

Between Scylla and Charybdis The Political Journey of Dimitrie Moldovan during 1861–1867

ALEXANDRU ONOJESCU*

“**I**N THIS respect the generous D. Moldovan stood out among others. Men of his stature mediated afterwards, in 1860, the conciliation between the two prelates for the following four years.”¹ This is how George Bariț described, in his monumental historical masterpiece, the former aulic councilor Dimitrie Moldovan, a first-class Romanian political figure during the neo-absolutist and liberal period, who was permanently caught between opposing loyalties and rival groups. Married to a relative of Uniate metropolitan Alexandru Șterca-Șuluțiu, he was in fact an Orthodox, and consequently within the confessional influence of Andrei Șaguna and dependent on the latter for the appointment to various positions; as a Romanian official in Vienna, his loyalty was divided between the official policies of the Court and the national requirements from home; he maintained an ambiguous position in regard to the two dominant political trends that emerged beginning with 1865, activism and passivism; he disappeared from the Romanian political scene in Transylvania after his retirement in 1867. These are only a fraction of the many arguments which made us focus on this historical personality, insufficiently studied by the Romanian historiography.² Despite the fact that there are numerous memoirs, archival and journalistic references about Dimitrie Moldovan, Romanian historians have granted him only two small monographs, excelling more in highlighting the various sources related to his life, and especially to his political activity.³ All these, as well as a series of unedited sources found in archival collections from the District Directorates of Alba and Cluj Counties of the National Archives, will serve as a basis for our historical research.

* Investing in people! Ph.D. scholarship, project co-financed by the SECTORAL OPERATIONAL PROGRAM FOR HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT 2007–2013, priority Axis 1, “Education and training in support of the growth and development of a knowledge based society,” key area of intervention 1.5: Doctoral and post-doctoral programs in support of research, contract no. POSDRU/88/1.5/S/60185—“Innovative doctoral studies in a Knowledge Based Society,” Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

The objective of our research is to underline the activity and the importance Moldovan had in shaping a political strategy within the Romanian national movement in Transylvania in the era of the constitutional experiment, and to tentatively describe the relationship this Romanian official developed with the two hierarchs and with the secular leaders of the nation: Vasile Ladislau Pop, George Bariț, Iacob Bologa, Pavel Vasici, Ioan Rațiu, Ilie Măcelariu etc. But, before this, a short description of his activity before year 1860 is required.

BORN ON 16 October 1811 in Deva, in a family of tradesmen, true representatives of the Romanian Transylvanian bourgeoisie, he continues the family tradition by graduating from the Polytechnic School in Vienna and from the Montanistic Academy in Schemnitz.⁴ An active participant in the revolution of 1848, he may be found in the delegation to Vienna tasked with presenting the National Petition to the Emperor, and afterwards, on an administrative line, as an alternate in the supreme committee for Hunedoara county (November 1848–September 1849). Hostilities having ceased, Moldovan continues his administrative career, becoming the civil adviser of General Adolf Kriegsrau, the head of Alba Iulia military district. In 1854, upon the elimination of the military districts,⁵ he becomes a class I commissioner in Orăștie and a member of a constitutional committee, lead by the then governor of Transylvania. In 1857 he appears in the official register of the Great Principality of Transylvania, together with other Romanian officials, among whom the most important were: Pavel Vasici, Gavril Dorgo, Andrei Mureșanu, Vasile Ladislau Pop, Ioan Bran de Lemeni, Paul Dunca, Iacob Bologa, Ioan Alduleanu, Gheorghe Anghel. The majority of these officials from the absolutist period, as well as others in the forthcoming years, will constitute the administrative structure of the Romanian national movement during the liberal period.

