

**A NEW EUROPEAN CULTURAL SERIES:  
FROM "SANCTA MASSERIZZIA" TO THE "HOLY CITY"**

**Ilie Bădescu – University of Bucharest**

*Beginning with the 14<sup>th</sup> century up to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Western Europe is shattered by a profound and complex crisis, which generalized and gradually seized all the layers of the society. It reached the population, the material and spiritual culture. Turn by turn, the agents of the old world – empire, kings, papacy, and knights – fail in their attempt to save the structures of the old Europe. A state of interregnum strikes root in the world, and the horizons of prediction grow dark. In order for Europe to get out of this crisis, new historical agents will have to emerge. They will not only raise a new material culture (new productions), but also a new spiritual culture – a new paradigm, a new type of rationality.*

*Who are these "agents", which is the new type of rationality that they bring in the history of Europe, which are the mechanisms of the genesis and of the socialization of the new patterns and values, in a word, which is the new cultural paradigm that is now being born? And moreover, which will be the destiny of the various European areas in relation to the movement of culture? Will culture follow the economies' pattern of change or will it develop its own pattern of historical movement? As we have demonstrated, economies have developed through desynchronization: some of them, namely the metropolitan (Western) ones evolved progressively towards the industrial Revolution; the others, the Southeastern European ones, moved regressively towards a peripheral, stagnating state.*

*The second situation is typical for Romanian society in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, more precisely between 1821 and 1921, when an economy that was weakly developed in an European context was correlated with a culture that was in a very precipitated process of affirmation, so that, after about 50 years of synchronization with the great culture of capitalist Europe, it becomes (along with the Polish culture) one of the first European critical cultures (beginning appreciatively with the year 1870). This is why we will try to derive the directions of culture movement especially in relation to the defining features of its new paradigm, typical for the modern epoch. The task of our thesis will be that of reading into the parsimoniously selected documents the elements of the modern cultural paradigm that is built in our area by the creators of the "heroic culture" and of the "critical culture". These elements refer, obviously, to "exemplary images", guide ideas, social types, motives, symbols, which become, in our view, the elementary phenomenological "stratum" of the modern Romanian consciousness, crystallized, as we consider, into two moments: that of the "heroic culture" (approximately overlapping the 1848 period) and that of the "critical culture" which, although having its germs in the "heroic culture", will reach its climax with the Eminescu "moment".*

*"Sancta masserizzia" and the dawn of the modern European man. The human type in the Florentine Mediterranean area, in 16<sup>th</sup> century England, and in the 1848 Bucharest.*

W. Sombart considered that the "social type" newly emerging in Europe at the dawn of modernity was "formed within the bourgeois groups" comprising merchants or craftsmen, townsmen, and it could be located in Florence, towards the end of the quattrocento; "it had been of course born during the trecento"<sup>1</sup>. Besides being the representative of a social class, the "bourgeois" emerging in Florence embodies a new "human type, a new type of European man" that can be later on recognized in the entire series of social behaviors which mark the modern evolution of the modern world (from quattrocento until today). The representative figure of the new human type could be – still according to Sombart – the Florentine L. B. Alberti, whose letters allow us to emphasize the "state of mind" and the type of social behavior that are specific for this stage of the new historical cycle called modern evolution. We owe to Alberti the famous books on the "family behavior" (*Del governo della famiglia*) in and through which this new man at the gates of the modern era has drawn his spiritual portrait, transmitting it as such to the posterity.

"They have already been admired and read by his contemporaries; they have, even from their first appearance been considered as a classical treatise which other family fathers have used in their chronicles and in their memories, be it totally or only excerpts. Thus, Sombart concludes, the ideas which Alberti expressed in his books on family (...) were widespread in his time, and they reflect a general manner of seeing..."<sup>2</sup> (italics supplied).

L.B. Alberti is, therefore, a "representative figure" for the new series of social behaviors that is present in the European societies in the 16<sup>th</sup> century (1450 – 1640; according to I. Wallerstein's chronology). He is "representative" for the new type of social agent that succeeds the "project makers" in the European culture. Evidently this succession is not rigorously chronological, but it only has a cultural significance. In a certain way, the *albertine type* is simultaneous in the European time and space with the type of "project makers", to which it is very close, but from which it is also very distinct. As a representative figure, it has only expressed a new spiritual orientation, in which one can read the "historical option" of the European man, in relation to the state of interregnum. By this orientation and due to it, the new historical rationality and a new cultural paradigm will triumph, and it will mediate other spiritual framings of the early modern European's social behavior.

