

Dimitrie Cantemir between Sword and Pencil Wielder

Ion IFRIM, CS II¹

¹ Ph.D., habilitated, Institute of Legal Research "Acad. Andrei Radulescu" of the Romanian Academy; prof.univ.dr. abilit. "Stefan cel Mare" University, Suceava; ionut_ifrim24@yahoo.com, ion.ifrim@icj.ro

Abstract: *In this article, we reveal the work and personality of Dimitrie Cantemir between sword and pen, 350 years since the birth of the great scholar of Moldova, ruler of Moldova, and 300 years since his death. To celebrate the event of the Romanian scholar, the Romanian state declared this year, the Year of Dimitrie Cantemir, an event in the attention of world science. This created the opportunity to respond, through a broad presentation of the work and personality of Dimitrie Cantemir, to the deep interest not only of the Romanian people for one of the most renowned figures of national history but also to the many desires from abroad to know his scientific merits.*

Of course, monographic works on the life and activity of personalities of Moldavia and the Romanian Country have been written on numerous other occasions, but since the time of Dimitrie Cantemir the seeds of a new and modern historiographical phenomenon have appeared, going beyond the biographical area of ruling families and approaching histories with a more general character. Author of numerous works, diversified thematically, among which we mention the Description of Moldavia, Dimitrie Cantemir established himself as a European scientific personality through his work, Geschichte des Wachstums und des Sinkens des osmanischen Reiches. As has been noted, "The history of this kingdom written by him is divided into two periods, the first of its rise until 1672; the second, of its decline, from that date until 1711". In this work, the author highlights the end of the Ottoman victories and the beginning of the decline of the Ottoman Empire, through the loss of "fearful battles... and the power of the Ottomans greatly weakened by the loss of many kingdoms and countries, by the destruction of whole armies, and by internal rebellions and emperors" With this text, Dimitrie Cantemir opened the discussion of the Oriental question. Dimitrie Cantemir proved to be a keen observer and erudite commentator on practices embedded in our material and spiritual culture.

Keywords: *Dimitrie Cantemir, voivod, pen, 350 years after the birth of the great scholar and 300 years after his death.*

How to cite: Ifrim, I. (2023). Dimitrie Cantemir between sword and pencil wielder. *European Journal of Law and Public Administration*, 10(1), 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.18662/eljpa/10.1/199>

1. 350 years after the birth of the great scholar and 300 years after his death, the Romanian state, through its authorities, wanted to re-contextualize the personality of Dimitrie Cantemir, establishing this year the "Cultural Year of Dimitrie Cantemir". To honor Dimitrie Cantemir is to evoke the multitude of plans on which the ruler of Moldavia (on two occasions: March-April 1693 and 1710-1711) illustrated himself, revealing to universal civilization the power of Romanian spirituality. It has created the opportunity to respond, through a broad presentation of the work and personality of Dimitrie Cantemir, to the deep interest not only of the Romanian people for one of the most renowned figures of national history but also to many desires from abroad to know the scientific merits of the man whose name is written on the frontispiece of the Sainte Genevieve library in Paris. (Cristian Popișteanu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Roman people, interview with Miron Nicolescu*, President of the Romanian Academy, year VII, no. 7, (76) July 1973, p. 9, col. I.).

2. Dimitrie Cantemir, one of the most valuable thinkers of the country, was born in Iași (October 26, 1673), during the reign of Dumitrașcu Cantacuzino. At the age of 32, Dimitrie Cantemir was married to Casandra, daughter of Șerban Cantacuzino, and had 6 children with her. In 1720, Dimitrie remarried Anastasia Trubețkoi, 30 years younger, whom contemporaries found to be "an intelligent, daring woman with a restless character". His father, Constantin Cantemir, (ruler from 1685 to 1693), was then a small boyar who had spent his time in the arms trade. His mother's name was Ana, from the Bantis family, also from a line of small nobles. It has been said that his mother had a book-learning and literary inclination. (Monica Joița, Cantemir's Portrait, in "Noua Revistă Română" - Serie nove - nr. 8 - 9 from November - December 1996, p.11.) Cantemir himself gives him an admiring portrait when he says: „*Mulier inter mulieres illius seculi in primis recensenda, literis optimis instructa, rei oeconomicae peritissima et prudentissima*” (a woman among women, among the first in this century, educated in the best literature, very clever and very prudent in domestic affairs). (Ion Verdeș, *Dimitrie Cantemir, patriot, thinker and scientist*, vol. II, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1957, p. 62.),