The year 1860 and the important events that began to quickly unfold in the Habsburg Empire as a result of the international climate⁶ found the majority of the above still in office, but also in close contact, grouped in three centers: Blaj, Brașov and Sibiu, each proposing a strategy for the common movement of Romanians with the objective of reclaiming the national rights.⁷ Actually, the very existence of a regular correspondence during 1860–67 between characters such as Paul Vasici, Iacob Bologa, George Bariț, Alexandru Șterca Șuluțiu, Andrei Șaguna, Ilie Măcelariu, Vasile Ladislau Pop, Ioan Rațiu, Axente Sever, Ioan Pușcariu etc. reveals the mobilization of the Romanian elite. As Simion Retegan showed, the official elite pushed the two bishops into the political arena, compelling them to collaborate at least on political-national grounds, and to set aside the confessional disputes.

In this context, the role of Dimitrie Moldovan is crucial. Known as one of the most competent Romanian officials of the absolutist regime, one of the confidants of metropolitan Șuluțiu, thanks to the family ties between them,⁸ as well as being familiar with bishop Șaguna, Moldovan met the requirements for a possible mediator between the volatile personalities of the two prelates. Therefore Iacob Bologa invites Moldovan to join a group which was comprised of himself, Vasici, Bran, Pușcariu,

and which aimed to persuade Șaguna to try to re-approach Șuluțiu.⁹ The events quickly developing in the imperial capital required swift decisions and the unification of the divergent viewpoints, reason for which the summoning of a national congress became a *sine qua non* condition. The summoning involved the necessity to send a delegation to Vienna, which was to request approval for the congress, and explain to the Viennese authorities the grievances of the Romanian nation. At Șaguna's proposal,¹⁰ Șuluțiu becomes head of a delegation that was to travel to Vienna to represent the Romanian interests. The action culminates with the refusal of the delegation *in corpore*, only Șuluțiu and Popasu being received by the Emperor¹¹ on 10 December 1860. The only thing they manage to obtain is the verbal consent of the new minister Schmerling for organizing a national conference.

Simultaneously with the Romanians' movements, the Viennese authorities, without necessarily considering the Romanian people, appoint Kemény Ferenc as the aulic chancellor of Transylvania. A conservative aristocrat, he will proceed to a wide reorganization of the Principality, mainly complying with the imperial rescript of 21 December 1860, which provisioned equal respect for both privileged classes and those lacking rights until 1848. Consequently, the Aulic Chancellery was intended to contain 4 sections, among which a Romanian one,¹² and the Gubernium was to welcome in its structures 3 Romanian councilors from a total of 16 and 2 secretaries from a total of 12. Beginning with this moment, it can be rightfully said that a true competition begins among the Romanians of both denomination, a competition for positions within the new administrative system, which proves to be overall entirely counterproductive.

The first sign is given by the letter of Ioan Bran de Lemeni to Moldovan.¹³ Appointed by Șaguna and by a part of Sibiu's intellectuality, Bran presents to him the Romanian principles that should be followed in the organization of the Aulic Chancellery. The letter was intended as a signal to Șuluțiu not to accept or support in any way the candidacy of Gheorghe Anghel to the position of aulic councilor as a representative of the Romanians, their friendship being well-known in Sibiu. Șuluțiu's reply to Moldovan restates the will to collaborate with Șaguna and assures Bran de Lemeni that he had nominated neither Anghel, nor one of his three grandsons.¹⁴ Moreover, he expresses the hope that various political leaders would not begin quarrelling over positions, asking the bishop to appease the fervor of his underlings. In exchange, Șaguna sends a letter to the new chancellor, on December 19, recommending Bran de Lemeni for the position of aulic councilor,¹⁵ and D. Moldovan as interim gubernium councilor, further stating the injustice of having appointed both Pop and Anghel as aulic councilors, as both were of the Uniate confession. Kemény replies that there was one position of councilor allocated to the Romanians and that it had been given to Vasile Ladislau Pop, who could not be "overlooked."¹⁶ Consequently, he asks Șaguna to send his proposals for other positions. Moldovan's reaction to this entire controversy, as a man caught between two extremes, is very clear in the argumentation he prepares for Șaguna: he sends Bran's letter directly to the metropolitan, and after receiving the reply, he assures the bishop of the best intentions

