
RESTITUTIONS

An Unpublished Study by the Historian Silviu Dragomir

IOAN-AUREL POP
SORIN ŞIPOŞ

This research of Silviu Dragomir, unpublished until now, shows us a well-documented researcher, concerned with the early fate of the Romanians in Transylvania, with their native tradition of Byzantine faith, trapped by conquest into the Kingdom of Hungary.

Ioan-Aurel Pop

Academician, rector of Babeş-Bolyai University, director of the Center for Transylvanian Studies.

Sorin Şipoş

Professor, prorector of Oradea University.

THIS STUDY, carried out by Silviu Dragomir in the context of his concerns with medieval Transylvanian Romanian history, was written against the background of the dispute between Romanian and Hungarian historians on the status of the Romanians in Transylvania, north of the Danube in general, and in Transylvania and Hungary in particular. This controversy about the continuity and prevalence of Romanians in Transylvania (a territory considered here broadly, in its modern sense) increased even more in the interwar period, after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and after what the Hungarian public opinion called the “tragedy of Trianon” (the treaty that provided, *inter alia*, a legal international recognition of the union of Transylvania with Romania, decided on 1 December 1918). The reduction of Hungary to its ethnic borders and the presence of major Hungarian ethnic groups in the successor states initially caused stupor and disorientation, gradually degenerating into a very strong revisionist movement whose peak was reached at the beginning of the Second World War. Romania (like other countries in the region) advocated the opposite position, namely the preservation of the borders established

by the Versailles system. In both countries (as almost everywhere in Europe), the historical writing was put in the service of the specific national cause, although historical rights were no longer an argument to legitimize the rule of states over any territory.

Silviu Dragomir belonged to the gallery of top professional historians, authentic scholars defined by honesty and integrity in the exercise of their profession. Alongside other contemporary scholars, Silviu Dragomir turned his job into a patriotic mission; his gesture shows profound decency and flawless ethics. However, the scholar had been the witness and sometimes the protagonist of events from which he could not be completely separated; these events left their imprint upon his training, his attitudes, and his writings. He lived an important part of his life in a foreign country in which he was and felt discriminated against, just like his whole nation of peasants and priests, marginalized, humiliated and educated in the spirit of submissiveness. Like his entire generation, he regarded the military confrontation in which Romania had become involved since 1916 as the “great war for national reunification.” As a direct protagonist, he went through the emotional experience of the Great Union—considered as the astral event of the Romanians—and he felt overwhelmed during his whole life by this act of national will, which turned fear into courage and humility into pride and hope. He experienced the two interwar decades—with all their difficulties—as a glorious era in a worthy European state, placing his scholarly and political activities in the service of the great ideal to which he had pledged his allegiance. He saw World War II and especially the tragedy that followed as a humiliation, and then was deprived of his liberty by the communists; he died a sad and sick man, but an undefeated one.

His investigation of the first entries concerning the Romanians in some Hungarian documents of the thirteenth century is not exhaustive; it was described as the outline of a plan involving a thorough analysis and harmonization according to the requirements of the genre. Silviu Dragomir’s study, “First Mentions of the Romanians in Hungarian Documents (13th Century)” can be found in the Library of the Romanian Academy.¹ The text is handwritten, on A5 sheets, simple (pp. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19) and double (pp. 4–5, 12–13, 16–17), in black ink. The study does not indicate the author’s name, but was found together with other documents signed by Silviu Dragomir. The handwriting is undoubtedly his. Also, one can easily recognize his editing style, with numerous interventions, additions, and corrections. As to the moment when the study was written, we would place it in the interwar period. There are some clues in this regard, namely the works of the authors listed in the study, works which were published between the two World Wars. Also, in the 1930s the polemics with the Hungarian historiography intensified because of the propaganda unleashed by the neighboring state, which desired a change of the borders set after World War I. Silviu Dragomir was actively involved in this dispute. During these years, Dragomir published over 60 articles in various journals and newspapers in Romania on topics related to Transylvania and the Romanians living in this province. Most likely, the study found in manuscript form was prepared by the author either for a conference, or as a preliminary material in view of its subsequent publication. The study remained in manuscript form, among other such documents, set aside for future publication. After the death of the Dragomirs, Ms. Florica Enescu, the granddaughter of Prof. Silviu

