

DIMITRIE CANTEMIR AND TRANSYLVANIA – SOME CONSIDERATIONS

IOAN AUREL POP
Membre de l'Académie Roumaine

After the humanist Nicolaus Olahus¹, Dimitrie Cantemir² was the second greatest Romanian creator extremely important at continental level, who was part of a European cultural, literary and scientific current contemporary with him, with no chronological blockage. As such, in 1714, Cantemir was not only Leibniz' colleague in the Berlin Academy of Sciences, but he also shared the same ideas, i.e. Cantemir was an authentic pre-Enlightenment advocate or partaker in the visions on the world comprised in what is known as the *Früh-Aufklärung*³. He was preceded by a Transylvanian, born in the dynasty of the family reigning in Wallachia, namely Nicolae Românu (Nicolaus Olahus, Nicholas the Wallachian), who lived in the 16th century (1493–1568), and who thought of himself as being the equal of Erasmus of Rotterdam, having with the latter a delectable epistolary dialogue. Cantemir moved with the easiness and the confidence of his great erudition between the Byzantine and the Slavic, the western and the eastern cultural environments, taking over the entire valid tradition of the late humanism and firmly announcing the encyclopaedism of Voltaire's century. The community of ideas between Olahus and Cantemir resides in their honest admiration for the Greek and Latin classicism, for the Roman heritage, for the seal it left for eternity on the region around the Danube and the Carpathians, for the Roman and Romanian community, for the Roman world and the continuity of the Romanian people, etc. However, there also are between the two typological differences, which can be explained by the period of only one century and a half between their lives and works, as well as by their different visions about the world, about the creations, about the purposes of science and knowledge in society. Olahus was born Romanian (*Valahus*) and has always

¹ See the book *Umanistul Nicolaus Olahus (Nicolae Românu) (1493–1568). Texte alese*, introductory study and notes by I. S. Fîru and Corneliu Albu, București, 1968, *passim*.

² Among the most important general works about Dimitrie Cantemir, see: Petre P. Panaitescu, *Dimitrie Cantemir. Viața și opera*, București, 1958; Ioan D. Lăudat, *Dimitrie Cantemir. Viața și opera*, Iași, 1973; George Pascu, *Viața și operele lui D. Cantemir*, București, 1924; Dan Horia Mazilu, *Dimitrie Cantemir. Un prinț al literelor*, București, 2001; Andrei Eșanu (coordinator and scientific editor), *Dinastia Cantemireștilor. Secolele XVII–XVIII*, Chișinău, 2008; Ștefan Lemny, *Les Cantemir. L'aventure européenne d'une famille princière au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 2009.

³ See, for the inclusion of Dimitrie Cantemir in the pre-Enlightenment period, Pompiliu Teodor, *Interferențe iluministe europene*, Cluj-Napoca, 1984, pp. 49–71.

remained so deep in his soul (in the subsidiary), but, during his adult life, he felt as an important member of the Hungarian elite (*Hungarus*) and, especially, a humanist, who entered and received full rights in the European “Republic of Letters” (*Europaeus*)⁴. With Dimitrie Cantemir, who was a prince and dealt with crowned leaders, who discussed with some of the most important European diplomats, who communicated directly to the empyrean of the scholars at that time, we enter the modern era of the European equilibrium, the world of the medieval empires decay and of the rise of nations. It was a world some defined as the world of the “European consciousness crisis”⁵, while others called it “the passage from the small to the large Europe”⁶.

