CONTENTS

STUDIES AND ARTICLES

NOTES AND REVIEWS

STUDIES AND ARTICLES

ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH THE DICTATURE IN ROME. HISTORIOGRAPHICAL WIEVS

Florian Olteanu[*]

Abstract

The article reveals the ideas of some representatives historians of the Republican Roman period, concerning the relations between society, state and the historical evolution. There are pointed out the principles which approach and differentiate the Greek and Roman societies and also the historiographical conceptions appropriate to these cultures, the most remarquable in the Ancient history of the Europe.

Key words: *Society, Historiography, State, Political Relations, Influence*

The Roman history is an original combination between people, facts and attitudes which provided a large field for the contemporary historiography. The Roman historians came from the two political and social cathegories of Rome, senators and knights, they were deeply involved in the process of *making decision*, administration or in the cultural movement.

Rome had three main periods of its history: *Kingdom* (753-509 B.C.), *Republic* (509-27 B.C.)[1] and *Empire* (27 B.C.-476 A.D.). In 395 A.D., the Roman Empire was divided in the Eastern and Western Roman Empire. The Eastern Empire will survive with the capital at Constantinople until 1453, being known as the Byzantine Empire.

Rome succeded to have an empire on three continents (Europe, Africa and Asia) but it kept the institutions of a city state. Any attempt to change the *mos maiorum* (the tradition of the ancestors) was seen as an act of sacrilege. The Senate accepted later to give political rights to the plebs being forced by the external forces which threatened Rome (Gauls, Carthage).

In Rome, in case of disaster, was appointed the *dictator*, who discharged the ordinary magistrates – the *consuls* – an extraordinary magistrate who acted independent for six months and after the victory he gave the power to the

---

[*] Lecturer, PhD, University of Craiova, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, Departament of Public Administration, History and Political Science, no. 107 D, Calea Bucureşti Street, Dolj, tel. 0351/177103, e-mail: f_olteanu19811901@yahoo.com
[1] Theodor Mommsen, *Istoria Romană*, vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1971, *passim*.

Senate. There are known the examples of Fabius Cunctator or M. Furius Camillus. But the power of the Senate was symbolic, many times Rome will be threatened by its own statesmen.

The first case is that of Coriolanus a great Roman military who fought with courage for the glory of Rome, but after being exiled in the Etrurian territory, attempted to enter armed in Rome, for revenge. The Rome was saved by the mother of Coriolanus, Veturia who came in front of his son claiming that she preferred to die instead seeing her son as conqueror and transforming her in a slave. Emotioned, Coriolanus witdrew and later was killed on his return way to the Etrurians.

The "sentimentalism" of Coriolanus stayed only in the historical books, because the ambition, the fights for power will influence the entire course of the Roman history.[1]

The creation of a new social group, the knights (sons from marriages between members of the originary patrician and plebeian groups) will force the Senate to resist on the position of the only guardian of the *mos maiorum.* Even the senators could not make business, they saw the opportunity to become landowners spoliating the small properties of the peasants, or renting the *ager publicus* (public soil territories conquered by Rome and being under Senate control n.n.) used in the military campaigns during the first wars of Rome on the principle *bonus milites bonusque colonus* (*good military and good peasant*).

The attempts of Gracchus brothers (nephews of great Cornelius Scipio) in 133-123 B.C. to offer land from the *ager publicus* were smashed by the Senate.

The necessity of a good and a permanent army in the new conditions of external wars of Rome, imposed a new reform made by Caius Marius, who offered land to his soldiers in Africa after the defeat of King Iugutha (105 B.C.).[2]

Marius, having a conflict with Sulla, his former lieutnenant from Africa (who vanquished Mithridates VI in the East) went in Africa and enterd in Rome with his veterans, opening the way of "Roman attacks on Rome ", as the historiography registered under the name of "the civil wars".

In the conflict between Marius and Sulla, the *socii* (Roman subjects from Italy) received the Roman citizenship on the principles of the Roman law (*ius Italicum*) in 88 B.C.

The great uprisings of the slaves in Sicily and the uprising of Spartakus, the wars in the East appointed new names as Pompeius and Crassus, Caesar

---

[1] Claudio Rendina, *Roma Ieri oggi e domani*, vol. I, Roma, Newton Compton Editori, 2007, p. 23-24.
[2] M. Cary, John Wilson, *A shorter History of Rome*, New York, Macmillan, 1963, *passim.*

able to concentrate military obedient forces which will "erase" the authority of the Senate.

From 60 until 48 B.C., Rome was led by powerfull names al Caesar, Crassus and Pompeius, which finally confronted, Caesar being the great leader until his assasination in 44 B.C. He kept the unlimited power with the formally accord of the Senate, which had no army, and by this cause had no power.

The assasination of Caesar did not solve the Problem, the republican institutions being unable to controll the situation in Rome (including the conquered territories).[1]

The Roman historiography was influenced by the Greeks. The first contacts were established during the Macedonian wars (215-168 B.C.), which conducted to the occupation of a great part of the Greece by Roman Republic.[2] It is the time when Polybios (210-128 B.C.), a Greek from Arcadia, son of a great achaean general, Lycortas, was initiated in politics, which will influenced his work. In 168 B.C., after the defeat of Macedonians in 168 B.C. by Roman Republic, he was put on the list of 1000 men took as hostages by Romans as a waranty for the peace treaty. He spent 16 years in the Eternal City, in which he could observe the social and political realities from the Roman Republic[3]. Becoming a close friend of Cornelius Scipio the conqueror of the Greece, he could observe and understand the Roman vertues and the discipline which conducted Rome to the highest position in the Ancient world. His work survived in fragments.[4] The most important, *Universal History*, in 40 books, presents the steps of the Roman expansion over the Greek world from the begining of the second war with Carthage (219 B.C.) to the siege and destruction of Corynthe (46 B.C.).[5] Helped by his political knowledge, he could realize a scientific investigation based on realism and critical spirit. The society influenced the great political decisions. A historical event had a pretext, some causes which will influence its course. He considered the history, (as he declared in the Book IX), as relying on three main pylons: genealogy (included the gods and the legendary heroes), the creation of the colonies and the political relations between colonies and their mother-cities (geopolitical and institutional history) and the political facts in which were involved people and leaders, politicians and armies (military, political and social history).[6]

---

[1] *** *Istoria Universală Larousse*, vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Teora, 2005, *passim.*
[2] Horia C. Matei, *Civilizaţia lumii antice*, Bucureşti, Editura Eminescu, 1983, p. 87-89.
[3] Jean Defradas, *Literatura elină*, Bucureşti, Editura Tineretului, 1968, p. 214.
[4] Virgil G. Popescu, *Note*, la Polybios, *Istorii*, II, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1970, p. 530.
[5] Joachim Hermann, *Lexikon Frühen Kulturen*, Band 2, Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut 1987, p. 76.
[6] *Ibidem*, p. 9.

The conclusion of his work is that of the interdependence of the historical events. The historian might act with responsibility and impartiality. Rome having a superior type of social relations could conquer the Greek world in 53 years, offering a period of tranqulity for Greece (where the peace was the temporary break in the conflict),described by Indro Montanelli as "the grave peace".[1]

The first Roman historian was Caius Iulius Caesar (100-44 B.C.). Born in Rome, he was a rich senator, an extraordinary military commander and the greatest statesman from the last fifty years of the Roman Republic.[2]

His main historical works are *Commentarii de bello Gallico* (in seven books), in which he describes the campaign against the Gauls (58-52 B.C.) and *Commentarii de bello civili* (in three books), in which are presented the events from the beginning of the civil war with Pompeius until 48 B.C.[3]

These works are considered as being apologetic and tendencious, because they have as main and immediate purpose the political propaganda. He would to influence the public opinion for accepting and understanding his political strategy. Beside the literary value, the plenty of data regarding the civilizations from the Roman frontiers, the military organization and tactics, the work of Caesar is important from the informations concerning the Roman society and politics at the end of the Republic.

The crisis of the Roman state was generated mainly by the social-political structures of the Republic which were unable to provide an unitary political frame of the conquered territories which formed *de facto* a large empire extended from the Atlantic to the Southern Europe and from the Northern Africa to the Minor Asia. It was extended by the confrontation of the two political groups, *optimates* and *populares*, which were not separated by wealth criteria as Marxists considered. They were the supporters of two opposed ideas: the conservation of the traditions, with the Senate as main political center – the *optimates* and the concentration of the *making decision* in the hands of influent and skillfull statesmen in accordance with the republican institutions – the *populares*.

Caesar noted the essential facts and events, being interested by the action, facts, human will and hazard.

In the same historical period lived, created and took part at the political life of Rome one the most important personality, Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.) son of a rich family of knights from Arpinum (70 km south-east from Rome).

---

[1] Indro Montanelli, *Istoria Grecilor*, București, Editura Artemis, 2004, p. 103.

[2] Michel Mourre, *Dictionnaire enciclopedique d'histoire*, vol. 1, Paris, Bordas, 1996, p. 567.

[3] Charles Daremberg, *Dictionnaire des antiquites grecques et romaines*, vol. I, Paris, Hachette, 1881, p. 182.

Cicero understood that the main characteristic of last century B.C. was a decadence of the habitudes, the highest position of the collectivity being undermined by the individual personalities.

Cicero is not an historian but he was involved in great social and political events. Integrated in the Senate, he was appointed in 75 B.C. *quaestor* in Sicily. Appreciated on a very large scale, in 70 B.C., Cicero will be the defender of the Sicilians during the process against the former governor of Sicily, Veres known as one of the most corrupt person in the Roman state. His discourses (*In Verrem orationes septem*) make a portrait of the abuses in the Roman society: bribery, piratery, desertion, corruption.[1]

He will accomplish the senatorial magistracies of *aedilis* (69 B.C.) and *praetor* (66 B.C.) reaching the highest magistracy from the *cursus honorum*, that of *consul*, in 63 B.C. In this quality, he will discover the conspiracy of Lucius Sergius Catilina and will attack him in a master-piece of discourses, *In Catilinam orationes quattor*. The crisis of the Roman Republic knew the trial of seizing power by conspiracy. Catilina was the exponent of the *populares* and Cicero the exponent of the *optimates*.[2] Catilina with the help of an army from Etruria intended to abolish the debts, to release the slaves, to put fire on Rome and to kill all the senators and magistrats and to offer highest dignities to his friends.[3]

As a Roman official Cicero presented sucessfully the image of the Roman society which would transform in the age of the Empire.

In the I[st] century B.C., in the Roman historiography, we can note the existence of a special type of the historical discourse, the monography. Its main representant is considered Caius Sallustius Crispus (86-35 a.Chr.).

Acomplishing several tasks and magistracies (in 52 B.C. he was *tribunus of the plebs*), Sallustius is a *homo novus*, being appointed in the Roman Senate. He was accuzed by immorality and excluded from Senate in 50 B.C (in reality he was one of the supporters of Caesar, and the Senate was the Partisan of Pompeius Magnus n.n.). Caesar admmitted him in the Senate in 49 B.C.

From his rich historical work, we will insist on a monography, *De coniuratione Catilinae* (*About the plot of Catilina*), wrote in the period 43-41 B.C., and referring to the plot of Lucius Sergius Catilina (64-63 B.C.).[4]

---

[1] *** *Der Grosse Ploetz, Die Daten Enzyklopadie der Weltgeschichte*, Freiburg, Ploetz, 1999, p.243.
[2] *** *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie*, Band 1, Mannheim, Brockhaus Verlag, 1988, p. 368-369.
[3] Hermann Kinder,Werner Hilgemann, *Atlas de istorie mondială*, vol. 1, Bucureşti, Editura RAO, 2003, p. 83-85.
[4] Claudio Rendina, *op. cit.*, 2007, p. 56-57.

In this monography, Sallustius presents Catilina, the exponent of the *nobilitas* as an expression of the vice:

"*L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo provoque. Huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere, ibique iuven- tutem suam exercuit. Corpus patiens inediae,algoris,vigiliae,supra quam cuiquam credible est. Animus audax, subdolus, varius, cuius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator; alieni appetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum. Vastus animus immoderata, incredibila, nimis alta semper cupiebat* (De coniuratione Catilinae, 5, 1-5).

Catilina is presented as a powerfull and without fear fellow but having a bad and vicious character (*ingenium malum pravoque*). Also, Catilina is rezistant (*patiens*), courageous (*audax*), but in the same time smart (*subdolus*), actor (*simulator*), an hypocrite (*dissimulator*) and without limits (*profusus*).

Sallustius considers the *nobilitas* responsible for the crisis of the Roman Republic, the main cause being the decadence of the behaviour.

These are the main historiographical conceptions from the republican history of Rome, regarding the society. The conclusion we can make is that of the insufficiency of the Republican institutions in front of the great ambitions of the statesmen who had no fear to use the military force for accomplishing their purposes.

THE ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENTS
OF THE TRANSYLVANIAN SAXONS[*]

Alexandra Porumbescu[**]

Abstract

This paper will investigate the history of the Saxon community in the Transylvania region of Romania. The Transylvanian Saxons are a people of German ethnicity who settled in Transylvania from the 12th century onwards. First of all, we aimed to present the origins of this people who settled in the south-eastern part of Europe coming from distant area, and the reasons that drew them here. Then, we explained where the name "saxon" originates, continuing with a brief description of the way they lived and how their comunities were organized. The evocation of the most important events in the medieval period aims to highlight the important role played by the ethnic Germans in the history of the Romanian provinces.

Key words: *Transylvania*, *Saxones*, *Colonists*, *Settlements*, *Minority*

The history of ethnic German settlement in what is now Romania occurred in several phases and resulted in the formation of numerous German-speaking communities with distinct dialects and local traditions. The complicated changes in geopolitical control over northern and western Romania between various powers facilitated the diversity of the German minorities. The oldest group of German population that lived in south-eastern Europe was the one of the Transylvanian Saxons. Back in the XIIth century, they responded the call of Geza the IInd, who wanted to create German colonies in the East, in the "Country beyond the forests" (Terra Ultrasilvana), in order to protect himself from the Mongols and the Tatars. The name of "Saxons" (in romanian, *saşi*), does not represent a clear clue regarding the geographic origins of the first immigrants. Their origins cannot be clearly and accurately established. However, most of them appear to originate in the Rhine region of the empire.[1]

[**] PhD Candidate, Assistant Lecturer, University of Craiova, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, Department of History, Administrative Sciences and Political Sciences, no. 107 D, Calea Bucureşti Street, Dolj County, tel. 0351/177103, e-mail: alexandraporumbescu@yahoo.com

[1] W. Loth, *"Theutonici" în Siebenburgen. Zum Problem des Namens der deutschen Einwanderer*, în *Siebenbürgisches Archiv*, vol. I, Köln-Wien, Böhlau Herausgeber, 1962, p. 250-253.

The immense task to defend and develop the new territories was beyond the capabilities of the Magyars with their relatively small population. Qualified border settlers were not available in sufficient numbers. Often they were displaced groups from the steppe of Southern Russia. A shortage of skilled trades people, especially for mining, became apparent. The Magyars realized, as the founder of the nation St. Stephen reminded his son Emmerich in a "Libellus de institutione morum", "immigrating guests of various languages and customs bring different teachings and weapons. They decorate and uplift all regions and the royal court...because an empire with only one language and one law is weak and transient".[1]

Such guests ("hospites") had to be recruited with winning promises. Owning land was especially attractive in medieval times. The crown land (fundus regius) of the former desolate corridor of the old abatis border was made available. Privileges were also sought. These included rights which the guests were used to and "brought in their bones". However, it had to include rights beyond that to entice people to take the risk and settle in a region a thousand kilometers from their home land. Personal freedom, freedom of movement, permissiveness were magical words which gave promise of higher personal rank, security and better advancement. The Hungarian government made these promises and the promises were honored over centuries. Included in the constitution of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom of King Andrew II (he issued the Golden Bull, sometimes called the Hungarian Magna Charta in 1222) was the guarantee to guests of all nationalities.

As stated before, the colonization of the Saxons in Transylvania was initiated by King Géza II (1141-1162) of Hungary, being justified essentially by economic and military reasons. For decades, the main task of the German settlers was to defend the southern border of the Transylvanian Hungarian Kingdom. The German colonization in Transylvania continued until the late thirteenth century and the beginning of the next century.

The second great wave of German settlement took place after the Hungarian king Andrew II (reigned 1205-35) granted the Barcaság area (around present-day Braşov, Romania) in southeastern Transylvania to the Teutonic Order in 1211. The order, however, attempted to found its own state, and so Andrew, in order to win the Saxons' favour against the Teutonic Knights, granted the Saxons a wide range of privileges in his decree of 1224, the Andreanum. As a result the Saxons were united as one nation under the leadership of the crown lieutenant (*comes*; Latin: count) in Nagyszeben, and they received new territories. They were guaranteed free elections for priests and local leaders, together with exemption from customs duties and taxes,

---

[1] *Ibidem*, p. 251.

except for an annual payment to the king for the lands they had received from him. The Saxons also were obliged to provide soldiers for the king; these would come from their patrician class, the Gräfe.[1]

1. The origins of the name "*Saxon*"

The origin of the name that the inhabitants bore after the colonization of Transylvania by the German colonists, whose origin was mainly in the Rhine region, is controversial among researchers and still unclear.[2] Because a relatively small number of settlers had Saxon origins, as resulted in the study of the Saxon dialect, a surprising and paradoxical finding is that the name "Saxon" was picked by themselves, starting in the XIVth century. The first documented references from the twelfth century and the beginning of XIIIth century refer to "*Flandrenses*", "*Saxones*" and "*Theutonici*". Papal Documents from the archives of that period prefer the name "*Theutonici*", while the Arpadian documents call them "Saxones". Much more rarely, papal documents refer to "*Flandrenses*" or "*Saxones*". Wilfried Loth considers, as most researchers do, that all the names used refer to the same population.

