

# WORKS

## NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI

ON THE SOURCING OF MONEY(S) – THE HEGEMON (PRINCE) – HOW THE  
DUKE EXTIRPATES (EXTERMINATES) HIS OPPONENTS – THE  
INSURRECTIONISTS OF VAL – DISSERTATIONS ON TITUS LIVIUS (LIVY) – ON  
THE SITUATION IN FRANCE AND IN GERMANY

VOLUME ONE

## INTRODUCTION-SELECTION- TRANSLATION

## TAKIS KONDYLLIS

EDITIONS “KALVOS”, ATHENS, 1984

(FIRST PUBLISHED 1971 / 1972 (SEE HORST, G., *PANAJOTIS KONDYLLIS. LEBEN UND  
WERK – EINE ÜBERSICHT*, KÖNIGSHAUSEN & NEUMANN, WÜRZBURG, 2019. S. 321))

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK INTO THE BARBARIAN IDIOM BY THE  
KRAZY MAN BARBARIAN IDIOT

© 2025 – WHENEVER

# CONTENTS

PROLOGUE	3
NOTE ON THE LIFE OF NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI	7
INTRODUCTION	9

*The second volume (approximately 500 pages) will include the “Analysis of Florentine things (affairs)”, the “Art of War”, the “Memorandum to Raffaello de' Girolami”, the “Florentine History”, the “Belfagor”, the “Mandrake (Mandragola)” and Epistles*

[THE REMAINDER OF THE TWO VOLUMES ARE P.K.’S GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF MACHIAVELLO’S ITALIAN TEXTS, WHICH KRAZY MAN WOULDN’T TRANSLATE EVEN IF HE EVER FINISHED THE INTRODUCTION]

# PROLOGUE

The fact is well-known and eloquent that in this ill-fated (doomed, damned, ill-starred) birthplace of philosophy, there does not exist even one systematic interpretative presentation of the texts of a or b great European thinker; I remind us that here, in order to simply say that we do not need to seek any particular reasons, for which Machiavelli's work is essentially unknown in our country<sup>1</sup>, beyond general reasons of general delay (retardation)<sup>2</sup>. Only the "Hegemon / Prince" saw the light [of day] in Greek, whilst the minimal number of things written about Machiavelli, even though they were not all published in newspapers, remain at this or that level of newspaper columns and opinion pieces, and their authors were inspired at times by the goddess Fame and at other times by the goddess Fortune<sup>3</sup>. Of the presentations of the "Hegemon / Prince", leaving aside a minimal number of others, which are not worth the effort of being referred to, I'll mention two. The first was published in Athens in 1909, and the name of the translator is given with his initials, P. H (/ Ch).; the translation is most cold (frosty), but most precise [too], and is accompanied by extensive selected writings of Neocles Kazazis (1849-1936), of that scraggly (bony, harsh) old man erudite in law. In the small prologue of the translator, the Hegemon / Prince is connected with the man who will appear (be revealed) in order to resurrect humiliated and always-in-sorrow /

<sup>1</sup> Greece [the footnotes are by the Krazy Man and the endnotes are P.K.'s notes to his Introduction].

<sup>2</sup> Rest assured, folks, that the various “professorases” and “commentators” in “Gris” today are more retarded than a retarded JOO born of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-INCEST.

<sup>3</sup> AAAAA-HAAA!!

agony / anguish (badly suffering) Greece; and Kazazis, again, views Machiavelli above all like the great patriot with the high morale (cast of mind, mentality) and the enthusiastic faith, which showed the way / path / road towards / for the national unification of Italy and made the need for a strong man felt, the only man capable of realising this unification. It is extremely characteristic that such an interpretation was given in regard to Machiavelli, when the Greek statelet, crushed by military defeats, economic bankruptcies and political corruption, agonisingly sought a way out, a redemption; and this interpretation has no small significance for the historian of the epoch of [the movement of] Goudi<sup>4</sup>. On the other hand, the translation by Nikos Kazantzakis<sup>5</sup> constitutes a splendid achievement in/of style and the alive, luscious, juicy and curt, staccato, cutting discourse of the “Hegemon / Prince” gives richness (abundance, copiousness, roughness); however, Kazantzakis did not posit interpretative, but only stylistic, problems in his translation, with the result of the existence in it of a number of, more serious and not so serious, conceptual mistakes. Despite all of that, I would desire very much to include here certain chapters from his translation, recognising my debt to his endeavour and wanting to honour the memory of someone whose, in my opinion, greatest offering to our<sup>6</sup> letters was one of plasticity in language and of translation; however, the obstacle which stood in the way was / were again those notorious intellectual property rights of the inheritors (heirs) [of the Kazantzakis estate] and the narrow perspective of their local administrators (“How much [moolah] do you give?”).