Dimitrie Cantemir was the first Romanian scholar who made known to Europe, in Latin and in other vernacular languages, the history, the culture, the ethnography, the geographical location of his country, as well as the origin and specificity of his people⁷, following a programmatic path, outlined through a very well designed plan. The scholar’s belief regarding the unity of his people is expressed in various documents, but is synthetically emphasized in a fragment from *Historia Moldo-Valachica*: “As such, today, the inhabitants of Moldavia, of the Highland⁸, the Transalpine Wallachians, the inhabitants of Bessarabia and of Epirus all call themselves by a comprehensive name, not Wallachians, but Romanians, and they call their authentic language the Romanian language”⁹. In this text, the term “Transalpine Wallachians” denotes the Romanians beyond the mountains, namely the Transylvanians, placed just like the others in the corollary of the Romanian unity, despite the principalities, separated from a political point of view, inhabited by these Romanians. In the above-mentioned statement, Cantemir does not bring novel information; he only writes about a common place, noticed since the 14th and the 15th centuries by the foreign humanists, strengthened by the

⁴ Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Ethnic and Religious Mentalities in Transylvania during the Time of Nicolaus Olahus*, in „Europa. Balcania-Danubiana-Carpatica” (Budapest), vol. 2/A, 1995, pp. 68–75.

⁵ Paul Hazard, *Criza conștiinței europene (1680–1715)*, translated by Sanda Șora, Prefață de Romul Munteanu, București, 1973.

⁶ Pierre Chaunu, *Civilizația Europei în secolul Luminilor*, translated by and foreword by Irina Mavrodin, București, 1986.

⁷ Dimitrie Cantemir elaborated this work in Latin and finished it in Russia, in 1716, giving it the following title:

Descriptio antiqui et hodierni status Moldaviae, known after a manuscript from 1727, copied after the autograph one, put at the clerk’s disposal by the author’s son. The manuscript, translated into German, was then published in instalments, in Frankfurt, in „Magazin für Neue Histoire und Geographie“, in 1769. Two years later, the book was also published as a volume in Leipzig, so that later, in 1789, it was published in Russian, and in 1819 in Greek, etc.

⁸ Note: the Muntenian Land (*Muntenia*) is a region of Wallachia, delineated by the Olt River to the west and the Danube to the east and south.

⁹ Dimitrie Cantemir, *Opere complete*, vol. IX, tom. I, pp. 414–415. Cf. Sergiu Iosipescu, „Cumanitatea” românilor. *Adnotări pe marginea unei discuții*, in the book „Retrospecții medievale. In honorem professoris emeriti Ioan Caproșu”, editors Victor Spinei, Laurențiu Rădvan, Arcadie M. Bodale, Iași, 2014, p. 348.

autochthonous chroniclers and humanists (born in the Romanian Principalities and in the provinces inhabited by both the Romanians and the allogeneic population), resumed by the foreigners (scholars or mere travellers), demonstrated by the historians and chroniclers of the 17th century, etc. The most extended and scholar argumentation for the unity and the Roman origin of the Romanians, preserved as such until the end of the 18th century, was made by Dimitrie Cantemir in his work *Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor* [The Chronicle of the Durability of the Romano-Moldo-Wallachians], published in a first edition in Sankt Petersburg in 1717 (7225). In this work, starting from the very first pages, the author clearly stated that the people of the Romano-Moldo-Wallachians “has continuously lived in Dacia (*id est* in Moldavia, the Muntenian Land and Transylvania)”¹⁰. The unity and the Roman heritage are, however, expressed after a few pages, before the *Prolegomena*, where it is actually shown the developed title of the work: “The Chronicle of the entire Romanian Country”¹¹ (which was later divided into Moldavia, the Muntenian Land and Transylvania) since its establishment from the time of Trajan, the Emperor of Râm (Rome). Similarly for the names it once had and it has now. As well as for the Romanians who, having settled in this country, are still living here”¹². The work placed the Romanians among the Romanic peoples, in their natural European framework¹³.