Dragomir, donated the studies remained in manuscript form to the Library of the Romanian Academy. Proof of this donation is the letter sent to Florica Enescu, on 1 June 1974, by Gabriel Ștrempel, the then director of the Manuscripts and Documents Office.²

Like other contemporaries and colleagues at the University of Cluj, Silviu Dragomir was concerned with the Transylvanian history of the beginning of the second millennium, and especially with the reasons for the relatively late mentioning of Romanians in the documents of the time. The author found two explanatory reasons, namely the late rendition of the Hungarian Royal Chancellery, correlated with the gradual conquest of Transylvania by the Hungarian Kingdom, on the one hand, and the lack of early donations to the Romanians from the Crown, on the other. In other words, their social condition and the Romanian way of life (shepherds and small farmers) at first did not make the Hungarian authorities involve the Romanians in the life of the state; apart from these reasons, the author believed that the Orthodox religion of the Romanians also played a part. The first finding is relative and insufficient even for Silviu Dragomir, who notes that while the Romanians are mentioned five times before the Tatar invasion (1241) and ten times after the invasion (1241–1300), the Saxons (newcomers) enjoy 78 entries before the Tatars and 285 after, until the beginning of the fourteenth century. The second reason is indeed decisive: the Romanians, as ancestral owners of the land, did not need donations from the central government to enjoy the fruits of the land, nor any written documents (privileges), being subservient to the new authorities. Instead, the Saxons, as “guests” (newcomers), needed written justification for each plot of land received, for any recognized “freedom,” for all their actions. Besides, as a subjected people conquered without notable resistance—as the author highlights—the Romanians could not have been included from the start into the “state life” of Hungary, being regarded with suspicion. Conversely, they looked at their conquerors with little trust.³ During roughly the same time, his colleague Ioan Moga⁴ was concerned with similar issues; he explained the relatively late mentioning of Romanians included in the Kingdom of Hungary by two causes: one was social-political in nature, as only the issues concerning the privileged groups (to which Romanians did not belong) were mentioned in writing, and the other was geographical-juridical, having to do with the inclusion in the written documents of the lands accessible to newcomers, usually up to an altitude of about 600 meters (the lower limit for beech growth); but the Romanians lived (or they had been driven) mostly above this altitude, in sheltered regions, hilly and mountainous, suitable for sheep raising and small farming. Of course, the research conducted in the decades that followed further refined the details, without changing too much the conclusions that had been reached by Silviu Dragomir and his contemporaries.⁵

THEN COME the presentation and the commentaries to the 15 entries about Romanians in Hungarian and Latin papal documents.⁶ The first refers to the year 1210, when the Hungarian King Andrew II sent military help to the Bulgarian Tsar Asen Boril, troops lead by the Comes Joachim of Sibiu and consisting of Saxons, Romanians, Szeklers and Pechenegs.⁷ Dragomir’s observations remain pertinent to this day, both in terms of the geographical origins of the named ethnicities, and in terms

