

ADRIAN PETRE POPESCU

"Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu

**DIMITRIE CANTEMIR „IN THE SEARCH OF THE STILL HIDDEN TRUE
PROTOTYPE”**

Abstract: The phrase “cultural diplomacy” is also described as a process of projection/thrust to the outside of the system of autochthon cultural values designed to exercise decisive influences on the cryptic/prophetic orientation within the spheres of foreign policies. By invoking political diplomacy, the role of “political ritual” is also called into question, a ceremonial practice that “displays and promotes the power of political institutions or the political interests of certain actors of social groups”. Dimitrie Cantemir is the prototype of the man who left at the beginning of the eighteenth century, in the volume „Monarchiarum physica examinatio” (1714), the only theoretical-diplomatic writing. It comprises the image of the scholar, the humanist, but also of the lord of Moldavia “wisely” dedicated to the artistic creation (literary, musical, etc.) and to the scientific research, concerned about the logics, metaphysics and philosophy of the great Jan Baptist van Helmont. Our first linguist and dialectologist, the first Romanian scholar who tried to create a scientific, philosophic and political-diplomatic terminology for our language, raising the Romanian language to the rank of the other literary languages of that time in Europe, the following works are added: “Metaphysics” (1700), “The image of the sacred science”, “About consciousness” and “The divan or quarrel of the wise man to the world or the soul’s spear with the body” (1698), Romanian philosophical paper in which reflections are embroidered on the notions of time, soul, nature, consciousness. One of the most important writings of Dimitrie Cantemir for the Romanian culture, which, through “its pedantry character”, also included in the category of “diplomatic literature” remains “Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor” – “The Chronicle of the history of Romanians-Moldavians-Vlachs”, to which we add “Istoria ieroglifică în douăsprezece părți împărțită” – “The hieroglyphic history divided in twelve parts” (1704-1705), a sort of “secret history”, “political allegory”, in which Cantemir shows interest for esoteric and obscurity, a “hermetic character” in language and an esoteric in the old signs of Arabic-Persian culture. We described the “Hieroglyphic history” as a textual labyrinth, a baroque narrative palace with closed gates, a magical-mythical, esoteric universe with several affinities and communicating bridges with the entire medieval culture, like a secret/encrypted history. Proved by the description of the “secret temple” of “Boadza Pleonaxii” (the Goddess of Greed), translated in an imaginary spontaneous-baroque. First of all, we have presented in “The hieroglyphic history”, the “discordances of the nature”, the overabundance of images, the attention focused on psychology, the invitation to dreaming and imagination but also to parable, as a “history of fundamental situations”. “The divan or quarrel of the wise man with the world” could not be overlooked from this analysis of the Cantemirian spirituality, a study reflecting the inner reconstruction of Eastern Europe humanists, captured in a declining formula of philosophy as wisdom, a “manual of wisdom of ancient Romanian culture”, which has aroused interest among Freemason diplomat writers of the nineteenth century, in their search for enlightenment. We would also add to this study the scholarly prose “Descriptio Moldaviae”: a paper which stands at the border of scientific and fiction prose, a book also considered as having diplomatic intentions. Being the first monograph of Moldavia, through which Dimitrie Cantemir tried to make Moldavia more popular among other nations. „Kitab-i-musiki” (The Book of the Science of Music) is under

the influence of the esoteric environment, a serious concern, specific both to the secret and archaic circles, reminiscent of ancient Greek biannual processions.

Keywords: history; diplomat writers; spirituality; esoteric culture; philosophy.

The phrase “cultural diplomacy” is also described as a process of projection/thrust to the outside of the system of autochthon cultural values designed to exercise decisive influences on the cryptic/prophetic orientation within the spheres of foreign policies. By invoking political diplomacy, the role of “political ritual” is also called into question, a ceremonial practice that “displays and promotes the power of political institutions or the political interests of certain actors of social groups up until the start of the 18th Century, the only theoretical writing on diplomatic subjects was the volume entitled “*Monarchiarum physica examination*” (1714) belonging to Dimitrie Cantemir. As part of the aforementioned work, the Adviser of Czar Petru I describes the “medieval plan” of the four monarchies, a plan guided by “rationalist interpretations” in the sense that Dimitrie Cantemir shows us the natural way of the birth, growth, decay and disappearance these monarchies.

