



**ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA    FACULTY of LETTERS**  
**UNIVERSITY of IAȘI**

# **DOCTORAL THESIS**

**DOMAIN: PHILOLOGY**

## **The Writing of History in the Romanian Language: A. D. Xenopol**

**- SUMMARY -**

**SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR:**  
*Professor Eugen MUNTEANU, PhD*

**PhD STUDENT:**  
**Neculai MUSCALU**

IAȘI, 2013



“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași  
Faculty of Letters

**PhD student Neculai MUSCALU**

**The Writing of History  
in the Romanian Language:  
A. D. Xenopol**

**- SUMMARY -**

SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR:  
*Professor Eugen MUNTEANU, PhD*

IAȘI, 2013



1. Implicitly contained in the title *Scrierea istoriei în limba română: A. D. Xenopol* (*The Writing of History in Romanian: A. D. Xenopol*), the thesis we aimed at demonstrating in our paper can be explicitly formulated as follows: *there is a particular way of writing history in Romanian, which is specific to A. D. Xenopol*. In other words, even if the nature and accuracy of science impose to the scientist a neutral and sober expression – unmarked stylistically, as a rule – still, in the case of great personalities, one can state that (even if to a small extent as compared to artistic literature) “the style is the man himself” (Buffon) is valid in science as well.

At the same time, in A. D. Xenopol’s case, we had to consider further aspects that influence, to a certain extent, the way in which the scholar wrote his work:

**α)** The fact that he was both a historian and a history theoretician.

**β)** The fact that he was both a speaker (a user of the literary Romanian language in general, and of scientific style, in particular) and a scientist who had his own conception on literary language and the way history must be written.

1.1. Even if the research we have done is a monograph aiming at Xenopol’s language of historical writings, we have considered that the following aspects must be specified, clarified and treated beforehand (in order to avoid certain misunderstandings):

**i)** By the phrase *limba română* (“Romanian language”) we refer, in this case, to literary Romanian language, the Romanian language as a language of culture, as written language. Thus, we found it appropriate to present briefly the stage of the Romanian language during the great historian’s times.

**ii)** Since history is a science with a special status, we also had to determine the peculiarities and essence of such a discourse.

**iii)** The writing of history is done/must be done in a certain way, in accordance with certain traditions regarding the historical text; thus, we had to identify the relatively stylistic virtues and requirements of historical texts.

iv) Judging things *in abstracto*, we had to see the extent at which one can talk about the existence (or autonomy) of a functional historical language, as a subtype of the functional technical-scientific style.

v) The issue of historical terminology is also important. As to what terminology is concerned, one needs to know (up to some degree) the field in question and its corresponding subject (whose requirements and objective criteria establish the respective terminology). Consequently, we had to place history within a classification of sciences and characterize the subject in question.

**1.2.** Thus, **the matter subject to research** was mainly constituted by A. D. Xenopol's main work, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*, published in six extensive volumes (comprising 3,994 pages), between 1888 and 1893. His work had, in time, four editions: the first edition (already mentioned, also republished as a popular edition, with no footnotes, in 1896, in 12 volumes); the second edition, revised by the author, estimated to have 14 volumes, but only the first five appeared (because of the author's poor health); the third edition, in 14 volumes, between 1925 and 1930, edited by I. Vlădescu and finally, the fourth edition (also partial, unfortunately: only the first four volumes appeared), under the control of Al. Zub, meant to reproduce, according to all the requirements of a critical edition (with numerous footnotes and correction and up-to-date information comments) in six initial volumes, including the author's subsequent revising and additions. Naturally, we have mostly used the last edition mentioned for our research. Since only the first four volumes out of the six estimated to be published appeared (following the initial distribution of its content as designed for the first edition), the rest of our research was based on the other two volumes, V and VI (see the abbreviations XIR, V and XIR, VI), consulted in the original version of 1892-1893. However, we have consulted the four volumes of the first edition (issued between 1888 and 1891), which are to be found in our bibliography with no abbreviations for certain aspects (for instance, to check certain language facts) and mentioned this fact wherever necessary.