of the order in which the Romanians are listed in this enumeration.⁸ Subsequent research has underlined other aspects as well, insisting on the high-level military organization of the Transylvanian Romanians, on the absence of Hungarians in the southern areas of the country in the 1200s, and on the general context of the crusade waged by the westerners in these regions invaded by the peoples of the steppe.⁹ A second entry dating from 1222 and referring to the “Country of Romanians”¹⁰ is rather brief, but the placing of this entity in the Land of Olt stands valid to this day. Further analysis has extended the area of investigation and the historical framework, noting the emergence of Romanians political structures, as well as their tendency to adapt to the system of territorial privileges that was taking shape in Transylvania.¹¹ Also, there is a record of the document issued by King Andrew II in 1223, which mentions the founding (approx. two decades earlier) of the Cistercian monastery at Cârța on a *terram . . . exemptam de Blaccis*, i.e. on a territory taken from the Romanians.¹² The boundaries identified by Silviu Dragomir remain valid even today (they encompassed a considerably large area, between the Olt Valley in the north, the Cârța River to the west, the Arpaș River to the east and the peaks of the Carpathians in the south); also valid remains the finding that that local place names, mostly Romanian, were translated into Hungarian.¹³ On the notion of “eximation” and its significance important works have been written since then; they revealed that the territory given to the Cistercian monastery at Cârța was taken at the beginning of the thirteenth century (probably in 1205–1206) from a Romanian religious or political-religious authority. The fourth entry refers to the famous *Andreanum* privilege (the Golden Bull of the Saxons) from 1224, in which the same King Andrew II gave to his Transylvanian “guests” the “forest of Romanians and Pechenegs” for their use from then on in fellowship with its old owners.¹⁴ The historian addresses the issue of the location of this forest, placing it on the *Fundus Regius*, on the right bank of the Olt River, “from Lotru and Tâlmaci all the way to Săliște.” This opinion did not withstand historical criticism. More recently and with relevant arguments, the respective forest has been located on the territory south of the Olt River, in the whole region of Făgăraș inhabited by Romanians and Pechenegs, on an area of almost 2,000 square kilometers and about 80 kilometers in length.¹⁵ The following entry, from 1234, comes from a papal document which speaks of “peoples” called Romanians from the Cumanian Bishopric.¹⁶ Although somewhat reticent in regard to the “abundance” of documents “churned out” in connection to the “Bishopric of Milcov,” the author says that this Diploma of Pope Gregory IX seems genuine. He territorially places the bishopric somewhere inside the Carpathian arch, “perhaps in the Szekler Land, in an area adjacent to the Land of Bârsa” and seems inclined to believe that the Romanians called their leaders prefects (the error comes from a confusion in terms, namely from misreading *prefati* for *prefecti*). This document was widely commented on and interpreted over the past half century, and the region in question was found to have been outside the Carpathians, from the bend area all the way to the north of the future Moldavia. Researchers have also described the political and religious organization of the Romanians formally included in the Cumanian Bishopric, confirming not only the “ethnic vigor of the Romanian element”—about which Silviu Dragomir also wrote—but also their structures of the Byzantine model in an area of contact with the Latin West.¹⁷

The importance of this papal document is highlighted in the context of the founding of the Cumanian Bishopric, headed by the former Dominican monk Theodoric (appointed in 1228), and in the context of the offensive against the “stubborn schismatics” launched by the papacy, with the help of the Latin kingdoms and monastic orders, after the Fourth Crusade.¹⁸ Thus, the document highlights the founding of this Latin bishopric in the area of authority of the bishops “of the Greek rite,” disobedient of Rome and considered therefore “false”; they were the ones followed by those “people” called “Wallachian,” and it was from them that the Wallachians received the church sacraments; moreover, some believers inside the Kingdom of Hungary—Hungarian, Teutonic and others—crossed over to the said Romanians, to live with them and together to form “one people” and to receive those holy sacraments from the “false Byzantine bishops,” “to the detriment of the Christian faith.” Therefore, to avoid “a danger for the soul” and in order to separate the Romanians from the “schismatic bishops,” the Latin Bishop was ordered by the Holy See to create for those Romanians “a Catholic bishop suitable for that nation ‘of Romanians,’ to be their Vicar,” to be obeyed by the Romanians, under the threat of “Church punishment.” Moreover, “King Bela, firstborn son of the King of Hungary,”¹⁹ as the Catholic prince “sworn” to compel them all to obey the Roman Church, was strongly urged by the Pope to stop “tolerating such schismatics in his kingdom.” The newer historiography has highlighted all the details significant for the confrontation between the Latin West and the Byzantine East, between Rome and Constantinople, and also the consequences of the Fourth Crusade for the peoples of Central-Eastern and South-Eastern Europe; it also presented the superior political-religious organization of the Romanians outside the Carpathian arch, within that region still traditionally called “Cumania.” However, new research has proven Silviu Dragomir at least partly right; he placed the said bishopric somewhere in eastern and south-eastern Transylvania, in the sense that the Cumanian Bishopric also included the Land of Bârsa and Braşov (called *Corona*).²⁰ Quite remarkable was the fact that, in 1234, that “Cumania” was home to “some people who are called Romanian,” with several bishops of their own, “of the Greek rite.” The Romanian political organization was inferred starting from the Latin term *populi* (as we have seen); such organization was also suggested by the existence of Byzantine bishops (who could not operate without the protection of a political structure). The expression whereby those Romanians “believe they are Christians by name” apparently proves not only the Pope’s intention to assimilate them as Catholics (since they had had a Latin bishop since 1227–1228), but also their awareness of the fact that they belonged to a canonical, true Church.²¹ From the Western perspective, the name “Christian” was given only to followers of the Roman Church. It was noted—all in the spirit of the “vigor” shown by the Romanians—that they reverted the sense of the proselytizing action: they were at the receiving end of harsh measures meant to make them convert to Catholicism, but instead of giving in they gathered Catholics around them (Hungarians, Germans and other ethnicities from the Kingdom of Hungary), and formed with them “one people,” of the Byzantine type (because they attended churches obeying “schismatic” bishops).²² Silviu Dragomir did not comment on all these issues, at least for three reasons. First, the entire text is only an outline, a listing of issues which he was going to