The new social behavior has European extension, because it is present both in the Mediterranean Europe - in the Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese world – and the north-western world. Still, as we shall see, it is not unitary, but contradictory, with discontinuous unfolding, with a spirit and a mentality that are anything but unitary. The Florentine society in the times of Leon Battista Alberti had a sensualist-empirical inclination, but through its new "propensity for form" (I. Burkhardt), it had surpassed the state of interregnum. In the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Sombart, *Le Bourgeois*, Paris, Payot, 1926, 129

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 130

“circles” (reunions) that are so brilliantly described by Burkhardt there were three series of behaviors: a. sensualist, focusing on frivolity, easy grace, on immoral little stories like those of Bandello, a famous character of that epoch; b. esthetical, intellectualistic, consisting of a taste for philosophy and music (reciting “canzone” was one of the daily conventions of organizing time in reunions that were dominated by the figure of the woman); c. rationalistic, so well synthesized in L. B. Alberti’s *Trattato del governo della famiglia*. For the sensualist behaviors, Lorenzo Magnifico’s *Hawk Hunt* is very significant, a work wherefrom we find that the Florentine was glad to praise in the most grandiose manner the pleasures of the life within the society. An extremely relevant element is the way in which Lorenzo satirically portrays Piovicino Arbatto, who: “wanting to regain his lost thirst was walking around with loafs of pastrami, a herring, a piece of cheese, a sausage, and four sardines hanging on his body (...), and all were cooking in sweat.”<sup>3</sup> In the society of the Italian city we also encounter the representative figure of the other type of social agent, which has forced social behavior out of interregnum – “the project maker” – as in the person of Castiglione. In the same world, in the same social space coexisted the model of “idealized society”, which Castiglione presents in Guidobaldo of Urbino’s yard as a supreme goal of life, with the model of a “society belonging to a type like Bandello, with all its frivolities,” an ideal which “gives the most proper measure of entertainment, of easy gracefulness”, just as in the same social space we also encounter the “delicate taste for poetry and art” and also the ideal of reforming the family expressed by L. B. Alberti, the one who, by his “treatise” sets the basis of the concept of “rationalist realism of the bourgeois household.”

This ideal will found a new historical series of social behaviors, as, eventually, “the desire for higher and higher forms in the social relations” will receive program, direction, and model precisely in and through L. B. Alberti’s *Trattato del governo della famiglia*. Thus, out of the three “desires for form”, giving expression to the three said social ideals, the one expressed by Alberti in his treatise will be the winner, the one which places in the center of the new cultural order the motif *Sancta masserizzia*. The utilitarian (instrumental) rationalism had decidedly won both against Castiglione’s “idealized society and against Bandello’s “sensualist society”.

The European man had placed at the center of the new cultural paradigm the *Sancta masserizzia*, which did not promote the sensualist orientation of distinction and of the fine taste for the arts, nor Castiglione’s idealizing-intellectualist one, but a new orientation which will conquer the behavior of the European man in all its dimensions, expressed by the “*common sense*” “with which all the problems of life within a community are examined and weighed.”<sup>4</sup> This orientation, this new model of action is expressed by the motif *sancta*

<sup>3</sup> I. Burkhardt, *Cultura renasterii in Italia (The renaissance Culture in Italy)*, Bucharest, 1969, 31