When we mention the Cantemir, either the scholar, the deeply read, the humanist or the Lord of Moldova, we take into account that he was an individual that “skillfully” dedicates himself to artistic creation (literary, musical etc.) and scientific research, deeply preoccupied with logic, metaphysics and the philosophy of Illuminati Jan Baptist van Helmont. We do have in front of us a polyglot initiated into the Oriental cultures, probing “abilities” that were very much beyond the horizon of the diplomatic art of the time and politics. Despite the short and long term “consequences”, Dimitrie Cantemir also reveals himself to us as a modern spirit, intensely preoccupied with the notion of truth, which he calls “the eyes, the soul and the life of history” - a perspective that sheds light on his pursuit of assuring a perfect match between his writings and the reality of facts. It is curious that being the scientist that brought back with him the Berlin Academy Oriental wisdom, filtered through European conscience, he received no “recognition” from either the manorial divan, or the diplomat scholar and polyglot Nicolae Costin (Nicolae Mavrocordat’s man of messengers). Therefore the already famous paraphrase of Nicolae Cartoian, after a saying by Miron Costin, “it’s more easy to fit ten dervish on a rug, rather than two Romanian scholars of the 18th Century”. The burning desire that Cantemir shows for the truth is definitely worthy of more attention because we also find it with obstinacy in his writings either to assure the readers that everything written is truthful, or to scold his fellow writers that were drifting away from truthful writings. His “pioneering merits” cannot be contested: he wasn’t only our first historian, our first ethnographer and, in a way, our first linguist and dialectologist, but he was also the first Romanian scholar that tried to create a scientific, philosophical and political-diplomatic terminology for our language, thus raising the Romanian language to the level of the other European literary languages of the time, making it a language capable of expressing abstract, philosophical and scientific notions. Proof of this would be literary works like “*Metafizica*” (1970), “The image of sacred science”, “About consciousness” and “The Divan or The Wiseman’s Quarrel with the World or the Soul’s with the Body” (1698) – the first Romanian philosophical writing in which reflections are broided on the notions of time, soul, nature and consciousness. Dimitrie Cantemir suggests the superiority of man among all other living creatures, thus making “man” ruler of the world. He especially got our attention with “*Logic and the Anthology of Texts from Van Helmont*” (1701). This work of writing will benefit from the mystical “erudite contribution” acquired from domains such as Christian and astrological Symbolism, Geomancy, medieval Hermetical science, palmistry, Cabala, physiognomy and so on. Therefore it is not surprising that “initiated Călinescu” wanted to

follow Cantemir in detail and observe his “Divan” way of approach on Apocalyptic visions and Hermetical appearances, as Dimitrie Cantemir was a close adept of Jean-Baptiste Van Helmont’s Paracelsian: All the ideas in *Archaeus faber causae et initia rerum naturalium* can be also found in *Imago*: the Enlightened creation through the help of elements (air, water), Archaeas, ferments, blas (the propulsive principle) and souls. The Archaea, half-spiritual and half-bodily, is the incentive of all life phenomena. It must be said that similar to Van Helmont, Cantemir is also considered a theosophist, because he writes “theologian-physics”. This implies acknowledging the Divine revelation through scripture from the start, but with a corrective that rightfully allows the separation of pure theology: the philosopher gets deeper into the Christian truth through self-enlightenment and searches through texts like some hieroglyphs filled with hidden meanings. One of Dimitrie Cantemir’s most important writings, from the Romanian culture point of view, is “The Chronicle of Roman-Moldo-Vlach Age” that can be added to the category of “diplomatic writing” because of its “pedantry”. Nicolae Manolescu considered it the work of a *Hasdeu* of the 18th Century, with a eutopical and unfulfillable plan in which the author asks himself more questions than all his National History predecessors put together.