of Blaj. Moreover, diplomatically, he explains that Anghel's appointment, in case it had taken place, would have happened before Șuluțiu's arrival in Vienna. Indeed, according to Șuluțiu's words, he arrived to Vienna on 8 December, and the conference of the people from Sibiu and Bran's letter date from 7 December.¹⁷ In order to calm him down completely, Moldovan states Șuluțiu's promise that all the appointments will be done "strictly in agreement with Your Excellency," at the same time drawing attention to the confessional split technique practiced by Hungarians, who praised the Uniate and disparaged the Orthodox. Eventually, the dispute is solved with Ioan Popasu's return to Sibiu, who confirms all the disavowals of the bishop of Blaj. Therefore, according to Vasici,¹⁸ "the old" metropolitan is anxiously awaited in Sibiu, and the "old" bishop regrets the impulsiveness he displayed. The desire of the people from Sibiu to bring Șuluțiu there is also expressed by Bologa. His plea to Moldovan is quite meaningful: "... I ask you and I pledge you on whatever is most dear to you to do everything possible so that the metropolitan from Orăștie comes here,"¹⁹ promising that the latter will be warmly welcomed. The meeting was necessary in order to proceed with common actions towards the national conference, now that both Schmerling and Governor Lichtenstein were in favor of the idea.

Simultaneously with the preparations for the conference, Moldovan receives the news of his appointment as secretary of the Aulic Chancellery, which raises an ethical question regarding the oath he is about to take. He will make his feelings public during the conference, being even ready to give up his position as secretary.²⁰ The reply will be given to him the very next day by bishop Șaguna during the opening speech of the third day of the conference, when he spoke of the importance of Romanians in public office in the new organization of the Principality. Therefore, Moldovan will take his oath on 22 March, assuring Bariț that "any of us can take this oath without constraint."²¹ But before proceeding to Vienna, Moldovan is co-opted as part of the 20 members of the National Committee, and also among the 8 Romanian representatives in the governance conference of Alba Iulia (February 1861). The National Committee should have been a public Romanian institution playing the precise role of coordinating and making lawful the actions of the Romanian political elite. Nevertheless, as it shall be seen, both its structure and representative position will be attacked in the future. Nevertheless, one thing is certain: the Committee reflected the confessional peace that the secular majority wanted to impose for safeguarding the national objective. The presence of only 4 clergymen and the equal proportion between Uniates and Orthodox among the laymen were to ensure this aspect.²²

Arriving in Vienna, after being sworn in, Moldovan begins his work in the Aulic Chancellery, an institution he will leave only upon his retirement in 1867. Here, at the beginning, he coordinated his activity on the national territory with Vasile Ladislau Pop, his superior, and with his colleagues Ioan Pușcariu and Ioan Maior. It is hard to state what his attributions were. The sources are quite deficient in this respect. Instead, we know that Moldovan, in his new position, becomes one of the coordinators of the Romanian political movement in Vienna, permanently acting as

an advisor and as source of precious information about the possible appointments on various positions or directions they should follow. He was also a messenger of the main political leaders in Transylvania: Șuluțiu, Șaguna and Bariț.

Actually, he permanently informed them about the necessity of constituting a permanent delegation to Vienna, who was to strongly support the Romanian interests: summoning the diet, drawing attention to an administrative organization totally contrasting with the stipulations of the Diploma of October and the Patent of February, trying to persuade certain leaders like Mocioni, Șuluțiu and Bariț against the idea of a general national congress.²³ In his opinion, but also in Vasile Ladislau Pop's opinion, supported by the political realism of Șaguna, the best way for Romanians was to send representatives in the Reichsrat, implying the necessity of convening a diet of Transylvania who was to enact the statute of the Romanian nation and language within the Transylvanian constitutional system. Moldovan even comes to make a series of nominations for the composition of the delegation: Ioan Popasu, Spiridon Fetti, Ioan Coste, Ioan Pipoș²⁴ etc.