The name "*Saxon*" given to the settlers is attested in documents only in 1206, when King Andrew II of Hungary (1205-1235) conferred privileges to the Saxons (in latin, *primi hospites regni*) of Cricău (Krakau), Ighiu (Krapundorf) and Romos (Rumes) and secured them a legal status. Since, in the royal chancery, they were referred to as "Saxons", all the Germans in Transylvania were consistently called Saxons.[3] In the early days of colonization, the name "Saxon" was given to poor miners and persons convicted from Saxony.[4]

The language spoken by the Saxons was called by them, in the Saxon dialect, *saksesch* (in German *sächsische*) until relatively recently, while the peasants referred to their own tongue as *detsch* (in German *deutsch*) meaning German, while the literary German (in German *Hochdeutsch*) it was being called, in the Saxon dialect, *muëseresch*, meaning "language of Austrian soldiers", seen by them as foreigners.[5]

K.K. Klein argued the idea that, as the Germans were not "Saxones", they received this name from someone outside Transylvania. In support of the

---

[1] *** *Encyclopedia Britannica, Transylvanian Saxons,* available at http://www.britannica. com/EBchecked/topic /674719/Transylvanian-Saxons, consulted on 10.11.2013.
[2] W. Loth, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
[3] Vogel Sandor, *Autonomia săsească în Transilvania*, available at http://www.epa.oszk.hu/00200/00278/ 00019/c000385.html, consulted on 12.11.2013
[4] K. Gündisch, *Autonomie de stări și regionalitate în Ardealul medieval*, în *Transilvania și sașii ardeleni în istoriografie*, Asociația de Studii Transilvane Heidelberg, Sibiu, Heidelberg, 2001, p. 33-53.
[5] W. Loth, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

concept, are the names given to their communities during colonization, recorded later, containing the word "deutsch" (e.g, Deutsch-Kreuz – Crit). These names were compared with "Sachsenhausen" (Săsăuşi), in dialect "Sessenhousn".[1] As the term "Sassen" is used in Lower Saxony and appoints to Saxons, the idea that the early settlers were German Saxons and therefore gave themselves the name "Saxon" (Sassen) is being induced. The word "Sassen", in Saxon dialect "Sessen", means, in addition to their name, "resident" or "naturalized". The researcher Annelise Thudt specifies instead that the names "Untergesäss" and "Obergesäss" do not indicate implicitly that the inhabitants of these localities are considered Saxons.

Long after the colonization process ended, it was found that the residents have taken the name "Saxon" with a non-saxon pronunciation: "*Sachsen*". This origin was determined by studying the phonetics of the Saxon dialect, resulting in the idea that it should sound "*Sasse*", but it was actually pronounced "*Sachse*". Other hypotheses would be that:

• the Transylvanian Germans have taken the term "*Saxones*" from the royal chancery;

• the term "*sas*" would come from particle "*Szasz*", that Hungarians attached to the names of the localities inhabited by German settlers, even if similar localities in Hungary the particle used was "Németi".[2]

This supports the hypothesis that the Hungarian chancellery wanted to create a clear differentiation between the Germans from Transylvania and Spiss and those seated in Pannonia. This distinction appears in the map published by Mályusz Elemér in 1939 in "Századok".[3]

"*... The reason that in the eyes of the Slavs and Magyars, "sas" would mean "German settler" has no support, the Germans in Hungary being settlers in the same way as the Saxons in Transylvania. If, somehow, the western Slavs meant by "sas" miner working, otherwise questionable, this striking difference remains unexplained, because only a very small part of the German population in Transylvania really dealt with mining. The name "Saxon" was used by all the peoples of Transylvania, not only Germans. If the Romanians in Transylvania use especially this name, in Moldavia and the Romanian Country, name German was used more often*".[4]

---

[1] K.K. Klein, *Der Völksname der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, în „Transylvanica", nr.2/2006, p.145.
[2] *Ibidem*, p. 152.
[3] By the analisys performed by Thomas Nägler on the results of the archeological research in the area. Also see Thomas Nägler, *Aşezarea saşilor în Transilvania*, Bucureşti, Editura Kriterion, 1992, p. 141-143 şi planşa grafică XVII.
[4] *Ibidem*, p. 144.

2. The saxon settlements

The first settlers – Germans (Franks), Walloons and Flemings – came from the territories situated in the basins of the rivers Rhine and Mozelos. Besides the Hungarian crown, an important role in the German colonization in southern Transylvania was played by the Teutonic Knights, the Igriş Cistercian monastery in Banat, as well as the Cistercian Cârţa Abbey of Fagaras Country. The territory colonized by Germans in southern Transylvania has an area of approximately 30,000 km².

In terms of territorial-administrative, the territories inhabited by Saxons were organized in Sibiu County or Province Sibiu. Later, in the first half of the fourteenth century, during the rule of King Charles Robert of Anjou, probably between 1325-1329, the Saxons will be held at the seat of Saxon. Saxons lived up to their old habits, self-governing, organized as a large administrative unit called Königsboden. But there were also many Saxon settlements outside that area. Micro-regions were inhabited by Saxons[1]:

• In southern Transylvania Plateau (from Drastic to Drăuşeni):
• Altland (space between Olt and Hârtibaciu)
   • Weinland (the region between the two Târnave)
   • Waldland (space between Hârtibaciu and Târnava Mare)
   • Zekeschgebiet (Rom. Ţinutul Secaşelor)
   • Unterwald (the space around Sebes and Orăştiei)
   • East of the mountains Persian is Burzenland (Rom. Barsa)
• In northern Transylvania Plateau (in northern Transylvania)
• Nösnerland (region Bistrita – Năsăudului Country)
• Reener Ländchen (around Reghin).

The vast majority of Saxons were farmers, with many others actively engaged in mining, forestry, artisan, military service, monastic priesthood, and merchant commerce. The main political and economic centres were Kronstadt (today Braşov), Hermannstadt (today Sibiu), Arad, Sathmar (Satu Mare), and many others. The Saxons retained prolonged cultural, political, and merchant contact with Germany (including Austria). This was evident by the fact that the German Teutonic Order, ceremonially subservient to the German emperor, was given protected lands in Transylvania in the beginning of the 13th century due to their ethno cultural and linguistic affinity with the Saxons. The crusaders adorned the Saxon city of Kronstadt with powerful defenses, as well as bolstered military, political, and religious foundations that made Transylvania a considerable commercial centre of the region.[2]

---

[1] *Ibidem*, p. 91-96.
[2] Konrad Gündisch, *The History of Transylvania and the Transylvanian Saxons*, Munchen, Herausgeber Langen-Müller, 1998, p. 89.

The development of the cities, consistently supported by the Hungarian Kings Carl I Robert of Anjou (1308-1342), his son Ludwig I the Great (1342-1382), and Sigismund of Luxembourg (1387-1437), resulted in the transition from a resource to a commerce economy, and attached the grain and stock production to the European trade of goods. The first obtainable rules of a guild dated 1376 points to an advanced differentiation of the craftsmanship at a level similar to west European cities. 25 trades were organized in 19 guilds. The cities became economic and cultural centres of the country. Constitutional and legal standards of German cities were adapted, in part the city laws of Magdeburg and Iglau. New laws were developed as early as 1271, the law of "Bergrecht von der Rodenau" for example.[1]

From the end of the 14th century on, the fortified cities were the best protection for the increasing threat by the Osman Turks. The cities withstood longer lasting sieges and hampered the advancement of larger forces. Fortified churches in villages offered protection from smaller raids. With this unique system of fortified churches and cities the Transylvanian Saxons became part of the much heralded "Antemurale Christianitatis", the advanced fortress of Christianity, protecting southeast European people from advancing Turks. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the mayor of Hermannstadt could write with pride that his city is "not alone a shield for the Hungarian empire but for all of Christianity".

3. History and development during the Middle Ages

The Mongol invasion of 1241-42 devastated much of the Kingdom of Hungary. Although the Saxons did their best to resist, many settlements were destroyed. In the aftermath of the invasion, many Transylvanian towns were fortified with stone castles and an emphasis was put on developing towns economically. In the Middle Ages, about 300 villages were defended by *Kirchenburgen*, or fortified churches with massive walls. Though many of these fortified churches have fallen into ruin, nowadays south-eastern Transylvania region has one of the highest numbers of existing fortified churches from the 13th to 16th centuries[2] as more than 150 villages in the area count various types of fortified churches in good shape, seven of them being included in the UNESCO World Heritage under the name of *Villages with fortified churches in Transylvania*. The rapid expansion of cities populated by the Saxons led to Transylvania being known in German as *Siebenbürgen* and *Septem Castra* in Latin, referring to seven of the fortified towns (see Historical names of Transylvania), presumably: Bistritz (Bistriţa), Hermannstadt (Sibiu), Sächsisch

---

[1] *Ibidem,* p. 95-97.
[2] Villages with Fortified Churches in Transylvania. UNESCO World Heritage Centre 1992-2010, available at http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/596, consulted on 10.11.2013.

Regen (Reghin), Kronstadt (Braşov), Mediasch (Mediaş), Mühlbach (Sebeş), Schässburg (Sighişoara).

Although the knights had left Transylvania, the Saxon colonists remained, and the king allowed them to retain the rights and obligations included within the Diploma Andreanum of 1224. This document conferred upon the German population of the territory between Draas (Drăuşeni) and Broos (Orăştie) both administrative and religious autonomy and obligations towards the kings of Hungary.[1]

In 1324 the Saxons rebelled against the Hungarian king Charles I (reigned 1308-42), who, after suppressing the rebellion, reorganized the region by creating three new territories for those Saxons who had settled in parts of Transylvania other than the Barcaság. Crown lieutenants governed the Saxon territories, with the exception of Nagyszeben, which was divided into *sedes* (Latin: seats) led by crown judges. In 1437 the Saxons signed the Union of Kápolna; they thus became one of the three feudal nations of Transylvania, alongside the Magyar nobility and the Szeklers (a distinct Magyar people). All the Saxon territories gradually came to be controlled by crown judges, and between 1464 and 1469 each territory won the right to elect its own crown judge. The Andreanum decree was extended to cover the three additional Saxon territories in 1486, from which time the leader of all the Saxon Lands was the Saxon count, who also held the title of mayor of Nagyszeben.[2]

The germ of the Reformation first appeared among the Transylvanian Saxons in the 1530s. In 1545 the Saxon *universitas* stated its acceptance of Lutheran teachings, and in 1553 the Saxons began to elect their own bishops.

The establishment of the independent principality of Transylvania within the Ottoman Empire, following the Turks' defeat of Hungary at the Battle of Mohács in 1526, forced the Transylvanian Saxons into a position of opposition. Being ethnically German, they tended to side with the Habsburg rulers of the Holy Roman Empire, rather than with the Ottoman Turks. Nevertheless, the Saxons continued to play a leading economic role in Transylvania, thanks to the trade they conducted with the Romanian principalities. During the 17th century Saxon class structure became increasingly rigid, and the cultural advance of the preceding century slackened.

The German minority remained disproportionately powerful in comparison with the far larger Romanian and Hungarian peasant populations in Transylvania. This is evident in the fact that most of the ancient cities in Transylvania today have a blatant Germanic architectural and cultural

---

[1] K. Gündisch, *Autonomie de stări şi regionalitate în Ardealul medieval în Transilvania şi saşii ardeleni în istoriografie…*, p. 33-53.
[2] *** *Encyclopedia Britannica, Transylvanian Saxons,* available at http://www.britannica. com/EBchecked/topic /674719/Transylvanian-Saxons, consulted on 10.11.2013.

appearance. Although there was inevitably economic interaction between the Saxon minority and the Hungarian and Romanian majorities, the dominance of the Saxon communities created increasing tension between ethnic groups, especially between Saxons and Jews. German, not Magyar (Hungarian), was the lingua franca for commerce and politics in Hungarian Transylvania despite the far larger Romanian and Hungarian populations. Nonetheless, the disparate and sparse population of family landholdings in Transylvania made inter-ethnic violence (at least in this period) almost nonexistent. Ostensibly, all three of the main ethnic groups in Transylvania (Saxons, Romanians/Vlachs, and Hungarians/Szekels) enjoyed superficial autonomy referred to as the 'Three-Nation Status'. However, the German minority, in vast control of the region's land and commercial centers, greatly undermined the extent of this supposed autonomy.[1]

Gradually throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Romanian principalities (Wallachia, Moldova, and Transylvania) slowly developed into significant economies and trading hubs in Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and the northwestern Ottoman realm. The Romanian financial centres became a crossroads for businessmen from Germanic-ruled parts of Europe, for Bulgarians, Jews, Russians, Serbs, and Turks. Vlad Tepes Dracul (the historical figure of Bram Stoker's Dracula) accelerated this growth with his liquidation of the begger class and part of the local Roma (Gypsy) population, since foreign merchants no longer had to pay for security and therefore found Bucharest an ideal economic destination. Germans, as in much of Europe, played a significant part in Romanian economic life and growth. The main commercial street, Lipscan Street (Strada Lipscani) was and still is named after the ethnic Germans from Romania proper and from Germany coming out of Leipzig (Lipscan in Romanian).

Emperor Joseph II attempted to revoke the Unio Trium Nationum in the late 18th century. His actions were aimed at the political inequality within Transylvania, especially the political strength of the Saxons. Although his actions were ultimately rescinded, many Saxons began to see themselves as being a small minority opposed by nationalist Hungarians and Romanians. Although they remained a rich and influential group, the Saxons were no longer a dominant class.

During the Revolutions of 1848, the Saxons ultimately supported the Romanian attempt to acquire equal political standing. The Hungarians, on the other hand, supported complete unification of Transylvania with the rest of Hungary. Stephan Ludwig Roth, a pastor who led the German support for

---

[1] Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 2000.

Romanian political rights, was executed by Hungarian radicals during the revolution.

***

In conclusion, the Transylvanian Saxon were not only witnesses, but also took a major active part in the history of the Romanian provinces. They did not only offer a great model of work, religion, or education, but also passed on architectural landmarks, works of culture or simply a life style model. Unfortunately, by the end of the twentieth century took place what researches refer to as "the most impressive and largely numbered migration in Europe since medieval times". Despite the controlled emigration period during the communist regime from Romania, even today they still represent one of the most important ethnic minorities living in our country.

DEALU MONASTERY – A CULTURAL LANDMARK AND RESTING PLACE FOR THE RELIC OF MICHAEL THE BRAVE (1601-1916)

Cornel Mărculescu*

Abstract

Dealu Monastery represents a major cultural landmark of the capital of Wallachia, Târgovişte, and the odyssey of the holy relic of Michael the Brave is related to it. Nowadays, 420 years after the enthronement of the reigning prince in Wallachia, the importance of this delicate chapter of our history continues to give birth to interpretations and controversies, both in point of the odyssey of the relic of the great ruler who reunited the three Romanian Countries (1601-1916), and in point of the attempts of transferring the sacred voivodal skull (1864-1874). The creation of the Military High School from Dealu Monastery in 1912, by the great politician Nicolae Filipescu, meant the appearance of a significant school for the Romanian army during the period between the Two World Wars, which contributed considerably to the process of modernization of the Romanian army.

Key words: *Dealu Monastery*, *Gheorghe Bibescu*, *Odissey*, *Mihai Viteazul (Michael the Brave)*, *Nicolae Filipescu*

Shortly after the infamous assassinate of Michael the Brave on August 9/19, 1601, carried out by the imperial general Gheorghe Basta, and the depositing of the holy relic near the "*capital of Wallachia*"[1] (Marco Bandini), Dealu Monastery was plundered by the army of Gabriel Bathory[2], during the period December 1610 – January 1611 – as one can see from the notes of the Father Superior of the Monastery, Matei al Mirelor (Matthew of Mira)[*] – when,

---

[*] Doctoral student, Doctoral School, Valahia University Târgoviste, Faculty of Humanities, 34-36 Lt. Stancu Ion Street, 130108, Târgoviste, Dâmbovita County, e-mail: ccmarculescu@yahoo.com

[1] Marco Bandini (1593?-1650), Marco Bandini to Ingoli, secretary of the Congregation De Propaganda Fide, November 9, 1644, Iaşi, in *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Writings about the Romanian Countries), vol. V, edition managed by Maria Holban and Paul Cernovodeanu, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1973, p. 311.

[2] Mihai Oproiu, *Târgovişte. Oraşul şi împrejurimile sale între 1600-1848* (Târgovişte. The City and Its Surroundings between 1600-1848), vol. I, Târgovişte, Editura Bibliotheca, 1999, p. 131; Mihaela Palade, *Biserica Mănăstirea Dealu. Istorie în forme şi culori* (The Church of Dealu Monastery. History in Shapes and Colors), Bucureşti, Editura Sophia, 2008, p. 29-30.

[*] Matei al Mirelor (around 1550-1624) was from Pogoniana, Epirus, and came to Walachia in 1602 or 1603, remaining in Târgovişte where he was appointed Father Superior by the reigning prince Radu Şerban, and then, in 1605, he became metropolitan bishop of Mira of Lycha (Minor Asia). See: Victor Petrescu, *420 de ani de la naşterea lui Matei al Mirelor. Personalitatea lui*

"*thieves rushed into our Monastery, stole all the jewels and broke open the princes' tombs and removed the slabs of the Church floor, hoping to acquire treasures of gold...*"[1]. Seeing the "*holy place damaged and broken and impoverished and stolen and completely ruined by the Hungarians*", but also "*the cells and the other houses made empty*"[2], the reigning prince Radu Mihnea (1611-1616) donated the monastery a few estates. Moreover, as Dealu Monastery is situated in a seismic area, it also had to face, between the 18th and the 20th century, numerous seismic phenomena, the best known being the earthquakes of 1793, 1802, 1829, 1940.[3]

The Monastery represented a major cultural landmark of the Wallachian capital, Târgovişte, attested in documents since 1396, the first written document mentioning it being the travelogue of the Bavarian traveller Johann Schiltberger.[4] According to this document, during the age of Matei Basarab, the

Matei al Mirelor în contextul cultural de la începutul secolului al XVII-lea (420 years since the birth of Matthew of Mira. The personality of Matthew of Mira in the cultural context of the beginning of the 17th century), in "Studia Valachica", 2, 1970, Târgovişte, p. 337-340; idem, *Matei al Mirelor – cronicar al epocii medievale româneşti* (Matthew of Mira – a chronicler of the Romanian Middle Ages), in "Curier. Buletin bibliologic", Târgovişte, nr. 2 (7), 1998, p. 6-9; idem, *Matei al Mirelor – un prelat grec la Târgovişte* (Matthew of Mira – a Greek prelate in Târgovişte), in "Almanah Bisericesc – Teologie, istorie şi misiune creştină" (Church Almanac – Christian theology, history and mission), coord. Î.P.S. Arhiepiscop şi Mitropolit Nifon, Arhiepiscopia Târgoviştei, Târgovişte, 2012, p. 132-136; Victor Petrescu, Serghie Paraschiva, *Dicţionar de literatură al judeţului Dâmboviţa 1508-1998* (Dictionary of Literature of Dâmboviţa County), Târgovişte, Editura Biblitheca, 1999, p. 153; *Enciclopedia oraşului Târgovişte* (The Encyclopedia of Târgovişte City)*,* coord. Honorius Moţoc, Mihai Stan, George Coandă, Victor Petrescu, Mihai Oproiu, Târgovişte, Editura Bibliotheca, 2011*,* p. 287.