revisit or to address orally.²³ Secondly, the level of knowledge during those times (the end of the interwar period) did not allow the historian to believe (as he himself confessed) that the Romanians in “Moldavia” could have had at the beginning of the thirteenth century such higher forms of political and ecclesiastical organization. Finally, suspecting that the Diploma of the Hospitallers was a forgery, Silviu Dragomir was also relatively circumspect in regard to the papal diploma; he wrote about this, a few years later, in a post-war study that has remained unpublished²⁴ until recently. However, when writing this text, probably towards the end of the fourth decade of the twentieth century, the historian did not challenge the authenticity of the papal diploma of 1234.

Most of the references made to the Romanians after 1241–1242 are listed only with very parsimonious comments. Thus, the Diploma of the Hospitallers²⁵ issued six years after the Tatar invasion is only mentioned with its date of issuance (1247) and with a commentary on the term *Olaci* (the name given to the Romanians, a variant of *Vlachs*).²⁶ Here as well, the reason is not only the limited aim of the text, but especially the author’s doubts about the authenticity of the document in question, doubts that would later materialize in a study about 100 pages in length. According to a recent analysis, we believe that these doubts, although justified in part at the time (given the level of interwar knowledge) do not withstand current historical criticism.²⁷

The next testimony—the donation made by King Bela IV in 1252²⁸ to a Szekler named Vincent, who received a piece of land located between “the Romanians’ land in Cârța, the Saxons’ land of Bârsa and the Szeklers’ land in Sebus”—is only briefly mentioned as well.²⁹ It was only recently referred to in the series of arguments justifying the “freedom” of the Romanian Land of Olt.³⁰ The eighth entry (from 1256) had a similar fate, although it referred to the privileges received by the archbishop of Strigonium (Esztergom) from the Hungarian kings; among the privileges was the levy of the tithe on cattle, sheep and any other livestock, from the Szeklers and the Romanians.³¹ Silviu Dragomir did not realize that it referred to “rights” received by that archbishopric since the “the first founding”, i.e., since the time of King Stephen; nor did he realize that it referred to all Romanians in the kingdom. This proves not only that the Romanians were old inhabitants of the land, inhabiting vast territories, in direct relation with their high number, but also that they were present in Hungary at the time when the kingdom was founded.³² The reason, we believe, is the schematic character of the text, because others, including Canon Augustin Bunea, had commented upon this specific testimony before the First World War.³³

The next entry, from 1260, important for the military role of the Romanians at a time when Hungary was at war with the king of Bohemia,³⁴ is also mentioned very briefly.³⁵ It was later discussed in more detail by historians Mihail P. Dan³⁶ and Gheorghe I. Brătianu.³⁷ The latter approached it in the context of the early system of Hungarian Estates in which, during the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, the Romanians in Transylvania had been present alongside the Hungarians.³⁸ The tenth testimony, erroneously dated in 1282³⁹ instead of 1285, is limited to a recording of the facts: the expedition undertaken by a Hungarian army “beyond the mountains” against the Romanian ruler Litovoi, killed in battle, and against his brother, Bărbat, taken prisoner and ransomed for a large amount of money.⁴⁰ This document (like the one from 1288,⁴¹