Eventually, the numerous requests of the Romanian officials from the Aulic Chancellery regarding the appointment of a permanent Romanian delegation to Vienna are heard and the National Committee sends Iacob Bologa, Ilie Măcelariu and Dr. Ioan Rațiu. This membership having been decided on in Blaj, it is also accepted in Sibiu,²⁵ and the three men will travel and arrive to Vienna after a stopover in Pest, on 22 June.²⁶ But this delegation, after less than 2 weeks, will find itself in conflict with the Orthodox bishop, the presence of both bishops being therefore required once again.²⁷ Two deputies, Iacob Bologa and Ilie Măcelariu, return: the first participates in a council in Blaj (2 October 1861), where it is decided that Șuluțiu is to go to Vienna again. Șaguna is also invited, but as he declines the offer due to a "mysterious illness," he also accepts that Șuluțiu should go "up there." The moment proved to be very well chosen: the imperial rescript of 19 September 1861, concerning the summoning of the diet and the acceptance of Kemény's resignation, the conflict between the interim leadership of the Chancellery and the Gubernium, the separate votes of the three Romanian councilors (Paul Dunca, Alexandru Lazăr and Ioan Alduleanu), as well as the separate votes of the aulic councilor Vasile Ladislau Pop. All led to postponing the summoning of the diet, but also to the crystallization of the Romanian requests. In the period between 8 October and 30 November 1861, the delegation held several conferences in Vienna, attended by the local officials, including Moldovan. In coordination with the meetings of the National Committee in Sibiu presided by Șaguna, the delegation set as an objective the appointment of a Romanian as president of the Aulic Chancellery. Obviously, the nominated character was Vasile Ladislau Pop.²⁸

Nevertheless, the man appointed to lead this institution, essential to the Austrian policies in Transylvania, was Francisc Nádásdy, seconded by Reichenstein, who would proceed to an administrative reorganization of Transylvania. The first step was to fire Mikó and to replace him with Ludovic Folliot de Crenneville (24 No-

vember 1862). V.L. Pop becomes vice-governor, which was a great achievement anyway: he was the Romanian who ranked the highest in the administrative hierarchy of the Empire. He will nevertheless be the first and the last one to do so. As a consequence of these changes, D. Moldovan is considered for the position left vacant by Pop in the Chancellery, being supported by the Gubernium. But this time, as revealed by the correspondence with other Romanian political figures, Moldovan will fall victim to the competition for positions. Likewise, if in the Șuluțiu-Anghel case the conflict had been general and confessional (to the advantage of the Uniate and to the detriment of the non-Uniate), this time the competition is intra-confessional, even if Șuluțiu is also directly involved. The counter-candidate of Moldovan is the same Bran de Lemeni, favored by Șaguna.

During his stay in Vienna, Nádásdy requested from Șuluțiu a list with candidates for various positions in the central structures of the Principality of Transylvania. Therefore, in his own turn, the metropolitan sent the request to Șaguna (11 November by the new calendar and 12/24 November), who did not reply, and therefore Șuluțiu himself had to also draw up a list for the Orthodox, in which Moldovan was proposed for the position of aulic councilor.²⁹ Obviously, *post factum*, Șuluțiu realized Șaguna had his own list, where Bran was nominated for this position, and also realized the error he had committed by interfering with Șaguna's prerogatives. Additional clarifications can be traced also in the correspondence of D. Moldovan with Vasile Ladislau Pop,³⁰ Spiridon Fetti,³¹ Iacob Bologa,³² George Bariț³³ and Ilie Măcelariu.³⁴ The last two clearly name Bran as Moldovan's competitor, even stating that an authentic campaign of the former for occupying the targeted position had been set in motion. Anyway, the event would have been insignificant if there had not been consequences.