This presentation, which shall extend to two volumes, has the ambition of encompassing whatever was the most essential which flowed from Machiavelli’s pen. However, the problem of selection automatically raises the problem of interpretation,

---

<sup>4</sup> Η νύχτα της 14ης προς 15η Αυγούστου του 1909 για τη μικρή Αθήνα των 80.000 κατοίκων ήταν ξεχωριστή. Από νωρίς κυκλοφορούσε η φήμη πως η εκδήλωση στρατιωτικού κινήματος ήταν ζήτημα ωρών κι όντως τα πράγματα δεν είχαν διαφορετικά. Εκείνη τη νύχτα, λοιπόν, άμαξες και στρατιωτικά ιππήλατα οχήματα κουβαλούσαν ασταμάτητα αξιωματικούς και στρατιώτες στο Γουδί, στο χώρο δηλαδή που τότε βρίσκονταν οι εγκαταστάσεις της φρουράς των Αθηνών. Με την ανατολή του ηλίου στο πεδίο ασκήσεων του στρατοπέδου βρίσκονταν συγκεντρωμένοι 449 αξιωματικοί, 2.546 στρατιώτες και ναύτες και 67 χωροφύλακες, όλοι οπλισμένοι, διαθέτοντας επιπλέον και 22 πυροβόλα. Οι συγκεντρωμένες στρατιωτικές δυνάμεις διακήρυξαν την αντίθεσή τους προς την κυβέρνηση της χώρας εκφράζοντας ταυτόχρονα την υποστήριξή τους προς το πρόγραμμα του «Στρατιωτικού Συνδέσμου», στις εντολές του οποίου υπάκουαν. Τα αίτια που προκάλεσαν το στρατιωτικό κίνημα, όπως τα περιέγραψε αργότερα στα απομνημονεύματά του ο αρχηγός του «Στρατιωτικού Συνδέσμου» Ν. Ζορμπάς ήταν: «Η Βουλευτοκρατία και η συναλλαγή, η οικονομική δυσπραγία ένεκα της πλημμελούς φορολογίας, επιβαρυνούσης ιδίως τας λαϊκάς τάξεις, η κακή απονομή της δικαιοσύνης και η έλλειψις δημοσίας ασφαλείας, ο ατυχής πόλεμος του 1897, το Κρητικόν ζήτημα και το απαράσκευον του κράτους προς οιαδήποτε πολεμικήν δράσιν [[+ ή πτώχευσις του 1893]]». *Πρξοπάστις*, Κυριακή 12 Αυγούστου 2001, (<https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=903432>).

IF A NON-GREEK IS INTERESTED (I DON’T SEE HOW, EVEN I’M NOT INTERESTED ANYMORE), DO A CUT AND PASTE JOOGLE-TRANSLATION ...

<sup>5</sup> 1883 – 1957. Great man of letters, Super-EGO (he thought he was divine !!!), Great ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-STOOGIE, best known in the Anglo-sphere for Zorbas the “teach me to dance, Zorbas – Dance ? You say dance ? Well dance !!!” Greek, even though his *Odyssey* is as great an achievement for the Krazy Man Greek reader.

<sup>6</sup> Modern Greek.