[1] Nicolae Iorga, *Manuscripte din biblioteci străine în istoria românilor* (Manuscripts from foreign libraries in the Romanians' history), in "Analele Academiei Române" (Annals of the Romanian Academy), Memoriile secţiunii istorice (Memoires of the historical section), tom II, XXI (1898-1899), p. 19-20; Victor Petrescu, *Matei al Mirelor, cronicar al epocii medievale româneşti* (Matthew of Mira, chronicler of the Romanian Middle Ages), in "Târgoviştea culturală", Târgovişte, 2000, p. 32.

[2] *Ibidem*.

[3] Ion Benone Petrescu, *Mihai Viteazul: comemorare (1601-2001)* (Michael the Brave: commemoration (1601-2001)), Târgovişte, Editura Domino, 2001, p. 16; Nicolae Roboiu, Sorin Enescu, *Şoimii de la Mănăstirea Dealu* (The Falcons from Dealu Monastery), Bucureşti, 1993, p. 232; Mihaela Palade, *Biserica Mănăstirea Dealu. Istorie în forme şi culori* (The Church of Dealu Monastery. History in shapes and colors), Bucureşti, Editura Sophia, 2008*,* p. 49; *Mănăstiri şi biserici reprezentative din Arhiepiscopia Târgoviştei* (Representative monasteries and churches of the Archbishopric of Târgovişte), coord. Î.P.S. Dr. Nifon Mihăiţă, Arhiepiscopia Târgoviştei, Târgovişte, 2009, p. 77-98.

[4] *Călători străini despre Tările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Writings about the Romanian Countries), vol. I, volum îngrijit de Maria Holban, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1968, p. 30; Mihai Oproiu, *Note despre apariţia oraşului Târgovişte* (Notes on the appearance of Târgovişte City)*,* in "Valachica. Studii şi cercetări de istorie" (Valachica. History studies and researches), vol. 10-11, Muzeul Judeţean Dâmboviţa,

Holy Monastery "*reached the summit of its glory and greatness*".[1] At the same time, the holy monastery from Dealu also received as donation from Matei Basarab a set of golden vessels, a very big cross made of gold and also a cross made of cypress wood.[2]

By the middle of the 19th century, the odyssey of the relic of the reigning prince who had managed to prevent the Ottoman Porte from introducing the pashalik in the area north of the Danube[3] was to acquire a new meaning. So, when he was enthroned in Wallachia, Gheorghe Bibescu (1842-1848), who was an "*adorer of our past*"[4], wearing the mantle and famous fur cap characteristic for the Transylvanian victories, went to "*bow his head in respect for Michael the Brave at his tomb from Dealu Monastery*".[5]

Gheorghe Bibescu had the Church of Dealu Monastery renewed, and turned the monastery into his summer residence. The works were realized under

---

Târgovişte, 1978-1979, p. 448; Mihai Oproiu, Constantin Manolescu, *Stampe Târgoviştene* (Engravings from Târgovişte), Târgovişte, 1996, p. 22-25; Maria Georgescu, *Târgovişte – Reşedinţa domnească a Ţării Româneşti (sec. XIV-XVIII)* (Târgovişte, princely residence of Walachia, 14th-18th century), in "Valachica. Studii şi cercetări de istorie" (Valachica. History studies and researches), vol. 15, Complexul Naţional Muzeal Curtea Domnească, Târgovişte, 1997, p. 90; Mihai Oproiu, Constantin Manolescu, *Târgovişte între legendă şi istorie (sec. XIV-XVI)* (Târgovişte between legend and history, 14th-16th century), Târgovişte, 2007, p. 20-21; Victor Petrescu, Mihai Stan, *Târgovişte. Călători străini. Cronicari (sec. XV-XIX)* (Targovişte. Foreign Travellers. Chroniclers, 15th-19th century), Târgovişte, Editura Bibliotheca, 2009, p. 11.

[1] Christache Georgescu, *Matei Basarab*, Bucureşti, 1936, p. 3.

[2] Ştefan Ştefănescu, *Nepieritorul îndemn al lui Mihai Viteazul* (The immortal exhortation of Michael the Brave), in "Magazin Istoric", XVII (1983), nr. 12, p. 12; Pr.dr. Constantin Niţescu, *op.cit.,* p. 20.

[3] Mihai Maxim, *Ţările Române şi Înalta Poartă. Cadrul juridic al relaţiilor româno-otomane în Evul Mediu* (The Romanian Countries and the High Porte. The juridical framework of the Romanian Ottoman relations during the Middle Ages), Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 1993, p. 125.

[4] Virgiliu N. Drăghiceanu, *Monumentele istorice din judeţul Dâmboviţa* (Historical monuments of Dâmboviţa County), Bucureşti, 1912, p. 21.

[5] Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria Românilor. Unificatorii* (The Romanians' History. The Unifiers), vol. IX, Bucureşti, 1938, p. 94; idem, *Soarta rămăşiţelor lui Mihai Viteazul: Idei dintr-o conferinţă ţinută la Iaşi şi discursul rostit la Mănăstirea Dealului în numele Academiei Române şi al Ligii Culturale cu prilejul aducerii capului lui Mihai Viteazul* (The fate of Michael the Brave's remains: Ideas from a conference organized in Iaşi and the discourse uttered at Dealu Monastery in the name of the Romanian Academy and of the Cultural League on the occasion of the return of Michael the Brave's head), Bucureşti, Tipografia Cultura Neamului Românesc, 1920, p. 16; idem, *Soarta faimei lui Mihai Viteazul* (The fate of Michael the Brave's fame), Bucureşti, Editura societăţii Cultura Neamului Românesc, 1919, p. 23; idem, *Ideea unităţii româneşti* (The idea of Romanian unity), Bucureşti, 1987, p. 165; idem, *Cel ce nu se poate odihni: Mihai Viteazul* (The restless: Michael the Brave), in *Oameni cari au fost. Prima ediţie critică integrală* (People who once were. The first complete critical edition), vol. 1-2, critical edition, notes and comments by Valeriu Râpeanu and Sanda Râpeanu. Introductory study by Valeriu Râpeanu, Bucureşti, 2009, p. 521-522.

the supervision of the architect Ioan Schlatter between 1845-1854, the painting was made in a Florentine style by A. Derigny[1], Gothic style furniture was provided, a belfry was built, bearing the name of Bibescu, and a sculpted marble icon honoring the monastery's dedication day was achieved, where the reigning prince and his wife Maria are represented as well.[2] At the same time, the reigning prince Bibescu decided, in 1844, to have a road built, with a lime alley on its sides, meant to connect the Romanian capital with Dealu Monastery[3], the resting place of the relic of Michael the Brave, who "*…was, when it was found, where it had to be, in order to accomplish what fate had in store for it*".[4]

During the restoration works from Dealu, the reigning prince of Wallachia decided to take out the skulls of Michael the Brave and Radu cel Mare (Radu the Great), placing them on the left wall of the church, in a fir tree cupboard with glass on two scales, which for Grigore G. Tocilescu represented a "*rotten wooden box*".[5]

---

[1] Constantin Bălan, *Mănăstirea Dealu* (Dealu Monastery)*,* Bucureşti, Editura Meridiane, 1965, p. 12; Ion Benone Petrescu, *Mănăstirea Dealu. Cinci secole de dăinuire (1501-2001)* (Dealu Monastery. Five centuries of persistence, 1501-2001), Târgovişte, Editura Domino, 2001, p. 12; Mihai Oproiu, Anda Andronescu, *Târgovişte, ghidul turistic al oraşului* (Târgovişte City, tourist guide), Târgovişte, Editura Transversal, 2002, p. 61; Mihaela Palade, *op. cit., p.* 48-49; Mihai Oproiu, Eduardt Samoilă, Honorius Moţoc, Georgeta Toma, *Înfruntând veacurile. Aşezări şi monumente dâmboviţene* (Facing the centuries. Settlements and monuments of Dâmboviţa County), Târgovişte, Editura Transversal, 2009, p. 62.

[2] Serviciul Judeţean al Arhivelor Naţionale Dâmboviţa (National Archive Office of Dâmboviţa County) (henceforth, S.J.A.N. Dâmboviţa), *fond Prefectura Dâmboviţa*, dosar 67/1943. Monografia judeţului Dâmboviţa (Monograph of Dâmboviţa County), f. 41.

[3] Honorius Moţoc, Mihai Oproiu, *Dicţionarul geografic al judeţului Dâmboviţa* (Geographic Dictionary of Dâmboviţa County), Editura Transversal, Târgovişte, 2007, p. 54.

[4] Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria lui Mihai Viteazul pentru poporul românesc* (The History of Michael the Brave for the Romanian People), ediţia a II-a, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte grafice şi editură Minerva, 1901, p. 24-25.

[5] Dimitrie Onciul, *Ştefan cel Mare şi Mihai Viteazul. Două cuvântări...Cu un proiect din 1864 relativ la capul lui Mihai Viteazul. Comunicat de Gheorghe Adamescu. Se vinde în folosul fondului pentru ridicarea unui monument funerar lui Mihai Viteazul în Mănăstirea Dealu* (Stephen the Great and Michael the Brave. Two discourses. Accompanied by a project of 1864 related to the head of Michael the Brave. Communication by Gheorghe Adamescu. To be sold for the benefit of the fund meant for the building of a funeral monument for Michael the Brave at Dealu Monastery), Bucureşti, Editura I.V. Socec, 1904, p. 69-70; Nicolae Iorga, *Soarta rămăşiţelor lui Mihai Viteazul...*, p. 16-18; Niculae I. Şerbănescu, *Creştinul Mihail, mare voievod ce au fost domn Tării Româneşti şi Ardealului şi Moldovei – 375 de ani de la moartea lui Mihai Viteazul* (The Christian Michael, great voivode who was reigning prince of Walachia and Transilvania and Moldavia – 375 years since the death of Michael the Brave), in "Mitropolia Olteniei", XXVIII, 1976, nr. 9-10, p. 693; Marcel Dumitru Ciucă, *O iniţiativă necunoscută a domniei lui Cuza. Cinstirea lui Mihai Viteazul* (An unknown initiative of Cuza's reign. The honoring of Michael the Brave), in "Magazin Istoric", XVI (1982), nr. 6, p. 41.

Carrying out a visit in the princely city of Târgovişte on September 9-10, 1857, the commissioner of Sardinia, Rafaello Benzi, went to Michael the Brave's tomb from Dealu Monastery, honoring the great voivode and reigning prince.[1]

For a decennium, between 1864 and 1874, there were attempts to transfer Michael the Brave's relic to Bucharest, to the holy place he had founded, namely Michael the Brave's Monastery (Mănăstirea Mihai Vodă) – which lies on a small hill outside the city; it was built between 1589 and 1591, when its founder held the high positions of great Seneschal and great Agha and then of Great Ban of Craiova.[2] The location was not chosen randomly, as Michael the Brave's Monastery was "*magnificent*", being surrounded by many cells and a dwelling for the founder, and the church was adorned with "*marvellous silver and gold ornaments*"[3], so that, the architectural set that was made up of the church and Michael the Brave's Monastery represented the most accomplished achievement of the medieval architecture in Wallachia, at the end of the 16th century.[4]

At the expressed wish of the Ruler Alexandru Ioan Cuza, about whom Victor Place (the French consul in Iaşi) – stated that "he had *wit, finesse and determination*"[5], and at the suggestion of Dimitrie Bolintineanu – the Minister of Instruction and Cults, beginning with March 24, 1864, there were attempts to bring the holy relics belonging to the Romanian people, to the edifice founded by Michael the Brave in Bucharest. Moreover, Dimitrie Bolintineanu suggested a law draft proposed for adoption, in order to obtain the sum of 31,000 lei, needed for the "*transport of Michael the Brave's skull from Dealu Monastery to Michael the Brave's Church in Bucharest, and for the execution of a coffin that*

---

[1] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii în epoca renaşterii politice a României, 1848-1878* (Conspirators and conspiracies during the age of political renaissance of Romania, 1848-1878), "Cartea Românească". Aşezământul Cultural Ion C. Brătianu, Bucureşti, 1930, p. 117.

[2] Nicolae Stoicescu, *Dicţionar al marilor dregători* (Dictionary of High Officials of the Past), Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1971, p. 70.

[3] Gheorghe Cantacuzino, *Cercetări arheologice pe dealul Mihai Vodă* (Archeological Research on Mihai-Vodă Hill), in vol. *Bucureştii de odinioară* (The Bucharest of the Past), Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1959, p. 98.

[4] Cornel Mărculescu, *Odiseea relicvei lui Mihai Viteazul de la Turda la Târgovişte* (The odyssey of the relic of Michael the Brave from Turda to Targovişte), in vol. *Arheologie şi istorie în spaţiul carpato-balcanic* (Archeology and history in the Carpatho-Danubian area) (coordinator Denis Căprăroiu), Târgovişte, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2011, p. 325.

[5] *Românii la 1859. Unirea Principatelor în conştiinţa europeană. Documente externe* (The Romanians in 1859. The Principalities' Union in the European Conscience), vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1984, p. 327; *Documente privind Unirea Principatelor* (Documents concerning the Principalities' Union), vol. VI, *Corespondenţă diplomatică franceză (1856-1859)* (French Diplomatic Correspondence), ediţie de Grigore Chiriţă, Valentina Costache şi Emilia Poştăriţa, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1980, p. 176.

was to be placed on a marble pedestal".[1] Yet, Cuza was forced to abandon his project, because of the events that precedeed the coup d'Etat of May 2/14, 1864[2], *for the most undefended just cause*[3] – determined by the rejection of the rural law draft by the House; consequently, the Unifier's skull remained at Dealu Monastery.[4]

The odyssey of Michael the Brave's relic continued in 1873, when there were new attempts to bring the royal skull to Bucharest, to be placed inside a vaulted undercroft, on the place of Michael the Brave's Church, under the position of the statue, but king Carol I (1866-1914) decided that the statue should be placed in the park in front of the University, so, Michael the Brave's skull continued to remain at Dealu Monastery.[5] Two years later, namely in 1875, Titu Maiorescu, the Minister of Public Instruction and Cults of the government led by Lascăr Catargiu, which government was the 10th during the reign of Carol I[6], paid a visit to Dealu Monastery, after which he decided that in front of Michael the Brave's skull "*a votive eternally lit light should be added in a silver vase*".[7] Later on, a new period – between the commemoration of three hundred years since the death of Michael the Brave (1901)[8] and of four

---

[1] Marcel Dumitru Ciucă, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[2] Şerban Rădulescu-Zöner, *Actul de la 2 mai 1864 în contextul relaţiilor româno-franceze (The document issued on May 2, 1864 in the context of the Romanian-French relations)*, in vol. *Unirea Principatelor şi Puterile europene* (The Romanian Principalities' Union and the European Powers), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1984, p. 210-211.

[3] Nicolae Iorga, *Unirea Principatelor şi Puterile europene. Cuvântare comemorativă ţinută la Ateneul Român în ziua de 2 aprilie 1920 (*The Romanian Principalities' Union and the European Powers. Commemorative speech held at the Romanian Athenaeum on April 2, 1920), Bucureşti, 1920, p. 37.

[4] Dimitrie Onciul, *op. cit.,* p. VI-X; Constantin Rezachevici, *Capul lui Mihai Viteazul şi Mănăstirea Dealu* (Michael the Brave's Skull and Dealu Monastery) in the volume of papers presented during the scientific sesion *Mihai Viteazul, domn creştin, strateg militar şi întregitor de neam* (Michael the Brave, a Cristian Ruler, Military Strategist and Country Unifier"), Târgovişte, 7-8 septembrie 2001, Târgovişte, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2003, p. 63.

[5] Marcel Dumitru Ciucă, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

[6] Titu Maiorescu, *Istoria politică a României sub domnia lui Carol I* (Romanian Political History during the Reign of Carol I), ediţie, postfaţă şi indice de Stelian Neagoe, Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 1994, p. 29-46; Ion Mamina, Ion Bulei, *Guverne şi guvernanţi 1866-1916* (Governments and Governors, 1866-1916), Bucureşti, Editura Silex, 1994, p. 216-217.

[7] Ştefan Ion Ghilimescu, *Titu Maiorescu la Târgovişte, Dealu, Viforâta şi Gorgota* (Titu Maiorescu at Târgovişte, Dealu, Viforâta and Gorgota), in *Conexiuni şi interferenţe culturale târgoviştene* (Cultural Connexions and Intertwinings in Târgovişte), Târgovişte, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2005-2006, p. 103.