The matter of having appointed Moldovan, as well as other matters chiefly of a confessional nature, weakened the mutual trust of the two hierarchs more and more. Șuluțiu was to say that "Ș[aguna] is ambitious and when his interests are threatened, [he is] merciless and fanatical."²⁹ It is very possible that Șaguna's intention to impose Bran de Lemeni as councilor was related to the restoration of the Orthodox metropolitan see. The Orthodox bishop needed a trusted man in the Chancellery, someone with good lobbying skills. Aware of his relationship with Șuluțiu, Șaguna was not convinced that Moldovan could have accomplished this mission. This explanation is also supported by the opposition among the Uniate clergy, led by Iosif Pop-Szilagy and Alexandru Dobra, who did their best to ensure that the new Orthodox metropolitan see did not also belong to Alba Iulia.³⁵ All these, as well as Șuluțiu's incapacity to sign a convention regarding confessional relationships,³⁶ made Șaguna state that ". . . the evidence of Blaj about the confraternity for Sibiu is still limited to empty words and promises!"³⁷ Likewise, Șaguna's attacks will not be directed only towards the Uniate hierarchy, but also against V. L. Pop, who also challenged Șaguna's project.³⁸ The events are confirmed by Ilarion Pușcariu, who states that in January 1862, Nádásdy asked Ioan Pușcariu, a Chancellery official, to issue a memo-

randum proposing to the Emperor the re-establishment of the metropolitan see. Reichenstein (vice-chancellor) and Pop (vice-governor) came up with the idea of founding an Orthodox metropolitan see only in the geographic area of Transylvania, and therefore Șaguna asked Schmerling to take the cause from the Chancellery and make the necessary proposals to the Emperor³⁹ himself. Thus, Moldovan was also excused of the additional competencies, managing to maintain his good relationship with Șaguna, as reflected by their correspondence. He will be part of all the delegations Șaguna led in his actions for the restoration of the Orthodox metropolitan see, but became involved as little as possible in confessional matters, only to the extent in which this was required by the position he held.⁴⁰

The confessional disputes between the two hierarchs are doubled beginning with the end of 1862 by a series of disagreements regarding the political action. They will only be briefly listed here: the matter of the national congress in 1863 (election of the deputies and the national program), the matter of convening another national congress within the political context of 1865 and the matter of the participation of Romanian deputies in the diet of Cluj, the Rațiu-Bariț petition of 1866, followed by the death of metropolitan from Blaj⁴¹ in 1867, which extinguished the conflict. In this context, the attempts at a rapprochement proved to be illusory, as between 1862 and 1863 Moldovan, as an aulic councilor, was caught up in many more political projects. He attends the national conference in April 1863, being re-elected as a member of the Permanent Committee, and is part of the delegation led by Șaguna in order to present the conclusions of the conference to the Emperor. Likewise, the entire correspondence of Moldovan from this period is filled with support requests for various positions in the administration. Șuluțiu intervenes many times in favor of his nephew Iosif Șterca Șuluțiu,⁴² Măcelariu asks him to facilitate the relationship with Reichenstein for taking up the position of gubernium councilor,⁴³ Spiridon Fetti asks for support for occupying a position of secretary or official in the Aulic Chancellery,⁴⁴ Andrei Șaguna suggests various names for the position of assessor with the Royal Board or for the appointment of Nicolae Popea as royalist with the diet in Sibiu.⁴⁵

The ambiguity of his position as an imperial official is best reflected in the attitude Moldovan displayed towards the Romanian Diet in Sibiu. Probably at his request he is not appointed royalist, precisely in order to avoid the obligation to always be present at the debates. He followed Șuluțiu's advice, who considered the Chancellery a much more important institution than the Diet.⁴⁶ The constant presence in Sibiu would have prevented Moldovan from defending the Romanian interests within the Chancellery, where the truly important decisions were made.⁴⁷ Consequently, he participated in the elections and won a deputy mandate in the Ighiu circle of the Lower Alba county, but did not rush to attend the opening of the Diet, appearing only at the debates and only beginning with 7 September 1863.⁴⁸ In each plenary session of the Diet he would support the official projects proposed by the Gubernium and sanctioned by the Chancellery, collaborating closely with

the other Romanian officials (“the 7–8 men”: Pop, Măcelariu, Alduleanu, Bologa, Vasici, Bran, Pușcariu) in order to speed up the Diet’s activity, incurring even more criticism regarding their actions.⁴⁹ In the second session of 1864, Moldovan would not be present during the works, also owing to the fact that he was also part of the Reichsrat.