and for the former to be resolved, the solution to the latter is presupposed. The interpretation is carried out in the introduction, which, despite all the effort at limiting it, spread out somewhat disproportionately; nevertheless, every shortcut / abbreviation would be a dangerous simplification or deficient validation / substantiation : for that reason, I preferred to write several pages more, with the hope that the informed reader will find those elements which justify them (the several pages more), not as the making known of things already said, but rather as the attempt at a new conception / comprehension. The interpretation, therefore, dictates the selection, yet the selection is obliged to include, apart from the theses/positions which support the interpretation, also whatsoever still constitutes a point indicative or contradicting, controversial in the Machiavellian texts, whatever is usually mentioned in the icy columns of the references. Finally, the translation posits/poses separate problems, its own. Machiavelli's style, albeit always elegant, in his other texts comes about as more protracted and drawn-out than in the "Hegemon / Prince", and always depends upon each and every respective disposition and the interest of the author. Apart from this here microcosm of his, he also has in parallel his macrocosm, all, that is, the style (stylistics) of Italian prose from Boccaccio and later, and the translator must move equally comfortably in both. Now, since the language of the transfer(ence) / transportation of the Italian text is Greek, that means that between these two languages, not only the grammatical and syntactical relations, but also their historical bonds, ties must be pointed out as props of translation, which begin with the injection / inoculation of elements from the time of Frankish Rule and peak / culminate with the remoulding (metamorphosis) of Italian models in Cretan theatre. Animated by the experience of the translation of Machiavelli, I would like to indicate as an excellent area, sector of study for the linguist or literary scholar those historical bonds, ties of the Italian language with the Greek language, whose, incidentally, knowledge directly interrelates with the understanding of important sectors, areas of our more recent literature, starting with Solomos's work and the School of the Ionian islands (Heptanesa / Seven Islands between Greece and Italy).

In conclusion, I thank all those friends who covered with their offers the proverbial destitution, want, penury of our libraries or who helped in the re-working (processing) of the introduction and the translation. Out of respect for their modesty, I (shall) keep them anonymous.

TAKIS KONDYLLIS

**N.B. For the translation, apart from the semantic analyses of passages which are given by various interpreters in their works, the more recognised German and English translations were taken into account too. The language of the translation in part accepts the morphological, form-related and phonological variety of the demotic language, deliberately following in regard to that the language of the original. On the other hand, the interpretive notes were limited to inaccessible (and not only to the Greek reader) incidents of European history or to the explanation of institutions which are referred to in the texts or in the indication of certain inaccuracies, not so much because these provoke the touchy conscience of the linguist / literary scholar, but because they reveal the mechanisms of Machiavelli's thought. Points are not clarified, illustrated, elucidated whose explanation is deduced, inferred, presumed from the careful reading of the texts; moreover, knowledge of Greek and Roman history is necessarily presumed.**

**. . . fortune gave it and, not knowing how to  
speak of either wool's or of silk's works,  
either of gains or of losses, it befits me to talk  
of the state, and I must either swear an oath  
that I shall be silent or that I shall speak  
about that.**

**N. Machiavelli**

**(epistle to Vettori, 9.4.1513)**

**N. Machiavelli was born in Florence on 3<sup>rd</sup> of May 1469, son of the lawyer Bernard M., who also had two older daughters and one son younger than Niccolò. On the 19<sup>th</sup> of June of 1498, a little after the overturning of Savonarola, he becomes the secretary of the second Chancellery of Florence and immediately thereafter the secretary of the Ten (of the ministry of External/Foreign Affairs and Defence, we would say today). In 1501 he marries Marieta Corsini from whom he shall acquire five children, four boys and a girl. He participates wholeheartedly in his work, he processes a volume, bulk of correspondence and takes part, officially as the second person usually, in many missions: to France (1500, 1504, 1510, 1511), to the German Emperor (1507 – 1508), to the papal court (1503, after the death of Alexander VI Borgia and, immediately thereafter, of his successor Pius III, in order to be present at the election of a new pope; and 1506, when he accompanies pope Julius II in his campaign against Imola and Bologna), to Ceasar Borgia (summer 1502, autumn 1502 – January 1503; in the autumn of 1503 he sees Borgia again in Rome, now defeated), to Caterina Sforza at Forli (1499) and still in many more, in neighbouring cities. He repeatedly finds himself on the battlefield during the long-standing siege of Pisa (it surrendered in 1509), whilst in 1506,**