As such, from Dimitrie Cantemir’s perspective, the Romanians benefitted in the far-away past from a primordial political unity, from a state called the Romanian Country, the foundations of which were laid by the Romans of Emperor Trajan, at the beginning of the 2nd century of the first millennium. Between the pre-Roman, Roman Dacia and the generic Romanian Country, as well as between the Romans and the Romanians, the author does not see any fundamental differences, regarding the type or the structure, but rather differences related to the genre or the form; he does not notice essential differences, but differences in the appearance. That is why, the names used in Cantemir’s work interfere: one may sometimes read the name Dacia instead of the Romanian Country, and Romans instead of Romanians. Somehow, without any clear statement, the Romanians are seen as the genuine Romans, as they had lived for over one millennium and a half on the territory of Dacia, later called the Romanian Country, temporarily and formally separated, but which remained stable in its generic unity. For this purpose, from time to time updates are

¹⁰ The first critical edition, in Romanian, using Latin characters, is D. Cantemir, *Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor*, published under the auspices of the Romanian Academy..., edited by Gr. G. Tocilescu, București, 1901, in „Operele principelui Dimitrie Cantemir”, volume VIII.

¹¹ Note: what the Romanians generically called “Țara Românească” (“The Romanian Country”) was, for any foreigner, “Valahia” (“Wallachia”).

¹² D. Cantemir, *Hronicul...*, p. 57. This definition of the Romanian Country, of the Romanians’ origin and historic unity is presented by the author, after the chapters *Predoslovie*, *Praefatio* and *Catastihul istoricilor, gheografilor, filosofilor, poeticilor pomeniți în Hronic*, right at the end of this latter section and before the *Proleomena* (the author’s translation).

¹³ Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Între real și ideal: Dimitrie Cantemir despre locul românilor în Europa*, in the book „Dimitrie Cantemir (scientific conference: 10 December 2010)”, București, 2011, pp. 285–296.

given, such as: “the beginning of the name of Dacia (on which the principalities of Moldavia, the Muntenian Land and Transylvania rely upon)”¹⁴. The unique and eternal Dacia includes – from Cantemir’s point of view – a wide area, corresponding to the one where the Romanians of his time used to live on (even if, especially towards the borders, they were mixed with other peoples). “Since the aforementioned writers, its ancient borders are known, as they have always been, from the spring of Tisza and from the Land of Maramureş to where Tisza flows into the Danube, and from the outfall of Tisza along the Danube towards the East to the outfall of the Nistru (Dniestr) river, and from there on along the Buh (Bug) river to the North coming back towards the West until the Axiac river and the Carpathian Mountains, which separate the Polish land from Transylvania”¹⁵. Otherwise said, Dacia spread from the Tisza river (towards the East) to the Nistru and Bug rivers (towards the East and the North), and from the southern part of the Danube to the Nordic Carpathians. Naturally, this entire space had suffered modifications along the years, revealed by Dimitrie Cantemir, but these modifications are considered superficial. After the narration of a complicated and, sometimes, confusing ancient history, the author noticed: “Dacia was divided into nine other territories. What once was the middle Dacia then became Transylvania, or Ardeal as we call it. Between it and the Danube was the Smaller Wallachia, namely the Muntenian Land. Between the Smaller Wallachia and the Prut river, between the Prut river and the Nistru River until the Black Sea was the Great Wallachia, or Moldavia”¹⁶. Without any chronological precision, he showed in a scholarly manner how the great Dacia (called Wallachia or Volohia by the foreigners after some time) was divided (“separated”) into Transylvania (also called the middle Dacia), the Muntenian Land (or the smaller Wallachia or Dacia between Transylvania and the Danube) and Moldavia (the greater Wallachia or Dacia among the Carpathians, the Nistru River and the Black Sea). Consequently, all Romanian principalities bore the name Dacia, then Wallachia (the name given by the foreigners), and formed a primary unity. For Cantemir, the fact that the Hungarian Kingdom conquered “the middle Dacia”, i.e. Transylvania, was of no great importance, and neither was the fact that the Tatars and the Turks “destroyed” Moldavia (in 1484, the fortresses near the Danube and the Sea had been conquered by the Ottomans; later, in 1538, Tighina became a *rayah*, etc.) or the Romanian Country. Romanians and foreigners had to know everything was just as it had been, in the initial unity. Mention should be made that, as a result of this belief, the Moldavian scholar preferred the name “Muntenian Land” instead of “Romanian Country” (i.e. greater Wallachia, a name usually given to the principality south of the Carpathians), although the Muntenian Land was only one part of the country under debate. It is obvious that, for Cantemir, the Romanian Country represented “the entire land ethnographically inhabited by the

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 65–66.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 305.