3. Recognized as an imposing personality by the vastness and unity of his work, and as a *patriotic thinker of the humanist* type, (Vaida Petru, *Cantemir's Humanism and the Problem of Moral Conscience*, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1971, p.7; C.I.Gulian, S.Ghiță, N.Gogoneață, C.Joja, R.Pantazi, and Al. Poșescu, *History of Social and Philosophical Thought in Romania*, Romanian Academy Publishing House, Bucharest, 1964, p.79.) Dimitrie Cantemir manifested himself in many aspects in his time's entire field of sciences. (Dan

Bădărău, *The Philosophy of Dimitrie Cantemir*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1964, p.6.). His multilateral and particularly vast work contains problems in almost all directions of the development of Romanian culture at that time. His multilateral preoccupations in the fields of law, philosophy, history, literature, music, ethnography, economics, and social-political life place him among the most advanced European scientists of his time.

4. About the personality of Dimitrie Cantemir, historically speaking, we point out that Romanian encyclopedism exploded with him, a pre-Voltaire European encyclopedist philosopher who did not carry out his program to the end, but he traced it in his important lines, he among the first who tried to break the line of chronographs by creating geographical and historical circles on data themes. The work of Cantemire also developed among the leaders of the Ardelene School in a chronographic approach. (N.Georgescu, *A Triumph of Romanian Philosophical Encyclopedism, in Europe and the Romanian Nation -Națiunea*, year. XXI, no. 542 (1007) of 13-19 January 2010, p. 11.)

Moreover, we would also like to point out that Voltaire's work found in the Principality the most suitable setting for its reception, his ideas became fruitful seeds that fell into a most fertile germination bed. This phenomenon was all the more possible because the Enlightenment ideas of Dimitrie Cantemir had been circulating in the Principality long before they were formulated by Rousseau and Voltaire. This is why Voltaire's work was not rejected by the Romanian national body but was integrated into the thinking of Romanian society, where it found many contingencies and similarities.

In Voltaire's conception, we also observe a certain *moral precept*, saying that "*The princes who have the greatest right to immortality are those who have done something good for the people*". So, for Voltaire, history is a means of making monarchs immortal as a reward for their good deeds. It should be noted that the phrase "*good deeds*" was used earlier by Dimitrie Cantemir, who, lamenting the lack of sources, reproached his ancestors in the Moldavian dominion for "*being more at heart to do good deeds than to write them down*".

5. Perhaps we dare not go too far in saying that in the development of European culture and civilization, Cantemir was a star of the first magnitude. His entire work shows him to be a forerunner of European encyclopaedism, but he made his mark on the intellectual world of his time above all as a historian. Cantemir's Europe was beginning to take on a more precise shape, particularly about the neighboring empires, whose dominant ambitions were intertwined in the Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic area. (Alexandru Zub, *Romanian Historians in search of Europe*, *Academica Magazine*, a magazine published by the Romanian Academy, no.10, October 2014, year

XXIV, 288, p.66).

Romanian culture is linked to the twilight of the late European revival through Dimitrie Cantemir, that type of *humanist scholar*, doubled by an *ardent patriot and a wise statesman*. (Cristian Popisteanu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Roman people*, op.cit., p. 8, col. I.).

In Cantemir's time, Romanian culture had matured, formed a system of secure values, and acquired specific features. For example, the Romanian language had - at last - triumphed over the hitherto official Slavic language, contacts with Europe were permanent, and Latin culture had gained ground. These favorable conditions, facilitated by the relative political stability of the second half of the 17th century, allowed a whole host of authors to develop a vigorous and original way of thinking. (Vlad Georgescu, *Political Ideas and Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities 1750 - 1831*, Ed. Romanian Academy, 1972, p. 49.).

Culture is not something that can be borrowed from elsewhere. At its core, it is the most intimate product of one's personality. Culture is always created, not borrowed. It unconditionally requires the creative activity of the human person: the objectification of content into lasting values. Without this creative activity, the notion of culture cannot be conceived.