The political changes of 1865 and the summoning of the Diet in Cluj again find Moldovan as a mediator between Șaguna, Șuluțiu and Bariț⁵⁰: he asks them to go to Vienna for advice on what should be done, but also because the presence of the two hierarchs would have given greater weight to the Romanian requests. All three decline the request, which does not prevent him from giving further advice. He sends letters to Șuluțiu and Bariț detailing the strategy that should be followed in the Diet.⁵¹ Likewise, he specifies the fact that he will not participate in the Diet, which already indicates his turn to a passive approach, reason for which he will support the petition of Bariț and Rațiu.

At the end of 1866, Moldovan, feeling the imminent dissolution of the Aulic Chancellery, asks Bariț about the attitude the Romanian officials should adopt and what the nation’s interest would be.⁵² Practically, the same dilemma arises as in 1860. Bariț’s answer is identical with his reply from January 1861: it depends on the conscience of each one of us, admitting however that the nation needs officials.⁵³ Despite this ambivalent answer, Moldovan preferred to retire when the Chancellery was dissolved on 11 March 1867.

From this point on, the life and activity of Moldovan are veiled in mystery. The sources are scarce and filled with gaps, a fact which leads us to believe that, at least for a period, he disappears from the public arena. He will reappear at the various meetings of 1872⁵⁴ between passivists and activists, pleading for the participation in the elections for the Diet in Pest and demanding the reactivation of the Permanent Committee of 1861–63. But this time he will stand on the other side of the barricade, opposite his former collaborators: Vasici, Bologa, Măcelariu etc. Following this episode, he will retire to his personal life, slightly discredited also by his vacillation between passivism and activism.



Notes

1. George Bariț, *Părți alese din istoria Transilvaniei pe două sute de ani în urmă*, Sibiu, 1890, vol. I, p. 671 apud. Camelia Elena Vulea, “Aspecte din activitatea lui Dimitrie Moldovan între 1849–1860,” in *Sargeția*, 28–29, 1999–2000, no. 2, p. 165.
2. Liviu Botezan, “Dimitrie Moldovan – fiu al Devei. Rolul lui în viața politică a Transilvaniei din perioada 1848–1867,” in *Sargeția*, 25, 1992–1994, p. 567–621 and Camelia Elena Vulea, “Aspecte din activitate,” p. 161–179.