Romanians” – as Mihail Kogălniceanu would say a century later when defining his country from a romanticist perspective. In the same spirit, of the vision of the Romanian unity seen from the east, the greater Wallachia could not have been, for Cantemir, the Muntenian Land (as most foreign authors used to write), but the Moldavian principality (the land of Moldavia), which, according to its historical borders (the only ones that mattered), had a surface almost two times greater than its southern neighbour.

The history of Transylvania was not analysed by Dimitrie Cantemir in a systematic manner and it couldn't have been analysed that way. Following the era of the actual Roman glory, disparate information appeared, such as: Transylvania was conquered by the Gepids (Gepidae)¹⁷ in the 5th century A.D. The conquest and occupation of Transylvania by the Hungarians, which happened gradually, between the 9th and the 13th centuries, was seen as the result of an agreement, of a contract, through which the European leaders at that time gave them a place under the sun: “Here, first of all, we discover the historians who said that a part of Wallachia or Dacia was given to those Hungarians as a homeland, namely beyond the mountains until the Tisza River, a place that, as I mentioned in Dacia's geography, was part of Dacia. The latest Greek historians call this land the Pannonia-Dacia and, ever since that time, being separated, remained part of the Hungarian kingdom, as it still is today”¹⁸. The meaning is easy to decipher, meaning that Dacia or “Wallachia” (i.e. the Romanian Country in the west and middle) was temporarily “given” to the Hungarian Kingdom, although it remained undivided in relation to the initial unity. Moreover, it did not become Pannonia, but remained the “Pannonia-Dacia”, bearing the names of the ancient units, reflecting two different heritages. Nothing is said about the Habsburgs' conquest in 1688–1699, being probably considered irrelevant, since Hungary was (partially) maintained as an entity under Vienna's protection, the Roman-German emperor being also the king of Hungary. As such, Transylvania continued to appear as part of the Hungarian Kingdom. Dimitrie Cantemir knew that the Saxons too lived in Transylvania: “Therefore, the Saxons... those from central Dacia, more specifically from Transylvania... live today amongst the Romanians, who have always lived there”¹⁹. The Saxons had been living in those places – Cantemir believed, in compliance with that era's cliché – since the time of Carol the Great. Subsequently, on the same lands, the Szeklers supposedly came, both ethnical groups being placed among the Romanians. “During the time of Charles the Great came the Saxon colonies, sent by that emperor, and they settled in several territories in Transylvania, amongst the Romanians, where they built seven fortresses; later, in those fortresses, Transylvania was called *Siebenburg* in the Saxon language (or *săsească* as we, Romanians, call it), which means the land of the seven fortresses. After the Saxons, also came the

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 321.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 356.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 350.