6. In the context of European cultures in Constantinople, Nicolae Iorga said about Dimitrie Cantemir: "There in Constantinople, he met *three cultures*. There was the Turkish culture, totally different from ours, the Greek culture, totally foreign to the Turkish one and, then, in Pera there was also the French culture, if you like, and the Italian one - he certainly knew Italian too -; there was also the general Latin culture. What would an ordinary man have done, the time, which unfortunately we know so much about today, of our disoriented people? He would have utterly wasted away, stammering sometimes one way, another, and above all he would have shunned speaking and writing a language which he had mastered, for which he was made and which was made for him. He, however, had achieved *his synthesis*. (Monica Joița, *Portrait of Cantemir*, op.cit., p.10). Nicolae Iorga understood the Moldovan gentleman best. He wondered "What were the Russians to Dimitrie Cantemir?" It was the most common and controversial question about Dimitrie Cantemir *as a personality*. "Also, the policy of the tilt between Ottoman and Russian power, considered by many as a Balkan-type political "*dedubulation*" (in the pejorative meaning of this politically - diplomatically justified concept), was the negative side of the Western reception of the Moldovan scholar. Describing very well the huge cultural difference between the exiled Cantemir and Tsar Peter's courtiers, which the Romanian undoubtedly felt painfully, Iorga tries to exonerate Cantemir, invoking the

argument of the decline of the Ottoman Empire, but especially the Christian hope in a pravoslavnic Russia that would liberate all peoples from the Turkish yoke.

7. On Dimitrie Cantemir's literary and scientific activity during his years in Istanbul. (post 1695), we mention that he wrote the *Divan or The Wise Man's Gossip with the World* and printed it in Iasi in Romanian and Greek in 1698. It is one of Dimitrie Cantemir's most widespread writings. "Cantemir's effort is directed towards the enlightenment of his people"; the dialogue of the Sage with the World in *Divan* seeks to identify the purpose of human existence, to place learning at the service of human ideals, to enlighten the many by imposing not only biblical precepts but also philosophical thought. The insistent appeal, sometimes to one means of communication, sometimes to another, and the pendulum swinging between hedonism and religious asceticism make many of the concepts formulated increase the *love of wisdom*.

Cantemir is not tributary to Orthodox reformism, he tries and succeeds in overcoming, through his thought, the mentioned crisis of conscience present in the Orthodox Church. He does not accept the line of mystical doctrine, nor the forms of Orthodox traditionalism, which does not mean a break with the Christian concept, dominant at that time in the culture of south-eastern Europe. Attentive to what was going on in Western Catholic society, the Romanian scholar understood and at the same time came closer to the Western rationalist orientations, without denying the originality of the Eastern lay and ecclesiastical spirit. Cantemir advocates an East-West dialogue, wishing to contribute to the emancipation of Moldavia, as Theophilus Corydaleus once did. Jeremiah Cacavela praises his wonderful thoughts and state of mind, his "*pitorious*" craftsmanship, his embellishment of the Moldovan language, his gift of learning, and his wit. The *Divan* addresses both Romanian and Balkan society at the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century. (Victor Neumann, *Religious Reform and Crises of Conscience: From Theophilus Corydaleus to Dimitrie Cantemir, in Romanians in Universal History*, vol. II, coord. I. Agrigoroaie, Gh. Buzatu, V. Cristian, "Al. I. Cuza, Iași, 1987, p. 400).

Dimitrie Cantemir also collected Turkish chronicles to later write the history of the Ottoman Empire and compiled a plan for Constantinople. The first scholar to address this issue, later debated by European historians, was Dimitrie Cantemir in his work on Ottoman power. (The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Court, 1714-1716 - Unpublished; A fragment published at Iași, 1833; 2nd edition, London, 1756; in Italian, after 1734 (unpublished); in French, 1st edition, Paris, 1743; 2nd edition, Paris, 1743; in

German: Hamburg, 1745; in Romanian: Bucharest, 1877). Only the second part of Cantemir's phrase reveals the crisis into which the Ottoman Empire was beginning to slide imperceptibly. This fine observation of Dimitrie Cantemir was amplified by the ardent desire of the Moldovan Lord to shake the Ottoman yoke off the shoulders of the Romanians. However, Dimitrie Cantemir did not refer to this decline of Ottoman power as a 'problem' or 'crisis'. From 1858 onwards, the first work on the history of diplomacy appeared, which included the term 'Oriental', in which the author considered that the history of the Empire became an 'Oriental problem' in 1744.