wanting to enforce a personal plan of his, he gathers men in order to form national guard units, which appeared in Pisa as well. In 1512, the Spaniards bring to Florence again the Medici, in exile from 1494, and expel Piero Soderini, elected for life to the administration of the city from 1502. Immediately thereafter, M. loses his position too, whilst at the beginning of the next year he is arrested and tortured, suspected of participation in a conspiracy against the Medici. He withdraws to the paternal / ancestral estate of San Casiano, outside of Florence, where he writes the “Hegemon / Prince” and starts the “Dissertations”. At the same time, he does whatever he can to approach the new rulers and to win again a new position. He frequents the humanistic circle of the Orti Oricellari, he supplements the “Dissertations”, he writes the “Art of War” and most of his literary works (1515 – 16 and so on/following); and he corresponds with Vettori, ambassador to Rome, whom he asks to intercede / mediate on his account / behalf. Cardinal Julius de’ Medici assigns, delegates to him the writing of the “Florentine History” and M. presents in 1525 in Rome its first eight books, when he (the said Cardinal) is by then pope Clement VII. He is in constant contact with Guicciardini and he travels to Lucca and to Carpi for matters which they assign, delegate to him, probably of a private nature. Finally, they entrust to M. a public office, to supervise the repair of the walls of Florence (1526). However, he runs out of time to enjoy his partial restoration, because in the following year the Medici are overturned, and M.’s old faction, sceptical, suspicious now of him, does not bring him back / restore him to his previous office, position. Embittered and ill, he dies (with)in a few days (21 June 1527).



# Introduction<sup>7</sup>

From the point of view of chronological division, Machiavelli's life has such a schema, form, shape, that the/a simultaneous biographical and theoretical presentation is made easier within (inside) one sole study. If he follows this path, way, road, the researcher will first describe Machiavelli's action as [the action of] a political person, paying attention to stress those experiences which will later mark his works; reaching 1512, when / whereat Machiavelli's public activity stops, the interpreter will summarise its essence and will follow how this (public activity) was utilised / given value inside Machiavelli's by now written work, which is uninterrupted from 1512 and thereafter, and includes nearly all his writings, if we exclude his diplomatic reports. This approach (which illustrious, prominent studiers of Machiavelli followed) has the advantage that it proceeds by having as its compass two systems of reference together, the biographical and the theoretical; its disadvantage is that it excludes, in principle, the comprehension of Machiavelli from inside the prism of a more general methodology and with wider presuppositions, a methodology which could formulate interpretive claims about the life and the work of other personalities. In this way, however, the fear exists of factors remaining outside of the analysis which were / stood as very significant for the formation of Machiavelli's thought, even if they cannot be directly and tangibly traced inside his course of life / bioprocess and its interrelations / relevancies. That is why, whoever benefits from the external / outer perspicuity, sharpness of Machiavelli's life's arrangement and wants to rest/support the method of his approach on a symptomatically suitable, appropriate, expedient, opportune element, runs the risk of finding in the theme, topic he is examining solely the limited and the peculiar, idiosyncratic, but not also the threads which lead to more catholic, universal, general phenomena. Yet in this way a thinker is narrowed down and done an injustice / is wronged.

---

<sup>7</sup> Pages 15 to 187 of the 1984 Greek edition.

On the other hand, there exists the orthodox and somewhat trite, banal more methodological schema of the placing, putting, positioning of a personality inside its epoch. The worst case of the application of that schema is when the general features, characteristics, traits, attributes of an epoch are given (assuming they are given in perfect fullness and the criteria of their selection are right) and directly thereafter the general features of the personality are placed next to/beside and parallel to one another, without points of contact with the former; the simple / mere enumeration of the general features of an epoch in order for a personality to be exhausted appears to be here enough, as if this (personality) were solely their mirror: but then all the personalities which lived in the same epoch would have to be the same<sup>8</sup>. Things are presented better when the colour gradations of the painting which depicts the/an epoch correspond with those of the painting which depicts the personality, whilst the two paintings are not simply (in) parallel, but are connected with horizontal lines as well. And the schema is even fuller when the points of the painting of the epoch do not correspond rectilinearly (in a straight line, lineally) with the points of the painting of the personality, but are reached with diagonal (oblique, slanted, crosswise, abeam, transverse) lines, curves and crooked / twisted lines – when, that is, a serious attempt is made at the discovery and the reduction of the many and complicated social and psychological factors. Irrespective, however, of the sufficiency of its application, this schema suffers organically, because it is obliged to move at the level of abstraction, of the fictitious (fictional, fictive) construct(ion). The creature (figment) here is the “epoch” whose fundamental features are summarised / summed up, classified and are attributed retrospectively to the people who lived in it (i.e. the said “epoch”). However, the general and abstract image of the “epoch” is hysterogenic<sup>9</sup> (i.e. retrospective / backward-looking / one that comes about after the fact (ex post facto)), and nor could it ever be anything else; it is a logical construct(ion), an ideal type, an organ, instrument of research and of understanding, that is, by definition it has inside it as something intense the conventional element, and moreover, it directly depends on the level of our own positive kinds of knowledge, consequently it is subject to revision on account of / for purely technical reasons. The abstract comprehension and negotiation of historical forces contains, directly or indirectly, their onto-poiesis (i.e. entityisation, manifestation as beings) (which perhaps is the idealised nootropic remnant of primitive anthropo-poia,

---

<sup>8</sup> Which has never been the case anywhere in any era.