Szeklers and they occupied a part of Transylvania as well. And all of them with a large number of Romanians inhabited together, and even today they share the lands; however, most of them towards the upper part of Transylvania, while the others, who live on the other side of the mountains still have the ownership of their lands and fortresses in Transylvania. Those from the Moldavian regions in the lands of upper Transylvania, while those from the Highland in the lands of lower Transylvania”²⁰. Cantemir believed that, when military, political, and demographical pressures were exercised upon the Romanians, they used to find refuge in the mountains and shelter around the Carpathian crown, in Transylvania. They defended themselves and protected one another until the attackers, the migrators, the destructive factors diminished their pressures, and continued their road to Italy or on the other side of the Danube, etc. In order to defend his idea, Cantemir quoted medieval authors, especially Antonius Bonfinius. As such, the Romanians moved within the same wide area of Romanian civilization, in the ancient Dacia – which later became Wallachia – where they could always find shelter and protection, without being afraid to fight if need be. Transylvania, however, was always depicted as a place of refuge, shelter, and preservation of the Romanian civilization. Referring to the great Tatar-Mongolian invasion in 1241–1242, Dimitrie Cantemir quoted the Italian chronicler “Marin” (the Venetian Marino Sanudo), who mentioned the Romanians and the Szeklers, fighting together to defend the Carpathian cols against Batu Khan: “When Batu and the Tatars came, not only did the Wallachians – i.e. the Romanians – fight together with the Szeklers without any hesitation, but they also pushed the Tatars towards the mountains’ gorges, and prohibited their entry into the Hungarian Kingdom”²¹. As such, while the Transylvanian Romanians “joined forces with the Szeklers” to defend their country and the Hungarian Kingdom, some extra-Carpathian Romanians – worried by the Tatar invasion – found refuge in the mountains, passing to Transylvania, where the Hungarian prince initially kept them away, and afterwards protected them; they remained there for some time until, at the right moment, Voivode Dragoș passed to Moldavia with a part of them, while Voivode Radu the Black took the others back to the Muntenian Land²². Therefore, the dismounting²³ from Transylvania appears as a sort of compensation, a return to the homeland, after the mountains’ crown had generously protected those in need. Some Romanians, who had found refuge in Transylvania, returned with their voivodes – the historian says – to their “homelands”, namely to Moldavia and the Romanian Country. Others remained on the same territories in Transylvania as it has always been “as it is well known that Transylvania is even now full of Romanians, who have been noblemen

²⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 463–464.

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 465.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 466.

²³ Note: Dismounting (*descălecat*) is a term used to describe the founding event of the arrival of princes/voivodes from Maramureș or Transylvania.

until recently. Romanians were also members of the national assemblies together with the others – the Szeklers and the Saxons²⁴. Dimitrie Cantemir expressed a less known and accepted idea in the recent times, namely that, initially, the Romanians were part of the state in Transylvania, together with the noblemen, the Saxons, and the Szeklers. This fact also results from the *Gesta Hungarorum* (voivode Gelou's men, following the defeat and death of their prince, "joined" the Hungarians and continued to live free and equal), from the documents issued by the estates assemblies in 1291 and 1355, as well as from the documents of the Bobâlna Revolt (1434–1438), etc. They all prove that, until the end of the 14th century and during the first part of the 15th century, the Transylvanian Romanians participated in the estates assemblies (which Cantemir called "national assemblies") as a privileged group (whose rights and freedoms were recognised), in the name of their ethnicity.

Further, the author mentioned the "geographical maps", i.e. the maps made at the command of "Emeric Techelie", the prince of Transylvania (Emeric Tökölyi, the prince of Transylvania between 1690–1691), printed at the end of the 17th century: "In the aforementioned map, the entire land of Transylvania is divided into provinces, i.e. lands, out of which some of them (especially the Saxon ones) were Moldavian, i.e. they belonged to the Romanians who came from Moldavia, and others belonged to Wallachia, under whose name they belong even today. Before the invasion of Batu Khan²⁵, after the Gepids removed the Romanians, who had been placed in Transylvania by the Roman emperor Trajan (as I have already mentioned in the right place), I have not found any proof that other colonies from Italy had come in any other part of Transylvania, which is a credible thing. After the return of King Bela to his kingdom, there is no proof that he had given any lands to them"²⁶. The lands of the Romanians from Moldavia are known in Transylvania – according to Cantemir – the land of Rudivani "formerly known as Rodna; and the fortress in that region is known as Vestendorf²⁷. The second region was Tordia²⁸, on the Morâș river. The third region was Cochelvar²⁹, located between Clușvar³⁰ and Mediiăș, on the Cochel river³¹. The fourth region was Trotuș, with the fortress of Pogava, with many other villages from its territory. The Romanians from this region could also come from the Trotuș and Bacău rivers, giving the same name to the region in Transylvania, where they settled, Trotuș and Pogava –

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 473.