**1.3.** What would **the importance and relevance** of such a monograph be? Apart from the particular interest that we could show

regarding A. D. Xenopol's ideas on language and style particularities which characterize such a strong personality as Xenopol's (or any personality), the merit of such a research lies in trying to analyze a work that is highly important for the Romanian culture and mainly for the literary Romanian language: *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*. This ample work – mainly thanks to its popular edition, published in 12 volumes in 1896 – was to be found, according to Al. Zub's estimation “even in the smallest hamlet”, being considered as one of the most important readings of the time: “It is no exaggeration to say that this work was a formative element of civic conscience for a long time and it contributed to a great extent to creating the national solidarity”<sup>1</sup>. It has thus influenced not only the Romanians' knowledge regarding their history, but also (to some degree) the language of those who read it. *Mutatis mutandis*, referring mainly to the grave register of science and not to the artistic one, one must state that not only poets are (literary) language creators, but also scientists of whom some (e.g., Xenopol) even more than others.

## 2. Synthetic presentation

**Part 1**, entitled *Theoretical Framework*, consists of three chapters whose role is to:

1) place the field of history within the general framework of sciences, while establishing its specific features;

2) define literary language, while making a division of periods of literary Romanian language and characterizing the language of culture from A. D. Xenopol's times;

3) circumscribe the nature of the historical style and discourse, as compared with the scientific style in general (as functional language) and with the specialized scientific discourse.

Considering these subjects (history, literary language and style, historical discourse) from a content point of view, we have also referred, in parallel, within each of the three chapters, to A. D. Xenopol's ideas on the subjects in question, as they are dealt with both outside *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană* in various studies, as well as in the respective masterpiece. What is more, we have also made a

---

<sup>1</sup> Al. Zub, *Foreword* at XIR, I, p. 5.

short presentation of the language and style of some of Xenopol's main forerunners as to what history is concerned, since Xenopol entered his name in a tradition which cannot and must not be eluded.

**Part II**, The Language and Style of A. D. Xenopol's Historical Texts consists of two extensive chapters in which are analyzed:

1) issues that only deal with language (an analysis made on language levels)

2) stylistic / rhetorical issues, where we aim at finding the features who confer Xenopol's historical texts their well-deserved place.

Even if the subject of this work refers mainly to the language and style of *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*, we have sometimes mentioned some of Xenopol's other historical works in order to reinforce some findings on the constancy of some of the scholar's language and style particularities or, on the contrary, to signal certain changes, renunciation, discontinuities from one stage to another.

### **3. Analytical presentation**

In our *Introduction*, apart from the preliminary specifications, which aimed at presenting the objectives and methodology of our research, we have shown great interest in A. D. Xenopol's personality, presenting essential aspects of his life and work. The biographical sketch (his formative horizon and scientific career) prove mainly Xenopol's preoccupations and events in his life, which are relevant for the development of his style or of a certain conception regarding the literary Romanian language the historian applied both in his work and by means of the frequent publications he edited or to which he collaborated.

**3.1. Chapter I** (*History as Science*) of the first part (*Theoretical Framework*) focuses on A. D. Xenopol's conception on science in general and history in particular. Thus, one must remark that the Romanian historian brought his original contribution, acknowledged worldwide, regarding the theory of history. This theoretical aspect was illustrated both in his ideas on literary language and on the way in which Xenopol used (with certain reserve) neologisms in his writings. For instance, the concept of "historical series", which the Romanian historian opposed to the concept of "law"

from the sciences of nature is to be found in the explanations which Xenopol will give to some language phenomena: the introduction of the Romanian language in church (to the detriment of Slavonic), the influence of the French language on the Romanian language, etc.