Furthermore, we point out that Cantemir's history of the Ottoman Empire was written first in Latin, then published in French and English, and that unprinted translations - in Russian and Italian - were prepared, perhaps the first work of its kind written in a Western style.

He was a true authority on the subject, unquestioned and unchallengeable for a century, until the appearance of Hamnier's work *-Acta eruditorum* in Leipzig published an account of Cantemir's work *Sistema della religione mahomedane*, "composed with the greatest care and worthy of trust". The great Voltaire...slipped into the History of Charles XII, a praise of the man who "united the talents of the ancient Greeks with the science of letters, and that of arms". European recognition of these qualities and merits was given by the Berlin Academy, which, in 1714, made it a point of honor to elect Cantemir as a member. As the correspondence shows, the Berlin Academy was expecting this work *History of Moldavia and the Romanian People in the Writings of Dimitrie Cantemir* (which various members of the Academy called *De Dacia*) (Cristian Popișteanu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Roman people*, p.9.:) (P. P. Panaitescu, *Dimitrie Cantemir, vita e opera*, Bucharest, 1958, p. 37.)

The drafts that prepared Cantemir's Chronicle date from 1716-1717. One is called *Historia Moldo - Vlachica* dates from 1716 and is a Latin summary of the future Hronic. The original is in the Central State Archive for Old Documents of the USSR, from where a xerox was brought, after which Dan Slușanschi compiled the 1983 edition (p.21) vol. IX, Part I, the Latin original and translation, published by the Romanian Academy. The existence of this manuscript attests to Cantemir's original wish to write his work on the territory and people of ancient Dacia originally in Latin "*ad usum Europae*".

Author of numerous works diversified thematically, Dimitrie Cantemir established himself as a European scientific personality through his work, *Geschichte des Wachsthums und des Sirkens des osmanischen Reiches*. As has been noted, "The history of this kingdom written by him is

divided into two periods, the first of its rise until 1672; the second, of its decline, from that date until 1711". In this work, the author highlights the end of the Ottoman victories and the beginning of the Ottoman Empire's decline, through the loss of "fearful battles... and the power of the Ottomans was greatly weakened by the loss of several kingdoms and countries, by the destruction of whole armies, as well as by internal rebellions and emperors"... With this text, as we have already pointed out, Dimitrie Cantemir opened the discussion of the Oriental problem, the beginning of which he placed in 1672. (Maria Holban, *Foreword to Foreign travelers about Romanian countries*, vol.I, Editura Științifică, Bucharest, 1968, p.XIX).

The main judgments in the *Question of the Orient* about the liberation effort of the Romanian countries, however, are formulated by Cantemir in his *History of the Growth and Decline of the Ottoman Empire*, whose title alone expresses a political conviction. The historical necessity of the loss of Ottoman domination is scientifically substantiated here to convince the European powers, and above all Russia, to speed up this irreversible process. Based on the theory also set out in his *Research on Monarchies*, Cantemir shows that the decline marked by the territorial retreat of the Porte would continue until the end of the slope on which the empire had embarked. This leaves only one path for the followers of the Crescent, that of coalition and its defeat. But alas," continues the author, "we shall have to weep eternal tears over the discord between Christian principles" (i.e. between the Austrians and the Russians). At this time, the Romanian country "groans under the yoke of that tyrant" and "no learned man is ignorant of the miserable tyranny under which Moldova groans". The general sense of the book is the resumption of hostilities with the Porte and the resolution of the Eastern Question in this way. (Mircea Malița, *Pages from the Past of Romanian Diplomacy*, Ed. Politică, Bucharest, 1966, pp. 198 - 199.)

On the other hand, Dimitrie Cantemir, wrote one of the first grammars of Turkish music, composing *semaiuri* and *peşrevuri*, being a classic of Turkish music. (Halil Bedii Yneiken, D. *Cantemir dans l'histoire de la musique turque in Actes du Colloque international de civilisation balkaniques*, Sinaia 8-14, juillet 1962, București, p. 145 – 149); (Virgil Căndea, *Dimitrie Cantemir and the beginnings of the Oriental Question*, in V. Căndea, Dinu C. Giurescu, Mircea Malița, *Pages from Romania's diplomatic past*, Editura Politică, Bucharest, 1966, p. 189).