²⁵ It actually refers to Batu Khan, the Mongolian leader during the 1241–1242 invasion.

²⁶ D. Cantemir, *Hronicul...*, p. 473.

²⁷ An error since Westendorf is the German name of the Veștem village, in the Șelimbăr commune, not far from Sibiu.

²⁸ Turda, today in the county of Cluj, but not on the Mureș river.

²⁹ Literally translated „Cetatea Târnavei”, actually Cetatea de Baltă.

³⁰ Cluj, an imitation of the Hungarian name of Kolozsvár.

³¹ The German name (Kokel) – later adopted by the Hungarians as well – for the rivers Târnavă Mare and Târnavă Mică. The name of Târnavă (Slav-Romanian) precedes the German-Hungarian one and comes from the period of cohabitation of the Latin-speakers and Romanians with the Slavs.

the fortress on the Bacov river; very little did some Hungarians change the meaning of the names according to their language. Similarly, the Romanians who came from the Muntenian Land, apart from the region now known as Satu Mare, also owned the fortresses of Fines³², Cheplac³³, Beling, Papneț, Bele and Mișcov. And between Alba Iulia (which is the Great Oradea³⁴) and Sibiu, they had the borough of Roșia, whose inhabitants, after their return, were called the group of Roșia, as well as the group of Serbs, who is known as Venedii, and they were called Venetini, similarly to the way in which, in the Muntenian Land, these groups bear the same name. They also had there the region of Halaos (from where Voivode Radu the Black left to the Muntenian Land), as well as Benii, Morsenii, Hacegul³⁵ and Verhel³⁶ (which was formerly known as Ulpia Traiana). In the same way, on the Strela river (which today is known as the Strig river³⁷), they owned Mediiăș, Crașe³⁸ and Sapson. These territories and fortresses kept the Romanians in Transylvania at that time; and, therefore, for some time, the Szeklers and the Saxons remained heirs and landowners of those places, and there is no proof that our Romanians, during the time of Batu Khan, either with their prince Ioan Alexie or with one of his sons who was supposedly named Bogdan (as these things cannot be known for sure), had settled at that moment on those territories³⁹. The author mentioned then a certain borough called Bogdan, “situated where the Maramorăș river flows into the Tisza river, whose name probably came from the Voivode Bogdan”; the name “Black”, he stated that the Voivode Radu of the Muntenian Land was also called “the Black”. As to “both principalities”, he showed that one was called “the black Wallachia” (the Muntenian Land), while the other was “the black Bogdania” (Moldavia); as such, “the prince of the Moldavians is known as ... the prince of the black Bogdania”, and reference is made to the byzantine writer “Laonic Halcocondilas” (Chalcocondilas)⁴⁰. These references emphasize the dismounting from Transylvania, its role in the sheltering of the Romanians, Romanian’s status of landowners and rulers in Transylvania, as well as a certain domination of the peoples of the steppe in the extra-Carpathian region.

Consequently, Transylvania was – in Dimitrie Cantemir’s historical perspective – a rightful part of the Dacia colonised with Romans by the emperor Trajan, then a rightful part of the Romanian land (which the foreigners called “Walachia”), embodied by the Hungarians in their country, a land however that had

³² Finiș, a town in the county of Bihor.

³³ Suplacu de Barcău, in the same region.

³⁴ Confusion.

³⁵ Hațeg, in the county of Hunedoara.

³⁶ The Hungarian name (literally translated as a “fortified place”, “fortress”) of today’s Sarmizegetusa, formerly known as Grădiște, in the county of Hunedoara.

