, 1595), sigs. A7v ('duplex munus'), A8v ('vtriusque rei fundamentum est religio'). The first edition was published in Leipzig in 1594; Foglietta died in 1581.

Muhammad had cleverly strengthened it by appealing to ‘the pleasures of the flesh’.³² The German political theorist Arnold Clapmarius, describing what he called the ‘hidden methods of rule’ of the Turks, placed second on his list ‘filling the people with great fear and the greatest possible superstitions’.³³

But perhaps the most important writer developing this kind of politico-religious analysis was the late sixteenth-century theorist Scipione Ammirato. As a commentator on Tacitus and a theorist of ‘reason of state’, he is sometimes seen as a developer of the Machiavellian tradition, with his fixation on the power of ‘interest’ in human affairs and his Tacitist analysis of the tricks and devices of government. But, like Giovanni Botero (with whom he is often linked), he thought of himself as anti-Machiavellian; their methods and conceptual tools may have been similar to Machiavelli’s, but their aims were profoundly different. Indeed, they might better be characterised as the political science wing of the Counter-Reformation. Against Machiavelli’s idea that Christianity was enfeebling, an impediment to good ‘ordini’, and in opposition to any idea that religion should be merely instrumentalised by the state, they wanted to show that Christianity should be the very basis of the state, and that a state so grounded in true religion would be more successful, more advantageous, in human terms as well as divine. When Ammirato considered the Ottoman state, he was impressed by the number of aspects of its success that could be attributed to a religious foundation; he thus assimilated the sixteenth-century material on the strengths and virtues of Ottoman society, and at times came close to the moralistic rhetoric which complained that those heathen possessed the true virtues which degenerate Christians lacked. But he was also animated by tremendous anti-Ottoman zeal. Ammirato wrote a series of ‘Orations’, addressed to the Pope, the King of Spain and the nobility of Naples, urging them to reform and strengthen Christendom in order to fight the Turks; Botero, likewise, penned a passionate celebration of the idea of a new crusade.³⁴ Their view of the Ottoman system was thus deeply ambivalent; they saw its methods as Machiavellian, and hoped to defeat it by using similar, but more

³² R. de Lusinge, *De la Naissance, durée, et cheute des estats* (Paris, 1588), fos. 113r (‘quelque pretexte de Religion’), 115v, 116r (‘les plaisirs de la chair’).

³³ A. Clapmarius, *De arcanis rerumpublicarum libri sex* (Bremen, 1605), p. 287 (‘occulta sua consilia imperij’; ‘magno metu maximisque superstitionibus induere plebem’).

³⁴ See R. de Mattei, *Il pensiero politico di Scipione Ammirato* (Milan, 1963), pp. 37–58 (Ammirato was born in Lecce, and was thus a subject of the King of Spain); G. Botero, *Discorso della lega contro il Turco* (Milan, 1614); cf. the comments in G. Botero, *The Reason of State*, tr. P. J. Waley and D. P. Waley (London, 1956), pp. 221–3.

effective, methods, for non-Machiavellian purposes. Thus, for example, in the late 1590s Traiano Boccalini (a writer who shared many of their assumptions, though he was, or became, more sceptical, less pious, and probably more sympathetic to Machiavelli) recommended imitating the training of the Janissaries: every town, he thought, should have a military academy of this kind, so that there would be ‘as many as the ones founded by the Jesuits for teaching philosophy’.³⁵ And in his ‘Oration’ to Sixtus V, published in 1598, Ammirato noted that Plato had paid special attention to the upbringing of children, and said that the Turks had rediscovered this; he recommended creating ‘seminaries of boys’, especially the poor and the illegitimate, for intensive military training (starting at the age of ten or twelve), thereby forming a ‘holy militia’ to fight the Turks.³⁶

IV

This is the background against which the methods and assumptions of Campanella’s *Monarchia di Spagna*—the work which was probably first drafted in 1598, before the revolt, being re-worked later in prison—can best be understood. In that treatise, Campanella advises the King of Spain first to submit fully to the spiritual authority of the Pope, and then to use every possible device (including surprise attacks, extermination, and population transfers) to extend his rule, in order to become, under the direction of the Papacy, the universal monarch of the world. Campanella sees himself as defending true religiously based politics against Machiavellianism, and as advancing the cause of Christianity against the great infidel enemy, the Turk; yet he is quite untroubled by the fact that the methods he recommends are almost identical with those of his enemies.

Thus, for example, he notes that the Sultan ‘has made some seminaries of soldiers, called “seraglios”, in which he puts fine, strong boys from all the nations he conquers and despoils; and these boys become accustomed to recognise no other father but him, and they learn the military

³⁵ T. Boccalini, *Ragguagli di Parnaso e Pietra del paragone politico*, ed. G. Rua and L. Firpo, 3 vols. (Bari, 1910–48), 3, 343–4 (‘quante ve n’hanno fondate i Gesuiti per insegnarvi la lor filosofia’) (from a letter to Giacomo Sannesio, c.1597).