not mentioned by Dragomir but recording the same fact) has been extensively commented on in various writings and associated with the period that saw the founding of the Voivodeship of Wallachia. The eleventh record, dating 1288, also alludes to the acceptance of the Romanians among the privileged groups in Transylvania, as the Archbishop of Strigonium (Esztergom) addressed “all Hungarian, Saxon, Szekler and Romanian nobles from the counties of Sibiu and Braşov.”⁴² Silviu Dragomir, however, does not talk about it but wonders whether the term “noble” refers to all those listed or only to the Hungarians, stressing the indication of a Romanian presence “between the Saxons and the Szeklers, in counties where the Saxons were organized on the basis of the Andrean privilege.”⁴³ The use of the term “noble” also in connection to the Szeklers, Saxons and Romanians is valid only in a generic sense: the Szeklers, the Saxons and the Romanians were similar to the nobles in the sense of being privileged groups, but could not actually have been true noblemen. Some of the Saxon, Szekler and Romanian leaders were later ennobled, but after this elevation of their social status they left their original groups and were gradually assimilated into the noble Estate. This document was also the object of several analyses, and more recently it has been included in a collection of sources relating to the functioning of the congregational regime in Transylvania in the second half of the thirteenth century.⁴⁴ The following source is discussed in more detail, although it appeared in the same context as the previous one, namely, in the context of the Estates system in Transylvania.⁴⁵ It is true that this time around we are dealing with a royal testimony concerning the entire voivodeship, which had to be “reformed,” under the aegis of Andrew III, by the general assembly of nobles, Saxons, Szeklers, and Romanians, convened in 1291.⁴⁶ The historian commented upon the return of the Sâmbăta and Făgăraş estates to “master” (*magister*) Ugrinus, and upon the presence of Romanian “nobles” in the congregation by virtue not of privilege but rather on account of their number and of the services brought to the Crown.⁴⁷ He believed that the publishers had used the comma “arbitrarily” after *nobilibus*, to make the term *noble* refer only to the Hungarians.⁴⁸ This claim, however, is unsubstantiated: the nobility were then an Estate without any ethnic connotation, and the Saxons, the Szeklers, or the Romanians were listed among the Estates even if they were not nobles. The idea that the non-nobles⁴⁹ were not part of these assemblies of the country (called *regnum Transilvaniae*) is erroneous, although generally accepted by Dragomir’s contemporaries. The Hungarian historians Hunfalvi and Szádeczky believed it to be so; Dragomir rightly disagrees with them on another issue, because they considered those Romanians to have been mere “trial witnesses.” Still, Silviu Dragomir’s conclusion that the Romanians asserted themselves among the leading groups through military merit, “which must have brought them some distinctions,” opening the “gate to privilege,” is correct,⁵⁰ although these privileges only meant individual and not group ennoblement. New investigations of the document of 1291 relating to the general assembly chaired by King Andrew III brought to light additional information concerning the cessation of the traditional Romanian autonomy of the Land of Olt, the elimination of the Romanians from among the privileged “nations” in Transylvania, and even the fabled arrival of Negru-Vodă (the Black Prince) from Făgăraş to Wallachia.⁵¹ Then comes an observation—generally valid even today—concerning the

“royal domain,” from which the Hungarian sovereigns donated compact parts to the Saxons and the Szeklers, the rest gradually becoming “private estates.”⁵² But—argues Dragomir—unlike in the rest of the kingdom, in Transylvania the king reserved the “right to collect tax from the Romanians.”⁵³ As long as this *census Valachorum*—says Dragomir—was levied on the royal domains, it was a privilege (because it guaranteed old liberties to Romanians); then, when levied on the estates donated to the new owners, it turned into a “heavy burden” (for the mass of Romanian serfs).⁵⁴

The following section of the study explains the competition between the royal and the noble (private) domains to attract peasants (the workforce), at a time when the productivity of an estate depended on the number of inhabitants. The Romanians featured prominently among the targeted groups, by virtue of their large numbers, of their tradition in small farming and shepherding, and of the high value of their labor.⁵⁵ Within this competition, paradoxically enough, it was the nobles who often managed to entice the Romanians. Hence, the Crown sought to prevent or to limit such a process, damaging (as a form of evasion) to the central authority. This topic, revisited by important medievalists,⁵⁶ is only a preamble for the great historian, a preparatory prologue to the analysis of the following two documents from the thirteenth century. These had been erroneously seen as evidence of the immigration of the Romanians from the south. In the first (the thirteenth testimony of the 13th century), dating from 1292,⁵⁷ the king allowed a nobleman from the Akos family (clan) to bring to his lands some Romanians from the Romanian county of Hunedoara (Ilia, Gurasada and Feneş) and to keep them there and collect the royal tax due from them.⁵⁸ In the following testimony, the fourteenth, from 1293,⁵⁹ the same King Andrew III decided that all Romanians born on the royal estate of Săcaş,⁶⁰ listed as present on some noble estates, should be brought back; it is also recorded that the predecessor of Andrew III, King Ladislaus IV (the Cuman), had allowed the Chapter of Alba Iulia to settle sixty Romanian families on two of its estates, with a waiver of the taxes due from them. The author rightly believes that it was absurd to conclude from these testimonies that the Romanians had been brought as colonists to Transylvania, and that until the 1300s they had been very few in number.⁶¹ Subsequent historical writings have indeed shown that there was a fierce competition between the royal, the noble, and the Church estates in terms of attracting the workforce, and that the king, in special cases, allowed the settlement of people from his estates on the lands of the nobles or of the Church. Peasants throughout Europe were moving about in search of better living conditions, and the Romanians, together with the other inhabitants of Transylvania, were no exception, but within absolutely normal limits. Nowhere, in any source, documentary or narrative, can we find any entries saying that the Romanian groups “gathered” on any estate in Transylvania or Hungary had come from afar or from the south, from outside the country. In other words, it was a process of internal migration, also known as pseudo-colonization or swarming, because it generally involved travelling over short distances.⁶²