<sup>9</sup> Nothing to do with “hysteria” here (Greek: ὑστερογενής).

i.e. humanisation as in the making of humans), that is, their observation as self-existent and self-sufficient beings, who stand above humans, people. However, these forces are presented as impersonal only (and solely) because in reality they are incomprehensibly many-faced, because they exist and act by means of infinite bearers. Solely these bearers here are real, more or less scattered; the “epoch”, either as the systematisation of factual data, either as the “spirit of the epoch” of objective idealism, does not exist in itself.

If this is right, then the interpretation of personality by means of its reduction to an epoch constructed in terms of theory retrospectively, of essence (at (its) depth) is not but a tautology, since in this way we take the live / living nucleus / core of an epoch (which, of its own justice / automatically, constitutes a sector of the personality under investigation too), we project it (the said living nucleus) on our fictive painting and thereafter we restore, revive it (bring it back), transformed into an interpretive principle, in order to analyse areas, regions of the world from where we took it (the said living nucleus). (Here it must be noted that, since the theoretical construct(ion) is retrospective (hysteronogenic, made ex post facto), it will characterise the “epoch” on the basis of its elements which a f t e r w a r d s proved to be more predominant, but which t h e n perhaps were balanced / brought into equilibrium with their counterbalancing elements). Consequently, the (by) chance / coincidental / accidental general features of an epoch, which we encounter most definitely varied in the world of the personality, the personality has not engaged / employed them in their unchanged (as they were in the beginning) and pure, clean form, with which we (re)present, depict them in our theoretical image – even though the existence of this theoretical image, with the unequivocal features, easily suggests to us such a deluded, misled, duped, deceived idea. The tendencies of the epoch reach the personality through incidents of life of individual, specific, everyday, daily contacts, through a thousand contacts of every hour with a tangible aspect of society. Thus, the personality is permeated by the epoch in a way much deeper, much more inwardly (as to consciousness), rather than finding its (the personality’s) basic features collected somewhere and adopted all at once, and on account of that undigested / without being digested. And again, since the epoch permeates the personality by means of multiple bearers, in relation to which every one of those bearers embodies in a partial and insufficient manner the general features of the epoch, it follows from that, that the personality will mould, shape, form its world with numerous refractions and contra-reflections, but with far fewer catholic, universal,

general and abstract representations. The differences from personality to personality arise because the multitude and the many-sidedness of the refractions of every individual makes impossible their coincidence with the refractions of some other individual, and moreover, because all the refractions together fall upon the, in the beginning, different biological and psycho-intellectual texture of every individual<sup>10</sup>.

If, therefore, we want to place people / humans in their epoch, we can imagine the epoch as a common base of countless (and uneven) pyramids (of various heights), with every one of them diverging more or less from the other pyramids, and thus has with the other pyramids more or less/fewer common points – from the greatest possible difference, which the common base allows, up to identification (i.e. the equating of one with another). The angle of view / viewpoint, with which we ought to look at the base, the epoch (when our end/goal/purpose is to interconnect it (i.e. the epoch) with a personality) will be different, in accordance with how acute(-angular/angled) the pyramid of every personality is, and with what kind of visual field its (the personality's) opening offers us. Hence, we shall try to see the epoch not in some clean, pure existence it has in common with everyone, but as a general trend / tendency which is impressed in everyone in a particular and fragmented manner. With that, certainly, the schema “personality – epoch” is not surpassed, overcome, and neither does today's level of our knowledge regarding / about social phenomena allow / permit us to surpass, overcome it in a scientific manner. But that is not a reason why we should not ceaselessly recollect its restrictions.