3. Especially Ioana Botezan's contributions: "Corespondența lui Alexandru Șterca Șuluțiu cu Dimitrie Moldovan între anii 1860–66," (I–II), în *AIICluj*, 27, 1985–86, p. 423–443, 28, 1987–88, p. 531–556; "Un document din anul 1861 privind strădaniile românilor din Transilvania de a cuceri drepturi politice," in *AMN*, 15, 1978, p. 489–494; "Din corespondența primită de Dimitrie Moldovan între 1857–1865," in *Societatea și civilizație*, Târgu-Mureș, 2002, p. 288–305; and Liviu Botezan's contributions: "Corespondența lui Ilie Măcelariu cu Dimitrie Moldovan din anii 1861–1871," in *Sargeția*, 28–29, 1999–2000, no. 2, p. 211–263; his correspondence with George Bariț (George Bariț și contemporanii, vol. V, 1981, pp. 114–166; vol. X, 2003, p. 177–231); various correspondence in *Mișcarea națională a Românilor din Transilvania între 1849–1918. Documente*, vol. III, coord. Simion Retegan, Bucharest, 2006.
4. The majority of bibliographic references are taken from Liviu Botezan, "Dimitrie Moldovan," p. 567–592 and Camelia Elena Vulea, "Aspecte din activitate," p. 161–165.
5. Ioan Pușcariu, *Dizertațiunea despre împărțirea administrativă a Ardealului*, Sibiu, 1864; Lorand Madly, "Les réformes concernant la division politico-administrative de la Transylvanie dans la décennie néo-absolutiste," in *Transylvanian Review*, vol. XVII, no. 1, Spring 2008.
6. Essential for a better understanding of the issue (Diploma of October and the Patent of February, the meaning of the two fundamental acts and the related struggle for political influence in Vienna), is the monograph by A.J.P. Taylor, *Monarhia Habsburgică, 1809–1918*, Bucharest, 2000, p. 85–114.
7. For the three programs, and for the Romanian reaction to the Diploma of October 1860, see Simion Retegan, *Reconstrucția politică a Transilvaniei între 1861–1863*, Cluj-Napoca, 2004, p. 60–65.
8. Moldovan was married to one of Șuluțiu's nieces; for the relation between the two see also Moldovan to Șuluțiu, Sibiu, 12/2 1859, in DJAAN, Coll. MRUB, file 700/1861, p. 29–32, where the former reminds the bishop of a promised loan of 6000 fl.
9. *Mișcarea națională*, p. 216–217.
10. Andrei Șaguna, *Corespondență*, I/1, eds. Ioan Vasile Leb, Gabriel Gârdan, Pavel Vesa, Bogdan Ivanov, Cluj-Napoca, 2005, p. 327–328.
11. Simion Retegan, *Reconstrucția*, p. 72–76.
12. Ioan Pușcariu, *Notițe despre întâmplările contemporane*, Sibiu, 1913, p. 52–53.
13. *Mișcarea națională*, vol. III, p. 332–333.
14. Ioana Botezan, "Corespondența," (I), p. 427–428; *Mișcarea națională*, vol. III, p. 357–360.
15. *Ibid*, p. 393–394.
16. *Ibid*, p. 411–413.
17. *Ibid*, p. 413–414.
18. *Ibid*, p. 419–420.
19. *Ibid*, p. 420–421.
20. *Protocolul ședințelor conferinței naționale românești ținute din 1/13 până în 4/16 ianuarie 1861 la Sibiu sub președinția a doi Arhiepiscopi românești din Transilvania cu aclusele sale și cu un comentariu*, Brașov, 1861, p. 41–43; George Bariț, *Părți alese*, vol. III, Sibiu, 1891, p. 75–76.
21. *George Bariț și contemporanii săi*, vol. V, p. 127.