[8] At the initiative of the Romanian Cultural League, on that occasion, a laurel crown was brought, bearing the inscription: "*Lui Mihai Viteazul (1593-1601) Omagiul. Liga Culturală a Românilor*" ("To Michael the Brave (1593-1601). Homage. Romanian Cultural League"), and on the laurel leaves it read "*Mănăstirea Dealu 1598, 1595 Dunăre, noiembrie 13, Călugăreni, Şelimberg 1599, Alba Iulia 1599, Goroslău*". ("Dealu Monastery 1598, 1595 Danube,

hundred years since that of Stephen the Great (1904) – followed, when there were attempts to edify a memorial for sheltering the skull of the man who had intended… *"to extend the political borders up to those of his nation(ality)"*[1], and who consequently succeded in chasing away the Ottomans from all the vilayets[2], consolidating the border of Wallachia along the Danube.[3] Thus, at the initiative of academician Grigore G. Tocilescu[4], the Cultural League for the Unity of All Romanians, in co-operation with other cultural personalities of the time – Dimitrie Onciul was among them[5] – collected funds by different actions, *"to properly preserve the skull, which was now out of the tomb"*.[6] In 1903, Nicolae Iorga visited Târgovişte and Dealu Monastery, which he considered *"…a miracle of the Oriental art"*, and, when he stopped in front of the shrine

---

November 13, Călugăreni, Şelimberg 1599, Alba Iulia 1599, Goroslău"). See: Radu Gioglovan, Mihai Oproiu, *Inscripţii şi însemnări din judeţul Dâmboviţa* (Inscriptions and notes from Dâmboviţa County), vol. I, Muzeul Judeţean Dâmboviţa, Târgovişte, 1975, p. 257; Mihai Oproiu, Pârvan Dobrin, *Târgovişte. Oraşul şi împrejurimile sale între 1821-1918* (Târgovişte. The City and Its Surroundings between 1821-1918), vol. II, Târgovişte, Editura Bibliotheca, 2001, p. 282.

[1] A.D. Xenopol, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană (History of the Romanians in Dacia Traiana)*, vol. III, ediţia a IV-a. *De la moartea lui Petru Rareş până la Matei Basarab şi Vasile Lupu. Epoca lui Mihai Viteazul* (From Petru Rareş's Death up to Matei Basarab and Vasile Lupu. The Age of Michael the Brave), a text established by Nicolae Stoicescu Simionescu, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Pedagogică, 1988, p. 210.

[2] Ion Donat, *Domeniul Domnesc în Ţara Românească (sec. XIV-XVI)* (The Princely Domain in Wallachia) (14th-16th century), Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 1996, p. 206.

[3] Cornel Mărculescu, *Odiseea relicvei lui Mihai Viteazul… (The Odyssey of Michael the Brave's Relic)*, p. 326.

[4] Grigore Tocilescu (26 Oct. 1850, Fefelei, Prahova County – 18 Sept. 1909, Bucureşti) is a professional archaeologist, historian, folklorist and epigraphist. He attended primary school in Ploieşti and then – benefiting from a grant from the Government – he attended "Sf. Sava" Highschool in Bucharest. He studied Letters at the University of Bucharest, Law (he took his Bachelor Degree in 1874) and Philosophy. He obtained his PhD in Philosophy in Prague, where he specialized in Slavic languages, as well. In 1877 he was elected corresponding member of the Romanian Academic Society (which then became the Romanian Academy), and in 1890 he became a full member. See: Ioana Bogdan Cătăniciu, *Grigore Tocilescu – Întemeietor al şcolii de arheologie românească* (Grigore Tocilescu – Founder of the Romanian Archaeology School), in "Ephemeris Napocensis", I, Cluj-Napoca, 1991, p. 189-195.

[5] Dimitrie Onciul (1856-1923) was a student of the University of Cernăuţi for three years (1876-1879); then he attended the University of Vienna and of the Institute for the Research of the Austrian History (1879-1881). In 1884, he obtained his PhD at the University of Cernăuţi, with the doctoral thesis: *"Despre începuturile fiinţei de stat româneşti"* (On the Beginnings of the Romanian State), and in 1889 he was elected a member of the Romanian Academy. He started his professor career at the University of Bucharest in 1895, and five years later he was elected general director of the Romanian State Archives. On Kalinderu's suggestion, in 1905, he was elected full member of the Romanian Academy, and, in 1920, he even became chairman of this high scientific forum, which position was to hold until he passed away.

[6] Dimitrie Onciul, *Ştefan cel Mare şi Mihai Viteazul. Două cuvântări...*, p. IV.

sheltering the skull of the reigning prince Michael, the great historian concluded with his whole soul: "*Rejoice, heart! You have the chance of seeing the only relic that may still be seen of Michael the Brave... and the Romanian people does not have enough wealth to reward the respect this man had for it by a brilliant tomb!*".[1]

In the autumn of 1904, at the initiative of Grigore Tocilescu and of *Tinerimea Română* (Romanian Youth Society), the glass shrine was replaced by a bronze, tower-shaped one, with Neogothic windows, 76 cm in height, created by A. Zemle and set on a marble base, which the great historian, Nicolae Iorga considered nevertheless improper for keeping such a precious relic, as it was "*… a cheap little metal tower, bearing – in a chromolithograph medallion – the image of Michael's head*".[2]

At the initiative of Nicolae Iorga, the new secretary of the League for the Cultural Unity of All Romanians, on November 8, 1909, a pilgrimage to the shrine of Michael the Brave from Dealu Monastery was organized.[3] The climax of the events organized at Dealu was the conference that the league secretary, Nicolae Iorga, held in the Armoury Hall, a conference entitled "*Lessons Taught by Michael the Brave*", recorded by the best expert in the princely court, Virgil Drăghiceanu.[4]

Having the financial support of Nicolae Filipescu – the future Minister of War between December 29, 1910 / January 11, 1911 – March 28, 1912 / April 10, 1912, in the government led by P.P. Carp[5], and at Nicolae Iorga's

---

[1] Gabriel Mihăescu, Eugen Fruchter, *Nicolae Iorga la Târgovişte. 40 de ani de la moartea savantului* (Nicolae Iorga at Târgovişte. 40 Years since the Academician's death), in "Valachica. Studii şi materiale de istorie şi istorie a culturii" (Valachica. Studies and Articles of History and Culture History), vol. 12-13, Târgovişte, 1980-1981, p. 378.

[2] Nicolae Iorga, *Soarta rămăşiţelor lui Mihai Viteazul…*, p. 18-19; Ilie Dumitrescu, Constantin Cârjan, *Odiseea capului Viteazului*, in "Magazin Istoric", X (1976), nr. 8, p. 23; Neculai I. Staicu-Buciumeni, *Colegiul Naţional "Nicolae Filipescu"* ("Nicolae Filipescu National College"), Galaţi, 2006, p. 11; Nicolae Roboiu, Sorin Enescu, *Odiseea capului Viteazului* (The Odyssey of Michael the Brave's Head), in *Şoimii de la Mănăstirea Dealu. Amintiri despre Liceul Militar Nicolae Filipescu 1912-1948* (The Falcons from Dealu Monastery. Memories from Nicolae Filipescu Military School 1912-1948), Bucureşti, 1993, p. 20-21.

[3] S.J.A.N. Dâmboviţa, *fond Primăria Târgovişte*, dosar 1/1909, f. 19; Pârvan Dobrin, *Documente inedite din arhivele dâmboviţene referitoare la activitatea lui Nicolae Iorga* (New Documents from Dâmboviţa County Archives, on Nicolae Iorga's Activity), in "Revista Arhivelor", anul LXXIV, vol. LIV, nr. 1, Arhivele Naţionale ale României, Bucureşti, 1997, p. 185-186; Mihai Oproiu, Pârvan Dobrin, *Târgovişte. Oraşul şi împrejurimile sale...*, vol. II, p. 283-284.

[4] Nicolae Iorga, *Pomenirea lui Mihai Viteazul* (Commemoration of Michael the Brave), in *Oameni cari au fost. Prima ediţie critică integrală*, vol. 1-2, ediţie critică, note şi comentarii de Valeriu Râpeanu şi Sanda Râpeanu. Studiu introductiv de Valeriu Râpeanu, Bucureşti, 2009, p. 252-257.

[5] Ion Mamina, Ion Bulei, *op. cit.*, p. 191-192.

insistence, two white marble sarcophagi were created by the sculptor Carol Storck, which sarcophagi were laid on the two lateral sides of the narthex: one was created in 1908, on the occasion of the 400th commemoration of the death of Radu cel Mare – where the ruler's relics were buried for good, while the second sarcophagus was created for Michael the Brave's skull, in 1912 and was finished in 1913.[1] The royal memorial from Dealu Monastery was made of Carrara marble, by Storck, had inscriptions in geometric grids and was adorned with floral patterns, and was guarded by two marvellous bronze candle-sticks, which had also been created in the foundry of the Storck brothers in Bucharest.[2]

Great things which could not be fully completed – given the political events occurred between 1912 and 1916[3]: the Balkan wars, the "much awaited" entry of Romania in the war, in the *first war of the civilizations*, as well as the death of king Carol I and of Nicolae Filipescu[4]: the relic of the *martyr of the greatest Romanian glory*, was impossible to be laid in the sarcophagus, thus remaining in the shrine that had been made by Grigore G. Tocilescu, stirring Nicolae Iorga to suggest that "*the coronation of the first Romanian king should be held in that place, in front of it*".[5] In that context, the words said by Nicolae Filipescu to king Ferdinand, at the enthronement, became famous: "*You will be*

[1] Nicolae Iorga, *Soarta rămăşiţelor lui Mihai Viteazul..., p.* 18-19; idem, *Cel ce nu se poate odihni: Mihai Viteazul*, in *Oameni cari au fost...*, p. 522; Ilie Dumitrescu, Constantin Cârjan, *op. cit.*, p. 23; Nicolae Iorga, *Oameni care au fost*, vol. I, ediţie îngrijită, prefaţă şi note de Ion Roman, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Literatură, 1967, p. 223; Niculae I. Şerbănescu, *Creştinul Mihail, mare voievod...,* p. 693; idem, *Soarta şi cinstirea rămăşiţelor pământeşti ale marelui domnitor Mihail Viteazul* (The Destiny and Honour of the Holy Remains of the Great Ruler Michael the Brave), in vol. *Dimensiunea religioasă a personalităţii domnitorului Mihai Viteazul (1593-1601) – premise şi argumente pentru canonizare* (The Religious Dimension of Michael the Brave's Personality (1593-1601) – Prerequisites and Arguments for Canonization), Arhiepiscopia Târgoviştei, Târgovişte, 2011, p. 256; Rodica Chira, *Un obiect expus spre aducere aminte* (An Object Displayed for Remembrance), in "Studii şi materiale de muzeografie şi istorie militară", nr. 9, 1976, p. 173; Constantin Rezachevici, *Capul lui Mihai Viteazul şi Mănăstirea Dealu...,* p. 65; Cornel Mărculescu, *Odiseea relicvei lui Mihai Viteazul...*, p. 327.

[2] Ştefan Ion Ghilimescu, *Familia Storck şi Târgoviştea* (The Storcks and Târgovişte), in *Conexiuni şi interferenţe culturale…*, p. 132.

[3] Nicolae Iorga, *Soarta rămăşiţelor lui Mihai Viteazul...,* p. 19; Niculae I. Şerbănescu, *Creştinul Mihail, mare voievod...,* p. 694.

[4] Nicolae Polizu-Micşuneşti, *Nicolae Filipescu. Însemnări 1914-1916* (Nicolae Filipescu. Notes 1914-1916), Bucureşti, Editura Universul, 1937, p. 276; I.G. Duca, *Portrete şi amintiri* (Portraits and Memories), ediţia a V-a, Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 1990, p. 96; idem, *Memorii* (Memories), vol. III, *Războiul* (The War). Part I (1916-1917), ediţie şi indice de Stelian Neagoe, Bucureşti, Editura Machiavelli, 1994, p. 52-53; Nicolae Iorga, *O înmormântare: a lui Nicolae Filipescu* (The Funeral of Nicolae Filipescu), in *Oameni cari au fost…*, p. 501.

[5] Nicolae Iorga, *Oameni care au fost...*, vol. II, ediţie îngrijită, prefaţă şi note de Ion Roman, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Literatură, 1967, p. 41-42.

the greatest Voivode of the Country, and will be adorned by the titles of Michael the Brave, ruler of all Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia; you will add to the brightness of the royal purple or, if defeated during the highest impetus of bravery of the Romanian people, you will be worshipped as a national hero. Sire, may you be crowned at Alba-Iulia, or die on Turda Plain"[1]

In 1912, when the Military School was founded, near Dealu Monastery, by Nicolae Filipescu (which school shall bear the name of its founder)[2] – Michael the Brave's skull was laid in an artistic and carved shrine, engraved with the words of Nicolae Iorga: "*Here are what murder and impiety left of the holy body of Michael Voivode the Brave, while his soul lives on in the souls of the whole Romanian nation, until the Holy Scriptures shall be fulfilled, when he shall find rest along with the righteous in heaven, together with the happy souls of his forefathers that once lived – 1595 Călugăreni-Giurgiu, Nicopol, Vidin, Silistra, Rusciuc, Plevna. 1599 Șelimberg. 1600 Mirăslău, Gorăslău. Turda – August 18, 1601. – This tomb was embellished at the expense of his people, 311 years after his sacrifice*".[3]

We ought to mention the considerable efforts of Nicolae Filipescu (1862-1916)[4] for the foundation of the third Romanian military school[1], joining

---

[1] Nicolae Filipescu, *Pentru România Mare. Cuvântări din război 1914-1916* (For the Great Romania. Speeches from War, 1914-1916), București, 1925, p. 24; Ion Benone Petrescu, *Liceul militar "Nicolae Filipescu" de la Mănăstirea Dealu 1912-1940 (1948)* ("Nicolae Filipescu" Military High School near Dealu Monastery 1912-1940 (1948)), Târgoviște, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2002, p. 17; Constantin Nițescu, *Mănăstirea Dealu și Liceul Militar Nicolae Filipescu (Dealu Monastery and Nicolae Filipescu" Military School)*, Târgoviște, Tipografia "Viitorul" Petre G. Popescu, 1932, p. 84.

[2] The name of the military school that had been founded in 1912, was changed from „Dealu Monastery" to „Nicolae Filipescu", based on the Report of November 29, 1928 and on the High Royal Decree no. 8302 signed by the war minister – Division General Henri Cihoski. The ceremony for changing the school name took place on January 27, 1929. See: Arhivele Ministerului Apărării Naționale – Centrul de Păstrare și Studierea Arhivelor Militare Pitești "Radu Rosetti" (henceforth, A.M.Ap.N. – C.P.S.A.M.P.), *fond Registrul istoric al Liceului Militar "Nicolae Filipescu" de la Mănăstirea Dealu. De la înființarea sa și până în 1940* (*Historical Register of "Nicolae Filipescu" Military School near Dealu Monastery. Since its foundation until 1940*), fond, file no. 2572, f. 39v-40)

[3] S.J.A.N. Dâmbovița, *fond Prefectura Dâmbovița*, dosar 67/1943, f. 41-42; Radu Gioglovan, Mihai Oproiu, *Inscripții și memorii din județul Dâmbovița* (Inscriptions and Memories of Dâmbovița County), Târgoviște, 1976, p. 16; Constantin Nițescu, *op. cit.*, p. 43; Nicolae Iorga, *Soarta faimei lui Mihai Viteazul* (The Fate of Michael the Brave's Fame), in *Istoria lui Mihai Viteazul*, ediția 1968, p. 425; Niculae Șerbănescu, *Creștinul Mihail, mare voievod…*, p. 693-694; idem, *Soarta și cinstirea rămășițelor pământești...*, p. 257; Cornel Mărculescu, *Odiseea relicvei lui Mihai Viteazul...*, p. 328.

[4] Nicolae Filipescu attended high school in Geneva and Law in Paris, and came back home in 1885; then, he founded the "Epoca" (The Age) newspaper, was mayor of Bucharest (1893-1895), a conservative party deputy between 1888 and 1911, a senator between 1911 and 1916, a minister of the Domains and Agriculture (1900-1901 and 1912-1913), a Minister of War (1910-1912),

those from Iaşi (1872) and Craiova (1881), to offer to the Romanians a significant military school, placed near the Monastery founded by Radu the Great, where Michael the Brave's skull shall rest forever "*...so that, the memory of the brave Voivode may be always alive in the souls of the students who were to become officers*".[2]

Thus, together with his most devoted co-operator, Major Marcel Olteanu, *the great forger and sower of ideas* Nicolae Filipescu, made the final decision of setting up an elite military school near Dealu Monastery[3], a new school, "*whose base he expressed in these words: men with a strong character, men of action*".[4]

In this context, the new Minister of War, Division General Ion Argetoianu, submitted to king Carol I the Report no. 418 of June 1, 1912, by which he requested the approval of the setting up of the Military School near Dealu Monastery, which school "*shall have the mission to train reliable men, with a solid military-school education, well-trained according to the new German and English methods, where the young are trained in scools situated in the countryside, out in the open, and equipped with all the necessary means for*

---

jurnalist, writer, a great orator, President of the Conservative Party and led the fight for joining the unification war (1916), beside the Triple Entente. He died on September 30, 1916, defeated by disease, a few days after the Turtucaia disaster. The death of the great Romanian was also accelerated by the absence of a defence plan against the German-Bulgarian attack. See: Nicolae Polizu-Micşuneşti, *Nicolae Filipescu. Însemnări 1914-1916* (Nicolae Filipescu. Notes 1914-1916), Bucureşti, 1937, p. 276.

[1] At Dealu Monastery, there had also been a Division Officer School (1879-1883) – led by Captain Alexandru Anghelescu, from where the future Marshal Alexandru Averescu was to graduate, as head of the first cohort, as well as an Army School (Scoala copiilor de trupă) (1902-1912), led by Cpt. Hergot, and then by Lieut. Moşoiu.

[2] Mihai Oproiu, *Târgovişte, două decenii de democraţie (1918-1938)* (Târgovişte, after two democracy decades (1918-1938)), Târgovişte, Editura Transversal, 2005, p. 308; Cornel Mărculescu, *Liceul Militar de la Mănăstirea Dealu şi readucerea capului marelui Voievod Mihai Viteazul în 1920* (The Military School near Dealu Monastery and the Return of the Skull of the Michael the Great, in 1920), in "Revista Hristica", editată de militarii din Garnizoana Târgovişte, Nr. 9, Târgovişte, 2011, p. 15.

[3] Mihaela Oproiu, Mihai Oproiu, *Cum s-a hotărât să se facă liceul militar Nicolae Filipescu de la Mănăstirea Dealu* (The Resolution on Founding the Nicolae Filipescu Military School near Dealu Monastery), in *Spicuiri din presa interbelică dâmboviţeană* ("Fragments of the Interwar Press of Dâmboviţa County"), Târgovişte, Editura Transversal, 2007, p. 75-77; Cornel Mărculescu, *Centenarul liceului militar de la Mănăstirea Dealu (1912-2012) (Centenary of the Military School near Dealu Monastery (1912-2012)*, in "Curier. Revistă de cultură şi bibliologie", an XVIII, nr. 1-2 (35-36), Târgovişte, 2012, p. 40.