8. According to Arnold J. Toynbee, author of a voluminous historical work, entitled *A Study of History in 12 volumes*, published in 1955 - 1961, he makes references, sometimes ample, sometimes in synthesis, to Dimitrie Cantemir. He begins with *two portraits* of the ruler. In the first he is

depicted in Ottoman dress, with a turban and dagger at his belt, but no longer on the frontispiece of an English translation of 1734 - 1735 of Cantemir's history of the Ottoman Empire.

These *changes in dress* were, of course, outward symptoms of changes in intellectual structure. Dimitrie Cantemir read and wrote fluently in Latin, Italian, and French, in addition to his mother tongue, Romanian, he knew ancient and modern Greek, and ancient Slavonic, which was his cultural heritage as an Orthodox Christian, as well as Turkish, Persian and Arabic, which he had needed as an Ottoman civil servant. (I. M. Stefan Tounbee, vol. VIII, "*The water passes, the stones remain...*" Historical Magazine, year VII, no.7 (76) July 1973, pp.26 - 27.)

9. In Russian exile, we note that Dmitri Cantemir wrote his most valuable works: History of the Ottoman Empire, Descriptio-Moldaviae, (it was first known in a German version, by Anton Friedrich Büsching, with the help of Johan Ludwig Redslob, published between 1769 and 1790, then in the volume Frankfurt in 1771). (Maria Holban, A word to foreign travelers about Romanian countries, volume I, Editura Științifică, Bucharest, 1968, p.XIX) Monarchiarum physical examination first study of Romanian geopolitics, Hronicul vechimei romano-moldo-valahilor, a landmark work of Romanian historiography". So much polyglot teaching - Iorga points out - did not respond to his first inherited nature, the nature of a man of the country, of Moldovan law. (Monica Joița, *Portrait of Cantemir*, op.cit., p. 12.).

10. "For contemporaries, Dimitrie Cantemir appears as an exception of Romanian culture. Just as Eminescu is an ontological model of the Romanians, Dimitrie Cantemir embodies our encyclopedic possibilities, our gnostic capacities, "*encyclopedism*" or "*polyhistorism*", to quote C. Noica, the biography of the Moldavian gentleman, his myth perpetuated in posterity, the versatility of his preoccupations, the multitude of projects, many of which remain unfulfilled, the contemporary situation of not being able to know him in his entirety in the absence of a complete edition represents not only the data on which the Cantemir myth was built but also the landmarks of a destiny." He, however, also achieved the synthesis in quotation marks.

His work must be understood in the spirit of the lofty patriotism with which he himself was animated; "*sweet is the love of the estate!*" -that is, of the country- he says somewhere, and this love urged him to write and make his estate, *his country, known throughout Europe*".

11. Miron Nicolescu also stated that Dimitrie Cantemir "is a great precursor of contemporary Romanian historiography". He supports this fact with the fact that Dimitrie Cantemir scientifically *legitimizes our ancestry three centuries ago by writing the "Hronicle"* of the antiquity of the Romano-

Moldovlahs (in Latin 1717, in Romanian 1719 -1722) at a time when the confrontation between the supporters and opponents of Romanity had already begun - for the time being at home: Grigore Ureche and especially Miron Costin defended it, Simion Dascălu contested it. In the same century, only six decades later, the reactionary and anti-Romanian theory of emigration was consecrated by the historian Sulzer (1781); after him, in the 17th century, the historian Sulzer (1781) was the first to take up the cause of emigration. Roesler and then the entire "*school*" of scholars who sought in history arguments for certain political tendencies, fiercely contested the continuity of the Romanian people, bringing forward, as supreme proof, that millennium of silence - the argument *a silentio* - of the 3rd - 13th century.

The author also stressed the predictive value of Cantemir's work, that is, "*the demonstrated value* of his ideas in patriotism, affirmed, let us not forget, not a decade or a century ago". "The timeliness of his complex preoccupations - and especially those of history, linguist, jurist, and geographer - brings Cantemir into the immediate contemporary context". (Cristian Popișteanu, Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Romanian people, op.cit., p.8, col I.). Cantemir, who, however, had only a few sources known at the time, intuited, with his logic and all the auxiliary knowledge apparatus with its rich knowledge of national and universal history, that there could be no question of a break in the continuity of life on Romanian soil. With Dimitrie Cantemir begins the period of *historiography proper*.