In the **second chapter** (*Literary Romanian Language*), after having defined the concept of “literary language” and establishing the main periods of literary Romanian language, we have presented Xenopol’s conception of this issue and mentioned some of the Romanian historian’s ideas about language in general and Romanian language seen as a historical language. Xenopol’s competence in dealing with all these issues, in a correct manner most of the time, is impressive. Thus, the fact that he is one of the few Romanian scholars of his times interested in language philosophy (paying tribute to Hegel and Humboldt’s philosophy) is worth mentioning here. What is more, one must mention the fact that he was interested, in his studies and articles, in the internal variety of the Romanian language (from a diatopic, diaphasic, and diastratic point of view) and formulated pertinent observations on these aspects as well. Even if, in general, Xenopol’s conception on literary language (seen as “superior dialect” was a correct one; he became known among his contemporaries by permanently opposing the neologisms borrowed from French mainly. His articles from the publications of his time in which he made an inventory of undesirable terms (just as in the case of *Appendix Probi*), as opposed to their accepted vernacular synonyms (*îmbelșugat* for *abundent*; *dobândire* for *achiziție*, etc.)

**Chapter III** (*The Style and Discourse of History*) aimed at determining the scientific stylistic and discursive features specific to science in general and history in particular. At the same time, in order to prove the tradition of the historical writing which A. D. Xenopol possessed, we have briefly presented the main ideas of his forerunners starting with the first chroniclers to B. P. Hasdeu, his contemporary) and signalled the continuities and discontinuities present in the language, but also (mainly) in the style of the historical writings. Just as in the case of the other issues previously treated (the theory of history, literary language, etc.), A. D. Xenopol expressed his opinion on the way historical texts should be written, by describing his forerunners’ style while characterizing, at the same time, his own

scientific style, both in the case of highly specialized historical texts and in the case of didactic texts (literary textbooks).

**3.2.** The latter part of our work (*The Language and Style of A. D. Xenopol's Historical Texts*) deals exclusively with the language and style of A. D. Xenopol's historical work, our analysis focusing mainly on *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*.

**3.2.1.** Chapter I (*The Language in A. D. Xenopol's Historical Writing*) treats, in a traditional manner, on levels (phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical) the aspects linked to the language used by A. D. Xenopol in his masterpiece, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*. Out of obvious reasons, we have included and discussed here the phraseological component as well. Even if all the sections of a writer's language are equally important, our analysis focused on the lexical and grammatical level (mainly the morphological one). Although there is not a clearly marked border in the case of phraseology, since phraseological units present features linked to either the lexical level (through semantics) or the syntactic level (by the way the words they consist of are combined), we have also aimed at discussing these issues within this chapter as well. A special place is granted to the phrases belonging to repeated discourse (namely phraseology broadly speaking), which are not real or potential equivalents of some words (famous sayings, quotations, proverbs, etc.), but rather "micro-texts" having an independent meaning. In order not to disrupt the logic of our research, we have treated them in the same place as well.

i) With reference to ***the phonological level***, as we have already seen in the *Introduction*, we have not focused on the orthographical issues, even if some of them can be mentioned. For instance, from the very beginning of Xenopol's *History* (in its first edition, from 1888), we come across the following spelling issue: the letter *i* indistinctively notes either the sound [i], or the sound [î], despite the fact that the graphical sign *î* is also used: *in* [în], *sin* [sîn], *inriurire* [înriurire], *intreg* etc.; and yet, it is written: *dînsul*, *pămînt*, *pînză*. We have not insisted on the proper sounds (either of the Moldavian sub dialect or of colloquial speech), since they were already signalled by the editors of *History* in the preliminary notes (also reproduced in our work).

ii) On the other hand, *the morphological level* at which we have recorded numerous linguistic facts that no longer follow the norms of the current literary Romanian language is worth considering.