[4] Ion Benone Petrescu, *Liceul militar "Nicolae Filipescu" de la Mănăstirea Dealu 1912-1940 (1948)* (Nicolae Filipescu Military School near Dealu Monastery 1912-1940 (1948)), Târgovişte, 2002, p. 8; Cornel Mărculescu, *Odiseea relicvei lui Mihai Viteazul...*, p. 329; idem, *Liceul Militar de la Mănăstirea Dealu şi readucerea capului marelui Voievod Mihai Viteazul...*, p. 16.

physical, moral and intellectual development".[1] The location had not been selected randomly, as it lay in the very heart of nature, in the area of the church that had been founded by Radu cel Mare, which housed the holy relic of the Romanian national ideal.[2] On June 4, 1912 the headstone of this military settlement was set[3], and the construction was built according to the plans of architect A. Reiss, of the Ministry of War[4], and of engineer Carol Blaimayer, who took care of the execution of the water installations for the Military School near Dealu Monastery.[5] Consequently, Nicolae Filipescu fulfilled once again the well-known patriotic credo of the common Romanians, which was – according to an expression famous at the time: "*it is to you, my dear country, that I dedicate my work power and my love power*"[6] – by founding the Military School near Dealu Monastery (1912-1940).[7]

During the Romanian neutrality in the first war of the civilizations[8], on May 16, 1915 Martha Bibescu – a descendant of the reigning prince Gheorghe Bibescu – followed the itineraries of her father, as ruler of Wallachia, at Târgovişte and Dealu Monastery, in 1844 and 1846; there, in front of the skull of Michael the Brave – "killed by the Germans" (as the inscription of the time read) – she could notice that the holy relic of the Romanian people, placed in a glass niche, looked like "*a train-station slot machine for chocolate*".[9]

---

[1] Constantin Niţescu, *op. cit.,* p. 59; Cornel Mărculescu, *Odiseea relicvei lui Mihai Viteazul...*, p. 329; idem, *100 de ani de la înfiinţarea Liceului Militar de la Mănăstirea Dealu: Nicolae Filipescu (1861-1916)* (100 years since the foundation of the Military Scool near Dealu Monastery: Nicolae Filipescu (1861-1916)), in "Revista Hristica", editată de militarii din Garnizoana Târgovişte, Nr. 12, Târgovişte, 2012, p. 46.

[2] Constantin Niţescu, *op. cit.*, p.85; Marin Gr. Năstase, *Destinul unui militar* (The Destiny of a Military Man), Bucureşti, Regia Autonomă Monitorul Oficial, 2004, p. 27; Cornel Mărculescu, *100 de ani de la înfiinţarea Liceului Militar de la Mănăstirea Dealu…*, p. 47.

[3] A.M.Ap.N. – C.P.S.A.M.P., *op. cit.*, f. 11; Neculai I. Staicu-Buciumeni, *Colegiul Naţional "Nicolae Filipescu"*, Galaţi, 2006, p. 4; Constantin Niţescu, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[4] *Ibidem*.

[5] S.J.A.N. Dâmboviţa, *fond Primăria oraşului Târgovişte*, dosar 86/1912-1913, f. 1.

[6] Nicoale Filipescu, *Pentru România Mare. Cuvântări din Războiu 1914-1916 (For the Great Romania. Speeches from War 1914-1916)*, Bucureşti, "Biblioteca Neamului", 1925, p. 4.

[7] S.J.A.N. Dâmboviţa, *fond Prefectura Dâmboviţa*, dosar 67/1943, f. 42.

[8] Anastasie Iordache, *Reorientarea politică a României şi neutralitatea armată 1914-1916* (Politic Reorientation of Romania and Army Neutrality 1914-1916), Bucureşti, Editura Paideia, 1998, p. 98-118; Ion Mamina, *Consilii de Coroană (Royal Councils)*, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 1997, p. 27-52; Mircea Muşat, Ion Ardeleanu, *De la statul geto-dac la statul român unitar (From the Getho-Dacian to the Romanian Unitary State)*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1983, p. 442-444.

[9] Ştefan Ion Ghilimescu, *Martha Bibescu la Târgovişte, Dealu, Viforâta şi Doiceşti* (Martha Bibescu in Târgovişte, Dealu, Viforâta and Doiceşti), in "Conexiuni şi interferenţe...", p. 109.

FRENCH TRAVELLERS' WRITINGS
CONCERNING THE ROMANIANS IN THE 18TH CENTURY

Iulian Oncescu[*]

Abstract

Out of the numerous foreign testimonies left behind by foreigners about the Romanians in the 18th century, the most important are those of the French, which are also the most numerous. In general, the rhythm of elaboration of the writings on the Romanians, and implicitly of travelogues, is in harmony with the evolution of the French-Romanian relations in general, which are directly connected to the evolution of the French Oriental politics, with the increasingly strong interest of France in the SE European area. Out of the French travellers who wrote on the Romanians in the 18th century, we shall mention: the chevalier de Bellerive, La Motraye, Guedeville, Jean Claude Flachat, Charles de Peyssonnel, baronul Damseaux, Jean-Louis Carra, Alexandre de Launay, baronul Francois de Tott, contele Alexandre d'Hauterive, Charles Joseph de Ligne, Roger de Damas contele de Ferriere, contele de Salaberry, Emil Gaudin, Louis Joseph Parant. Our paper aims only to point out the main French travellers of the 18th century in the Romanian area and their works on the Romanians.

Key words: *Foreign Testimonies*, *French Travellers*, *Romanians*, *Memoires*, *Histories*

For the Romanians' history, foreign testimonies have a great value as documents. It is in them that we find special information on the Romanian Countries, during a certain period, and on the evolution of the Romanian society, in all the domains. These writings and notes can help their reader to become conscious especially of the place attributed by the foreigners to the Romanians in Europe; practically, we can see how the foreigners see us and what they believe concerning our origins and our life, concerning our ideals and hopes, and our history. In other words, these foreign testimonies provide an image of the Romanian society as a whole.

Because in this category of historical sources concerning the Romanians there are many that belong to foreigners, especially to Westerners, it is necessary to know all these writings and especially those referring to the 18th

---

[*] Lecturer, PhD, Valahia University of Târgovişte, Faculty of Humanities, Department of History, 34-36A Lt. Stancu Ion Street, Târgovişte, 130105, Dâmboviţa County, e-mail: iulian_oncescu@yahoo.fr

century.[1] Our approach aims to re-evaluate the presentations in the Westerners' travelogues, and especially the travelogues of the French on the Romanians during the 18th century. The definition of the foreign traveller was formulated in the Romanian historiography even since 1968 by Maria Holban in the *Foreword* to the first tome of the series *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign travellers' statements about the Romanian Countries). The "foreign traveller" represented an extended notion including all those who went through the Romanian Countries for some reason or lived here for a while and left behind a testimony on what they saw here.[2]

So, out of the foreign travellers who went through Moldavia, Walachia, Transylvania and who left behind a series of testimonies on the Romanians, most were Westerners: French, English, Italians, Germans, Austrians, and Spanish. Sent on different missions in the troubled context of the Phanariot century, of the different wars between the great European powers or simple occasional travellers, such as missionaries, writers, journalists, officers, diplomats, they left behind a series of works, especially with a memorialistic character, from where one can distinguish almost all the features of the Romanian society. These travellers' merit is all the greater not just because they contributed to the knowledge of the Romanians în Europe, but also because to a certain extent some of them took part in the rebirth of the Romanian people of this period[3]. Out of the so-called "memoires" or "histories" concerning the

---

[1] Nicolae Isar, *Mărturii şi preocupări franceze privitoare la români. Secolele XVIII-XIX* (French Testimonies and Preoccupations concerning the Romanians. 18th-19th Century), Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2005, p. 7.

[2] *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign travellers' statements about the Romanian Countries), vol. VIII, editor-in-charge Maria Holban, assisted by M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Paul Cernovodeanu, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1968, p. XIII (under the generic name of travelogue, rendered in Romanian by *relatare de călătorie*, one may find diaries, occasional notes, memories, special works, paragraphs in larger works, and also scientific, military, consular reports).

[3] Nicolae Isar, *Mărturii şi preocupări franceze privitoare la români* (French Testimonies and Preoccupations concerning the Romanians), p. 7. From the beginning of the 18th century to our time there have been a series of preoccupations concerning the description of the Romanian area. The foreign travellers of the 18th century left special testimonies on the Romanians, which testimonies became part of the category historical sources. Practically, these narrative sources are considered historical sources from which one can realize what the situation of the Romanian society during the period 1700-1800 was. In fact, Transylvania, Moldavia and Walachia constituted a permanent concern in the travelogues of those who went through the Romanian area or lived here for a while. The narrative sources of the 18th century are therefore represented by the diaries of the foreign travellers, by notes of certain politicians, diplomates, military men, journalists, writers and even simple travellers. The increasing interest of the occidental, but also of the eastern world for the area of SE Europe, especially in the context of the Austrian-Russian-Turkish wars, which took place mainly in the Lower Danube area, led to the appearance of the *memoires* of certain politicians and diplomates, handed over to European

Romanians, left behind by the Westerners in the 18th century, we shall mention in this context especially only those left behind by French travellers, as their testimonies are the most numerous and the most important.[1] The French, during the 18th century, but also during the next century, contributed to the spreading of the information on the Romanians in Europe, but also got directly involved in the fight for the rebirth of the Romanian people. The French travellers – temporary visitors or preceptors, political agents or diplomats – therefore, left a series of testimonies about the Romanians[2]. So, the information in these notes on the Romanians was the result of the contact with the Romanians, in one way

---

monarchs or Romanian reigning princes, and *travelogues* realized by different personalities who crossed the Romanian area. (*Istoria Românilor/*The Romanians' History, vol. VI, *Românii între Europa clasică şi Europa luminilor (1711-1821)*/The Romanians between classical Europe and the Europe of the Enlightenment (1711-1821), coordinators: Paul Cernovodeanu, Nicolae Edroiu, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 2002, p. XXXVII).

[1] See, in brief, *Istoria Românilor* / The Romanians' History, vol. VI, p. XXXVIII-XXXIX.

[2] For a more complex image on the Romanian Principalities in French testimonies (18th century), see as well *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Statements on the Romanian Countries), vol. VIII, editor-in-chief Maria Holban, assisted by M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Paul Cernovodeanu, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1983, p. 305-309, 506-511, 512-531; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Statements on the Romanian Countries), vol. IX, editor-in-chief Maria Holban, assisted by M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Paul Cernovodeanu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1987, p. 31-42, 151-159, 253-260, 391-407, 595-619; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Statements on the Romanian Countries), vol. X, part I, editors Maria Holban, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Paul Cernovodeanu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2000, p. 234-259, 285-312, 673-679, 680-696, 784-792; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Statements on the Romanian Countries), vol. X, part II, editors: Maria Holban, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Paul Cernovodeanu (editor-in-chief), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2001, p. 891-908, 909-921, 922-929, 1001-1011, 1295-1327, 1354-1357, 1369-1379; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române* (Foreign Travellers' Statements on the Romanian Countries), supplement I, tome realized by Ştefan Andreescu (coordinator), Marian Coman, Alexandru Ciocâltan, Ileana Căzan, Nagy Pienaru, Ovidiu Cristea, Tatiana Cojocaru, Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 2011, p. 225-262; Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria Românilor prin călători* (The Romanians' History Seen through Travellers' Eyes), edition, introductory study and notes by Adrian Anghelescu, MCMLXXXI, Bucureşti, Editura Eminescu, 1981, p. 322-325, 361-364, 373, 379-382, 406-407, 415-416; Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria relaţiilor române. Antologie* (The History of the Romanian Relations. Anthology), edition and notes by Florin Rotaru, translation by Anca Verjinschi, Bucureşti, Editura Semne, 1995, p. 28-45; Nicolae Isar, *Istoria modernă a românilor. Imaginea societăţii româneşti în Franţa, 1774-1848* (The Romanians' Modern History. The Image of the Romanian Society in France, 1774-1848)*,* Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, 1992, p. 24-40; idem, *Mărturii şi preocupări franceze privitoare la români. Secolele XVIII-XIX…* (French Testimonies and Preoccupations concerning the Romanians. The 18th-19th Century), p. 7-24; Felicia Dumas, Olivier Dumas, *La France et Iaşi – 600 ans d'une histoire d'amour*, Iaşi, Editura Demiurg, 2009, p. 24-42.

or another, direct or indirect.[1] In general, the rhythm of elaboration of the writings on the Romanians – and implicitly of the travelogues – is integrated in the evolution of the French-Romanian relations, in general, and so this rhythm is directly connected to the evolution of the French Oriental politics, and the increasingly obvious interest of France in the area of SE Europe.

We estimate that, in the 18th century, the French writings on the Romanians might be divided into several stages:

1. until 1770-1774, they were rarer, rather occasional, as the interest of the French writers concerning the Romanians increased beginning with the time of the Russian-Turkish war of the years 1768-1774, concluded with the peace of Kuciuk Kainargi;

2. 1774-1800, when these writings and travelogues bloom on the background of the Austrian-Russian-Turkish wars of the end of this century, and also on the background of the increasing interest of France in the Romanian Principalities, especially after the French Revolution of 1789, substantiated in the creation of the French consulats of Iaşi and Bucarest (1798).[2] In this context, from the beginning of the 18th century until 1774, a series of French writers who went through the Romanian Countries wrote about the Romanians. Out of them, we shall mention the most important: the chevalier de Bellerive (year of travel 1711); La Motraye (years of travel 1711, 1714); Guedeville who publishes in 1718, in Amsterdam, a historical atlas – *Atlas historique ou Nouvelle introduction à l'Histoire, à la Chronologie et la Géographie, ancienne et moderne,* where one can find presentations about the the Romanians, as well; Jean Claude Flachat (year of travel 1740, work published in 1766 in Lyon under

---

[1] Nicolae Isar, *Mărturii şi preocupări franceze privitoare la români* (French Testimonies and Preoccupations concerning the Romanians), p. 7-8.

[2] *Ibidem*, p. 8; see, concerning this aspect: Dan Berindei, *Legături şi convergenţe istorice româno-franceze* (Romanian-French relations and historical convergences)*,* in "Revista de Istorie", tome 32, nr. 3, 1979, p. 406; Nicolae Isar, *Istoria modernă a românilor...,* p. 39-40, concerning the first French consuls and their presentations of the Romanians; see as well Pompiliu Eliade, *Influenţa franceză asupra spiritului public în România. Originile. Studiu asupra stării societăţii româneşti în vremea domniilor fanariote* (The French influence on the public spirit in Romania. Origins. Study on the condition of the Romanian society during the Fanariot reigns), Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 2000, p. 179-226 (about the French consuls of the Principalities at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, their relations with the Fanariot rulers; French immigrants); see as well Felicia Dumas, Olivier Dumas, *La France et Iaşi...*, p. 43-62; Leonid Boicu, *Principatele Române în raporturile politice internaţionale (1792-1821)* (The Romanian Principalities in the International Political Relations, 1792-1821), Iaşi, Institutul European, 2001, p. 104-106 – Flûry was appointed in Bucharest and Parrant in Iaşi; Lăcrămioara Iordăchescu, *Statutul reprezentanţelor diplomatice franceze în Principate (1798-1859)* (The Status of the French Diplomatic Representations in the Principalities, 1798-1859), in vol. *Franţa, model cultural şi politic* (France, a Cultural and Political Model), (vol. edited by Alexandru Zub and Dumitru Ivănescu), Iaşi, Editura Junimea, 2003 p. 200-201.

the title of *Observations sur le commerce et sur le arts d'une partie de l'Europe, de l'Asie, de l'Afrique et même des Indes Orientales*); Charles de Peyssonnel, diplomat who published several works in which he refers to the Romanians, *Observations historiques et géographiques sur les peuples barbares qui ont habité les bords du Danube et du Pont-Euxin,* Paris,1765; *Traité sur le commerce de la Mer Noire,* t. II, Paris,1787; *Observations sur le commerce de la Mer Noire,* Amsterdam-Leide, 1787.[1]

After the year 1774 and until the beginning of the 19th century, the French writings and travelogues on the Romanians become increasingly numerous. Such preoccupations can be found in the case of: baron Damseaux (year of travel 1771, publishes his work in 1774 in London under the title *Guerre des Russes contre les Turcs*); Jean-Louis Carra (who worked for the reigning prince of Moldavia, Grigore III Alexandru Ghica in 1776, published his work in 1777 in Bouillon under the title of *Histoire de la Moldovie et de la Valachie, avec un dissertation sur l'état actuel de ces deux Provinces*); Alexandre de Launay, conte de D'Antraignes (year of travel 1779); baron François de Tott (years of travel 1767-1769, he published his work in 1784 in Amsterdam under the title of *Memoires du baron de Tott sur les Turcs et les Tartares*); count Alexandre d'Hauterive (who worked for the reigning prince of Moldavia Alexandru Mavrocordat as French secretary in 1785-1787); Charles Joseph de Ligne (year of travel 1788, impressions on the Romanians in a letter appeared in the work published in 1860 in Bruxelles – *Œuvre du Prince de Ligne,* t. II, with a foreword by Albert Lacroix); Roger de Damas (year of travel 1790, work published in 1912, in Paris, by Jacques Rambaud, *Mémoires du Comte Roger de Damas*); count de Ferrières-Sauveboeuf (years of travel 1782-1789, publishes in 1790 in Paris the work *Mémoires historiques et géographiques des voyages faits en Turquie, en Perse et en Arabie, depuis 1792 jusqu'en 1789,* vol II); count de Salaberry (year of travel 1791, published his work in 1799 in Paris under the title *Voyage à Constantinople, en Italie, et aux Iles de l'Archipel, par l'Allemagne et la Hongrie*); Emil Gaudin, the first French consul in Bucharest (in his memo of 1796 addressed to the reigning prince Alexandru Moruzi, which appears in the work published in 1822 under the title *Du soulèvement des nations chrétiennes dans la Turquie européenne*); Louis Joseph Parant, vice-consul in Iaşi between the years 1797-1798, and in Bucharest 1802-1806 (in the memo of 1798). [2] Out of the works of these French

---

[1] Nicolae Isar, *Mărturii şi preocupări franceze privitoare la români. Secolele XVIII-XIX…*, p. 8-12; concerning the French travellers in the Romanian area until 1774, see as well *Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, vol. VIII, p. 305-309, 506-511, 512-531; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, vol. IX, p. 31-42, 151-159, 253-260, 391- 407.
[2] *Ibidem,* p. 12- 24; concerning the French travellers in the Romanian area during the period 1774-1800 see as well *Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, vol. IX, p. 595-619; *Călători*

travellers of the 18th century on the Romanians, particularly interesting are those created by Jean-Louis Carra (1742-1793), originary of Burgundy, novel writer with philosophical preoccupations who worked for the Moldavian reigning prince Grigore III Alexandru Ghica in 1776, and who wrote *Historie de la Moldovie et de la Valachie* (printed in Bouillon and not in Iaşi, as it appears on the title page, in 1777, with new editions respectively in Paris, 1778, and Neuschatel, 1781, and German translations printed respectively in Frankfurt and Leipzig in 1789, and Nürnberg, 1821, and a Russian one, in 1791)[1] and Alexandre d'Hauterive (1754-1830), who was part, after the year 1784, of the suite of the ambassador of the French emperor in Constantinople, and who stayed in Moldavia in 1785 and 1787, appointed consul of the French Republic in New York during the Revolution and then director of the National Archives of France. His *Mémoires* and the travelogue of his voyage from Constantinople to Iaşi in the winter of the year 1785, entitled *La Moldavie en 1785* and *Mémoire sur l'état ancien et actuel de la Moldavie présenté à S.A.S. le Prince Alexandre Ypsilanti hospodar régnant en 1787* were at first published by the French A. Ubicini in "Revue de géographie" in 1877, 1879 and 1880, and by Şt. Orăşanu and I. Bianu in Bucharest, 1902).[2] Our paper only aimed to highlight the main 18th century French travellers who left behind testimonies on the Romanians.