³⁶ S. Ammirato, *Orazioni del sig. Scipione Ammirato, a diversi principi, intorno I preparamenti, che s’aurebbono a farsi contra la potenza del Turco* (Florence, 1598), pp. 20 (‘seminario di fanciullo’), 21, 23 (‘sacra milizia’).

arts, and religion'.³⁷ Accordingly, a few pages later, Campanella recommends that the King of Spain should set up in his own territories 'two or four seminaries of soldiers in each place, taking all the boys of the country whose fathers are poor, and the young illegitimate boys, bringing them up together and getting them accustomed to use arms, and to recognise their King as their father . . . He should make another seminary for foreign nations, that is, one given over entirely to the children of Moors or Flemings [sc. Dutchmen], train them to be soldiers, and then use them as the Turk uses his Janissaries'.³⁸ And he goes on to comment: 'Let no one think that these colleges or seraglios are something peculiar to the Turks; for it is an extremely prudent method, practised also by the apostles in the Church . . . and the orders of St Dominic, St Francis and others are seminaries of apostolic soldiers'.³⁹ In his general advice on how to deal with conquered populations, Campanella's maxim is 'spagnolare il mondo', to make all nations Spanish; he points out that this will involve letting them participate in the administration and the army, 'as the Romans did, and as the Turk is wont to do'.⁴⁰ In his general comments on government, he criticises the absolute despotism of the Sultan, who, he says, inherits all his subjects' goods; but in his own advice to the King of Spain on the treatment of newly conquered territories, he suggests that the people should be dispossessed of all their estates.⁴¹ And discussing the relative strengths of Spain and the Ottoman Empire, he observes: 'So far as money is concerned, there is not much difference between them; but if the King of Spain were to use that absolute power which the Turk exercises, he would greatly exceed him in this respect'.⁴² Campanella's attitude towards the idea of a hereditary nobility is also ambivalent. On the one hand he

³⁷ Campanella, *Monarchie d'Espagne*, p. 130 ('si ha fatto alcuni seminarii di soldati, detti seragli, dove inchiude fanciulli belli et forti d'ogni nazione che doma e preda, e quelli s'avvezzano a non conoscere altro padre che lui, e imparano l'arte militare e la religione').

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 136–8 ('due o quattro seminarii di soldati per luoco, pigliando tutti i fanciulli del paese che hanno i padri poveri, e li bastardelli, e nutricolandoli insieme con avvezzarli all'armi, e a conosnere il Re loro per padre . . . E per le nazioni strane fare un altro seminario, cioè tutto di figli di Mori o di Fiamenghi, e allevarli alla soldatesca, e poi servirsene come fà il Turco de i giannizzeri').

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 138–40 ('Né si pensi alcuno che questi collegii o serragli son cosa da Turchi, perché è arte prudentissima, usata anche dagli apostoli nella Chiesa . . . e li ordini di san Domenico e san Francesco e altri son seminarii delli soldati apostolici').

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 108 ('deve tutte le genti spagnolare, cioè farle spagnole, e del governo farne parte e della milizia, come fecero i Romani e usa il Turco').

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 132, 320.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 324 ('Quanto alle monete, poco avanza l'uno l'altro, ma se re di Spagna usasse la potestà del Turco, più assai avanzerebbe').

regards the lack of ‘barons’ in the Ottoman system as a weakness, since, if the Sultan is defeated, the whole state may easily be occupied by his conqueror (this was precisely Machiavelli’s argument about the inherent weakness of the Ottoman Empire, as set out in chapter 4 of the *Prince*). But on the other hand, Campanella notes that the descendants of worthy ennobled men often turn out to be ‘useless people’, and observes that in order to remedy this ill, ‘the Turk has abolished all nobility among his people (apart from his own), and does not want the son of one of his barons to inherit either the status or the power, but rather to receive it from his lord if he is virtuous’. With some regret, he states that this remedy ‘is not suitable for use by Christians’.⁴³

In the final part of the book, Campanella offers his own advice on how to defeat the Ottoman Empire. Various suggestions are made, including making a secret deal with one of the Ottoman military commanders who are renegades (Muslim converts), a deal in which that commander would use his forces against the Sultan and would be rewarded by the King of Spain with a kingdom of his own: one of the candidates put forward by Campanella for this role is none other than Cicala, the admiral of the Ottoman fleet. But some of the other tactics recommended by Campanella are themselves derived from Ottoman practice, or from his own appraisal of how the Ottoman system functions. Thus he recommends introducing printing to the Ottoman Empire, in order to get the people preoccupied with philosophical and theological disputations. Bookishness weakens a people; ‘and for this reason the Turk, who is well advised, has wanted to obtain arms, artillery and slaves from us, but has not wanted to receive Arabic type’.⁴⁴ Campanella also recommends encouraging gambling in enemy states, in order to weaken the moral fibre of the population.⁴⁵ At the same time, in his advice on internal policy, he recommends banning the study of Greek and Hebrew (which has led only to the proliferation of heresies and disputes), and, in their place, introducing the study of Arabic, ‘in order to be able to defeat the Muslims’.⁴⁶

Throughout this work, then, Campanella exhibits a peculiarly ambivalent and intimate relationship with the Ottoman system (as he

⁴³ Campanella, *Monarchie d’Espagne*, p. 118 (‘disutili’; ‘il Turco ha tolto via ogni nobilità, altro che la propria, de suoi, e non vuole che erediti il figlio del suo barone state né facultà, ma che lo riconosca dal suo signore se è virtuoso . . . ma . . . non comporta l’use cristiano il remedio del Turco’).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 334 (‘E per questo il Turco accorto ha voluto l’armi da noi e l’artiglierie e li schiavi . . . ma non ha voluto ricevere le stampe arabiche’).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 98 (‘per potere vincere i Macomettani’).