³⁷ It refers to the Strei river, from the same south-eastern parts of the Transylvanian principality.

³⁸ Perhaps Caraș, in the region of Banat.

³⁹ D. Cantemir, *Hronicul...*, p. 473–474.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 474.

always been inhabited by the Romanians who mingled with the newcomers. During the migration waves, the number of the Transylvanian Romanians, descendants of the ancient Romans, was strengthened and augmented by some extra-Carpathian Romanians, led by their princes, who were looking for refuge from the invaders. After the stop of the Tatar invasion, those Romanians, who had come to the mountains' shelter from south and east, returned to their homelands led by Voivode Negru and Voivode Dragoş. The narration is synthetically resumed as follows: "And now, briefly, I want to show that from these lands, owned by our Romanians in Transylvania, as they were noblemen together with the Szeklers and the Saxons, it is well known that: firstly, after they passed to Transylvania, not as commoners and without leaders or in a secret way, but they had always lived there with their princes and noblemen. Secondly, it is well known that seeing that their homelands had been freed from the Tatar invasion (as I will tell you how the Tatars were defeated), led by their leaders and not as a crowd of herders – as the detractors mention – they returned to their ancient homeland, i.e. Voivode Dragoş, son of Voivode Bogdan, took a part of them to Moldavia, while Voivode Radu the Black (brother or cousin to Voivode Dragoş) took the other part to the Muntenian Land"⁴¹. Then Cantemir continues by contradicting Nicolae Costin, who, according to Antonio Bonifini, rightfully stated that during the time of king Louie there was a Voivode Bogdan of Maramureş who went from Transylvania to Moldavia.

Cantemir dealt with the founding of Wallachia and Moldavia and the dismounting from the intra-Carpathian regions at the highest level of the knowledge possible at that time. The numerous inadvertencies from the written sources still raise today complicated issues for the historians, problems that are far from being clarified. For the scholar prince, the Romanian Country, Dacia or Wallachia are one and the same, and the Romanians are the same as the Romans. Inside this vast territory, many Romanians, led by their princes, moved in order to defend themselves, to find shelter and refuge. The most preferred place for defence and preservation of the Romanian people was Transylvania. It was there that the Romanians concentrated during the first millennium and during the first quarter of the second millennium. Afterwards, some returned to the fields in the south and east. The legendary aspect is hard to elude in these episodes, and the exact ascertainment of the chronologies and genealogies leaves much to be desired. Therefore, Cantemir stated that the Moldavian and the Muntenian Land dismounting took place simultaneously, around 1274, and considered Voivode Radu the Black and Voivode Dragoş to be brothers (sons of Voivode Bogdan) or cousins, "who left Transylvania to go to their homelands"⁴². The illustrious scholar sees in that same moment the separation of the Romanian Country into Moldavia and the Muntenian Land. In Transylvania, Cantemir revealed a primordial political power of Romanian origin that the inhabitants had to share with the Szeklers and the Saxons,

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, p. 475.

⁴² See also the chronological tables in *ibidem*, p. 498.

until later when, as a result of their discrimination, they were removed from the power, marginalized and humiliated.

The tableau is not as distorted as it might seem, as it maintains the pillars of the partial truth, as much as it is accessible to us today. Cantemir authorized a generic and perpetual (including a political) Romanian unity, which foreshadowed the great enlightened demonstrations of the Transylvanian School in that direction and then set up as a prologue to the romanticist, elating vision of the Romanian Middle Ages. Considering this direction, the scholar prince complied with the European movement of ideas, especially with the central-European one, which, at that time, cultivated, through the Academy of Berlin, the ethnographical presentations of the peoples. This movement of ideas was preparing to elate, not far from that time, “the spirit of the peoples”, namely their languages, legends, songs, and traditions, in an organicist vision, full of vigour, a prelude to the Romanticist current.