The last of the fifteen documents dates from 1294⁶³ and it refers to the Romanians from Crişul Negru Valley (Bihor), who “carried out military duties” alongside the Hungarian guards of the fortifications.⁶⁴ This document, important for the military role played by the Romanians in the thirteenth century, is also not commented upon.

The conclusions drawn by Silviu Dragomir are significant. They reveal the fact that the first chancellery documents referring to the Romanians in Transylvania and Hungary present them: 1) as well-organized soldiers (warriors); 2) as owners of lands and forests, which are confiscated or diminished in size; some (not too many) are leaders assimilated to the nobility, and the others (the majority) are peasants and shepherds having to pay the king the *quinquagesima ovium*; 3) as a native population subjected by conquest but necessary to both royalty and nobility; 4) nowhere are they described as having come from south of the Danube, of from south of the mountains, from the area where a Romanian political organization was emerging. This latter conclusion reached by Silviu Dragomir refers to other written sources, of the narrative type, which refer to the Romanians and come to corroborate the data in the documentary sources.

THIS RESEARCH of Silviu Dragomir, unpublished until now, shows us a well-documented researcher, concerned with the early fate of the Romanians in Transylvania, with their native tradition of Byzantine faith, trapped by conquest in the Kingdom of Hungary. The historian correctly sees the life of these Romanians, anonymous for such a long time, concerned with “their silent work”—as David Prodan would have said—and disregarded by the authorities. Their status as conquered subjects did not allow them to be in the spotlight for long, on the one hand because they did not have the trust of their conquerors, and on the other because they could not trust the newcomers, who implicitly denied them certain freedoms, confiscated certain assets, restricted certain forms of movement. Of course—notes Dragomir—the sources are rich in entries about the newcomers who were the new, unusual element, and thus in need of the legitimacy given by official documents. Therefore, Dragomir’s conclusion comes naturally: the number or the age of a population cannot always be deduced from the number of entries or from the date when such entries were recorded. Another important conclusion is that a newly arrived population is not listed as the owner of properties that are vaguely defined or limited, but, *au contraire*, it is listed as a population that received such assets by donation. But the Romanians of the thirteenth century received nothing; they always had to give away what was theirs. Finally—a truth that remains complete in spite of the passing decades—there is no source, documentary or narrative, explicitly mentioning the arrival north of the Southern Carpathians of groups of Romanians from the south, in general, or from south of the Danube, in particular. On the contrary, there are clear sources dating back to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, showing the departure of groups of Romanians from Transylvania and Hungary to the other side of the Carpathians.

This study of Silviu Dragomir, despite the militant historiography of the time when it was written, and despite the combative stance assumed by the author, remains a model of analysis for the Transylvanian Middle Ages, a time of notable ethnic and confessional diversity. He explains in a realistic, although sometimes unilateral manner, the origins of the inferior political, confessional and ethnic status enjoyed by for Romanians for centuries, in a world based on hierarchy, obedience and privilege.