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 150,

*masserizzia*. As we have already mentioned, “the most valuable document in this respect is Leon Battista Alberti’s dialogical work, which refers to the art of administering a house. This is, in a summary made by J. Burkhardt, the content of this work: “There are all the details of keeping a big and rich house, which, through thinking things through in an efficient manner, and through leading a relatively moderate life, can ensure the happiness and welfare of an entire line of generations. To this one can add an “estate”, whose products cover the needs of the household, and maintains it from an economic point of view, a «household industry, a weaving mill, be it for wool or for silk». The house is solid, the furniture is valuable (...). *Everyday life has to be as simple as possible...*”<sup>5</sup> (italics supplied). All expenses, from those of representation to the pocket money of the youngest of the sons, are calculated according to rational divisions, and in no way to conventional ones. The “master of the house” gives education not only to the children but to the entire family: - first, he forms his wife (“a shy girl at the beginning”) in the direction of a *massaia* (wise mistress of the household), “teaching her how to lead her servants.” After he makes of her a true *massaia*, he raises his sons “by carefully watching over them,” and leading them “more with his authority than with his force. Then there are the servants and the employees, whom he forms “according to the same principles, so that he makes them feel tied to the house.”<sup>6</sup> Therefore, *masserizzia* is the new spirit of “domestic economy”, having become the object of rational construction, achieved by the *massaio* (the all-moderate and all-knowing master of his household). Economy, even in its form of domestic economy, has become the center of the master’s life, the object of his thoughts and actions, the supreme value of his life, of his activity, and of his feelings. Thus, rational economic activity is raised at the value of ideal of action, expressed in a new doctrine whose postulate is *Sancta masserizzia*. On the basis of the new postulate of the system of social action, the element of behavioral orientation, the *center of man’s life* is no longer *pleasure, the gallant party*, but the *household, the domestic economy*, “the holy spirit of order” which has to dominate all facts and actions. This is the great leap that took place in quattrocento Florence, the equivalent of a *historical reform of social behavior*; L. B. Alberti is the one who theorized it. Nothing of what concerns the household “has to be avoided by the consciousness” of a *massaio* (the master of the household), moreover, everything that a *massaio* has in mind has to gravitate around, to agree with, in one form or another, with the ideal of the *Sancta masserizzia*. In this respect, *Sancta masserizzia* becomes a social myth, it embodies the latent tendencies of a world, of a new society, and it guides the thought, the feeling, and the action. This new orientation is based on the “radical rejection of all maxims of the feudal, senior-like manner of living”<sup>7</sup> and on adopting new maxims, synthesized

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 150-151

<sup>7</sup> W. Sombart, *op.cit.*, 132

in the *Sancta masserizza* ideal, which, essentially, are maxims of “rationalizing economic behavior,” of the “economical spirit.” This ideal has as a noological axis, the following two maxims: 1. “Remember this well, my sons: your spending should never exceed your income” (*tenete questo a mente, figliuoli miei. Sieno le spese vostre piu che l'entrate vostre, non mai maggiori*). 2. “One nickel saved gives me greater honor than a hundred nickels spent.”<sup>8</sup>

We realize that we are witnessing here, in Florence, the great historic event by which the European man's social behavior irreversibly broke away from that of the senior, whose purpose was to spend as much as possible. The pleasure of spending and of consumption makes way in this renewed man to the pleasure of saving, or of reducing consumption, which would have seemed incomprehensible to the senior, to the ancient man.

These are other derived maxims, excerpted from Alberti's dialogue:

a) “The more waste of a bad thing, the more saving a good, useful, and praiseworthy thing”; b) “Saving does not damage anyone, and it is useful for the family,” c) “Saving is a sacred thing”; d) “Therefore I say: they are *massai*, good masters of their households and of their families, those who know how to strike a balance between what is too much and what is too less. Question: But how do we recognize what is too much and what is too less? Answer: With the help of a means that is easy to handle. Question: I would like to know what means. Answer: Here it is: no spending must exceed the limit of what is absolutely necessary, nor to be inferior in relation to what honesty requires.”<sup>9</sup>

Here we are, therefore, in this 15<sup>th</sup> Florentine century, in front of a new social behavior, directed by a new ideal, which refers in the same time to the European man's soul, body, and time. Sloth, lazy sensualism are all banished from the body, the spirit, and the time of the European man. Sombart believed that “*the doctrine of bourgeois virtues* (which he does not see as plenary represented in Alberti's *Treatise* – our note) did not suffer any intensive change from the quattrocento until now (...). What the following centuries have inculcated to successive bourgeois generations summarizes what Alberti had tried to inculcate to his disciples. Between the way of being of Leonard's grandfather (Leonardo da Vinci – our note) and that of Benjamin Franklin the difference is insignificant. The fundamental principles have not suffered radical modifications between the two epochs. Each century repeats them almost word by word, as they had been formulated by Alberti...”<sup>10</sup>

Sombart was searching and finding the evidence for the manifestation of the same human type in Spain, in France, in England, in America, through Benjamin Franklin, the one through whom the world's “bourgeois conception” reaches its climax. Sombart understood the genesis of the “bourgeois” type in a continuing, evolutionist manner.