Thus, as to what verbs are concerned, we have encountered some examples which, considering their infinitive form, show the fact that they had a different conjugation from the current one: *a ținea* (and its derivatives: *a susținea*, *a obținea*, *a menținea*, etc.), *a rămânea*, etc. The same is true for the present form of some verbs, which have different forms as compared to their present (mostly in the III<sup>rd</sup> person singular or plural): [ei] *alerg*, *invoacă*, *acopere*, *constituiesc*, *posed*, etc. Such differences can be found in the case of the present subjunctive of some verbs: *să crează*, *să deie*, *să ieie*, *să trădeie*, *să înapoiască*, *să manifesteze*, *să respecteze*, *să spereze*, etc. Similar changes can be noticed regarding some forms of past tense: *se adăuseră*, *se îngreui*, etc. Moreover, there are some verbs that, as compared to the current norm, were used in the reflexive voice: *a-și răzbuna*, *a-și teme*, *a se ferici*, etc. With reference to non-predicative verbs, gerund is mainly used, some of its forms being in agreement with the preceding noun: „*materii arzânde*”; „*născândul colos al nordului*”, etc. The use of the infinitive instead of the conjunctive was quite frequent in Xenopol's times: „*astăzi ne vine greu a ne-o închipui*”; „*Mihai-Vodă avea gândul a se împatrona în Transilvania*”, etc.

Where nouns are concerned, Xenopol used forms which no longer correspond to the current norms. For instance, Genitive-Dative forms are worth mentioning here: *izbânzei*, *minței*, *soartei*, *valoarei*, etc. Similarly, some nouns have old plural forms or forms which are not specific to literary language as such, but can be found in colloquial speech: *afluente*, *austriaci*, *blăni*, *căminuri*, *certe*, *cireși*, *mașine*, *protesturi*, etc. In some cases, the gender is different from the current grammar norms: *clas*, *defavor*, *parantez*, *partidă*, etc. What is more, we have found that Xenopol preferred the long infinitive for the derived nouns that we now use (or which were created according to another pattern): *intervenire*, *surprindere*, *complicare*, *observare*, *protestare*, etc.

Regarding adjectives, one cannot state that it has specific forms in Xenopol's work. Still, the structures or ways in which the

superlative is sometimes formed have drawn our attention: *nespus, neasemănat, mai extraordinar, din cale afară de*, etc. The same is true for the adverb, which does not have special forms, even if one can notice Xenopol's preference for the adverbs derived from adjectives by means of the suffix *-ește*: *istoricește, canoniceste*, etc. The cases in which the adverbs are used as nouns are quite interesting: „...fără a acoperi *dinapoiele* sale cu lucrări de întărire”; „...soarta are *susurile și josurile* ei”.

In the case of pronouns, it is worth mentioning the presence of the personal pronoun *dânsul/dânsa*, which is explained by the fact that the author's maternal dialect is the Moldavian one (in the Moldavian dialect *dânsul* is not a polite form, unlike the Wallachian dialect). The false form of the demonstrative pronoun denoting distance in space (*acel / acea*) is frequently used by Xenopol instead of the demonstrative article *cel / cea*.

With reference to numerals, some forms of multiplicative cardinal numeral: *împătrit, încincit, înșeptit, pe întreitelea*, etc. can be noticed in his writings. Among the other parts of speech we have not referred to so far, prepositions are worth mentioning, even if they do not represent extraordinary linguistic facts. Still, one must mention the status of the preposition *pe*, which precedes some nouns (that lack personal gender), which no longer require this preposition in the Accusative, according to the current norms: „...unde soarta a voit să arunce *pe poporul* român de la nordul Dunării...” (XIR, I, p. 39). Similarly, the fact that Xenopol does not use *într-un/-o, printr-un/-o*, but only the forms *în un* and *prin un / în o* and *prin o* is quite bizarre.

**iii)** At the *syntactic level*, one can notice that Xenopol used long sentences (it may have been caused by the influence of Latin which he was mastering). In this sense, he reminds us of Bălcescu and mainly Odobescu's sentence construction. However, the sentences are so long sometimes that the reader may lose the thread of what s/he is reading:

„Lucru însă vrednic de însemnat și asupra căruia eu am atras pentru întâia oară luare aminte, deși era îndestul numai a arunca ochii pe ambele legiuiri spre a-l descoperi, este că capitolele cărții de învățătură a lui Vasile Lupu se află intercalate și răspândite, cu neregula pe care am caracterizat-o, în pravila lui Matei Basarab, fiind întreruptă continuitatea lor de capitole lungi, nesfârșite, ce conțin reguli canonice ce lipsesc în condica domnului

Moldovei, aceste capitole, comune ambelor pravile, nu numai că poartă același titlu în ambele legiuri, dar mai conțin și identic aceeași materie, împărțită într-un număr egal de paragrafe, încât se vede că pravila lui Matei Basarab cuprinde, în nămolul de dispoziții canonice, care alcătuiesc partea ei cea mai de seamă, și întreaga pravila lui Vasile Lupu, prezentând numai rareori unele mici și neînsemnate deosebiri dialectale.” (XIR, IV, p. 138).