---

străini despre Ţările Române, vol. X, partea I, p. 234-259, 285-312, 673-679, 680-696, 784-792; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, vol. X, partea a II-a, p. 891-908, 909-921; 922-929, 1001-1011, 1295-1327, 1354-1357, 1369-1379; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, supliment I, p. 225-262.

[1] *Istoria Românilor...* vol. VI, p. XXXVIII; see appreciations about the work of Carra in Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria relaţiilor române. Antologie*, p. 32-35; Giorge Pascu, *Călători străini în Moldova şi Muntenia în secolul XVIII. Carra, Bauer şi Struve* (Foreign Travellers in Moldavia and Walachia in the 18th Century: Carra, Bauer and Struve), Iaşi, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Brawo", 1940, p. 1-80; see for Carra and Ştefan Lemny, *Jean-Louis Carra (1742-1793). Parcours d'une révolutionnaire*, L'Harmattan, 2000.

[2] *Istoria Românilor*, vol. VI, p. XXXVIII; Contele d'Hauterive, *Memoriu despre starea Moldovei la 1777* (Memo on the Condition of Moldavia in 1777), Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Gobl, 1902. See appreciations on the work of Hauterive in Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria relaţiilor române. Antologie…*, p. 35-40.

AN EPISODE OF THE ROMANIAN-ITALIAN RELATIONS.
THE FRANCO-SARDINIAN-HUNGARIAN PLANS OF 1859 AND THE ROMANIANS

*Laura Oncescu**

Abstract
The affinities between the two peoples, Romanian and Italian, can be easily perceived as well in the context of the secret Franco-Sardinian-Hungarian plans of 1859 against Austria, plans in which the Principalities played an essential role. The Franco-Italian plans, aiming to remove the Austrians from the North of Italy, were initiated even since Plombières, in 1858, but in his politics, Cavour relied on a collaboration with the Hungarians, so that in case the war with Austria broke out, a revolution was to be triggered in Hungary, entailing a great conflagration later on. The role of the Romanian Principalities in the Franco-Sardinian-Hungarian plan was special, because without their adhesion, it would have been impossible to send the arms and ammunition transmitted by Napoleon III to the Hungarians in Austria and to set up the strategic points for the uprising. In exchange for this collaboration, the Romanians were to be helped later on to constitute their own independent State.

Key words: *Romanian-Italian relations*, *Franco-Sardinian-Hungarian revolutionary plans*, *Romanians*, *Cavour*, *Al.I. Cuza*

One of the significant episodes of the Romanian-Italian relations took place in 1859 in the context of the fight for Italian unity and of the ongoing French-Austrian-Sardinian War, when, with the participation of France, a common action plan was designed against Austria by the Italians, Hungarians and Romanians. This plan was being supported by Napoleon III, who, after 1856, was a mediator between the Italian, Hungarian and Romanian revolutionaries, desiring that they may trigger a Revolution against the Hapsburg Empire. The French emperor wanted, especially in 1859, that he may use, in his fight against Austria, officially the Piedmont, and, unofficially, the Italian, Hungarian and Romanian revolutionaries. One of the sensitive points of the success of this common action was the collaboration between Romanians

---

* University assistant Dr., Valahia University of Târgovişte, Faculty of Humanities, Department of History, 34-36A Lt. Stancu Ion Street, Târgovişte, 130105, Dâmboviţa County, e-mail: laurita1979iul@yahoo.com

and Hungarians, on the background of the situation of the Romanians from Transylvania.[1]

The ample plan, of revolutionary proportions, from the Orient, was supported and approved, as we have reminded, by the emperor of France and by prince Napoleon. An important feature of the Napoleonian diplomacy was that, beside the official policy of the French government, led by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, there existed as well a personal policy of the Emperor himself, which was sometimes contrary to the official one. This secret policy, in case of certain treaties or actions that failed, had the possibility to be denied by the official policy. In 1859, it seems that the secret policy had become more important than the official one. In this context, the secret project of alliance between France and Russia, the support for a revolt of the Hungarians against the Austrians, the Italian policy, and also the support for the conspiracies in the Orient were the main components of the secret policy carried out by Napoleon III during this period.[2]

Under these circumstances, the Romanian Principalities became the main pivot of the Oriental policy of Napoleon III, through their geographic setting, as they became now one of the basic components of his external policy. The Italian problem and the issue of the Principalities were considered levers for the practical realization of the political plan of Napoleon III. In order to accomplish it, the Emperor was promoting a personal policy, which, on numerous occasions, was in contradiction to the official one.[3]

The Conference of the Great Powers' representatives, held in Paris on May 10/22, 1858, for the mission of determining a common perspective on the future organization of the Romanian Principalities, divided the Powers into two camps: pro-Unionist (France, Russia, Prussia and Sardinia) and anti-Unionist (Austria, Turkey and England, after a pro-Unionist "drift" of one month). In the sense of avoiding a crisis, on the background of the diverging interests of the participants, on the whole, one can say that the spirit of the agreement of Osborne[4], between Napoleon III and Queen Victoria, prevailed. Particularly

---

[1] Ionuţ Şerban, *Alternative revoluţionare româno-italiene în cursul acţiunii politice de realizare a unităţii naţionale* (Romanian-Italian revolutionary alternatives during the political action of realization of the national unity), in "Analele Universităţii din Craiova" (Annals of Valahia University of Craiova), seria Istorie, anul XIV, nr 1(15)/2009, p. 355-356.

[2] Nicolae Corivan*, Relaţiile diplomatice ale României, de la 1859 la 1877* (The diplomatic relations of Romania, from 1859 to 1877), Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1984*,* p. 46- 47. See for more details, by the same author, *La politica orientale di Napoleon III e l'unione dei principati rumeni*, Iaşi, Institutul Grafic "Presa Bună", 1937.

[3] Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei (1866-1878)* (Romania in the Oriental politics of France), ed. a II-a, Târgovişte, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2010*,* p. 97-98.

[4] See, for more details about the meeting from Osborne, Leonid Boicu, *Unirea Principatelor române în dezbaterea forurilor internaţionale (1855-1859)* (The Union of the Romanian

interesting was the position of Sardinia, through its representatives, Villamarina and Cavour, concerning the "Romanian issue".

Considering the Romanians's anti-Hapsbourg feelings, the Prime Minister of Piedmont supported the Principalities' Union under a foreign prince[1], sharing the French viewpoint. By his policy, Cavour wanted to determine a weakening of the Austrian position at the mouths of the Danube and in the Balkans, and also to constitute a barrier against the pan-Slavic movement generated by Russia. It is also in this sense that he takes action to convince the British of the need for a Union of the Principalities, for the reason that in a contrary situation the two provinces would undergo an Austrian influence, just like the small Italian states.[2]

The meeting of Napoleon III with Cavour, in July 1858, at Plombières[3], before the conclusion of the Convention of Paris, was to shed new lights on the place of the "Romanian issue" in the political strategy of the French Emperor, who expressed his confidence in the neutrality of England and saw in the isolation of Austria a condition for success at war. Because neutrality was supposed to be bought, and the Principalities were back then a highly appreciated currency, Napoleon III used the "Romanian issue" during the period that preceded the war with Austria as a marionette in his politics towards Russia and England.

The concessions towards England in the context of the same issue, at the

---

Principalities in the debate of the international forums: 1855-1859), in vol. *Unirea Principatelor şi Puterile Europene* (The Principalities' Union and the European Powers), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1984, p. 64-70; Nicolae Corivan, *La politica orientale di Napoleone III el l'unione dei Principati Romeni...*, p. 6-12; T.W. Riker, *Cum s-a înfăptuit România. Studiul unei probleme internaţionale, 1856-1866* (The Making of Romania), Iaşi, Editura Alfa, 2000, p. 126-136; Gheorghe Cliveti, *România şi Puterile Garante, 1856-1878* (Romania and the Guaranteeing Powers, 1856-1878), Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Al.I. Cuza", 1988, p. 44-46.

[1] See, for more information Adolfo Omodeo, *L'opera politica del conte di Cavour (1848-1857)*, Riccardo Ricciardi Editore, Milano-Napoli, p. 319-332.

[2] Pasquale Buonincontro, *L'Unione dei Principati Danubiani nei documenti diplomatici napoletani (1856-1859)*, Napoli, Tip. Fratelli Mirelli, 1972, p. 14-15.

[3] Plombières, locality situated at the boundary between France and Switzerland, is the place where the secret meeting and the agreement between Cavour and Napoleon III took place in 1858. See Andrina Stiles, *Unificarea Italiei, 1815-1870* (The Italian Unification, 1815-1870), Bucureşti, Editura All, 1998, p. 79-80; Giuliano Procacci, *Istoria italienilor* (The Italians' History), Bucureşti, Editura Politică, 1975, p. 342-343; Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţii diplomatice ale României de la 1859 la 1877...*, p. 46; Franco Valsecchi, *L'unificazione italiana e la politica europea dalla guerra di Crimea alla guerra di Lombardy, 1854-1859,* Istituto per gli Studi di Politica Internazionale, Milano, p. 318-348; Ionuţ Şerban, *Războiul franco-austro-sard şi crearea regatului Italiei în lumina documentelor diplomatice italiene* (The Franco-Austrian-Sardinian War and the creation of the Italian Kingdom in the light of the Italian diplomatic documents), in vol. *Stat şi societate în Europa* (State and Society in Europe), vol. III, coordinators Marusia Cîrstea, Sorin Liviu Damean, Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 2011, p. 93.

Conference of Paris, assured to the Emperor a benevolent England regarding the unfolding of his plans: the neutrality of a formal ally, who was, concerning the issue of the Union, in the same camp as Austria, the future victim.[1]

The Convention of Paris held on August 7/19, 1858, concerning the Principalities, stipulated the constitution of the "United Principalities of Moldova and Walachia", under Ottoman suzerainty. The two Principalities were going to have, each of them, a reigning prince and an Elective Assembly, and, in common, a Central Commision in Focşani and a Court of Cassation.[2] Although the Convention of Paris was a compromise, being the result of confrontations of opinions between the pro-Unionist and anti-Unionist powers, it created a favourable framework for the development of the creative energies of the Romanian people towards the realization of the Union, and the conquest of the State independence.[3]

As the historian Dumitru Ivănescu stated, this was a moment when the Romanians themselves were called to decide on their own destiny, to decide a destiny springing from thir own aspirations. In this context, the solution of the double election of Alexandru Ioan Cuza, who put Europe in front of an accomplished fact, proved the most viable.[4] The double election of Cuza in Moldova and Walachia, on respectively January 5/17, 1859 and January 24 / February 8, 1859, inaugurated a new stage in the external relations of the Principalities with the guaranteeing Powers, constituting at the same time an acme of the fight for Union.[5]

Highlighting the manifestation of the popular will in favor of the Union, Eduardo Targioni, the ambassador of Napoli in Constantinople, reported to Luigi Carafa the reaction of the Porte when it received the news concerning the double election of Cuza; he brought to light especially the unanimous vote of the members present at the meeting.[6]

---

[1] Leonid Boicu, *Unirea Principatelor în dezbaterea forurilor internaţionale (1855-1859)* (The Principalities' Union in the debate of the international forums: 1855-1859), in vol. *Unirea Principatelor şi puterile europene...*, p. 76-77.

[2] Anastasie Iordache, *Stabilirea noului statut internaţional al Principatelor Române în perspectiva Unirii* (The determination of the new international status of the Romanian Principalities from the perspective of the Union), in vol. *Unirea Principatelor…*, p. 97-98. See, for the Convention of Paris of August 7/19, 1858, Iulian Oncescu, *Texte şi documente privind istoria Românilor (1774-1918)* (Texts and documents concerning the history of the Romanians: 1774-1918), Târgovişte, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2011, p. 288-291.

[3] See, for more details, T.W. Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 137-173.

[4] Dumitru Ivănescu, *Al.I. Cuza în conştiinţa posterităţii* (Al.I. Cuza in the conscience of the posterity), Iaşi, Editura Junimea, 2001, p. 70.

[5] Nicolae Corivan, *La politica orientale...*, p. 28-31.

[6] Ionel Gal, *Informaţii documentare externe referitoare la ecoul internaţional al Unirii Principatelor* (External documents concerning the international echo of the Romanians' Unity),

In his turn, General Durando, the representative of Sardinia in Constantinople, informed Cavour on the danger of an intervention of the Ottoman army in the Principalities.[1] From Turin, Cavour wrote, on February 7, 1859, to prince Napoleon: "[...] *The election of colonel Cuza by the Wallachian Assembly is a huge event... It is the triumph of the policy of France and Sardinia in the Orient. If Turkey refuses to recognize him and asks for the help of Austria, this might lead to a reason for breakup that would put an end to all our difficulties. I hope that the Emperor will support the legitimacy of the election, which does not contradict in any way the stipulations of the Convention of Paris* [...]."[2], and to Durando, who was in Constantinople, he telegraphed to support the double election, as "*it is a fact of the greatest importance. It does not assure the support of the governments of Moldova and Walachia*".[3]

In fact, making this declaration, the Prime Minister of Sardinia was mainly pursuing a chance to challenge Austria, against which both Napoleon III and he himself were trying to find a pretext to declare war, a war which had been so minutely prepared. So, serving the interests of his country, Cavour was saying his word at the supreme time of our political Renaissance.[4] In a letter addressed three days later to Prince Napoleon, Cavour, repeating that the diversion caused by the events in the Principalities would have served admirably to the French-Piedmontese interests and that Napoleon III and especially Walewski had to admit the accomplished fact, wrote: "[…] *The double election of colonel Cuza seems to me one of the happiest events. I think France will support its legitimacy […] The power being in the Principalities in the hands of our friends, the enemies of Austria, it will be simple to provide to Hungary all it needs to act when time has come* […]".[5]

---

in vol. *Unirea Principatelor şi Puterile Europene* (The Principalities' Union and the European Powers), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1984, p. 169-170.

[1] Raluca Tomi, *Constituirea statelor naţionale român şi italian, ianuarie 1859 – martie 1861* (The constitution of the national Romanian and Italian states, January 1859-March 1861), in "Studii şi Materiale de Istorie Modernă" (Studies and Materials of Modern History), vol. XVI, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 2003, p. 26.

[2] Nicolae Iorga, *Cavour et les Roumains*, in "Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen", nr. 10-12, 1930, p. 194; Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii în epoca Renaşterii politice a României, 1848-1877* (Conspirators and conspiracies during the age of Romania's political Renaissance, 1848-1877), Bucureşti, Editura Cartea Românească, 2000, p. 183; see as well Dan Berindei, *Constituirea statului naţional român în context European* (The constitution of the Romanian national State in a European context), in vol. Cuza *Vodă in memoriam*, coordinators Leonid Boicu, Gheorghe Platon, Al. Zub, Iaşi, Editura Junimea, 1973, p. 138-139.

[3] Leonid Boicu, *Din istoria diplomaţiei europene. Anul 1859 la români* (From the History of the European Diplomacy. The Year 1859 with the Romanians), Iaşi, Institutul European, 1996, p. 97.

[4] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...*, p. 183.

[5] *Ibidem*, p. 184-185.

The Italian public opinion as well showed a great enthusiasm to this political act. So, on February 11, 1859, Benzi, former representative of Sardinia in the European Commission, was writing to Dimitrie Brătianu: "*I honor you, dear Romanians, brave and good friends! Follow your way and trust in God, trust in yourselves and trust in those who love you! Believe me: the day of your and our existence is not as far as you believe!*"[1]

In his turn, the illustrious man of culture and friend of the Romanians, Giovenale Vegezzi Ruscalla[2], writing, on February 15, 1859, to Vasile Alecsandri, the new Minister of External Affairs in the Cabinet of Cuza, enthusiastically expressed his desire of realization of a Romania that would include Banat, Transylvania and Bucovina.[3] In view of the recognition of the double election, the Romanian leaders Vasile Alecsandri and Dumitru Brătianu undertook diplomatic missions in Paris and Turin, to sensitivize the French and Romanian diplomatic circles. Consequently, Vasile Alecsandri was received by the Italian Prime Minister and by the King as cordially as possible[4], and in Paris, the meeting with Villamarina, the head of the Sardinian delegation, allowed him to meet Constantino Nigra, the son-in-law of Vegezzi Ruscalla, who stated that the Union of the Principalities and the consulting of the people's ballots represented the beginning of a new epoch in the political system of Europe, as they would prepare, through their union, the union of all.[5] The affinities between the two peoples, Romanian and Italian, may be easily perceived as well in the context of the secret French-Sardinian-Hungarian plans of 1859, against Austria, plans in which the Principalities played an essential role.[6]

The policy of the nation-based State was encouraging the tendency of emancipation and of constitution of independent States by the Christian peoples of the Ottoman Empire. Napoleon III supported this policy and acted in order to

---

[1] Raluca Tomi, *Constituirea statelor naţionale român şi italian...*, p. 28.