<sup>8</sup> *cf.*, notes extracted by Sombart from Alberti's *Trattato*.... in *op.cit.*, 454

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> W. Sombart, *op.cit.*, 144

“...Thinking in a bourgeois manner had in time become an integrated part of the capitalist spirit, so that, Sombart underlines, the spirit of Leonardo’s grandfather (Leonardo da Vinci; therefore, the spirit emerging in the quattrocento – our note) animated circles that were both vast and numerous. (...) Leonardo’s grandfather and the father of the American republic are as similar as brothers. In the four centuries interval that separates them from each other, no feature of the painting suffered any change...”<sup>11</sup>

Sombart’s scheme is debatable because, as we have already mentioned, the European man in the new capitalist epoch is contradictory in time and space. *The new human type* underwent a process of transformation: *he was born in the quattrocento under the social form of a massaio*, in historical Florence, becoming a “gentleman pirate” in 16<sup>th</sup> century England, the one who set the bases of the mercantile-commercial Europe, and, through another process of historical transformation, it will acquire the image of the *utopian prophet*, of the national “messianic” in the Bucharest of 1848, represented by the figure of I. H. Radulescu, and in Transylvania through the series of the tribunes, represented by the prophetic and tragic figure of Avram Iancu. These transformations will, of course comprise the entire European area, so that limiting their unfolding to only one center – the quattrocento Florence, as Sombart does, or even to the entire Western Europe – would mean an “amputation” of one region or another in which the process has taken place in totally particular forms. This process relies on three distinct social types: “massaio” in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the “gentleman pirate” in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and the rationalist-utopian “messianic” in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. When we study the historical movement of cultures the insufficiency of the diffusive synchronism thesis, based on the model “center” – “periphery” is evident. The so-called “unity” of the European man in the modern epoch is in fact a unity in diversity. The cycle of modern culture comprises three historical series of relatively contradictory social behaviors, which are unitary only in one point: that of the “social myth” of a rational social unity, be it the *Sancta masserizza* or *Santa cetate* or the “legions” led by the tribunes of Avram Iancu’s Transylvanians, or on the southern bank of the Danube, the Aromanian *captains’ offices* led by the “captains.” The cultural paradigm has retained the same central element, the same orientation of social action in all 400 years, the ideas of the *instrumental “rationality” of the world and of an order so dear to God, guarded against all excesses, but, most of all, centered on the care for the more general order of life and of the world*, an idea that, in its essence, had been synthesized in Alberti’s *Sancta Masserizza*, and reiterated by Franklin’s 13 virtues: temperance, silence (discretion), order, decidedness, moderation, enthusiasm, loyalty, justice, self-control, purity, moral equilibrium, chastity, humbleness, or meekness. Both in Alberti’s treatise and in Franklin’s list of virtues we read the triumph of the Christian values and way of life, in the midst

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 150-151

of a bourgeois, capitalist mentality. The nucleus of the new social, capitalist system was formed, therefore, by Christian values, an issue entirely significant for the one who is interested in understanding the possibility of the European world's renewal at the dawn of modernity. The new world emerged everywhere on a clearly religious foundation which it will lose towards the end of modernity, sliding thus into the crisis of the end of a historical cycle, which philosophers mainly relate to the entire modern period. But how were the representatives of the new European man in 16<sup>th</sup> century England? Did they not really add anything to the behavioral maxims of the type theorized by L.B. Alberti? Here is their gallery: sir Walter Raleigh, whose slogan was "I serve both Mars and Mercury at the same time; Francis Drake, the "nobleman-pirate," sir Martin Frobisher, "scientist and dangerous pirate," etc. They inaugurate the "grand style merchant", who unites in the same person the "trinity": adventurer, pirate, and trader. He had a plundering warlike spirit," which "oriented all overseas relations."<sup>12</sup> Could this type be less significant for the European man and for the modern Europe as we know it?

Already after the Cateau-Chambresis peace, northeastern Europe becomes the center of the global European economy.<sup>13</sup> The towns of the Italian republic pass onto the second plan, after they had so closely tied their destiny to the habsburgic trend (the habsburgs' attempts under Charles V to absorb the entire Europe in their empire). The new European economic trend has two cycles. The first one has one end in 1450, then an ascending curve followed by a descending one, and the other end in 1557. It also expresses at the same time the failed attempt of the Spanish and French *empires* to incorporate the European economy. This is the historic period of the "failure of the empire," according to I. Wallerstein's expression, and it creates the conditions for the victory of another type of "global system," radically different from empires, founded on a "global economy." The mechanism of acquiring the surplus in the new global system is the market, while in the empires' "global system" the mechanism of acquiring the surplus was the tribute (Eisenstadt). The ascending phase of the first economic cycle in the 16<sup>th</sup> century determined prosperity for all commercial centers forming what is called "Europe's spine: Flanders, southern Germany, northern Italy, and Spain. The towns aspiring to become the center of the global European economy were Seville, Lisbon, Antwerp, Lyon, Genoa, and Hamburg. But none of these was prominent in 1600, but another one, which was not even a candidate for such a rank in 1450, Amsterdam."<sup>14</sup>