understands it): he wishes to defeat it, and, in order to defeat it, he wishes to imitate it. A similar ambivalence is observable in his handling of the theme of religion as law—as something founded by a ‘legislator’ in order to mould human behaviour on earth. ‘Every great man who has instituted a new monarchy’, he writes, ‘has altered the sciences, and often religion too, in order to make himself admired by the people’: his examples include Ninus, Cyrus, and Alexander the Great. ‘Muhammad, aspiring to monarchy, made a new religious doctrine, suited to the taste and admiration of the people, and Caesar, with the pontificate and the use of astrology, which was little known among the Romans, and with his alteration of the Roman calendar, laid the foundations of his greatness. Therefore Spain should do something similar, as it has a great opportunity to do so . . .’⁴⁷ For a moment, astonishingly, he seems to be suggesting that the King of Spain should imitate Muhammad and found a new faith. But he quickly adds that ‘since it is not possible to make a new religion’ (because Christianity is of course perfect), the King should confine himself to such measures as changing the names of the months to those of the twelve Apostles.⁴⁸ Campanella had thought long and hard about the Paduan Aristotelian identification of religion and ‘law’, and would return to it in several of his later works. In chapter 13 of his *Atheismus triumphatus*, and in book 16 of his *Metafisica*, he accepted the identification as such, but attacked Averroes and the Machiavellians for arguing on the basis of it that all religions were impostures; instead, he sought to distinguish between those introducers of new laws/religions who were guided by natural reason (such as Lycurgus and Plato), those who were guided by their own cunning, or by the Devil (such as Numa Pompilius and Muhammad), and those who were guided by God.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 94 (‘Ogni uomo grande che ha instituito monarchie nuove ha mutato le scienze, e spesso la religione, per farsi ammirabile appresso ai popoli . . . Macometto, aspirando a monarchia, fece nova dottrina in religione secondo il gusto e ammirazione de popoli, e Cesare, con pontificato e astrologia, poco a Romani cognita, e con mutar l’anni romani, diede principio alla sua grandezza. Dunque Spagna deve fare il simile, avendone grande occasione . . .’).

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 94 (‘E perché non può fare religion nuova’), 96.

⁴⁹ T. Campanella, *Atheismus triumphatus, seu reductio ad religionem per scientiarum veritates* (Rome, 1631), pp. 130–1; *Metafisica*, ed. G. di Napoli, 3 vols. (Bologna, 1967), 3, 238, 260–70. The *Metafisica* was drafted first in 1602, then in 1609; both drafts were confiscated, and it was then written in its present form in the period 1611–21. *Atheismus triumphatus* consisted of material about religion extracted from the *Metafisica* and re-worked as a separate text in c.1605. For valuable treatments of this ‘legislator’ theme in Campanella’s thought see G. Spini, *Ricerca dei libertini: la teoria dell’impostura delle religioni nel seicento italiano*, 2nd edn. (Florence, 1983), pp. 90–108, and Frajese, *Profezia e machiavellismo*, pp. 74–80, 106–10.

V

If we now turn to the *City of the Sun*, Campanella's idealised retrospective manifesto for the new society he had hoped to found in 1599, we shall find it resonating with many of the themes I have been discussing. This little work, written probably in 1602, subjected to some changes in 1607, and published for the first time (in Latin) in 1623, is, in literary terms, a direct descendant of More's *Utopia*: it takes the form of a dialogue in which a traveller is questioned about his experiences on an island in the South Seas. He describes the city which he found there—a city built on a hill, in the form of seven great concentric circles—and the way of life of its people. They live in what is literally a communist system, in which all property, wives and children are held in common; they lead a sober and virtuous existence, based on a special method of pedagogy, and ruled by wise officials (who direct them in, among other things, a programme of scientific eugenics). The supreme ruler is called 'Sun', and the three under him are known as 'Pon', 'Sin', and 'Mor', meaning 'Potentia' (power), 'Sapientia' (wisdom) and 'Amor' (love). Modern scholars have devoted great efforts to exploring the literary sources and models on which Campanella may have drawn; these include, in addition to Thomas More's work, the Bible (specifically, the reference to the 'City of the Sun' in Isaiah 19:18); Herodotus's account of the city of Ecbatana; Plato's republic; Diodorus Siculus' story of Iamboulos' journey to the 'islands of the Sun'; various modern accounts of the Incas and other civilisations in the New World (by Cieza de Leon, Acosta, Benzoni and Botero); the description by Botero of the city of 'Campanel' in the Indies; Alberti's architectural utopia; Ficino's *De sole*; and, of course, the model of life in a Dominican friary.⁵⁰ Some, perhaps most, of these may well have influ-

⁵⁰ See P. Treves, 'The Title of Campanella's "City of the Sun"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 3 (1939–40), esp. 248–51 (Isaiah); L. Firpo, 'Introduzione' to T. Campanella, *La città del sole*, ed. L. Firpo, revd. G. Ernst and L. S. Firpo (Bari, 1997), p. xxxviii (Herodotus; Botero: Mexico); R. de Mattei, 'Fonti, essenza e fortuna della "Città del sole"', *Rivista internazionale di filosofia del diritto*, 18 (1938), 405–39, esp. 408 (Plato; Alberti); L. Firpo, 'La città ideale di Campanella e il culto del Sole', in L. de Rosa, ed., *Ricerche storiche ed economiche in memoria di Corrado Barbagallo*, 3 vols. (Naples, 1970), 2, 377–89, esp. 386–7 (Herodotus; Isaiah; Diodorus Siculus; Botero: Mexico and 'Campanel'); B. Croce, *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 5th edn. (Bari, 1927), p. 203 (n.) (Pedro de Cieza de Leon: Peru); G. Ernst, *Tommaso Campanella: il libro e il corpo della natura* (Bari, 2002), p. 97 (Girolamo Benzoni: Peru); L. Diez del Corral, 'La città utopistica di Campanella: da Bisanzio alle Indie', in A. Pertusi, ed., *Venezia e l'oriente fra tardo medioevo e rinascimento* (Florence, 1966), pp. 309–22, esp. pp. 317, 319 (José de Acosta; Quito); R. Crahay, 'L'Utopie religieuse de Campanella', in M. Thiry, ed., *Homages à Marie Delcourt* (Brussels, 1970), pp. 374–91, esp. p. 380 (Ficino); W. Gussmann, 'Reipublicae