[2] Giovenale Vegezzi Ruscalla, publisher, politician, diplomat, journalist, philologist, ethnographer, linked his name to his friendship for the Romanians, which lasted for all his life. Showing concern for the Romanians' culture, language and history, he, along with Carlo Cataneo and Marco Antonio Canini, were among the forerunners of the idea of Latinity concerning the Romanians. (Alexandru Marcu, *Un fidele amico dei Rumeni: Giovenale Vegezzi Ruscalla,* extratto da "Il Giornale di Politica e di Letteratura", anno II, quad. VIII, agosto 1926, 26 p.; T. Onciulescu, *Giovenale Vegezzi-Ruscalla e i romeni*, in "Ephemeris Dacoromana", Annuario della Scuola Romena di Roma, IX, Roma, 1940, p. 351- 445.

[3] Gheorghe Platon, *Ecoul internaţional al Unirii Principatelor Române* (The international echo of the Romanian Principalities' Union), in vol. *Cuza Vodă in memoriam*, p. 168-169.

[4] See, on the visit of Vasile Alecsandri to Torino (Turin), Vasile Netea, *Camillo Cavour, 1810-1861*, in *Diplomaţi iluştri* (Illustrious Diplomats), vol. II, Bucureşti, Editura Politică, 1970, p. 205-206.

[5] Leonid Boicu, *Din istoria diplomaţiei...*, p. 172.

[6] Nicolae Corivan, *La politica orientale...*, p. 40.

accomplish it, especially as the then political circumstances were not preventing him from doing it.[1]

During the period that preceded the Conference of April 1859, held to recognize the double election of Cuza, Sardinia, focused on the complications of its own cause, will perseverently support the Union, yet from a less exposed position, as the Italian issue had advanced, instead of the Romanian one, to the first place of the European political agenda.[2] Even Gorceakov's Russia was planning to reunite a Congress of five powers, meant to debate the Italian issue, showing that if the Conference held for the recognition of Al.I.Cuza did not come together before the summoning of the Congress of the five powers, different complications and disorders might occur in the Principalities, requiring the intervention of the European governments.[3]

The French-Italian plans, aiming to oust the Austrians from the north of Italy, were initiated even since Plombières, in 1858, yet, in his policy, Cavour was relying on a collaboration with the Hungarians, so that in case a war with Austria should break out, a revolution may be triggered in Hungary, consequently leading to a great conflagration.[4] In this sense, the Prime Minister of Piedmont contacted and began negotiations with general Klapka, a Hungarian emigrant.[5]

This fact is highlighted by a series of unsigned notes, published in Geneva, on October 15, 1863, which highlighted the very activity of the Hungarian emigration in order to determine the above-mentioned anti-Austrian movement.[6] In order to apply the plan, different agents were to be sent in Hungary to stir the population to mutiny. Such agents had to be sent as well in Serbia and in the Principalities, "*to determine the heads of those countries to take part in the war in their own interest and to influence especially the Romanians in Moldova and Walachia to exhort their conationals of Hungary to join the Hungarians, sharing in the same cause*". The formation of a national army of 20-30,000 soldiers was considered, with equipment and arms for them to be sent clandestinely, declared as simple merchandise in Galați, Brăila and Belgrade, and then to be sent on to the Hungarian territory.[7]

---

[1] *Ibidem,* p. 3.
[2] Leonid Boicu, *Din istoria diplomației...*, p. 207.
[3] Nicolae Corivan, *Relații diplomatice ale României de la 1859 la 1877...*, p. 44-45.
[4] See, for more information on these plans of Cavour and Napoleon III, Luigi Chiala, *Politica segreta di Napoleone III e di Cavour in Italia e in Ungheria (1858-1861)*, L. Roux e C. Editori, Turin-Roma, 1895.
[5] Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franței (1866-1878)...*, p. 97.
[6] Serviciul Arhivelor Naționale Istorice Centrale (The Service of the Central national Historical Archives) (henceforth, S.A.N.I.C.), București, collection Microfilme Italia, roll 10/1, sequence 11.
[7] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori și conspirații...*, p. 176.

In order to realize his plans, Cavour began his negotiations with general Klapka, as we have mentioned, at the same time sending secret diplomatic agents to the Romanians, Croatians, Serbians and therefore projecting a mutiny of all the peoples of the Orient. In this sense, the meeting between Dumitru Brătianu, who was in Turin, and the leader of Piedmont assured the Italians of a Romanian support as the *"Romanians in the Principalities are ready to rise all as one to free their brothers in Banat, Bucovina and Transylvania".*[1]

At the beginning of the year 1859, Cavour continued his negotiations with Klapka and *"worked in order to extend the conspiracy project into the Orient"*.[2]

In January 1859, the concrete bases of the Sardinian-Hungarian action plan against Austria were set, an eventual help from the Romanians being added to it. The Hungarian general sent, at the end of the month of January 1859, to Cavour, a memo in which he clearly showed that in his plan he needed to use the Romanian Principalities and Serbia, as well.[3] To do so, he needed to send agents there, and the operations had to start in three points: on the Adriatic coast, in Transylvania and in Banat. Therefore, in Klapka's plan, the Romanian Principalities had an important role.[4] For the project to succeed, it was necessary for the people leading the destinies of Walachia and Moldova to share in this conspirative plan. It is under these circumstances that the double election of Al.I. Cuza took place. This explains to a certain extent Cavour's rush to support the Union.[5]

The role of the Romanian Principalities in the French-Sardinian-Hungarian plan was special, as, without their adhesion, the arms and ammunitions sent by Napoleon III to the Hungarians of Austria were impossible to be sent, and the strategic points of the revolt would have been impossible to be set up. In exchange for this collaboration, the Romanians needed to be helped to constitute an independent state. Consequently, in the context of the recognition of the double election, Cavour telegraphed to Durando, the Sardinian minister in Constantinople, to support the new reigning prince, who was therefore becoming a determining factor of the Sardinian-Hungarian politics in the Orient. It is also along this same lime that the meeting of Vasile Alecsandri with Cavour, in Turin, took place. Alecsandri, according to the instructions he had received from Napoleon III, requested from Cavour, along with the sending of a Sardinian consul in the Principalities, to facilitate the transport of 10,000

---

[1] Nicolae Corivan**,** *Relaţii diplomatice ale României...,* p. 46; Leonid Boicu, *Din istoria diplomaţiei...,* p. 284-289; Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei...,* p. 97.
[2] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...,* p. 166.
[3] *Ibidem*, p. 175-176.
[4] Nicolae Corivan*, Relaţiile diplomatice...,* p. 48.
[5] Alexandru Marcu, *op. cit.,* p. 183-190; Iulian Oncescu, *op. cit.,* p. 98.

guns offered by Napoleon III; he managed to obtain from the Italian minister the promise that the latter would make available trade ships for the transport of the respective arms to Galaţi.[1]

At the beginning of the month of March 1859, Napoleon III informed Nigra (the representative of Cavour in Paris) that Prussia and England would not maintain their neutrality in the case of a war with Austria. So, the Sardinian-Hungarian plan was encouraged, its actual support becoming the United Principalities, a fact indicating that the French emperor persisted in his secret policy. Napoleon III perceived Al.I. Cuza as an important factor in his plans and policy.[2] Klapka left for for Constantinople under a false name (Giuseppe Turin), and from there he was to get to Iaşi, later on, to lay the foundations of the Romanian-Hungarian agreement.[3]

In the Ottoman capital, he gets in touch with C. Negri (who, in turn, informed Al.I. Cuza on the arrival of the Hungarian emissary in the Principalities), but he also has discussions with the French ambassador, Lallemand, from whom he obtained a letter of recommendation to the consul Victor Place.[4]

The preparations being now ready, in March 1859, Klapka met in Iaşi the reigning prince Al.I. Cuza and the French consul Victor Place[5], the general presenting himself in this context as emissary of Napoleon, and by the end of that same month, two conventions were written: one on the collaboration[6] (arms etc.) and one on the Romanians of Transylvania.[7]

As he was not willing to sacrifice the interests of the Romanians in Transylvania, Cuza asked Klapka to draft a convention that would include a series of conditions in order to improve the destiny of the Romanians in Transylvania. By means of a secret agreement with the Hungarian general, concluded in Iaşi, on March 29, 1859, the Romanian reigning prince allowed the Hungarian emissaries to create hidden arms deposits along the Valley of Siret, in Bacău, Roman, Târgu Ocna, Piatra Neamţ, he undertook to ask Napoleon III for 30,000 guns, 10,000 for the needs of the Romanian army and 20,000 to be made available to the head of the revolt in Transylvania and

---

[1] Raluca Tomi, *Constituirea statelor naţionale român şi Italian…*, p. 30-31; see as well Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţiile diplomatice...*, p. 48-52; Ionuţ Şerban, *Alternative revoluţionare românoitaliene..*, p. 356-357.

[2] Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţiile diplomatice...*, p. 50.

[3] *Ibidem,* p. 51; Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei…*, p. 98.

[4] Marcel Emerit, *Victor Place et la politique française en Roumanie à l'époque de l'Union*, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice "E. Marvan", 1931, p. 87.

[5] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...,* p. 220

[6] Marcel Emerit, *op. cit.,* p. 88; Iulian Oncescu, *op.cit.,* p. 99.

[7] Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţiile diplomatice...*, p. 52; Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...,* p. 221-222; T. W. Riker, *op. cit.,* p. 255.

Hungary. In his turn, Klapka took upon himself the mission that, once in Paris, he would insist that the arms and ammunitions should be sent urgently to Galaţi. Immediatly after the beginning of the war in Italy, the government of the Principalities needed to make available to the military head of the Hungarian insurgency all the necessary means for the transport of the arms and ammunitions up to the Transylvanian frontier. In exchange, the Hungarian emigrants took upon themselves to actually help Cuza conquer Bucovina.[1]

Yet, the Romanian reigning prince had some reserves: some concerning the fact that, considering the hostilities of Turkey and Austria, but also the delay of the Conference of Paris, the Great Powers could tarry to express their position on his election as prince of Wallachia and Moldova; and others concerned the fate of the Romanians in Transylvania. In this sense, Cuza asked that at the beginning of the fight, the Hungarians should solemenly proclaim some guarantees for the Romanians of Transylvania, namely: the definitive reconciliation of the Serbs, Hungarians and Romanians, forgetting all the enemities of the past; the recognition of the Communes and Comitats; equal rights and freedoms for all the inhabitants of Hungary, regardless of race and religion; total independence of the cults and of education; the Romanian troops had to be organized and commanded separately; at the end of the war, a Transylvanian Assembly had to be summoned, to decide on the eventual union with Hungary.[2]

After the conditions were settled, general Klapka telegraphed to Prince Napoleon, confirming to him the participation of Al.I.Cuza to his plan and suggesting at the same time that he be recognized fast, and that the Conference may be summoned as soon as possible.[3] It was also on the same day that Cuza sent to Napoleon III a letter by which he was letting him know about the convention concluded with general Klapka and agreed to the project drafted by him. Delegating the general to make known to the Emperor the details of their discussion, Cuza exhorted to prudence and energy *"until the circumstances would allow him to assure for good the fate of all the Danubian States"*.[4]

Two months later, in May 1859, Cuza mentioned: "[…] *Doubtlessly, the events that are now being prepared may reserve a better future for the country that elected me to be its leader and I shall not waste any favourable opportunity that could consolidate its situation. But I am always very reserved when it comes to throwing it into an adventure whose end and practical outcomes*

---

[1] S.A.N.I.C., Bucureşti, Collection Microfilme Italia, roll 10/I, sequence 33-34.
[2] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...*, p. 220-222; Nicolae Corivan, *Walewski, Napoleon al-III-lea şi Alexandru Ioan Cuza* (Walewski, Napoleon III and Alexandru Ioan Cuza), excerpt from "Cercetări istorice" (Historical Researches), anul 9, nr. 3, 1933, p. 5-6.
[3] Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...*, p. 225.
[4] S.A.N.I.C., Bucureşti, Collection Microfilme Italia, roll 10/I, sequence 35.

would not be clear to me […]".[1]

Very important was during those moments the involvement of Vasile Alecsandri in the plans that were to take place under the patronage of France. As he was in Turin, Alecsandri returned to Paris, where he was transmitted that he had been empowered to negotiate and to conclude the deal with the Hungarian emigrants. Vasile Alecsandri remained in the French capital to deal with the obtaining of the arms, of the French instructor officers and also to negociate a loan of 10-12 million francs. However, during this stage, the French plan came to no conclusion, as the Romanian-Hungarian agreement was impossible to be sealed, given the exaggerate claims of the head of the Hungarian emigration, but also because of the determination of Alecsandri, who refused to make concessions greater than those stipulated in the initial drafts of the convention projects. In this context, in April 1859, the Conference of Paris occured, chaired by Al. Walewski. It was opened in the middle of the psychological and diplomatic war and was interrupted by the very outbreak of the French-Austrian-Sardian War, which got ahead of the Oriental plan.[2]

In the two meetings of the Conference of Paris of 1859 (April 7 and 13 aprilie), Turkey and Austria protested[3] against the double election of Al.I. Cuza, which was considered a breach of the Convention of 1858. At the meeting of April 13, 1859, Al. Walewski presented the "pact" concluded previously with England[4], by which he was asking Turkey to confer Cuza the designation as ruling prince of Moldova and Valahia. Consequently, while France, England, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, decided to ask Turkey to recognize the double election, Austria did not adhere to this perspective.[5]

The outbreak of the French-Sardinian-Austrian war led to the hastened recognition of Al.I. Cuza by most of the guaranteeing powers.[6] While France and Sardinia were getting ready for war, Ioan Alecsandri (Vasile Alecsandri's brother),who was in Paris, sent a letter to Al.I. Cuza by which he drew the ruling prince's attention on the fact that Napoleon III might request his assistance, showing that the French Emperor was considering him "his first aide-de-camp". The Romanian diplomat had clearly intuited the reasons of the double management of the Oriental poltics of France: first, in the official direction imposed by the government, which was directed against any complications and towards the stifling of the tendencies of rebellion, and,

---

[1] Alexandru Marcu, *op. cit.*, p. 237-238.
[2] Leonid Boicu, *Din istoria diplomaţiei...,* p. 210; Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei (1866-1878)...,* p. 99. See, for a brief description of the Franco-Sardian-Austrian War, Ionuţ Şerban, *Războiul franco-austro-sard…*, p. 93-98.
[3] Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţiile diplomatice...*, p. 52.
[4] T. W. Riker, *Cum s-a înfăptuit România...*, p. 217.
[5] Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţiile diplomatice...*, p. 52.
[6] *Ibidem*, p. 55.

second, in the conspirative direction, promoted by Napoleon III himself, of encouragement of the revolutions in Eastern Europe.

In the context of the outbreak of the French-Sardinian-Austrian War, Ioan Alecsandri acted as well as it was natural, supporting the momentary national interests, and, in this context, supporting general Klapka as well. In his turn, Al.I. Cuza concentrated the two armies, Wallachian and Moldavian, in the camp of Floreşti (April 1859), as a new European conflict was perceptible at the horizon, through the outbreak of the French-Sardinian-Austrian War, and Austria and Turkey had concentrated their troops and had the possibility to intervene in the United Principalities.[1]

By mid-April, Al. Walewski found out about Klapka's mission in the Principalities, and wrote to the consuls Victor Place and L. Béclard, informing them about the fact that it was false that the Hungarian general would have been authorized by prince Napoleon to speak in the name of Napoleon III. Béclard answered by means of a report, informing the French Minister of Foreign Affairs about this mission[2], in which he showed that he had not known about it, as he had only found out about it on the return of Prince Cuza in Bucharest. The French consul from Bucharest was at the same time aware of the informal involvement of prince Napoleon and of Lallemand, but he reminded that officially the French government had no involvement in Klapka's plans. Victor Place, although he had received an encoded message from Walewski, on April 10/22, in which he was asking for clarifications on the "*clandestine negotiations*" of Klapka with prince Cuza, only answered it on April 26 / May 8, which indicated the fact that he, as well, had intuited that the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was pursuing a different direction that that of the politics of Napoleon III. Victor Place consequently communicated to Walewski about the mission as being something of the least importance and about which he believed that the government from Paris did not need to be informed.[3]

On May 13, 1859 (our discovery), the French government sent instructions to his agents, by which he transmitted that any complications in the Orient could be unpleasant.[4] The line of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris seemed to acquire practical priority, yet the Hungarian conspiracy and its ramifications in the Orient, clearly disavowed by Walewski in the name of the French government, followed as well the course inspired by the Emperor.[5] In the atmosphere created by the French Minister against the Hungarians, Al.I.

---

[1] Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei (1866-1878)...*, p. 99- 100.

[2] Nicolae Corivan*, Walewski, Napoleon al III-lea şi Alexandru Ioan Cuza...*, p. 5-6.

[3] Alexandru Marcu*, Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...,* p. 244; Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei (1866-1878)...,* p.100.

[4] Nicolae Corivan*, Walewski, Napoleon al III-lea şi Alexandru Ioan Cuza...*, p. 6, 8-11.

[5] *Ibidem*, p. 7.