Notes

1. "Primele mențiuni despre români în documentele ungurești (sec. XIII)," Library of the Romanian Academy, Manuscript Section, file Silviu Dragomir, A 1281 i, 19 pp.
2. Gabriel Ștrempel wrote: "To Florica Enescu, in response to your letter dated 30 May 1974, recorded under no. 6656/30 V 1974, please be informed that we have received your donation for which we express our gratitude. The manuscripts of Prof. Silviu Dragomir's works, as well as their typed copies, have been included in the collections of Manuscripts–Documents Office; they can be consulted under the code A 1281 a–i." "Letter from Gabriel Ștrempel to Florica Enescu" in the Archive of the Șipoș family.
3. Dragomir, "Primele mențiuni despre români în documentele ungurești (sec. XIII)," 1–3.
4. Ioan Moga, *Câteva considerațiuni privitoare la cercetarea istoriei Transilvaniei* (Cluj, 1946).
5. Ștefan Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei*, 4 vols. (Cluj-Napoca, 1971–1989); Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Romanians and Hungarians from the 9th to the 14th Century: The Genesis of the Transylvanian Medieval State* (Cluj-Napoca, 1996).
6. Dragomir, 3–16.
7. *Ibid.*, 3–4; Emericus Szentpétery, *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica: Diplomata regum Hungariae ab anno MI. usque ad annum MCCLXX. complectens*, vol. 1 (Budapest, 1923), 277.
8. For subsequent details and citations, see Dan Nicolae Busuioc-von Hasselbach, *Țara Făgărașului în secolul al XIII-lea: Mănăstirea cisterciană Cârța*, vol. 1 (Cluj-Napoca, 2000), 251–252; Tudor Sălăgean, *Transilvania în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIII-lea: Afirmarea regimului congregațional* (Cluj-Napoca, 2003), 26; Pop, *Romanians and Hungarians*, 201–206.
9. Șerban Papacostea, *Românii în secolul al XIII-lea: Între Cruciată și Imperiul mongol* (Bucharest, 1993), 65–72. English version: *Between the Crusade and the Mongol Empire: The Romanians in the 13th Century* (Cluj-Napoca, 1998).
10. Dragomir, 5–6; Franz Zimmermann and Carl Werner, eds., *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, vol. 1 (Hermannstadt, 1892), 29–20 (hereafter cited as *UKB*).
11. Papacostea, 160–173.
12. Dragomir, 6; *UKB*, 1: 27–28.
13. See Busuioc-von Hasselbach, 1: 32–338; 2: 7–118.
14. Dragomir, 6–7; *UKB*, 1: 35.
15. Busuioc-von Hasselbach, 1: 253–272 (with all previous locating attempts).
16. Dragomir, 7–8; Ștefan Pascu, ed., *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, ser. D, *Relații între Țările Române*, vol. 1 (Bucharest, 1977), 20–21 (hereafter cited as *DRH*). To be noted here the erroneous translation of the term *populi* by "persons."
17. See Papacostea, 62–64. Daniel Barbu, in his work *Byzance, Rome et les Roumains: Essais sur la production politique de la foi au Moyen Âge* (Bucharest, 1998), 97–101, approaches Papacostea's interpretation with arguments that are, in our opinion, irrelevant. Paradoxically, however, he reaches an equivalent conclusion, namely that the Romanians in the Cumanian Bishopric formed or tended to form a higher political organization.
18. Ioan-Aurel Pop, "Percezioni orientali delle conseguenze della IV crociata (1204)," *Studi ecumenici* (Venice) 23, 2 (2005): 221–240.
19. On 14 November 1234, the date when the papal document was issued, King Andrew (the father of Bela IV, associated to the throne at the time) was ruling Hungary.
20. Victor Spinei, *Moldova în secolele XI–XIV* (Bucharest, 1982), 68–71. English version: *Moldavia in the 11th–14th Centuries* (Bucharest, 1986).