enced Campanella's thinking. But one of the most important influences of all has been almost entirely neglected: the model of Ottoman society.⁵¹

No reader who is familiar with the sixteenth-century literature on the Ottoman Empire, and who has already observed its influence on the *Monarchia di Spagna*, can fail to be struck by one detail after another in the *City of the Sun*. In a general sense, the whole society resembles Campanella's vision of the 'seminaries' in which the Ottomans trained their devşirme boys. All undergo a communal upbringing, so that their ruler is the only person they regard as their 'father'; their loyalty to him is therefore absolute.⁵² But the resemblance is also more specific: the boys are taught military skills from the age of twelve, while the less bright ones are sent to work on farms—exactly as happened to the Ottoman devşirme intake.⁵³ Gambling is strictly forbidden to the Solarians, and alcohol, while not prohibited, is allowed only in great moderation.⁵⁴ Campanella emphasises their frequent washing, and their use of baths for health-giving purposes; in the Latin text he explains that these baths are 'warm ones, according to the Roman custom'—in other words, like the contemporary Ottoman hamams.⁵⁵ His narrator also says that 'by these and other means they make great efforts to protect themselves against epilepsy, from which they often suffer'; and, just in case readers had not caught the significance of this, his interlocutor comments that epilepsy is a sign of 'great intelligence', and that Muhammad, among others, suffered

christianopolitanae descriptio: eine Erinnerung an Johann Valentin Andreae zu seinem dreihundertsten Geburtstag', *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, 7 (1886), pp. 326–33, 380–92, 434–42, 465–72, 531–48, esp. pp. 439–40 (Dominicans).

⁵¹ Jan Kvačala commented in passing on the influence of 'Orientalismus' in general, and 'Mohammedanismus' in particular, on *The City of the Sun*, but gave no examples: *Thomas Campanella: ein Reformator der ausgehenden Renaissance* (Berlin, 1909), p. 36. The only writer to have paid any attention to this theme is Gisela Bock, who identifies just three Ottoman-influenced elements in *The City of the Sun*: absolutism, the Janissary model of education, and the lack of a hereditary aristocracy: *Thomas Campanella: politisches Interesse und philosophische Spekulation* (Tübingen, 1974), pp. 174–5. One earlier writer argued that the religion described in *The City of the Sun* was similar to that of the Persians, as described by Thomas Hyde (M. Veyssièrè de La Croze, *Entretiens sur divers sujets d'histoire et de religion, entre Mylord Bolingbroke et Isaac D'Orobio* (London, 1770), p. 383 (n.)); however, this referred not to Islam but to Zoroastrianism (see T. Hyde, *Historia religionis veterum Persarum, eorumque magorum* (Oxford, 1700), esp. pp. 106–11, on the role of the sun in Zoroastrian worship).

⁵² T. Campanella, *La città del sole: dialogo poetico. The City of the Sun: A Poetical Dialogue*, ed. and tr. D. J. Donno (Berkeley, Calif., 1981), pp. 84–6.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 68.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 88.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 92 ('usano li bagni e l'olei all'usanza antica'); T. Campanella, *La città del sole: testo italiano e testo latino*, ed. N. Bobbio (Turin, 1941), p. 147 ('Utuntur balneis, ideo et thermas habent ritu Romanorum').

from it.⁵⁶ The Solarians have their version of the Ottoman ‘han’: travellers are given food for three days, free of charge.⁵⁷ Their system of justice is remarkably similar to the one described by contemporary writers on the Ottomans: ‘The trial is not committed to writing; rather, the accusation and the defence are uttered in the presence of the judge, and of “Potestà” [or “Potentia”: the chief executive official], and the judge immediately hands down his sentence.’⁵⁸ And, of course, the entire social and political system is strictly meritocratic: there is no hereditary principle (indeed, there can be no inheritance), and the highest officials are chosen for their abilities. The Solarians, it seems, have the same concept of nobility as the Ottomans; as the narrator puts it, ‘the one who learns the most skills and practises them best is held to have the greatest nobility. That is why they laugh at us when we call craftsmen ignoble, and describe as noble those who learn no skill and remain idle.’⁵⁹

The religion of the Solarians is certainly not identical with Islam, but it bears some intriguing resemblances to it—or, at least, to the version of Islam presented by contemporary writers on the Ottomans. The Solarians are monotheists; they are fiercely opposed to any form of idolatry, and use the sun only as a symbol of God; they believe in rewards and punishments after death; and they also believe in good and bad angels.⁶⁰ Each morning, after they have washed, ‘they turn to the east and say a very short prayer, like the *Pater noster*’; their priests, standing at the top of the central temple, sing psalms to God at four fixed times each day.⁶¹ On the wall where they display the portraits of great founders of ‘laws’ (i.e. religions) and sciences, they have ‘Moses, Osiris, Jupiter, Mercury and Muhammad’, and in a special place of honour they have Jesus Christ and his Apostles, ‘whom they hold in high regard’.⁶² This is not, as some commentators