## I

The difference between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance can *grosso modo* / in a rough / general fashion be summarised in the difference between feudal and early capitalistic / proto-capitalistic economy and society. However, this distinction does not represent two separate and successive historical stages; it more so suggests, implies the integration, inclusion, incorporation of two extreme characteristic features of two

---

<sup>10</sup> There is no necessary direct (and exclusive) correlation between epoch and individual personality traits. Individual personality traits up to types can be found across many up to all epochs, just as different epochs can have characteristics in common, as well as their from-epoch-to-epoch differences.

historical periods in two ideal types. The intense contrast, antithesis, opposition of these two ideal types is not due so much to the fact that historically their content(s) was counterposed / contrasted equally unequivocally, but more so to the fact that we, consciously designing, compiling, planning them / the ideal types, select and underline the elements of the antithesis, contrast, opposition, because we are interested in understanding the one type in contradistinction with the other type, and thus obtain, reap as much as possible more pure, cleaner guiding principles, with the purpose / end / goal of polarising around them (the said guiding principles) the great variety, multiformity of the in part / partial phenomena. Now, since here the aim is the finding of the sources of Machiavellian thought, the contradistinction of the two ideal types will be referred to solely in regard to the points which will be of use for the resolution of this problem.

The human type which is created by the natural economy<sup>11</sup>, or at least which corresponds psycho-spiritually to this natural economy, lives attached, glued to a community, whose bio-practical principles are expressed in a tradition so strong, so that its presence is natural, unexamined and imperceptible like a breath. In this community the individual is found in compulsory solidarity with others, a solidarity which manifested itself in the necessary exchange of services<sup>12</sup>. (To use Durkheim's language, we here have mechanical and not organic solidarity). He / The individual is not free<sup>13</sup>, but he is secured. He does not have a clear-cut knowledge of the boundaries, limits of his individuality, nor of its content, that is, he does not order, classify his life experiences in a chronological sequence, series, he does not live and experience time<sup>14</sup> and his capacity for volition is blunted. This intellectual rawness is expressed above all in the inability at calculation, at the precise, accurate measurement of goods and numerical quantities. In the Middle Ages, people were satisfied with data in approximation, nor could they properly keep in mind / take into account the concept of the "precise / accurate" and the simplest of calculations, reckonings, tallies which have reached us are full of mistakes<sup>i</sup>. The dissolution of this community, which Romanticism idealised without success, is brought about by production for sale, trade / commerce and money. Money, last in the sequence/series of appearance, but more tangible as a direct motive, grants

---

<sup>11</sup> I.e. a pre-modern, pre-technicised, pre-massified, pre-atomised, pre-industrial agriculture-based economy.

<sup>12</sup> Obviously not in the sense of the mass-democratic services "industry", but in regard to master-servant relations etc..

<sup>13</sup> Not absolutely, of course, but legally compared with serfdom and slavery etc..

<sup>14</sup> Consciously / self-consciously.

the possibility of detachment from the group. The individual can now be free<sup>15</sup>, but he is no longer secured. Unconscious compassion and the dominance of tradition / traditionalism of the community are succeeded in his soul by the abilities which he needed to develop in competition with others.

Contrariwise, trade / commerce from the very beginning turns the mind towards the metric, measuring and quantitative side of objects. The pre-capitalistic producer, peasant or artisan, craftsman, sees only the quality of his products and considers them simply, merely as use values; the trader, merchant sees them as quantities, as exchange values, with which he does not have a personal bond. The medieval producer confused himself with his products; the trader/merchant has an external and cold, icy relation with those products, he sees them as magnitudes and counts them in money<sup>ii</sup>. In his mind, the measurement and accounting conversion of goods into money becomes a basic function, that is, the intellectual comprehension of tangible things becomes all the more abstract. Human activity is expressed also in numbers, because the numbers, when they are systematised in accounting terms in order to show us the active and the passive, at the same time show us the result of the effort/endeavour<sup>iii</sup>. Money is converted into cognition (understanding), into an abstract general/common denominator of goods, and cognition (understanding), the ability at the careful and well-aimed programming of act(ion)s, is converted into money. An analogy exists between cognition (understanding) and money : they are both hyper/supra-subjective and impersonal elements, foreign / alien to sentimentalism and ethical obstacles/barriers, which comprehend the world abstractly and constitute a measure of appraisal/evaluation and classification of people / humans<sup>iv</sup>.