Among Xenopol's specific sentences, one must mention the ones in which the Romanian gerund acts as absolute ablative (in Latin): „*Murind* însă Burebista, împărăția lui, prea timpuriu încheată din elemente deosebite, nealipite unul de altul prin nicio legătură, se desface în patru părți, cum am văzut mai sus.” (XIR, I, p. 103); „Moartea lui Cesar *aruncând* Imperiul Roman iarăși în groazele războiului civil, dacii reîncep pustiirea provinciilor romane.” (XIR, I, p. 104).

Another type of sentence which characterizes Xenopol's style is the one in which the clauses of reason are in front position: „*Întrucât unele din cuvintele creștinești de origine latină nu s-au putut introduce în limba română decât învederat după Constantin cel Mare* și pe acest timp Dacia Traiană nu se mai ținea de Imperiul Roman, este învederat că trebuie ca poporația de mai târziu a acestei regiuni să fi locuit și după Constantin cel Mare în limitele Imperiului Roman, pentru a putea primi în limba ei asemenea cuvinte.” (XIR, I, p. 286).

iv) However, **the lexical level** is the most interesting and the richest in facts. Thus, we have recorded many words which are outdated in the literary Romanian language (archaisms), such as: *apriat* (clear), *atârnare* (dependence), *aterdisi* (overreach), *câtime* (quantity), *cerbicos*, *consângean*, *descăpățânare*, *fățari* (to pretend), *introlocare* (union), *îndecomun* (together) etc. At the same time, one can also find cases of rare neologisms: *autogen* (indigen), *pacificare*, *substrage* etc. Among the less common lexical coinage, we only mention a few examples: *fanariotiza*, *ungurire*, *împotrivor*, *încălcător*, *însemnător* etc. (mainly the ones formed by means derivation with the suffix *-ător*) or even *răzășofag* (more frequently used than its equivalent *mâncător de răzeși*).

The derivatives formed with the prefix *dez-*: *dezesperare*, *dezîncântare*, *deznaționalizare*, *dezțărare* etc. or with the negative prefix *ne-* (to the detriment of the prefix *in-*): *neconștiut*, *necult*,

*neestetic, nedescriptibil, neexact, nepropriu* etc. are worth mentioning. Or some words derived with the prefix *în-*, such as: *îndușmănit, înminunat, împatronat* etc. The derivatives with suffixes are less represented, such as the ones ending in *-ism (străinism), -enie (supușenie), -șag (adaoșag), -șug (priețeșug)*, etc. What is surprising, however, is the large number of nouns ending in *-(ț)iuine* (as compared to the ones ending in *-(ț)ie*): *aluziune, capitulațiune, condițiune, demisiune, excepțiune, intervențiune, producțiune*, etc.

v) If we consider the fact that the work in question is a scientific and not a belletristic one, we can state that **phraseology** (*stricto sensu*) comprises a great number of phrases and idioms. Thus, among the numerous verbal phrases recorded, we mention here some of the most frequent ones: *a sta pe/la gânduri, a se pune rău (cu cineva), a trece (cuiva) prin minte, a o rupe de fugă* etc. The idioms are even more numerous: *a aduce la sapă de lemn, a arunca pulbere în ochi (cuiva), a-și călca pe inimă, a-și lua lumea în cap, a prinde rădăcini*, etc. On the other hand, if we consider phraseology in a broad sense (as *repeated discourse*, in E. Coseriu's terms), we can also find quotations, famous sayings, proverbs, aphorisms etc. in Xenopol's historical work. Here are some examples: *Scopul îndreptățește mijloacele, Nu sunt vremile sub cârma omului, Proști dar mulți, De ce te temi, de aceea nu scapi*, etc.