⁵⁶ Campanella, *La città del sole*, ed. Donno, p. 92 (‘Si forzano con questi e altri modi aiutarsi contro il morbo sacro, chè ne pateno spesso’; ‘Segno d’ingegno grande, onde Ercole, Socrate, Macometto . . . ne patiro’).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 96 (‘Non si scrive processo, ma in presenza del giudice e del Potestà si dice il pro e il contra; e subito si condanna dal giudice’).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 42 (‘quello è tenuto di più gran nobiltà, che più arti impara, e meglio le fa. Onde si ridono di noi che gli artefici appellamo ignobili, e diciamo nobili quelli, che null’arte imparano e stanno oziosi’).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 106–10, 112–14.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 90 (‘fanno orazione brevissima al levante come il *Pater noster*’), 102.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 36 (‘che ne tengono gran conto’). The Latin version adds several more names to the list (including Lycurgus and Numa Pompilius), and also adds a negative comment about Muhammad, ‘whom, however, they hate as a lying and sordid legislator’ (Campanella, *La città del sole*, ed. Bobbio, p. 122: ‘quem tamen ut fabulosum ac sordidum legislatorem oderunt’).

have argued, a pre-Christian society; rather it is a non-Christian society, one which has acquired some knowledge of Christianity, but has never been subject to the effects of Christian revelation. Nor, for that matter, is it an Islamic society; it has an equivalent arm's-length relation to the actual figure of Muhammad. The religion of the Solarians is a natural religion, closely bound up with science, astrology and natural magic (the priests also study the stars in order to harness their natural forces to optimum effect in their eugenics programme); it is the best possible natural religion; and it is a form of religion that coincides to a significant extent with Islam.

One other aspect of it is, however, of special importance. Although the Solarians are strict monotheists and non-Christians, they nevertheless have a kind of philosophical trinitarianism. 'You will be amazed', says the narrator, 'that they worship God in the Trinity, saying that he is the highest Power, from whom proceeds the highest Wisdom, and that from both of them proceeds the highest Love. But they do not recognize the three persons as they are distinguished and named by us.'⁶³ It has long been known that Campanella was drawing here on a tradition of Christian Neoplatonism, which sought to interpret the Trinity philosophically as a triune procession of aspects of Being in God. But it has not been noticed that the source from which Campanella most probably drew this precise formulation of the argument was Book 1 of Postel's *De orbis terrae concordia*, which is devoted to explaining the methods by which Muslims can be converted to Christianity. Postel's first demonstration of the Trinity, for the benefit of Muslims, is that God, as an omnipotent creator, must have power, wisdom and love: wisdom proceeds from power, and love proceeds from wisdom and power together.⁶⁴

⁶³ Campanella, *La città del sole*, ed. Donno, p. 114 ('Qui ti stupisci ch'adorano Dio in Trinitate, dicendo ch'è somma Possanza, da cui procede somma Sapienza, e d'essi entrambi, sommo Amore. Ma non conoscono le persone distinte e nominate al modo nostro').

⁶⁴ G. Postel, *De orbis terrae concordia libri quatuor* (n.p., n.d. [Basel, 1544]), pp. 16–17 ('Opus ergo fuit, antequam à Deo in esse deduceretur, fuisse in illo potentiam, sapientiam, & amorem. Quoniam autem potentia prima in ordine, non in tempore est, patri Deo adscribitur. sapientia autem quia à summa potentia procedit, filius dicitur, metaphora à naturali generatione ducta: at quia à sapientia & potentia procedit benevolentia amorue, spiritussancti appellatione nuncupata est'). Campanella does not make any reference to Postel, but this is not surprising, given the notorious heterodoxy of the latter. One of the works to which he does refer, S. Rescius [Reszka], *De atheismis et phalarismis Evangelicorum libri duo* (Naples, 1596), contains a denunciation of Postel which, in the context of the argument I am presenting here, has a striking resonance: it describes him as having thought that 'a new religion should be invented, to be made by fusing together Christianity, Judaism and Mohammed's Koran' (p. 426: 'nouam esse fingendam religionem, quae sit ex Christiana, Mosaica, & Alcorano Machometi conflanda'; for Campanella's references to Rescius see Firpo, ed., *Il supplizio*, pp. 158, 164).

This clue points us towards what is, I believe, the real secret of the *City of the Sun*, the essential purpose it was designed to serve. What Campanella was describing in that work was an ideal society, embodying a perfect natural existence, cleansed of vice and filled with pure, natural pleasures—a society which, while not itself based on Islam, would correspond to many of the most positive features of Islamic practice, would appeal to Muslims, and would at the same time lead them on to something higher. It was, roughly speaking, a naturalistic half-way house between Islam and Christianity, a stage through which Muslims could pass in order to join the Christians in a higher form of religion. Whether that higher religion would have corresponded to orthodox Christianity seems very unlikely; if many of the witness-statements used at Campanella's trial are to be given any credence at all, his own version of Christianity was radically naturalistic, portraying Christ as just a great man (which implied that the Trinity existed *only* in an abstract, philosophical sense), denying miracles, and dismissing the sacraments as devices grafted onto the true Christian religion by Machiavellian 'legislators'.⁶⁵ This was a modified version of Christianity, and most of the modifications took it in a direction closer to Islam; when Maurizio de' Rinaldis was interrogated about Campanella's religious beliefs, he said that he had heard him describe Christ as 'a great man, who did good', and commented that 'I've heard that the Turks say that too, and many times Fra Tommaso spoke well of the Turks.'⁶⁶ But Campanella's starting-point was in Christianity, and in Christian prophetic revelation.⁶⁷ Nothing that he believed was based on the Koran, and it is no part of my argument to portray him as a crypto-Muslim.