But what is more relevant for us can be found in “The Hieroglyphic History divided in Twelve Parts, with 760 Sentences nicely embellished, at the Beginning with a Scale of Revealing Numbers and at the End with unknown Mystical Numbers” (1704-1705) – this work has been said to be a “secret history”, a “political allegory” and so on, his author proving himself to (possibly) be a passionate of the occult and obscurity, a “Hermetical agent” in languages and an insider of old sign language of the Arab-Persian culture. It is a strange fact that for an amateur of “infidel lectures” like Nicolae Manolescu was, in the “hieroglyphic history” there is no such thing as a “proper obscurity”. The critic is convinced that most of Cantemir’s contemporaries did not even need a character “scale” and believes that a playful approach is much more close to the truth than a mystical one: *All the cyphers, numbers of one sort or another, they are for him but simple games of a cultivated and intelligent man. [...] The hieroglyphical history resembles more with a very ingenious allegory, animated by a giant comical Genie, but also with a satiric benign, a writing both naïve and sophisticated, elementary and refined.*

The first Romanian literary work (in the modern sense) is in fact an “alexandrine” one that processes the popular medieval romance model and all its arsenal in the most scientific-artificial way possible. It is the first Romanian cult. Because of the large number of symbolic characters, the “Hieroglyphical history” has been perceived as a textual labyrinth, a baroque narrative palace with closed gates, a magical-mythical and abstruse universe with numerous affinities and connections with the entire medieval culture. It has also been said that just appealing to semiotics and a Hermetical analysis of signs can one generate a new decoding (especially of names) of such a semiotical lecture, having the sole purpose not only of capturing the mystical senses and the elucidation of symbol compensations regarding a hystorical situation, but also the principle of a literary work.

With the risk of contradicting Nicolae Manolescu, we cannot ignore the fact that the “Hieroglyphical history” can be categorized also as a “crypted/secret history”. This is demonstrated by the description of the secret temple of “Boadzei Pleonaxii” (the Goddess of Greed), that is transposed into an easily-baroque imagination, both complex and luxurious: The same abstruse view is projected upon the description of the dream of the treacherous Chameleon that fumbles through the dark woods and reaches a fire that is mixed with the water of the clouds, some sort of a lightning stretched from the sky to the ground. As the Chameleon was hungry, he sees inside this fire a salamander that was feeding on hot ash. The Chameleon embraces the salamander’s unsaturation as he also attempts to defeat his hunger by eating these ashes of the wilderness. But he burns himself from the inside. The

salamander offers advice and suggests to the Chameleon that it eats snake's eggs to heal. But this cure will only make it worse as the snake babies will poison its intestines. The next cure that he tries, the jab of a Unicorn, is also useless because the "power of the horn" only helps with "outside poison" and not for the venom that "is created inside". As a confirmation, while the treacherous Chameleon turns in his sleep the Unicorn struggles to free himself from the trap he was in. If we take a look further than the allegory that the writer will use to compare the two "monarchies", we find a certain psychology, illustrated mainly by the Unicorn. The soul oscillates "between the terrestrial solicitations and a wisdom fueled by the Ecclesiastical and stoic thinking".