21. The most recent and competent analysis of the functioning of the Cumanian Bishopric belongs to Victor Spinei, "Episcopia cumanilor: Coordonate evolutive," *Arheologia Moldovei* (Iași) 30 (2007): 137–180.
22. Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Națiunea română medievală: Solidarități etnice românești în secolele XIII–XVI* (Bucharest, 1998), 82–85.
23. We can suppose that—at least at an initial stage—the whole text was meant to be used at a conference and not to be published.
24. Dragomir, 9; Ioan-Aurel Pop and Sorin Șipoș, *Silviu Dragomir și dosarul Diplomei cavalerilor ioaniți* (Cluj-Napoca, 2009). French version: *Silviu Dragomir et le dossier du Diplôme des chevaliers de St. Jean* (Cluj-Napoca, 2012).
25. *DRH*, D, 1: 21–28.
26. Dragomir, 9.
27. Pop and Șipoș, 113–131. See also Ioan-Aurel Pop, "Noi comentarii asupra Diplomei cavalerilor ioaniți (1247) și a contextului emiterii sale," in *România în Europa medievală (între Orientul bizantin și Occidentul latin): Studii în onoarea profesorului Victor Spinei*, eds. Dumitru Țicu and Ionel Câdea (Brăila, 2008), 225–242.
28. *UKB*, 1: 77–78.
29. Dragomir, 9.
30. Papacostea, 165–166.
31. *UKB*, 1: 80.
32. Papacostea, 180–181; Ioan-Aurel Pop, "Conștiința publică oficială despre statutul românilor din Transilvania și Ungaria în Evul Mediu," in *Pe urmele trecutului: Profesorului Nicolae Edroiu la 70 de ani*, eds. Susana Andea and Ioan-Aurel Pop (Cluj-Napoca, 2009), 129–138.
33. Augustin Bunea, *Stăpânii Țării Oltului: Discurs de recepție la Academia Română*, ed. Mihaela Ciortea, introductory study by Ioan-Aurel Pop (Cluj-Napoca, 2010), 31.
34. For references, and also for other cases of Romanian participation in Hungarian military campaigns, see Papacostea, 160–161.
35. Dragomir, 10.
36. Mihail P. Dan, *Cebi, slovaci și români în veacurile XIII–XVI* (Sibiu, 1944), 18–19.
37. Gheorghe I. Brătianu, *Adunările de stări în Europa și Țările Române în Evul Mediu* (Bucharest, 1996), 212–213.
38. Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Instituții medievale românești: Adunările cneziale și nobiliare (boierești) din Transilvania în secolele XIV–XVI* (Cluj-Napoca, 1991), 9–26.
39. Dragomir, 10.
40. *DRH*, D, 1: 30–34.
41. *Ibid.*, 34–35.
42. *Documente privind istoria României*, ser. C, *Transilvania. Veacul XI, XII și XIII*, vol. 2 (1251–1300) (n.p. [Bucharest], 1952), 296–299 (hereafter cited as *DIR*).
43. Dragomir, 10.
44. Sălăgean, 214–222.
45. Dragomir, 11.
46. *UKB*, 1: 177–178.
47. Dragomir, 11.
48. *Ibid.*
49. It was proven that those who were denied attendance to congregations were not the non-nobles, but the people who were not free. See Pál Engel, *Regatul Sfântului Ștefan: Istoria Ungariei medievale 895–1526*, trans., eds. Adrian A. Rusu and Ioan Drăgan (Cluj-Napoca, 2006), 93–124. English version: *The Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526* (London–New York, 2001).

50. Dragomir, 12.
51. Papacostea, 171–173.
52. Dragomir, 11–12.
53. Ibid., 12.
54. Ibid., 13.
55. Ibid.
56. Maria Holban, *Din cronica relațiilor româno-ungare în secolele XIII–XIV* (Bucharest, 1981), 9–89; Radu Popa, *Țara Maramureșului în veacul al XIV-lea*, ed. Adrian Ioniță (Bucharest, 1997), 161–182.
57. Dragomir, 14.
58. *DIR*, C, 2: 389.
59. Dragomir, 14.
60. In original *Scekes*, present day Cunța, Alba County.
61. Dragomir, 15.
62. See also Sălăgean, 291–292.
63. Dragomir, 16.
64. *DIR*, C, 2: 404–405.

Abstract

An Unpublished Study by the Historian Silviu Dragomir

The paper presents an unpublished study written by Silviu Dragomir in the context of the dispute between Romanian and Hungarian historians on the status of the Romanians in Transylvania, north of the Danube in general, and in Transylvania and Hungary in particular. After World War I, the reduction of Hungary to its ethnic borders and the presence of major Hungarian ethnic groups in the successor states gradually generated a very strong revisionist movement whose peak was reached at the beginning of World War II. Romania advocated the opposite position, namely the preservation of the borders established by the Versailles system. In both countries, historical writing was put in the service of the national cause. Dragomir's study, found in manuscript form in the Library of the Romanian Academy, was prepared by the author either for a conference, or as a preliminary material in view of its subsequent publication, and it deals with the earliest references to the Romanians in Hungarian and papal documents. This study of Silviu Dragomir, despite the combative stance assumed by the author, remains a model of analysis for the Transylvanian Middle Ages, highly relevant and pertinent even today.

Keywords

Silviu Dragomir, unpublished manuscript, medieval Transylvania, historical sources