Nevertheless, it is important to understand why Islam occupied such a special place in his scheme of things. The universalist tradition to which Postel belonged (together with Nicholas of Cusa, another writer who may have influenced Campanella) was no less concerned to gather people from all faiths to the true religion—Muslims, Jews, Hindus and others. In one of the self-justificatory statements Campanella penned in prison, he wrote that he had examined Christianity in the light of 'all ancient and modern sects, and all the laws [sc. religions] of ancient people, and of the

⁶⁵ See the list of charges of 7 Sept. 1599 in Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 3, 195–6.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 3, 254 ('un grande huomo da bene . . . queste parole anco mi pare di havere inteso che le dicono li turchi, et molte volte il detto frà Thomaso hà ditto bene deli turchi').

⁶⁷ I would emphasise *prophetic* revelation here, as nothing in Campanella's position seems to have depended on the authority of Scripture as such—let alone the authority of the Church. He appears to have regarded prophecy too in naturalistic terms: like natural magic, genuine prophecy involved the harnessing, to an exceptional degree, of natural forces or natural powers.

Jews, Turks, Persians, Moors, Chinese, Cathayans, Japanese, Brahmins, Peruvians, Mexicans, Abyssinians and Tatars'; and his Solarians are themselves described as sending envoys throughout the world in order to learn what was good or bad in each society.⁶⁸ In some ways, it would seem in keeping with the purpose of Campanella's argument to treat the religion and society of the Solarians as a kind of syncretist naturalism, embodying the best practices of all peoples. It certainly does not bear the exclusive imprint of Islam. And yet, Islam has a special significance in it, quite different from that of any other model or influence. The explanation for this can be found in the peculiar set of beliefs—beliefs about the imminence of the apocalypse—that motivated Campanella's actions in 1599.

VI

In the months leading up to his arrest in September 1599, Campanella had not merely been organising some sort of political conspiracy. He had been preaching, and preparing for, the end of the world. All the portents were there: earthquakes, floods, eclipses, plagues, 'unheard-of changes in the stars', even the arrival in Italy of swarms of locusts. He was convinced that the end would occur in the Holy Year of 1600—or, at least, during the seven years thereafter.⁶⁹ First there would come the great war in heaven, during which the 'woman clothed with the sun' (representing probably the Church) would have to flee into the wilderness for three-and-a-half years (Rev. 12:1–7); then, after the pouring out of the vials, the fall of Babylon and the destruction of Antichrist, there would be the thousand-year reign of Christ on earth (Rev. 20:4–5). Campanella's aim was first of all to take people to the mountains, where they could survive the turmoil of the first three-and-a-half years (in one of his early apologias he compared

⁶⁸ Campanella, *Lettere*, p. 15, letter to Pope Paul V, 13 Aug. 1606 ('tutte sette antiche e moderne, e con la legge delle genti antiche e d'ebrei, turchi, persiani, mori, chinesi, cataini, giaponesi, bracmani, peruiani, messicani, abissini, tartari'); *La città del sole*, ed. Donno, p. 36. In a later commentary on the *City of the Sun* Campanella wrote that 'indeed we have gathered together observations, experience and knowledge from the whole world into our Republic' ('Immò nos ex toto orbe terrarum obseruationes, & experimenta, & scientias ad nostram Remp. congregamus'): *Disputationum in quatuor partes suae philosophiae realis libri quatuor* (Paris, 1637), 3rd pagination, p. 103.

⁶⁹ Firpo, ed., *Il supplizio*, pp. 2, 168 ('syderum varietas inaudita'); cf. also T. Campanella, *Lettere, 1595–1638, non comprese nell'edizione di Vincenzio Spampinato*, ed. G. Ernst (Pisa, 2000), p. 28, 'Memoriale al nunzio di Napoli' (1606).

this to the early Venetians retreating into the lagoon), and secondly to start building the ideal state in which people would live during the following millennium.⁷⁰ For, as he would later explain, his interpretation of this phase of the Apocalypse was both metaphorical and literal. It was metaphorical, in that he did not think this millennial kingdom would be populated only by miraculously resurrected Christian martyrs (as Revelation says), or ruled by Christ in person; rather, what would be resurrected would be the fame and spirit of holy men, and Christ would rule in the sense that his teachings would be perfectly embodied in the rule of a sacerdotal monarch. And Campanella's vision was at the same time remarkably literal: he believed that this kingdom would be a real, historical, human polity, in which human nature would be perfected in natural ways, and all spiritual and corporeal goods would be enjoyed together.⁷¹ (The most striking feature of this is that men and women would have sex without sin.)⁷² It would, in fact, be the 'golden age' described by pagan poets, predicted by prophets such as Isaiah, and desired by all men. Defending his vision of this millennial kingdom, he wrote: 'All nations, by a natural appetite—which is not given to them by God in vain—desire an age of this sort.'⁷³ Defending his *City of the Sun*, he wrote: 'I say that this republic and golden age are desired by all people.'⁷⁴ The two things—millennial kingdom and *City of the Sun*—may not have been identical in every detail, but the latter was at least an attempt to capture some of the key characteristics of the former. Explaining his actions in 1599 in a letter to the King of Spain and the Pope in 1611, Campanella wrote that he had 'only wanted, in the event of the great transformation taking place, to preach and establish the republic of the Apocalypse ["la republica dell'Apocalissi"]'.⁷⁵

Thus far, Campanella's millenarianism seems to have no special concern with Islam. It assumes, like most millenarianism, that this process will involve the gathering together of all humanity under Christ—in

⁷⁰ Amabile, *Fra Tommaso Campanella*, 1, 191.