But if this economic cycle (beginning in 1450 and ending in 1557) consumed in the historical current of the "failure of the empire", only the second economic cycle (which begins around 1550 and ends in 1640) decisively imposes the new historical course of the rise of the modern European

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 91 and 96

<sup>13</sup> I. Wallerstein, *Social World Systems*, New York, Academic Press, 1974, 225

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 165

civilization. It is related to the modern international trade, so that the emergence of Europe's powerful states and the configuration of the West's new class structure are simultaneous processes with the expansion of international trade. The latter is now decisively related to the English agent. Beginning in 1550, industrial activity starts to concentrate in certain northwestern states and to be reduced in others.<sup>15</sup> Europe's industrial zone was divided into two areas: the area comprising northern Italy (the state-towns), France, and Switzerland, and the area comprising countries in northern Europe: England, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and Scotland.

In the first there was an important growth in the artistic and luxury industries products, a development of art, and handicraft, but only a weak growth of heavy industries (...). In the second area there was an unprecedented expansion of heavy industries and of products thereof"<sup>16</sup>. However, from our point of view, the essential issue is that of the human or social type related to this kind of differentiation, and thus it remains relatively incomprehensible. Or, as opposed to the Florentine *massaio*, we encounter a totally different type in the England of the epoch we refer to, that of the gentleman-pirate, an agglutination of some curious spiritual patterns.

The central event, the one which will reveal the true position of the "gentleman trader's" behavior with respect to the Florentine "il *massaio*" (in general, with respect to the urban north Italian merchant) is the transformation of the commercial pattern within the English trade, which has at least two distinct aspects: wool trade transforms, in this case, into textile (wool) products trade, and, on the other hand, the industry becomes rural. "Textile industry" is more and more a rural industry, and for England it involved the need to search for larger and larger export markets"<sup>17</sup>. This situation triggered the "restriction of foreign traders' activity, especially Italians – a process that took place in the 15<sup>th</sup> century."<sup>18</sup> The same restriction was imposed on the hanseatic traders a century later (in the 16<sup>th</sup> century). Thus, this is the origin of the "gentleman-merchant." *He originated in a rural area and was related to a certain attitude towards space, and even to a certain social configuration of the latter, which, as we will see, developed for him a completely different cosmogonic vision compared to that of a Florentine *massaio*. The English textile industry involved an entire regional space, a "hunger" for space which generated the entire politics of "enclosures" and of devastating those *masserizze* (rational households) of the banished English peasants, or, more precisely, to use the so plastic expression "eaten by sheep." The enclosed space, with a sole center was devastated, decentered, swallowed by the great regional space of borderless pastures, as in front of a growing textile industry, called forth by an international trade also*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* 226

<sup>16</sup> John U. Nef, *War and Human Progress*, Norton, New York, 1963, p. 6, also quoted by I. Wallerstein in *op. cit.*, 226