But before all this, in the "Hieroglyphical history", Dimitrie Cantemir reflects the "discordances of the nature" using the syncopated rhythms of baroque narration. This is why we encounter images in abundance, effect of the channeled attention towards psychology, appealance to dream and imagination, but also towards parabola. At one point in the work, these all make way for "fundamental situations". In this way, History is a universe without solution. The multitude of coexisting intentions – or simply put an arborescent syntax – as well as the tendency towards multipolarity rule out the possibility of approaching the text from a privileged point of view. The baroque opening and dynamism that describe this work forces the reader to permanently change his angle of reading. Another literary work of reference is "The Divan or The Wiseman's Quarrel with the World", considered to be a reference study regarding self inner reconstruction of the humanists in eastern Europe, process enfigured as a refusal of philosophy as intelligence. The literary work is listed in the "Collective Catalogue of Old Romanian Books" as "The Divan or The Wiseman's Quarrel with the World or the Soul's with the Body: firstly invented and devised from the Old and New Testament; through the hard work and relentless love of Ioan Dimitrie Cantemir Voivode; again with the zeal and good care [...] of nobleman Lupul Bogdan; and they have been printed through the trouble of humble and lesser hieromonk Athanasie and monk Dionisie, moldavians [...] first of inventivity and devisement". Cantemir's "Divan", beyond any other general significance, maps an original sense of intelligence and can be considered without any shade of doubt the "textbook for intelligence of the old Romanian culture". It sparked interest amongst the Romanian diplomat-Freemason writers of the 19th Century as they were looking to cultivate their ethical virtues towards Enlightenment.

To this study we can also add the scientific prose "Descriptio Moldaviae", a literary work somewhere at the border between scientific prose and fiction. Published in 1716 at the express request of the Academy of Science in Berlin (at that time President was philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz) the book was written also from a diplomatic point of view. Being the first monograph of Moldova, it offers a variety of information from areas like history, geography, archeology, natural history, ethnography and folklore, compared linguistics, dialectology and social psychology, all meant to make Moldova popular amongst the other nations. Having structured this literary work into three separate parts, focused on geographical, political and ecclesiastical presentations, Dimitrie Cantemir manages to value his scholarship, his modern vision manifested both in content and in expression, and also his capability of synthesizing and essentializing the addressed problems. The part entitled "About the organization of Moldova state" is the first of its kind, part of Romanian political thinking. "Whoever wishes to politically describe Moldova, if you ask me, has to firstly research the way that it is being led [...]", states Cantemir, thus offering the "key" to opportune politics: legitimacy and the traditionalism of absolute ruling, guarded by the principle of heredity. In this chapter there are also several accounts about the diplomatic relations with the Gate. Cantemir distinguishes that in the course of time "the Turks have completely abolished the boyars' right to choose their leader", stripping this leader of the "right to declare war, declare peace, sign a treaty, send diplomatic messengers to neighbor states". The 3rd Chapter of Part 2

contains specific elements of the diplomatic environment, regarding enthroning and confirming Lords, writings necessary for ruler acknowledgement from places including Constantinopol: after agreeing with the candidate upon gifts and other conditions of the future rulership and after he receives the payment that he is entitled to, he will inform the King of his opinion by writing a letter called a “talhiș” as follows: «The present Ruler of Moldova bears hard on Your Majesty’s subjects. If this proposition is pleasing to the King and if no guardian – nor other acolytes of the King’s most intimate resist the vizier’s attempts, one usually writes below by hand for it to be made as written above». Adversary of boyar oligarchy, Dimitrie Cantemir recommends the promotion in public service based on culture and capabilities. His cultural preoccupations spread as to also reach the special attention granted to the origins of the Moldavian language. In the same “Descriptio Moldaviae”, inside a special chapter, the author proves that the Latin language is the cornerstone of the Moldavian tongue because of the large number of Latin words, even more that Italian possesses, context in which he quotes the likes of important scholars of those Moldavian times, including Ieremia Cacavela (who was also a former teacher of his). He also mentions the following: Before the Florence Council, the Moldavian people were using Latin characters as it was popular with all the other nations of this origin. “But after this synod, the Archbishop of Moldova switched sides to the papistry and was replaced by Deacon Marcu of Efes, Bulgarian of origin, named Theoctistus, who in order to eradicate further any sign of papistry inside the Moldavian Church and prevent young people from having contact with papistry writings, advised Alexander the Good not only to banish all people thinking differently, but also to replace the Latin letters with Slaavonic ones”. The diplomat Cantemir, predecessor of “absolute enlightenment” – very well spread during the 18th Century – considers that an enlightened monarch must look out for the better of the society and the development of the economy, science and culture. Taken from the memoirs of Moreau de Brassey, French officer in Peter the Great’s suite, we have a portrait of Dimitrie Cantemir: *This ruler was a man of short stature, with his body shaped in a delicate fashion, serious and with such a pleasant appearance, as I have never seen in my life. He was a polite man, amiable, with gentle, tender, flowing conversation, speaking Latin of the highest kind, which made him very likeable for those who spoke this language and had the joy of talking to this prince.*