He rises far above the level of the chroniclers. His book "Description of Moldavia", first published in German translation on Latin manuscript in 1769-1770, and in Romanian translation only in 1825 at the monastery of Neamt, represents a real epoch in the knowledge of the past of the Romanian people. From the way this work is written, although the author looks at some things from his viewpoint, one can see the developed degree of his critical sense and an obvious scientific method in dealing with matters. In a rather terse form and a relatively short volume, Dimitrie Cantemir manages to give us not only the most general news about the geographical situation of Moldavia, its wealth and administrative organization, but also, to a large extent, about the social-economic settlement, the relations between the social classes, the ancient rights of Moldavia, the judgment, the customs of the population and, in short, the general legal culture. (A.V. Boldur, *The History of Bessarabia - Contributions to the Study of the History of Romanians*, vol. I - Ancient times up to the 17th century, Chisinau, Tipografia, Dreptatea, 1937, p. 2.). For example, Dimitrie Cantemir points out in his *Description of Moldavia* the *need to respect laws and their*

role in the state that the law "... governs us, commands us, rules us and controls us...". Here it was argued that: the rule of the country with wisdom and justice, contributes to the strengthening of the state and to its flourishing; "then the public flourishes and blossoms, when the masters pity and chide in justice...".

On the other hand, he speaks out against those lords who put the interests of their prestige above the interests of the state and those who try to consolidate their power by violence or use it to achieve their ambitions. From here, we see that the gentleman is not free of responsibility for his acts and deeds, but he is accountable to the country for what he does. In this regard, we quote: "The old praxis ... that the desires and wills of the emperors are the unmitigated pravail of the obedient", he considers that the lord must respect the laws that he calls "our matcha and mamca", and show solidarity with the needs and interests of the people because "the true monarch's sammul is this, that neither with a needle shall he prick, nor with his teeth bite, nor with his nails gnaw, that in the wrong he shall pardon, in the wrong, he shall punish, in the subject, he shall have mercy, in the stranger justice, and in his monarch's decisions he shall have restraint".

For a fairer appreciation of his attitude, in general, towards the observance of the laws, we must also point out that, in the exercise of his office, the gentleman must take into account the needs and demands of the people, listen to the "mouths of the clouds" and the "whispers of the mobs". From this text, we see that Cantemir's ideas thus come close to the principle of enlightened monarchy, according to which the lords of the people should act as benefactors of the masses. As such, tyranny is harshly condemned, because "where the sole of tyranny treads, there the lap of justice shall tread. In characterizing tyranny, Cantemir states that a tyrant uses power to dispossess others for his benefit.

Dimitrie Cantemir also examines the relationship between *man and the state*, at the same time, he *raises the question of man's social freedom*, he speaks out for the respect of man's freedoms, but he takes the position of the abuse of freedom and of man's will to freedom, equivalent to anarchy, because there are no forces that can oppose it, "... to the imprisonment and binding of the body a chain and a fetter (prison) are enough, but to the tightening of the soul and to the stopping of the free will neither thousands of thousands of chains, nor tens of thousands of prisons can do anything"-his concept of freedom, being at the same time an advanced idea for his time. It follows that he was against complete freedom, arguing that man would tend to use this freedom to commit evil deeds "...for the will of the unbridled is more to evil and against the truth than to good and to the pleasure of its true

power"... A true monarch - Cantemir goes on to say - must treat his subjects with mercy, forgive those who do wrong, punish the wicked, and rule within his borders according to the rules established by custom and written law.

For all his sympathy for the struggle of the peasantry, granting them the right to revolt and even advocating the abolition of serfdom, Dimitrie Cantemir's class position led him not to give the peasantry an important political role. For example, although he was in favor of abolishing serfdom, he did not envisage the abolition of feudal relations, but only the abolition of the semi-royal state, and the removal of the peasantry from the regime of bondage and unlimited labor. Cantemir believed that the peasantry could be liberated by a reform organized by an enlightened monarch, for whose establishment he was campaigning. From here we see *the limits of his conception* of the peasantry and its social role. (P. P. Panaitescu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - Life and Works*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1958, p. 83-84.).