Even if their use (relatively frequent) does not follow the requirements of the scientific style in general (and of history, in particular), it confirms, apart from the figures of speech, rhetorical effects, etc., the expressivity of this great historian's discourse, the most specific feature of his style.

**3.2.2.** In the second chapter (*The Style in A. D. Xenopol's Historical Writing Rhetorical Effects*) we have dealt with Xenopol's sources of expressivity, mainly the figures of speech found in his historical work. The metaphor (or scientific analogy) and rhetorical interrogation are the most important of the multitude of stylistic-rhetorical figures which Xenopol uses.

i) The most striking feature of Xenopol's scientific style is the frequent use of metaphors and similes meant to clarify certain historical aspects. During our research, we have identified nearly 300

analogies (similes and metaphors) in the six volumes of *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*.

We will only illustrate here the vegetal element (the metaphor of the tree, one of Xenopol's favourite images) used, on one hand, to compare the birth and development of the Romanians and, on the other hand, to underline the idea of the union of all the Romanians: „...poporul român nu poate năbuși o speranță ce *încolțește* în el [...], anume că din păturile adânci ale unui viitor oricât de îndepărtat, va răsări odată *frumosul arbore al unirii tuturor românilor...*” (XIR, I, p. 44); „Este fără îndoială o tendință foarte firească de a căuta departe în timpuri *rădăcinile* unei idei mari întrucât ne vine greu a crede că un *arbore* atât de uriaș să-și găsească sprijinul său numai în păturile superioare ale *pământului*. Ideea unirii este într-adevăr un product al dezvoltării noastre, însă nu a celei politice, ci a celei culturale care tocmai în timpurile noastre coborându-se în viața poporului dădu din ea *roade* politice.” (XIR, III, p. 288); „Atunci se nascu ideea unirii politice, din *zămislirea* ei pusă pe timpul lui Matei Basarab și Vasile Lupu, unirea intelectuală. Deocamdată ea strânse în un singur *corp* numai cele două *ramuri* rășchirate din poalele Carpaților, fără a putea lega existența lor de *trunchiul* cel puternic rămas dincolo de piscuri.” (XIR, IV, p. 88).

The image-idea becomes an overwhelming allegory: „Aceasta a dezvoltat *sâmburele* vechi într-un *arbore* puternic cu *ramurile* întinse, *coroana* bogată și *rădăcinile* adânci. El *răsare* însă din această epocă, *sălbatic* și neregulat, ca *trunchiurile* primitive ce cresc în umbra *desișurilor*. Trebuia curățit și îngrijit, desfăcut la *rădăcină* și răsuflat la *crengariu*, spre a da întreaga dezvoltare puterilor sale latente. Curățirea, întreprinsă de mult, a fost dusă tot mai spre desăvârșire de epoca *regenerării*, care este aproape de a fi încheiată și care este menită a face din *sălbaticul fiu al pădurei* un *arbore* civilizat.” (XIR, I, p. 218).

Which would the reasons of Xenopol's preference for analogies in general and mainly for the analogies from the vegetal world be? The history of the Romanians (as well as history in general, as process) is – according to Xenopol – doomed. Regardless of the people's strong will, they have to obey the laws / historical series or the principle of causality. It is not by chance that the history of a people is compared to the growth of a tree (and hence some similarities of his conception

with Darwinian evolution). The tree grows according to some internal growth forces; it is (genetically) programmed to grow in a certain way; only that this program cannot be fully known beforehand. That is why, in the vast historical frame, outlined by A. D. Xenopol, the humans' nature, as well as their actions seem to have been unable to surpass a certain "natural condition", a certain "animal-like" structure; hence, the highly diverse nature (both organic and inorganic), metaphorically associated to psychology and man's field of action, covering the universe of discourse of Xenopol's historical writings. Obviously, history as a process is not the same thing as nature (or natural process), and the great scholar was perfectly aware of this truth.