His admittance as a full member of the Berlin Academy, his preoccupations of intellectual and spiritual order, his friendships and international connections (with affiliates of the Freemasonry like Czar Peter I Romanov – the one who introduced the Rosicrucian Order in Russia – and Peter Andreevici Tolstoi – Ambassador of Russia at the Ottoman Gate and Chief of the Secret Police) and his armorial arguments (the crest of Moldova, drawing made by Cantemir and included in “Descriptio Moldaviae”, in Chapter 8 – “About the court’s ceremonies”, but also the two chained arms in the fourth quadrante of his blazon which appear on all versions of his crests) are all succor to the idea of him being part of the Rosicrucian movement. To these preoccupations we can also mention his foray in the domain of mythology, spread onto the pages of “Descriptio Moldaviae”. He focused on Geto-Dacian mythology, making remarks of some “unknown spiritual Divinities” that look like “Dacian idols”: Lado / Venera and Mano / Cupid; Dzina / Diana; Dragaica / Cers-Doina; Devil of Tău / Water Spirit; Destinies / Faith; The Flyer / The lure of a beautiful young man; Tricolici / Men with faces of wolves or other animals and so on, fable characters that will later on be assumed and interpreted in works of Asachi, Hasdeu, Eminescu etc.

It is worth underlining the fact that during the Phanariot times there was a great rise of Freemasonry lodges in the Principalities. These favoured the entry of Occidental Enlightenment ideas, a context that can easily include the philosophical writing “Sacrosanctae scientiae indepingibilis imago”, written in 1700, in which Dimitrie Cantemir tries to integrate physics into a theist environment, a sort of reconciliation between science and religion,

between scientific determinism and medieval metaphysics. Actually, we discover a Cantemir that is interested in astrology and the sacred occult sciences that were specific to the Renaissance period and the European esoteric brotherhoods. Another literary work under the influence of the esoteric environment is “Kitabi-musiki” (the book of musical science). This is not just a simple study of music, but also a profound preoccupation that was popular with secret and archaic initiation circles that were moving forward customs assimilated from ancient Greece (circles took place in a temple in Eleusis, dedicated to goddess Demetra and her daughter, Persefona). In ancient Greece there used to be legends about initiation journeys in Egypt take by heroes and founders of religious schools, like Pitagora or Orfeu. Such processions were flooded by an exalted atmosphere, being filled with symbols of fertility, initiation, purification, ceremonies accompanied by dance and Phrygian flute music. Based on this information we can intuit Cantemir’s membership in a “luciferic” environment. Another argument to back this is Antioh Cantemir’s involvement in founding a Lodge in approximate 1707, organization initially named “Moldavia Lodge”, rebuilt in 1826 under the name “Dimitrie Cantemir Lodge” – a name that would have not been given unless Dimitrie was truly a Freemason. Viorel Dănaclu, Grand Master Ad Vitam and P.V.M. 33, brought a further argument to assure of Cantemir’s relation with the secret societies, saying: *Dimitrie Cantemir was the first ruler that made contact and was a member of a Rosicrucian lodge, because inside these lodges there was a clear custom of secretly beheading their dead members in order to bury their heads in Edinburgh, the headquarters of the order. Cantemir died in Russia. He was reburied in Royal Romania, [...]. Historian Nicolae Iorga, the artisan of these actions, found by opening the coffin that the deadman’s head was missing. [...] In the port of Constanța they found confirmation that inside the coffin there were parts of the bones, namely the bones of the arms and legs wrapped inside an old Oriental silk cloth.*