⁷¹ Campanella, *La prima e la seconda resurrezione*, pp. 16, 44. See also the discussion of this in G. Ernst, 'L'alba colomba scaccia i corbi neri: profezia e riforma in Campanella', in R. Rusconi, ed., *Storia e figure dell'Apocalisse fra '500 e '600* (Rome, 1996), pp. 107–25, esp. pp. 107–11.

⁷² Campanella, *Articoli prophetales*, pp. 88, 94.

⁷³ Campanella, *La prima e la seconda resurrezione*, p. 60 ('Omnes nationes naturali appetitu, qui non datur a Deo frustra, appetunt huiusmodi saeculum').

⁷⁴ Campanella, *Disputationum libri quatuor*, 3rd pagination, p. 103 ('Dico hanc Remp. & seculum aureum ab omnibus desiderari').

⁷⁵ Campanella, *Lettere, 1595–1638*, p. 50 ('solamente aver voluto che, si venia la mutazione . . . volea predicare e fare la republica dell'Apocalissi').

other words, the conversion not only of the Jews, but also of Muslims and pagans. Such universalism was certainly a feature of Campanella's thinking: the *Monarchia di Spagna* aims at a universal monarchy for that reason, and his later treatise on the conversion of non-Christians, *Quod reminiscetur*, aimed equally at the conversion of all of them. So wherein lies the special significance of Islam? The answer to this question can be found in the whole framework of prophecies with which Campanella supported his claims about the imminence of the end of the world. His thinking was dominated by a number of recent prophecies (by Ciprian Leowitz, Antonio Torquato (or 'Arquato'), Paul Scaliger (Skalić) and the so-called Abbot Ubertino of Otranto) which asserted that the Turks would invade Italy and would actually conquer Rome—thus putting the Papacy to flight, like the woman fleeing into the wilderness in Revelation.⁷⁶ These were supported by earlier revelations, by St Bridget of Sweden and Dionysius Carthusianus, also associating a conquest of Italy by the Turks with the coming of the last days.⁷⁷ There was, however, one ray of light among these gloomy prognostications. According to Torquato, the empire of the Turks would split into two; one half would turn to Christianity, and would defeat the other half. As Campanella put it in the first full-length defence he wrote in prison, 'they were destined to be divided between two kings; one of them would join our religion *and republic*'.⁷⁸ He also believed that this had been predicted by St Catherine of Siena.⁷⁹ Because of her closeness to the Dominicans, St Catherine was especially venerated as a prophetic authority by the Dominican order, and Campanella certainly shared that estimation of her.⁸⁰ But there was one prophecy that concerned him in particular: her statement that the Dominicans would (as he put it) 'bring the olive branch of peace to the Turks'.⁸¹ Campanella

⁷⁶ See, for example, Firpo, ed., *Il supplizio*, pp. 169, 171. On Leowitz see *ibid.*, pp. 54–5 (n.); on Torquato see J. Deny, 'Les Pseudo-prophéties concernant les Turcs au XVI^e siècle', *Revue des études islamiques*, 10 (1936), 201–20, esp. 207–15, and D. Cantimori, 'Note su alcuni aspetti della propaganda religiosa nell'Europa del cinquecento', in G. Berthoud *et al.*, *Aspects de la propagande religieuse* (Geneva, 1957), pp. 340–52, esp. pp. 344–6; on Scaliger see F. Secret, 'La Tradition du "de omni scibili" à la renaissance: l'oeuvre de Paul Scaliger', *Convivium*, ns, 23 (1955), 492–7; on the prophecy attributed to Abbot Ubertino see L. Firpo, 'Appunti campanelliani' (1962), pp. 364–7.

⁷⁷ See Campanella, *Articoli prophetales*, pp. 196, 232.

⁷⁸ Firpo, ed., *Il supplizio*, p. 104 ('dividendos esse in duos reges . . . et unum eorum venturum ad fidem et rempublicam'); the italics are mine.

⁷⁹ Campanella, *Lettere*, p. 24, to Cardinal Farnese, 30 Aug. 1606.

⁸⁰ See the comments in G. M. Barbuto, *Il principe e l'Anticristo: gesuiti e ideologie politiche* (Naples, 1994), pp. 82–3.