ii) The rhetorical interrogations (doubled by frequent ironical answers) are very frequent in Xenopol's historical discourse: „Ei bine, pe toți acești trădători ai cauzei naționale a dacilor, pe toate aceste eminente ajutoare ce veneau la Traian chiar în țară dușmană, să-i fi ucis romanii fără cruțare? Credem că o asemenea părere este, curat vorbind, absurdă.” (XIR, I, p. 139); „Unde sunt românii Peninsulei Balcanului? Să se întrebe autorii greci ei înșiși, care destăinuiesc, adeseori, fără să vrea, origina eroilor, de la care ei își fac atâta glorie; să se întrebe numele satelor din care ei sunt originari, și apoi să se cerceteze populația, tradițiile, numele patrimonice a acelor locuitori, limba pe care o vorbesc, însă numai pe ascuns și în sânul familiilor lor, și atunci se va arăta adevăratul caracter al populației lor române, acoperite de valul grecesc.” (XIR, I, p. 408).

Apart from interrogations, the Romanian historian' work displays a wide range of rhetorical exclamations. Here is one of the most impressive, expressing in words an idea that animated him throughout his life: „De câtă încordare va avea nevoie simțământul național la români, pentru ca luându-și zborul peste culmile carpatine, să prindă într-un singur lanț viața lor ca popor!” (XIR, I, p. 43).

#### **4. Conclusions**

Researching such a complex subject – the writing of history in the Romanian language at A. D. Xenopol – involves a multi-faceted approach. Xenopol is an important personality of both the Romanian and European culture, who stands out thanks to his various preoccupations (he was a historian, philosopher, economist, jurist,

sociologist, etc.) and impresses by the tenacity shown in carrying out his greatest projects. What must be remarked at this great Romanian historian is the tendency – unfortunately, not very frequent at the Romanian scholars – to theorize, to reflect, the wish to set a solid philosophical basis for the field he does research in.

Nothing is done at random by Xenopol: when dealing with a subject, he always starts from one of his conceptions; acting in a certain way, he also follows certain judgment that he had previously reached. The same thing is true for the writing of history in Romanian. Xenopol has a particular way of making history and accordingly, a specific way of writing it.

At first sight, things can seem (to some people) simple: Xenopol writes his fundamental work, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană* (1888-1893) in Romanian and does it according to the rules traditionally set by the science of history; in other words, he follows the linguistic norms of the idiomatic community in which he lives and the valid writing norms of a community of historian scholars.

In fact, things are far from being that simple. Xenopol does not simply write in Romanian (as historical language), but in the literary Romanian language, which is not fully established yet; its historical process of development, even advanced, is not entirely finished. It is a language to whose perfection the scholar himself contributed to a certain extent. As observed, the scholar had his own conception both regarding literary language and the style convenient to writing a scientific text, in general, and (national) history in particular. And, unlike other scholars, in whose cases we have to deduce the ideas from their writing, even if intuitively, concerning language and style – at Xenopol we have already encountered his ideas on language and style expressed and justified, one has to see the degree to which they are applied and followed in his writings.

The necessity to divert from the proper subject of our paper, referring first to the author's biography, to his conception on science in general and history, his ideas on national culture and language in general, as well as literary language, etc., is fully justified.

Some autobiographical confessions reveal aspects concerning the use of metaphors/analogies in his scientific writing or the learning of foreign languages and their influence on one's own language, some

concepts from his historical theory / the concept of “series”, for instance, clarify his vision on literary language and the issue of neologisms, etc.

After having studied – from a double perspective – linguistic and stylistic – Xenopol’s historical writing, mainly his masterpiece, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*, we can conclude that the Romanian historian preserves, to a certain extent, the European and Romanian tradition of writing a historical text, while also innovating in some respects, such as the use (almost exaggerated) of scientific analogies, which have either an aesthetic or a revelatory role. For instance, he preserves the complex sentence (long periods) which we find at Bălcescu, Kogălniceanu, Odobescu, but, – regarding the affective involvement – , even if a great patriot, he tries to be more objective than his forerunners (although, sometimes, his „pen gets warm”). At the same time, even if he masters rhetorical techniques, he is more temperate than B. P. Hasdeu, his contemporary.