All in all, this profile of scholar-diplomat Dimitrie Cantemir is to highlight the importance of Romanian diplomats / negociators, their essential or formal role in relationship with other states, the fact that not just once have their words been their weapons, alongside the powerful personality of each and everyone of them, “political leaders [...] that apply foreign policies in order to obtain what they believe is national interest – adjusting national policies”. Therefore, we find ourselves in front of a great personality, surely one of the most prominent in our culture, who George Călinescu describes, trying to capture his complexity: “Enlightened voivode, ambitious and blasé, a people’s man and an ascetic person in the library, scheming and solitary, handler of people and misanthrope, in love with the Moldova after which he yearns, adventurer, singer and Romanian chronicler, knower of all wordly pleasures, Dimitrie Cantemir is our Lorenzo de Medici”.

Bibliografie -References

BIANU, Ioan, *Bibliografia românească veche: 1508-1830*, vol.I. Ed. Academiei Române, București, 1944.

CANTEMIR, Dimitrie, *Hronicul vechimei a româno-moldovlahilor*, Ed. Minerva, București, 2000.

CANTEMIR, Dimitrie *Opere, Hronicul vechimei a româno-moldo-vlahilor*, Edit. AR, București, 2003.

CANTEMIR, Dimitrie, *Divanul sau Gâlceava Înțeleptului cu Lumea*, Ed. Ptr. Literatură, București, 1969.

CARTOJAN Nicolae, *Istoria Literaturii Române vechi*, Editura Minerva. 1971.

CĂLINESCU George, *Istoria Literaturii Române. Compendium*, Editura pentru Literatură, București, 1982.

CĂLIN Vera, *Structuri alegorice în literatura veche și nouă*, Editura pentru Literatură, București, 1969.

- CERNĂTESCU Radu, *Literatura Luciferică*, Edit. Cartea Românească, București, 2010.
- CURTICĂPEANU Doina, *Orizonturile vieții în literatura română veche*, Ed. Minerva, București, 1975.
- CURTICĂPEANU Doina, *Istoria ieroglifică*, Editura Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 1999,
- CURTICUS Ernst Robert, *Literatura europeană și Evul Mediu*, Ed. Univers, București, 1970.
- DJUVARA Neagu, *O scurtă istorie a românilor povestită celor tineri*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2008.
- DRÎMBA Ovidiu, *Istoria culturilor și civilizațiilor*, Ed. SAECULUM I.O., București, 2009.
- ELIADE Mircea, *Mitul reintegrării*. Editura Humanitas, București, 2003.
- FOUCART Paul, *Misterele de la Eleusis*, Editura Dacia, Cluj, 1914.
- GEORGHIU Grigore, *Filosofia culturii. Cultură și comunicare*, Editura Comunicare, București, 2004.
- GIURESCU Constantin, *Istoria Românilor..*, Ed. Fundația Regală pentru Literatură și Artă, București, 1946
- HUINZIGA Johan, *Homo ludens*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2003
- MACKAY Albert G., *Legende, miturile și simbolistica Francmasoneriei*, Editura Herald, București, 2008.
- MANOLESCU Nicolae, *Istoria critică a literaturii române*, Ed. Fundației Culturale Române, București, 1997.
- NICULAE Florian, *Dimitrie Cantemir*, Cuvânt Masonic, Ed. CRSF Paris-București, București, 2009.
- PAQUIN Stéphane *La paradiplomatie identitaire*, Éditeur Société de science politique, Québec, 2004.
- STRAUSS Claude Lévi, *Antropologie structurale*, II, Éditions Plon, Paris, 1973.