Naturally, there does not remain much room here for ethical crashing / shattering and repentance, nor for the metaphysical visions of (the) medieval (hu)man. The human / Man of calculating and weighting cognition (understanding) is more shallow and external; he is especially, primarily interested in weighing up one sector well and conquering it with the rational utilisation of his available means, at the moment when the (hu)man of feudal society did not know how to exploit in a calculated fashion / manner either his means or his time. And thereafter, his circle of action was determined

---

<sup>15</sup> From the group, but not from money and those who control (KONTROL) / the group (i.e. increasingly from the twelfth / thirteenth, but especially from the seventeenth / eighteenth / nineteenth, centuries) ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ AND THEIR ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEEZ) which controls (KONTROL) it.

by tradition, whereas weighting cognition (understanding) draws the boundaries on its own of its motion / movement<sup>v</sup>. The differences between these two human types widen, expand, extend for as long as the younger type makes his calculating cognition (understanding) deeper, exercising it in sectors all the wider / broader, first in his household, then in his business and finally in its (i.e. his business's) many branches. As nicely / beautifully said, in the Middle Ages the household of the feudal lord was the product of custom, a simply superior / higher natural product<sup>vi</sup>; the Renaissance was first to seek and apply rational<sup>16</sup> organisation.

The place which in the ideal type of the Middle Ages faith (belief) possesses in the / its metaphysical, theological element, in the ideal type of the Renaissance is possessed by Reason<sup>17</sup>. The catholic (i.e. universal / general) prevailing, predominance of theological thought presupposes, like earthly, worldly sights, reflections of the centuries and of its immobile, immoveable models, situations which last, endure so much and so undisturbed that they suggest of themselves the idea of eternity, which is a basic predicate of God too. It presupposes political construct(ion)s which hold / last whole centuries / periods of one hundred years or institutions, like the monarchical institution, which go back so deeply inside history that their historicity is forgotten and they are presented as metaphysical categories. In this sense, medieval theological thought is related to the blunt (dull, flat, obtuse) living through / experiencing of time, which we referred to above as the essential psychical constituent element / component of the members of feudal society. (Contrariwise, theological thought, which is crystallised in periods of social upheaval(s), can have an almost existential sense of time, as Augustine shows us). The fragmentation, breaking up, shattering of society into merchandise, commodities, wares, (tradeable) goods and into competitive individuals brings about a series of ceaseless displacements, relocations and of unstoppable quick changes, whose following (monitoring, observation) needs, requires the development of another way, mode, manner of thought / thinking. One phase now succeeds the other phase and the fortune / luck of the individual alters, changes, varies so quickly that worldly, earthly things do not have time to be interrelated with some kind of transcendental category and to be presented as its representatives; then the metaphysical systems of reference (referential systems) are dissolved and the mind / intellect seeks dynamic and tangible

---

<sup>16</sup> Referring to rational as means-end(goal)-calculation in the material / pecuniary sense and not to "rational" in the scientific sense discussed, inter alia, in P.K.'s *The Political and Man*.

<sup>17</sup> As an ideological / normative reference point.

reasons, causes, homologous (similar, comparable, equivalent) to the facts which it (i.e. the mind) wants to interpret.

Since, in this way, the divine, godly and hyper/supra-individual order of things collapses, now the work of the regulation of the world and its formation in accordance with free purposes / ends / goals (that is, [[relatively free in the sense of]] outside of tradition) goes/passes/crosses over to the individual<sup>vii</sup>. Speaking always about ideal types, individuality in the Renaissance is naked, bare, despotic, self-sufficient (self-reliant, autonomous). Since the Christian perception of the meaning and the value of self-sacrifice and the renunciation, repudiation of individuality has already fallen by the wayside / abased, demeaned itself, these concepts do not again meet one another, albeit in a varied form, but when individuality also comes again under a catholic, general, universal governing, commanding principle, like the principle of Reason in the Enlightenment; especially, however, the principle of Community and of the People, in Herder and in Romanticism. Between these two epochs<sup>18</sup>, that is, in the period of early capitalism, the individual stands/is for a period of time naked, full, above all, of himself / itself. There is no catholic, general, universal and official ideology in the Renaissance, which can cover (over, up) individual consciousness and which can give its fallacies, delusions, errors [in an already] ready, prepared [fashion, manner], even though certain groups form an elementary ideology for/by their own account / on their own behalf; the intellectual-spiritual demands and fermentations are expressed with symbols borrowed from antiquity, which Renaissance people imagine it (i.e. antiquity) as an epoch of free, unbound, unfettered individuals, projecting, in this manner, on its (i.e. antiquity's) screen their own demand, requirement or ideal. (From the perception of the Renaissance about, regarding antiquity, which was rekindled in the epoch of liberalism<sup>19</sup> and which underrates, underestimates, belittles, debases, downgrades, demotes, devalues the role of religion and of ideology in the life of the ancients / ancient people, we have not yet entirely freed ourselves). The early, opportunistic phase of capitalism corresponds with this nakedness of the individual, in his relative freedom from "ideology". Capitalism is not yet a hyper/supra-individualistic and unapproachable, inaccessible system which is expressed in an ideology equally hyper / supra-individual (albeit individualistic); it is an individual pursuit, a sum, aggregation