<sup>17</sup> I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, 228

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 339



borderless and without a center, yesterday's margins of the nobleman's pastures became points from which the rush for new lands was launched once again. The English nobleman acquires a new attitude towards space, and at the same time a new vision of the latter, a space without center and borders, a regional space which did not have its center or its borders within it, but in the productive capacity of the new textile industry. The attitude towards lands incorporated in the pasture space is transposed by the English nobleman into commercial attitude towards the new markets, in order to present his textiles. In front of the setback registered by textiles trade and in relation to the need to sell on many markets (thus the area of commercial competitiveness and the dimensions of political difficulties involved by the conquest of new markets being enlarged), the "gentleman-merchant" transposes the new type of social behavior – the expansionist one, of conquering new spaces – into a new model of commercial organization: *The Fellowship of Merchant Adventurers of London*, created in 1486. It monopolized the export relations with Antwerp, and thus the expansionist social behavior is definitely fixed into institutional structures, and therefore regulated, launching the model of a new norm of rationality, a norm that orients behavior towards the exterior, and not towards the interior of domestic economy (towards the attachment of new commercial spaces and raw material providing spaces). *Sancta masserizzia* had developed the model of a space with only one center – the household – and is model of rationalizing behavior referred to the actions of a *massaio* (the master) within its domestic economy. The new rationality had indeed developed the mentality of the economic calculation – a new feature for the behavior of the European man – but it aims at only one term – "masserizzia". The rationalization way of a *massaio* can be classified into what L. Blaga called rationalization through "generic concepts", which permits "the organization of both the empirical and theoretical world into larger and larger (upwards) and tighter and tighter (downwards) "generic concepts.""<sup>19</sup> This is the mental model of a *massaio* directed by the "Sancta masserizzia." He acts through a rationalization by gradually enlarged stages of the social-economic world of his household: first he educates himself *in the spirit of the new concept – model -* of behavior, then *he extends his behavior upon those around him* – his wife, then his children, the servants, the employees, etc. – so that, gradually, *the complex system of simple interactions* represented by the "masserizzian" economy will be integrated into the order requested by the new spirit ( the new ideal of behavior). "Sancta maserizzia" is thus the "symbolic center," the "generic concept," on which the rationalization of the domestic economy will be founded, and the behaviors of its members will be gradually placed under the imperative of the new maxim: "do not spend more than you earn." Of course this new maxim is based on a mentality operating with calculations, but, as we have said, the calculation

<sup>19</sup> Lucian Blaga *Experimentul și spiritul matematic (The Experiment and the mathematical spirit)*, Bucharest, Editura Științifică (Publishing House), 1969, 173 - 174

scheme is in accordance with the Euclidian spatial models – with only one center. It is precisely this type of rationality that was replaced when the “gentleman – pirate” emerged on the historical stage. The latent, unconscious, obvious spatial model, which orients his actions, is completely different. *As such, the calculation scheme and the manner of rationalizing the empirical world which this social type will develop are different from those of a massaio.* His rationalization manner can be classified under what Blaga called the type of “rationalization on the line of the contradictory identity. This type of rationalization is the one that we currently name – dialectic manner. The dialectic manner is constituted by the most concessive adaptation of rationality to the structures and articulations of the empirical world.

The dialectic manner *searches the similar not only in various forms, but also under contradictory forms* (italics supplied).<sup>20</sup> Thus, it is clear the distinction between the mental schemes of the two (“massaio” and “gentleman-pirate”). *The first adapts the structures of the empirical world to a generic concept (of a platonic order), the second one acts in an opposite direction, adapting rationality to the structures of the empirical world. His spatial model admits several centers and no borders, wherefrom the idea that the similar can acquire “contradictory forms.”* His scheme is therefore based on a calculation with two or more competing terms, therefore, in a contradictory relation, so that the rationalization interest is displaced from the *term* itself to the *relation* between terms, which can be marked, as we have shown, even by *opposite tendencies*. From the fact that in such a situation each of the two has to chose between two strategies – “being aggressive” or “being cooperative” – a “pervert structure” is developed, in that none of them has the first preference for the cooperative strategy. Each of them has the advantage of choosing the strategy of aggressiveness in the case he is right to be afraid that the other one will be aggressive. In this kind of system, the competitor (to read, the trader, the merchant), notices that irrespective of the other’s option (in relation to the two strategies of action) he is in the best situation by choosing the strategy of aggressiveness. If the other is being aggressive, he will use the strategy of aggressiveness in a defensive manner, and if the other chooses the strategy of cooperation, he will use aggressiveness in an offensive way. Therefore, his aggressiveness reveals as being the preferentially-dominant strategy for both competitors. Thus one can explain why the “gentleman-merchant” becomes a “trader-pirate” whose code of behavior is fixed in the norms of a corresponding institution: *Merchant Adventurers*. In the competition with merchants in the Netherlands, *Merchant Adventurers* act in a manner that “calculatedly avoids” any kind of commitment, “maintaining themselves in a position of economically favorable transaction.”<sup>21</sup> *The “gentleman-pirate”, the “nobleman-trader”, had invented a new type of social behavior, which will defeat the behavior based on*

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 175

<sup>21</sup> I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, 230

*the Sancta masserizzia ideal*. No matter how strange it seems, the modern variant of capitalist social behavior in the mercantile epoch is developed in the space of the rural industry and not in that of the urban productions of the Italian state-towns. In fact, between 1550 and 1600 England begins to lead capitalist Europe, and the center of the new international system "moves" from the Mediterranean area to the north of Europe. This change is not reducible to the simple fact of the development of industrial techniques (let us not forget that Spain maintained a textile commerce whereby it successfully competed with England), but it is mainly related to the fact that *The Merchant Adventurers* had invented a new type of social behavior, a lot more efficient in relation to the new condition created precisely by those textile industries. In the new circumstances it was not the techniques in themselves that were important, but the social behaviors putting them in action, that is, the spiritual and mental structure of the new social agent.