22. Vlad Popovici, "Elita politică românească din Transilvania (1861–1881). O perspectivă alternativă," în *AUAH*, 14/1, 2010, p. 216.
23. For the debates concerning the summoning of a general national congress, see Simion Retegan, *Reconstrucția*, p. 140–143.
24. *George Bariț și contemporanii săi*, vol. V, p. 129.
25. Andrei Șaguna, *Corespondență*, p. 364.
26. Keith Hitchins, Liviu Maior, *Corespondența lui Ioan Rațiu cu George Bariț 1861–1892*, Cluj-Napoca, 1970, p. 47–48.
27. See Andrei Șaguna, *Corespondență*, p. 364–368; George Bariț, *Părți alese*, p. 593–597.
28. Simion Retegan, *Reconstrucția*, p. 157–163; Idem, *Dieta românească a Transilvaniei (1863–1864)*, Cluj-Napoca, 1978, p. 53–54; Ioan Pușcariu, *Notițe despre*, p. 59–61; Nicolae Josan, "Documente inedite privind lupta națională a românilor din Transilvania în anul 1861," în *Apulum*, 27, 1979, p. 539–572. Andrei Șaguna, *Corespondență*, p. 375–404.
29. For the letters in Andrei Șaguna, *Corespondență*, p. 391 și p. 399; Ioana Botezan, "Corespondența," (I), p. 438–440; list of nominees in DJAAN, Coll. cit., file 701/1861, p. 58–60.
30. DJAAN, Coll. Demetriu Moldovan, 3/1862.
31. Ibid, 9/1862.
32. DJCAN, Coll. Biblioteca Centrală Blaj, XI–258, p. 19–20.
33. *George Bariț și contemporanii*, vol. X, p. 198–199.
34. Liviu Botezan, "Corespondența lui Ilie Măcelariu," p. 227.
35. D. Suci, *Studii privind mișcarea națională a românilor din Transilvania în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea*, Cluj-Napoca, 2004, p. 93–98.
36. Nicolae Bocșan, "Din trecutul relațiilor interconfesionale românești. Andrei Șaguna și Alexandru Șterca Șuluțiu," in Nicolae Bocșan, Marius Eppel, Ioan Vasile Leb, Gabriel Viorel Gârdan, *Instituțiile Bisericii Ortodoxe Române din Transilvania (1850–1918)*, Cluj-Napoca, 2009, p. 98.
37. DJCAN, Coll. Biblioteca Centrală Blaj, XI–266, p. 22.
38. Ibid, p. 36–38, 51–52.
39. Ilarion Pușcariu, *Mitropolia românilor ortodocși din Ungaria și Transilvania. Studiu istoric despre reînființarea mitropoliei dimpreună cu o colecțiune de acte*, Sibiu, 1900, p. 139; Ioan Pușcariu, *Notițe despre*, p. 79.
40. Did not attend the Orthodox synod of 1864, DJCAN, Coll. Biblioteca Centrală Blaj, XI–266, p. 60–61.
41. See Nicolae Bocșan, "Din trecutul relațiilor interconfesionale românești. Andrei Șaguna și Alexandru Șterca Șuluțiu," p. 93–112; Keith Hitchins, *Conștiință națională și acțiune politică la românii din Transilvania (1868–1918)*, II, Cluj-Napoca, 1982, p. 207–234.
42. Ioana Botezan, "Corespondența," (II), p. 535, 540, 543, 546, 555. 5 letters of a total of 38.
43. Liviu Botezan, "Corespondența lui Ilie Măcelariu," p. 238.
44. DJAAN, Coll. Demetriu Moldovan, 26/1863.
45. DJCAN, Coll. Biblioteca Centrală Blaj, XI–266, p. 42–45, 53–54.
46. Ioana Botezan, "Corespondența," (II), p. 544.
47. For the relation between the Aulic Chancellery and the Diet, see Simion Retegan, *Dieta românească*, chapters V, VI and VII.

48. *Concordia*, 75/1863.
49. Un apel la Națiune!, în Idem, no. 85–86/1863; Ioan Pușcariu, *Notițe despre*, p. 76–77.
50. Ioana Botezan, “Corespondența,” (II), p. 547; *George Bariț și contemporanii*, vol. X, p. 216; DJCAN, Coll. Biblioteca Centrală Blaj, XI–266, fila 72.
51. Liviu Botezan, “Dimitrie Moldovan,” p. 607.
52. *George Bariț și contemporanii*, vol. V, p. 162.
53. Ibid, vol. X, p. 226.
54. Dumitru Suci, *Mișcarea antidualistă a românilor din Austro-Ungaria și Ilie Măcelariu (1867-1891)*, Bucharest, 2002, p. 364, 389–391.

Abstract

Between Scylla and Charybdis: The Political Journey of Dimitrie Moldovan during 1861–1867

The main goal of this essay is to present the political activity carried out between 1860 and 1867 by Dimitrie Moldovan, one of the most prominent figures in the Romanian national movement. Profoundly divided between his loyalty as a Romanian official at the Habsburg Court and his people's efforts in the struggle for political and religious freedom, Moldovan finds himself in the position of giving advice to both Catholic and Orthodox leaders of Transylvania, but also to other members of the Romanian elite. His main goal was to give a sense of unity of action, regardless of religious dissent and personal interests.

The paper comprises two parts. First of all, based on a comprehensive literature, the historical context in which Moldovan carried out most of his political activity will be established. After that, by bringing forward some new evidence from the National Archives, we shall attempt to present his personal and public ties with some of the most important political figures of his time.

Keywords

Transylvania, political elites, national movement, Romanian officials