As for the *Bohemian council*, he begins to see it as an aid to the lord, attributing to it only an advisory character. The wisdom of a gentleman is seen when he admits to being advised because "no matter how wise a man and how well he knows things, he alone can give his advice and to ask no questions of others so that he does not err beyond his means"... As can be seen, there must be complete unity between the lord and the Bohemian council, which he saw as being achieved by incorporating the authority of the lords into the authority of the lord. On the other hand, however, he envisages a hierarchical distance between the lord and the nobles "as the sun shines towards the other stars, as the emperor shines towards the senators and other subjects". (Dimitrie Cantemir, *Description of Moldavia*, vol. I, p. 131.).

At the same time, according to Cantemir, unity between the lord and the nobility is conceived as a means of preventing intrigues, which lead to the weakening of the unity of the state. For example, Cantemir advocates the removal from the council of those guilty of enmity.

Another of Cantemir's legal ideas was also the obligation for the people to listen to and serve their rulers with love, emphasizing in this regard that the state is strengthened only when "subjects listen and serve with love.". But at the same time, Cantemir also recognizes the right of the people to rise against the monarch and the laws when he abuses and rules by force. In this regard, we quote: "Where pravila in silence and strength, but not in good reason and justice is supported, there no obedience of the subjects is necessary". For Cantemir, therefore, there is what has been called natural law, that is, a set of rights enjoyed by men, which no power can violate and which are imposed on the sovereign lawgiver and law-keeper.

Silence cannot be legislated; and even if the state power were to attempt to prescribe rules which are not following justice, such measures would only arouse revolt among the people.

As can be seen, we find in Dimitrie Cantemir, ideas of the natural law school, according to which positive law is preceded by an ideal, universal right, which would derive from human nature or reason and which no power can violate. The measures taken by sovereigns, which would not be by natural law, would produce a revolt of the masses. From this perspective, it could be stated that positive law must be by natural law.

Dimitrie Cantemir, like the other followers of the *natural law* of his time, explains the existence of unjust laws, as well as the regime of cruel feudal exploitation, by the fact that the sovereigns do not know what the rights of the people are, hoping for the establishment of more enlightened masters who will know equal rights for all. It is, therefore, about the establishment shortly of an enlightened monarchy, which will realize the people's desire. The position of future lord made Dimitrie Cantemir not understand that social justice cannot be established in a society. (Ioan Platon, Some ideas advanced from Dimitrie Cantemir's political and legal thinking, op.cit.p. 76). In addition to these, Dimitrie Cantemir also supported other legal ideas regarding the country's great assemblies for electing the lord or taking important decisions, about the practices used to confirm the lords by the Gate, the diplomatic agencies of Moldova in Constantinople.

12. Without losing its universal character, Cantemir's work is deeply Romanian; only what is deeply and nationally representative enters the universal heritage. Cantemir's work can only be properly understood and correctly evaluated by relating it, first of all, to the Romanian culture and civilization of South-Eastern Europe. Only in this way can the leap represented by Cantemir's work be appreciated at its true value, only in this way can its original and valuable contribution to the development of legal culture and European civilization be weighed. His work must be understood in the spirit of the high patriotism by which he was animated; "*sweet is estate love!*" -that is, of the country- he says somewhere, and this love prompted him to write and make his estate, the country, known throughout Europe". The Cantemirian opera in the vision of Dumitrie Gusti undoubtedly meant a new path in the study of the life of the popers. Besides, he would have been, in addition to a great scholar, also a great Lord if the fate of the war had turned differently - Xenopol pointed out.

13. Referring to *the end of Dimitrie Cantemir's life*, we emphasize that, "after the campaign in the Caucasus (1722), after which an impressive

amount of intellectual work remained, Cantemir suffers the first crisis of diabetes, and at the same time a sudden and total disgrace from Peter. Dimitrie Cantemir then retires to one of his estates, where he lives the last months of his life." (Monica Joița, *Portrait of Cantemir*, op.cit., p.13.). He *died* at his Dimitrievka estate in Ukraine, on August 21, 1723. About his death, author Ilie Neculce wrote: "and they also paid their debt of this world, the ancestral one, and went to their parents." "The embalmed body of the Moldavian ruler was taken to Moscow and buried on October 1 at the Greek monastery, where it stayed for *two centuries*. In 1935, the bones of Dimitrie Cantemir (1710 - 1711), who on September 21, 1723, had ended his days far from the precious land of Moldova. (Neculce Șerbănescu, *Tomb of the Martyr Voivode Constantin Brâncoveanu in "BOR"*, year XC VIII, no. 1-2 Jan-Feb. 1980, p. 116).