A social behavior is, through the values and symbols it participates in, in relation to a culture in its ensemble, which it redefines, it reorders in a new vision on the world, but from which it can never break, except with the price of a dangerous deculturation, of a historical regression. If we keep in mind the *Merchant Adventurer*, we will be able to bring as argument in the support of this idea, even I. Wallerstein's conclusion which proves that the success of the English merchant was related to the "new" English society in its entirety. England's position was distinct from the position of other commercial powers by a complex of aspects which we will only enumerate: a) its taxation system was a lot less oppressive than those of other old commercial centers (Flanders, northern Italy) and its technical organization was at that time more economical, thus ensuring the advantage of competitiveness compared to the other centers; b) the internal unification in an early period (the monarchical centralization and the "administrative revolution of kings Henry and Tudor), which explains England's ability to pursue its industrial advantages in the "second stage" of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. c) England had already developed a powerful and centralized main city, a both economic and cultural force, and, as a consequence, the capacity of maintaining an internal peace without a *standing army*, etc. thus, from inner unity and outer trade, the "nobleman-pirate" was born, the man who was at the same time merchant adventurer, on world's seas, an politician (citizen) with powerful religious conviction within the monarchic state. The entire 17<sup>th</sup> century and then the 18<sup>th</sup> century represent the period in which the type of behavior of the merchant adventurer was generalized, which determined Goethe to say: "War, trade and piracy form an indivisible trinity."<sup>22</sup>

The Dutch company of the Oriental Indies had such "heads", characterized by a warlike disposition, doubled by entrepreneurial spirit. The risk had become the new means of rationality, and aggressiveness its sole form

---

<sup>22</sup> W. Sombart, *op. cit.*, 97

of manifestation. This is what E. Laspeyres writes about the Dutch merchants: "At the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Dutch displayed warlike dispositions, and this because trade was then a true adventure; all discovered regions were rapidly exploited, and when a region ceased to bring great benefits, they oriented towards others, and they started to exploit new branches."<sup>23</sup>

But in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the ideal expressed by *Sancta masserizzia* reappears within another historical series of social behaviors, which reveals another hypostasis of the European man in the modern cycle of his evolution. The new series expresses the attempt to develop a new model of social behavior, which to reconcile the ideal put forth by *Sancta masserizzia*, with the "new spirit" that had emerged together with Merchant Adventurers in the mercantile epoch. The fact that the new model of behavior proves to be utopian helps us understand that the western European cultural paradigm did not yet have a real solution for reconciling the two opposite tendencies in the modern European man's personality: the tendency for rationalization and equilibrium "at home" (illustrated by *Sancta masserizzia*), a Christian pattern of social personality, and the expansive, non-rational tendency for a devastating attitude in the "external area." This is the (antinomian) pattern of structuring the "capitalist spirit" which Sombart considered "homogeneous:: a behavior according to a self-centered capitalism, whose ideal was *masserizzia*, a construction at the center of which was *il massaio*, the "master of the house", guided by an economic morale, having a Christian nucleus, and an expansionist, aggressive capitalist behavior in the exterior, well defined by the merchant - warrior - adventurer "trinity." Through the ideal of the *Sancta masserizzia*, which guided in its first phases the Florentine bourgeois's behavior, the capitalist spirit was in relation both with the ancient model of the Roman house, considered a *sacred place*, and with the pattern of the "Christian householder," preoccupied of making out of the Christian virtues founding values of his household. For the "gentleman-pirate," *massaio* is a petit-bourgeois. The vision of the world for the two is opposite. Their cosmogonic models come from different sources: one is platonic, the other one is Kantian; one comes from the Greek-Roman (Latin) cultural paradigm, and the other from the Nordic, Anglo-Saxon cultural paradigm.