---

<sup>18</sup> Of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment (flowing into Romanticism).

<sup>19</sup> Here, circa 1700 to circa 1900.



of daring, personal acts. In the eyes of (their) contemporaries, the acts in themselves set the tone, and not their social content and the social perspective to(wards) which they tend. For this reason, still, the act, the action, not its result, the wealth, which in the beginning is considered to be a simple means or incidental / adjunct phenomenon, is worshipped much more. The businessman / entrepreneur must possess three basic abilities in relation to which all three are intensely individualistic: he must be strong-willed, volitional, volitive (that is free from (prior) commitments, bonds, ties (made in advance) and bold, daring); he must have an organisational spirit / intellect (something which presupposes a sense of expansion, dilation and a priority of the organiser vis-à-vis that which he has to organise); and he must have negotiatory skill(s) (that is, to pursue, seek / in pursuing his individual ends, goals(,) [whilst] aborting, frustrating, foiling, forestalling the opposite ends, goals of other individuals)<sup>viii</sup>.

The intense, in especially the Italian cities, political life, – which in putting / setting aside inertia, becomes an invitation to action, a trigger of individualism –, contributes to the outbreak of individualism. The more frequently the [[political]] parties in power change, so many more possibilities does the individual have of rising high<sup>ix</sup>. However, for the individual to reach [a] high [position], as an individual, another precondition, prerequisite is also essential : to not be bothered, hampered, impeded by the bonds, fetters of the nobility of blood, to recognise the concept of superiority which has its root in personal ability and value<sup>20</sup>. This concept is found formed from the 13<sup>th</sup> century and we see it clearly in Petrarch; on the field of social conflict, strife it constitutes a significant weapon in the hands of the bourgeois class against the feudal aristocracy.

---

<sup>20</sup> Of course, under ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RULE, from ZIO-Great Britain etc. to ZIO-USA, the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID replaced the Christian nobility of Europe with its own ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-INCESTUAL-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL-EMETIC-FAECES-SELF AS A “ROOL DA WORLD, MASTER RACE” which only ruled “the West” and the absolutely useless part of the extra-West, destroying “the West” totally in the process, and leading everyone else to Final Perdition as is written, all in the name of equality!!! and merit !!!, especially from the second half of the twentieth century.

---

## NOTES

(The years (dates, chronologies) in parentheses refer to the first edition of a work)

**[[KRAZY MAN COULDN'T GET *WORD* TO PUT THE ENDNOTES IN THE 1,2,3,... FORMAT AS IN P.K.'s GREEK TEXT]]**

<sup>i</sup> W. Sombart, *Le bourgeois*, Fr. transl. S. Jankélévitch, Paris 1966 (1913, German), p. 21.

<sup>ii</sup> *Ibid.* p. 318 – 319.

<sup>iii</sup> *Ibid.* p. 123.

<sup>iv</sup> A. Martin, *Soziologie der Renaissance*, Stuttgart 1932, p. 51 (the idea belongs to Simmel) Cf Marx, *Ökonomisch – philosophische Manuskripte*, Leipzig 1970, p. 232 («Die Logik – das Geld des Geistes»).

<sup>v</sup> A. Doren, *Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, I, Jena 1934, p. 656.

<sup>vi</sup> J. Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, Stuttgart 1966 (1860), p. 374-375.

<sup>vii</sup> Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>viii</sup> Cf. Sombart, *op. cit.*, p. 54 ff..

<sup>ix</sup> Burckhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 125 – 126.