⁸¹ Firpo, 'Una autoapologia di Campanella', p. 106 ('nos . . . delaturos olivam pacis ad Turcas').

believed that the Dominicans had a special missionary role to play; another saint to whom he frequently referred was the Dominican St Vincent Ferrer, who had spent years converting Muslims in Spain.⁸²

If we put together all these clues, we can construct a plausible account of what Campanella was really trying to achieve in those heady summer days of 1599. He was expecting a Turkish invasion of Italy, and was seeking, indeed, to hasten it. But he also believed that Cicala, the admiral of the Turkish fleet, would return to Christianity, taking half the Ottoman Empire with him, and would then fight against the other half. Cicala's return to Christianity—and that of his Muslim followers—would be accomplished, as the prophecies had foretold, by a Dominican, Tommaso Campanella. And the means of accomplishing it would be, at the same time, the means by which a group of people would at first be protected from the tribulations of the Last Days, and then be enabled to live a pure and perfect natural life on earth, the life of the golden age, in the 'republic of the Apocalypse'. When he used that phrase in his letter to the King of Spain and the Pope, he said that what he was describing had been 'expected now by St Vincent, St Catherine, St Bridget, Dionysius Carthusianus, and Serafino da Fermo'—a group of writers connected only by their interest in the danger of the Turks and/or the conversion of the Muslims.⁸³ And when he included the *City of the Sun* in a list of his writings which he compiled in 1607, he called it '*The City of the Sun*, that is, a dialogue about my own republic, in which is outlined the plan for the reformation of a Christian republic, as it has been promised by God to St Vincent, St Bridget, St Catherine of Siena, and many others.'⁸⁴ Those saints are invoked not—as modern Campanella scholars have assumed—in con-

⁸² See for example T. Campanella, *Legazioni ai maomettani*, ed. R. Amerio (Florence, 1960), p. 90.

⁸³ Campanella, *Lettere 1595–1638*, p. 50 ('aspettato mo da san Vincenzo, Catarina, Brigida, Dionisio Cartusiano, don Serafino da Fermo'). On Serafino da Fermo see G. Ernst, "'L'alba colomba'", p. 115. In his *Breve dichiarazione sopra l'apocalipse de Gioanni, doue si proua esser uenuto il precursore de Antichristo* (Venice, 1541), fo. 39v, he predicted that 'there will be a great struggle between Christianity and Islam, and during the time of Antichrist the Church will hide during the time that he rules in the world' ('sara gran contrasto tra la legge Christiana, & Macomettana, & nel tempo d'Antichristo la Chiesa s'ascondera per quel tempo che regnara nel mondo').

⁸⁴ Campanella, *Lettere 1595–1638*, p. 37 ('La Città del Sole, hoc est dialogus de propria republica, in quo idea reformandae christianae reipublicae, uti sanctis Vincentio, Brigidae, Catharinae Senensi aliisque multis pollicitus est Deus, delineatur'). As Germana Ernst has noted, versions of this description appear as the titles of the text in two early manuscripts: Bibliotheca philosophica hermetica, Amsterdam, MS BPH M 65, and British Library, London, MS Royal 14 a XVII ('Nota al testo', in Campanella, *La città del sole*, ed. Firpo, pp. 63–101, here pp. 74, 78).

nection with the general reformation of the Church, but in connection with something much more specific: the conversion of the Muslims. And how would that conversion be effected? In the second of his long self-justificatory texts, written in prison in the early months of 1600, Campanella gave his answer: 'the Turks will come more readily to the true faith, when they hear that the paradise described by Muhammad, in which people eat and get married, will take place not in heaven but on earth—as a sort of prelude to the heavenly paradise which Muhammad did not consider.'⁸⁵ Muhammad was thus almost completely wrong, because he was almost completely right. He deluded people with promises of a false kind of celestial life, when the life he was describing was in fact the perfect life on earth. In one sense, therefore, he was an extreme example of a Machiavellian who manipulated religious beliefs for his own purposes; Campanella would tend, in his later, more orthodox, writings on the Apocalypse, to portray Muhammad as a diabolical figure, identifying him with the precursor of Antichrist, or the principle of Antichristianity, and declaring that the Antichrist himself would be of Muhammad's 'seed'.⁸⁶ Yet in another sense, he had been able to regard Muhammad as a near-genius, a man (as the interlocutor in the *City of the Sun* put it) of 'great intelligence', a 'legislator' who had devised a very effective system of life and who had harnessed people's natural desire for a perfect one. All that was needed, it seemed, was for an even greater legislator to found a new republic, to which Muslims would be irresistibly attracted. That legislator was Tommaso Campanella; and that new republic, the republic of the Apocalypse, was his City of the Sun.

⁸⁵ Firpo, ed., *Il supplizio*, p. 152 ('Turcae promptius ad fidem venient, cum audierint quod Paradisus quem ponit Macomettus, in quo manducatur et fiunt matrimonia, non in Coelo sed in terra erit, praeludium quasi coelestis Paradisi, ab eo non considerati'). Cf. his later comments in *Articuli prophetales*, p. 89, on the golden age foretold by Isaiah: 'Here Isaiah speaks about death and procreation in the way in which I described them in the *City of the Sun*, under propitious stars, when parents, purged of sin, will have sex in the name of God, without sin—something that will not happen in paradise, unless in the Muslim one. Therefore the meaning of the prophet is historical, and he locates these things on earth, not in heaven' ('Hic Isaias loquitur de morte et de generatione modo qualem ego descripsi in *Civitate solis* sub felicibus astris, quando parentes purgati scelere in nomine Dei coeunt, quod non erit in paradiso, nisi machometico. Ergo sensus prophetae est historicus, et in terra ponit haec, et non in coelo').

⁸⁶ Campanella, *Articuli prophetales*, pp. 215–17; *De antichristo. Inediti: Theologicarum liber XXVI*, ed. and tr. R. Amerio (Rome, 1965), pp. 36, 44–6 ('eius ex semine, hoc est Machometico'). G. M. Barbuto notes that Campanella was thus repudiating the mainstream tradition, still accepted by many Jesuit writers, that Antichrist would be a Jew: *Il principe e l'Anticristo*, p. 95.