Capitalist behavior of Florentine model (the Latin spirit) is emerges again in Eastern Europe, but here there is a modification: the *masserizzia* of the individualist Florentine merchant is here the "nation", the "people." Serving in a rational (the new, modern spirit in Romanian culture) one's country, leading it on the path of fulfillment, of its "mission" is the new call for the modern European man of Romanian variant. Nothing is above raising one's "nation." Alberti's *Sancta masserizzia* becomes *Santa cetate* with I.H. Radulescu. *Massaio* is here the "prophet of the nation," the "spirit of rationalization," of the "domestic economy," "becomes "national positive messianism." Just as Alberti

---

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 96

had discovered a rational norm for the expenses of a *massaio*, the forty-eighter was searching a rational norm for the expenses of the one responsible for the nation's wealth. From Dinicu Golescu (the one who had the nostalgia of the expenses fruitful for the nation) to C. Conachi (preoccupied with the moral reform of society), to I.H. Radulescu and M. Eminescu ("the theory of compensation") there is the same "modern spirit" of rationality, of the equilibrium between what is spent and what is earned. The modern Romanian's "masserizza" is the country, the "holy city." Eminescu bemoaned the weariness of the Romanian people. The order which leads to the degradation of the biological background of a people, to its social declassing and to cultural decline is not a rational order. Seen from Bucharest, the "holy spirit of order" of modern capitalism, as it appeared to Sombart in the western metropolis, appears destructive, irrational, blind and rapacious. The face it turned towards London, Berlin, Paris, Florence is radiant, rational, just, but the face it turned towards Bucharest, Sofia, Belgrade, is dark and hideous, it is a "monster" totally hostile to these "young nations" in the east of Europe, which yearned for harmony. This is how, in three European places (the Mediterranean area, the Nordic and the Eastern one), just as many different visions of the "capitalist spirit" emerge, and just as many hypostases for the type of the capitalist. A "nobleman-pirate" in London, and "massaio" in Florence, he becomes salesman and money lender in Moldavia, or budget-pension "politician" in Bucharest. Against this series of social behavior, the ideal of the *sancta masserizza* is reaffirmed through the symbol of the "Holy city," expressing a collective need for rationalizing social behavior in the area belonging to the "Danube's Latin people" (Eminescu). Between its first doctrinary- symbolical expression (Alberti's Treatise) and this last one (an ideological cycle starting with Alberti's "Sancta masserizza" and ending with Heliade Radulescu's poem *Santa Cetate* (the Holy City)) there is an interval of 400 years. Meanwhile, the utopian socialism, especially the Fourierist one, a sort of evangelist socialism, had itself resuscitated, in a doctrinary expression (the "societary" theory), the same Florentine ideal regarding the rationalization of the bourgeois "household," so that *Sancta masserizza* can be considered a representation of a perennial ideal of the modern man. On the other hand, precisely because the Fourierist socialism developed a new doctrine, a more complex one, in relation to this social ideal, explains why Heliade does not go directly to Alberti's Treatise. In its essence, however, the ideological cycle wherefrom *Sancta Cetate* was born expresses the same social ideal which had oriented Alberti's behavior as well. This is why we have considered that in both time and space, the area of European synchronization of the Romanian "heroic culture" is a lot larger, and it does not only refer to the *circulation of literary motifs and idea*, but also of the circulation of *social ideals*, and especially of *social ideals*. Moreover, this circulation is not imitative, but creative (L. Blaga) and it answers collective needs and not certain individual intellectualist aims. The creator who, borrowing cultural elements from other areas, gives the shape

of a new work under the impulse of this collective need, does so by placing himself at the service of a social ideal. In order to acquire the complete form in the cultural work, the new ideal has to be the deep expression of an "exemplary personality." The affirmation of the new ideal thus passes through the transformation of the type of personality (the social type of man). It is on the success of this process that depend the new ideal's force and expansion. A representative figure for the type of social personality on the transition epoch in the Romanian area is Costache Conachi. In his spiritual formula the two tendencies present in the type of social personality in the transition epoch in the whole of Europe are confronting each other. In his way, as a social pattern, Costache Conachi prefigures I. H. Radulescu, and completely portrays the inner torments of the man who no longer belongs to the old world, but who does not succeed in passing to the new world from its very beginning either. This type of man had to emerge at that moment and we have identified him in Costache Conachi's representative figure, whose inner portrait we have found painted with matchless art in a very beautiful book, unique in its own way, by Eugen Simion. Without this landmark book, our access to the inner portrait of Costache Conachi would have been rather difficult, if not utterly impossible.