References

- Cristian Popișteanu, Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Roman people, interview with Miron Nicolescu, President of the Romanian Academy, *Magazin istoric*, year VII, no. 7, (76) July 1973, p. 9, col. I.
- Monica Joița, *Cantemir's Portrait*, in "Noua Revistă Română" - Serie nove - nr. 8-9 from November - December 1996, p.11.
- Ion Verdeș, *Dimitrie Cantemir, patriot, thinker and scientist*, Din istoria filosofiei in România, vol. II, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1957, p. 62
- Vaida Petru, *Cantemir's Humanism and the Problem of Moral Conscience*, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1971, p.7;
- C.I.Gulian, S.Ghiță, N.Gogoneață, C.Joja, R.Pantazi and Al. Posescu, *History of social and philosophical thought in Romania*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 1964, p.79
- N. Georgescu, A Triumph of Romanian Philosophical Encyclopedism, in Europe and the Romanian Nation -*Națiunea*, year. XXI, no. 542 (1007) of 13-19 January 2010, p. 11.
- Alexandru Zub, *Romanian Historians in search of Europe*, *Academica Magazine*, a magazine published by the Romanian Academy, no.10, October 2014, year XXIV, 288, p.66
- Cristian Popișteanu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Roman people*, op.cit., p. 8, col. I.
- Vlad Georgescu, *Political Ideas and Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities 1750 - 1831*, Ed. Romanian Academy, 1972, p. 49.

- Monica Joița, *Portrait of Cantemir*, op.cit., p.10.
- Victor Neumann, *Religious Reform and Crises of Conscience: From Theophilus Corydaleus to Dimitrie Cantemir*, in *Romanians in Universal History*, vol. II, coord. I. Agrigoroaie, Gh. Buzatu, V. Cristian, "Al. I. Cuza, Iași, 1987, p. 400.
- Cristian Popișteanu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Roman people*, p.9.
- Maria Holban, *Foreword to Foreign travelers about Romanian countries*, vol.I, Editura Științifică, Bucharest, 1968, p.XIX.
- Mircea Malița, *Pages from the Past of Romanian Diplomacy*, Ed. Politică, Bucharest, 1966, pp. 198 - 199.
- Halil Bedii Yneiken, *D. Cantemir dans l'histoire de la musique turque in Actes du Colloque international de civilisation balcaniques*, Sinaia 8-14, juillet 1962, București, p. 145 - 149;
- Virgil Câdea, *Dimitrie Cantemir and the beginnings of the Oriental Question*, in V. Câdea, Dinu C. Giurescu, Mircea Malița, *Pagini din trecutul diplomației românești*, Editura Politică, Bucharest, 1966, p. 189.
- I. M. Stefan Tounbee, vol. VIII, "The water passes, the stones remain..." *Historical Magazine*, year VII, no.7 (76) July 1973, pp.26 - 27.
- Monica Joița, *Portrait of Cantemir*, op.cit., p. 12.
- Cristian Popișteanu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - a personality worthy of the Romanian people*, op.cit., p.8, col I.
- A.V. Boldur, *The History of Bessarabia - Contributions to the Study of the History of Romanians*, vol. I - *Ancient times up to the 17th century*, Chisinau, Tipografia, Dreptatea, 1937, p. 2.
- P. P. Panaitescu, *Dimitrie Cantemir - Life and Works*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1958, p. 83-84.
- Dimitrie Cantemir, *Description of Moldavia*, vol. I, p. 131.
- Ioan Platon, *Some ideas advanced from Dimitrie Cantemir's political and legal thinking*, op. cit. p. 76.
- Neculce Șerbănescu, *Tomb of the Martyr Voivode Constantin Brâncoveanu in "BOR"*, year XC VIII, no. 1-2 Jan-Feb. 1980, p. 116.