Cuza but also the Romanian politicians Dumitru Brătianu and Mihail Kogălniceanu began to have a more reserved attitude as well.[1]

By the end of the month of May 1859, the Romanian reigning prince sent Ion Bălăceanu on a mission to Napoleon III, requesting his approval for the realization of the Union in a dictatorial way, yet with the suggestion of establishing certain contacts with the Hungarian emigrants of Italy, in order for them to hand on the 10,000 guns that the Emperor had promised.[2] Although the Romanian envoy met the Emperor in Italy (at Vallegio), the answer that Al.I. Cuza sent to him was handed to him only in Paris, where the prefect of the Romanian capital gained a hearing and was "*questioned for a long time about the ruling prince Cuza, about the Romanian businesses and about certain problems related to the Oriental issue*".[3]

Obviously, Napoleon III really wanted to get to know better the new reigning prince Cuza, his intentions and his plans, and remarked the boldness of his last ones. Finally, the end of the French-Sardinian-Austrian War came with no practical results for the Hungarian cause and the Danubian conspiracy plan, due to the continual disapproval of the official French diplomacy.[4]

So, in the Orient, the two directions and actions of the French politics tended to exclude each other: the secret one, which was discretely patronized by the Emperor, by the prince Napoleon and by Cavour, was losing ground in front of the official one, namely that of the Frech Minister of Foreign Affairs, represented by Al. Walewski.[5]

The conservative spirit of Walewski was in fact hostile to the Emperor's projects related to Piedmont and to his plans for the future, as he was considering them "*a politics of aventure*". It is for this very reason that the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was replaced, at the beginning of the year 1860, by Edouard Thouvenel, a connoisseur of the Oriental problems.[6]

The end of the war of 1859 and the conclusion of the armistice of Villafranca, between Napoleon III and Austria, by which Lombardy had to be ceded to France, to be given to Piedmont, disappointed the Italians and particularly Cavour.[7]

---

[1] Nicolae Corivan, *Relaţiile diplomatice...*, p. 60.
[2] Idem, *Walewski...*, p. 14-15; Ion Bălăceanu, *Amintiri politice şi diplomatice (1848-1903)* (Political and diplomatic memories, 1848-1903), translation from French, introduction, notes and comments by Georgeta Filitti, Bucureşti, Editura Cavallioti, 2002, p. 76-88.
[3] Ion Bălăceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
[4] Nicolae Corivan, *Walewski, Napoleon al III-lea şi Alexandru Ioan Cuza...*, p. 17; see, for more details, Alexandru Marcu, *Conspiratori şi conspiraţii...*, p. 249-285.
[5] Nicolae Corivan, *Walewski, Napoleon al III-lea şi Alexandru Ioan Cuza...*, p. 20-21.
[6] *Ibidem*, p. 21; Iulian Oncescu, *România în politica orientală a Franţei...*, p. 101.
[7] Andrina Stiles, *op. cit.*, p. 45-46.

The collaboration between the Romanians, the Italians and the Hungarians and their battle plans against Austria, collaboration which had begun in 1859, and which continued during the reign of Al.I. Cuza, especially in the years: 1860-1861, 1863-1864 and 1864-1865.[1]

---

[1] See, for a brief information on this topic, Ionuţ Şerban, *Alternative revoluţionare româno-italiene în cursul acţiunii politice de realizare a unităţii naţionale...*, p. 357-361; Tomi Raluca, *Testimonianze inedite su antiche cospirazioni e cospiratori. L'attivita di Gustav Friegyesy nei Principati (1863-1864),* in "Quaderni della Casa Romena di Venezia", 2 (2002), a cura di Ion Bulei, Şerban Marin, Rudolf Dinu, Bucureşti, Casa Editrice Enciclopedica, 2003.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BALKAN COMMITTEE IN LONDON FOR THE DEFINITION OF THE BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION, 1903-1908

Aleksandar Spirkovski[*]

Abstract
The members of the Balkan Committee, founded in London, exerted significant political and public influence in Britain, concerning the possible resolution of the Macedonian Question, in the years after the great Ilinden Uprising of 1903. They sought reforms in the concordance with the Treaty of Berlin, organising rallies, publishing articles, submitting resolutions to the Parliament and the Foreign Office. Had an outmost importance in the shaping of the proposals suggested by Lord Lansdowne and the programme initiated by Sir Grey in 1908, culminating with the Reval meeting of the British and Russian Majesties, in June 1908.

Key words: *Balkan Committee, Reforms, Public Awareness, Reval Meeting, Young Turks*

The activity of the Balkan Committee in London had an exquisite significance in the definition of British policy towards the Macedonian Question, in raising awareness about the issue and thus creating political pressure and presentations in London, in the specific period. Composed of British intellectuals, publishers, journalists and writers, as Bryce, an MP, Lord Buxton, H.N. Brailsford, O' Conor etc., as well as Church notables as the Archbishop of Canterbury himself and a number of Bishops, its activity became prominently visible in the period following the Ilinden uprising, and especially through the undertaken humanitarian actions and the foundation of the Relief Fund for the victims in Macedonia. It had demonstrated an incredible activity to attract the public attention to the atrocities taking place in Macedonia, and even further, to exert sufficient influence on the domestic Government in order to provide the Macedonian population with prosperity by demanding a committed reformation of the province, under the direct auspices of the European powers. In this sense, the Committee organised a number of political gatherings and rallies, making speeches and demands, adopting resolutions and publish proclamations in the newspapers. At one of these assemblies, held in London, in September 1903 and dedicated to the situation in Macedonia, the Archbishop

---

[*] Macedonian diplomat, PhD degree in Politicals Sciences, from the University of Bucharest, Faculty of Political Sciences. E-mail:aspirkoski@aim.com

and the other notables openly demanded that the Government bear down the influence of all civilised forces of Europe in order to stop the tyranny and sufferings of both the Christian and Muslim population of all concerned parts of Macedonia. The speakers asked for something far more than the Austro-Russian plan, a strife for decisive reforms undertaken under a governor responsible to Europe instead to the Sultan, as a main precondition for achieving a practical emancipation of the Macedonians. The policy of Mr. Gladstone was praised in this sense. Bryce, in the capacity of a member of the Parliament expressed the belief that no effective reforms could have been implemented by the Ottoman Government and evoked the British Government to act out of sympathy and Christian solidarity.[1] The Balkan Committee had previously even issued a manifesto on the Macedonian question, signed by James Bryce, MP, and Sir Noel Buxton at a gathering event in Birmingham, calling upon the responsibility and inactivity of the European powers regarding the atrocities that had taken place in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula. In continuation, they had also stressed the role of England in any further attempts to intervene in favour of the Macedonian and to put an end to the massacres of the Christians.[2] Perceiving such a harsh reality, the media further informed about the British course of policy, found between the disinterest of direct involvement, rather in supporting the scheme, already introduced by Russia and Austria- Hungary in February 1903, and the pressure imposed by the progressive British civil and intellectual dimension, as represented, in this case, by the presentations made by the Balkan Committee, pushing forward a reaction from the Government. While keeping in mind that the Great Powers had also joined the British efforts in supporting the Austro-Russian programme, the Balkan Committee was asking Balfour to demand a joint effort from France and Italy resulting into a coercive action against the excessive Ottoman actions in Macedonia, preparing the ground for a European control. In response, Foreign Secretary Balfour, remaining coherent to the previous stances, replied in the aforementioned fashion of perceiving the affairs in respect to the difference in race and religion and the course of action of continuing support for Russia and Austria. Furthermore, in his reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as a firm supporter of the Balkan Committee, Balfour also stated that the Revolutionary Committee could not receive support; therefore, their actions had not been morally tolerable.[3]

---

[1] British Library, "The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser", 30th of September 1903.
[2] British Library, "The Citizen", 18th of September 1903.
[3] British Library, "North Devon Journal", 1st of October 1903.

Hence, a few points come forth – that the Government perceives the necessity of explaining itself about the policy of non-interference regarding the Macedonian Question under the decisive pressure by the Balkan Committee. Also, in relation to the address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, it perceives the necessity to express the concern about the welfare of the Christian population; and thirdly to further argument the policy of non-interference, primarily due to the interest of the other Powers and the already direct political involvement of Austria and Russia.

Nevertheless, in the same period, as the civil actions against the atrocities in Macedonia were frequently taking place, the media increased more public attention to the subject, reporting in details about the events and the political influence exerted. For instance, there was a humanitarian action and civil assembly, organised by the Mayor of Derby, in Derby, in October 1903, with the purpose of protesting against the Turkish misrule and sufferings in Macedonia. According to the media, apart from the Mayor and the Bishop of Derby, the event was also attended by a number of Parliament members, town notables, as well as by Mr. Lazarovich, President of the Joint Balkan Committee in London. The local newspaper reported the general messages of the speakers, as they recognised the genuine nature of the insurrection as a Macedonian strife for freedom, justified by the harsh misrule, but also evoking directly – the responsibility of England in the matter, as a main solicitor of the Treaty of Berlin, an act disrespected by the Ottoman authorities. More specifically, it also reported the messages of the Mayor of Derby, who had the interference of Britain in the matter a quarter of a century earlier, when Russia had defeated Turkey, preventing the Treaty of San Stefano and inducing the Treaty of Berlin. While he justified the incumbent Prime minister for his deeds, the mayor stressed that by doing so, Britain had defined terms for better Government of Macedonia, which had never been carried out. Hence Macedonia waited for twenty five years in vain, while the then current Government should have been encouraged to decisively deal with this situation, strengthened by the wide public support of Derby and the other British towns.[1] And furthermore, the speech of Mr. Lazarovich, given at the same rally, outlining the main revolutionary goals of the Macedonian insurrection, condemned the imperialistic propagandas of the neighbouring countries of Macedonia, noting that:

"…Macedonia did not desire to become Bulgarian, she did not want to become Greek, and a still greater calamity would it be for her to fall into the hands of Russia or Austria or Germany. (Aplause.)… What Macedonia wanted

---

[1] British Library, "The Derby Daily Telegraph", 20th of October 1903.

was an autonomous government with a Christian governor, under European control...[1]

E. Lazarovitch, who was personally familiar with the state of the affairs, stated that Germany had been a firm supporter of the Ottoman Government, because it had pursued the markets of the East, and while Russia was unwanted in Macedonia, it remained to the British nation and Government to stand against the Turkish yoke and demand liberty for the Macedonians.[2]

Another example of an event attracting the media attention, and again in the same manner, evoking the British Government to action and considering its directly responsible for the Macedonian affairs, was the lecture of one Reverend R.F. Garbett, titled "Crisis in Macedonia", given at the Portsea Parish Institute, in December 1903, where he justified the rise of the Macedonian insurrection, and again calls upon the undertaken responsibility of England in the entire matter. Furthermore, he explained that the Christian population in Macedonia had been asking for nothing more than what it had been promised – not to be granted independence but a Christian Governor. At the end, Lazarovitch proposed that England should have led the initiative of the European Powers for organising a naval demonstration, witnessing the cruelties taking place in Macedonia, a step that would have convinced the Sultan in the seriousness of their intentions.[3]

Since we have already mentioned the contribution of the British press in the actualization of the Macedonian Question, addressing the public attention – with an emphasis on "The Times", still another thing must not remain unnoticed – the intellectual response, the significance and meaning of the British intellectuals, functionaries, journalists, politicians – in the form of loud and clear support for an eminent resolution of the Macedonian Question, in the light of the events following the Ilinden Uprising. There were declarations addressed, gatherings organized – in the sign of relief of the suffering, seeing the atrocities and taking firm action.

One event presented itself as a clear example is presented in this respect – a Public Meeting to Protect against Massacres in Macedonia and in Aid of the Sufferers, which took place in Leicester, on 1st of December 1903. First, the press proclamation had clearly shown an involvement of well known British notables, such as the Archbishop of Dublin, MP-s as Redmond, Russell, Law etc, with the intention of gathering a relief fund for the sufferers of Macedonia.[4]

The Resolution adopted upon the meeting, directly addressed the Foreign Secretary of the State, the Marquis of Lansdowne, expressing the

---

[1] *Ibidem.*

[2] *Ibidem.*

[3] "The Evening News", 7th of December 1903.

[4] PRO Reference No. FO 78-5289.

highest form of indignation about the atrocities that had taken place in Macedonia, and urging its own Government to impose moral influence on the Sultan, in accordance with the rest of the Great Powers, in order to cease these forms of violence.[1]

Eugene Lazarovich also defined a Twelve Points programme, elaborating the model of political autonomy for Macedonia, and addressed to the British Embassy in Constantinople, the Porte and other European Powers. The programme stipulated the political objectives towards gaining political autonomy of the vilayets comprising the territory of Macedonia, Albania, Old Servia and Adrianople – as four autonomous provinces under political and military rule of the Sultan (Article 1-2); The following articles define the limitations of the Ottoman authority in the autonomous provinces – and prescribed that a High Commissioner of European origin should be designated to the four provinces, conducting a reformative international body of police, while each province would be administered by a Governor – General of European origin, and each province would be reformed by a special Commission – assisted by native representatives, in consent with the Porte, while the Sultan would preserve the right to military protection of the borders, but was not to interfere in the interior affairs (Articles 3-6). Furthermore, while providing that the Commission would be in-charge of the interior administration and of the formation of army corps – consisting of neutral European officers and men, in-charge of the interior affairs, while the Sultan would withdraw the troops, save the ones protecting the borders. In return the Sultan would preserve his rights and obligations concerning the railways and the Ottoman debt – supported and contributed by the four provinces (Article 7-12).[2] Such action by the Committee is an effort towards introducing and widely disseminating the political goals among the European, and in this specific case, British public, and to present the project of the autonomy in a modern, acceptable manner, and in a further prospect of preserving the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in compliance with the British strategic interest, which, in itself, indicated the recognition of the power of the public opinion in the policy formation. As such, this announcement presents a genuine diplomatic attempt, regardless of any other political aspects. It is also very important that the Committee was publishing a standard newspaper in London, called "L'Autonomie", in a bi-lingual – English and French edition, always propagating the aforementioned project of autonomy of the European provinces of the Ottoman Empire. In an egalitarian manner, the organ would promote the project of autonomy, without any hesitation or hidden agenda, politically

---

[1] *Ibidem.*
[2] Telegram from Sir N. O'Conor to the Marquess of Lansdowne, Constantinople, on 10th of September 1903, reference No. FO 78-5289.

discussing the proposals of Sir William Gladstone as the most mature ones regarding the autonomy of Macedonia, regarding him the first British man promoting the concept of "Macedonia for the Macedonians". The newspaper interpreted this concept in a manner of wisdom and epiphany, explaining that the knowledge of Gladstone of the ethological problems in this very specific part of South- Eastern Europe was persistent and sufficient, aware of the difficulties lying ahead. It emphasised that Gladstone had not been resorting to the idea of reviving San Stefano and annexing Macedonia to Bulgaria, but rather, to granting a special form of autonomy to Macedonia:

"...It is known also that Mr. Gladstone was not favourable to the wholesale annexation of Macedonia to Bulgaria, contemplated by the San Stefano Treaty... but preferred that the immediate necessities of the case should be met by the separate treatment of Macedonia on the basis of autonomy, leaving the ultimate solution to the operations of nature and time".[1]

In continuation, as the project of the Macedonian autonomy was further promoted, in the writings of the newspaper, the Macedonians were always addressed as a separate entity, in a constitutional sense, as referred to "Macedonian Committee", "Macedonians meet...", "Macedonian revolutionists" etc. Moreover, the organ constantly informed the British and European public in general about the outrages committed to the Macedonian population under the Ottoman rule, regardless if they were instigated by individuals, gangs or official representatives of the Ottoman authorities, as well as about the activities of the revolutionary committees and the heroic deeds of certain individuals[2], as the imprisonment and exodus of Damjan Groueff – one of the founders of IMRO – to Asia Minor.[3]

The proposal asserted in the twelve points was consistent with the decisions stipulated in the Treaty of Berlin and imposed the project that reflected an autonomous status within the Empire, rather than political independence, due to the recognition of the interests of the Great Powers.

As discussed above, due to its adherence to the principles, and the basic sympathy for the sufferings caused by the insurrection, the Relief Society resumed an honorary position, as a civil association directly involved in the humanitarian missions in Macedonia, offering help, support and raising a political voice, referring to the difficulties. The Relief Society had been established by the Balkan Committee, as a form of direct humanitarian aid aimed to the victims of the long lasting reprisals in Macedonia. The relief mission in Macedonia, undertaken by the Society in 1903, in the direct aftermath of the Ilinden Uprising, was led by the above mentioned publicist,

---

[1] "L'Autonomie", 10th of May to 15th of July 1902, British Museum Microfilm Service, London.
[2] *Ibidem.*
[3] *Ibidem.*

journalist and writer Henry Noel Brailsford, along with his wife. Foreign Secretary Lansdowne himself had been informed about their relief mission, announcing their arrival to the Embassy in Constantinople. Further, Lansdowne explained that together with Mr. Buxton, the head of the Balkan Committee had been working on a plan of concealing the nature of the Society as purely humanitarian, in order to avoid any suspicion or impediments by the Ottoman authorities. Lansdowne had not been benevolent to the proposal of granting direct consular protection to the envisaged humanitarian camps of the Society, as he presumed it would have meant a direct political involvement, but he reassured Buxton about the readiness to undertake additional steps in the direction of guarantying the protection of the camps.[1]

At the sign of formation of a Relief Fund, conducted by Mr. Buxton – a prominent member and president of the main advocate of the Macedonian Question in London – the Balkan Committee, which intended to distribute a humanitarian relief to the refugees and the other distressed persons in Macedonia, the Porte reacted promptly and the Turkish Ambassador in London swiftly presented concerns regarding such a development of the events, claiming that it would only encourage the brigands to stir new disturbances. However, there was a firm response – that the Ottoman Government did not appear able to handle such humanitarian challenges, and what is more, it should provide protection for the altruistically displayed efforts by the Fund.[2] Regarding the further activities of the Relief Society, like the distribution of the relief resources and the conditions in the refugee camps, the consular sources were sufficiently informative, especially about the undertaken humanitarian actions in the most distressed region – the Bitola vilayet. The Vilayet was divided in nine districts with humanitarian depots: Monastir, Resna, Okhrida, Klissura, Kastoria, Biglishta, Kyrchevo and Krushevo. Each of the depots were managed by a member of the Society, including Mr. and Mrs. Brailsford and members of the American protestant missions in Macedonia. The depots were successful in disseminating and processing a significant amount of humanitarian aid – blankets, flour, and even medical care – within the improvised hospital by Brailsford in Ohrid, treating the people of infectious diseases such as small pox, and helping the suffering civilians in the areas, beside, as McGregor reports, evident discontent among the Muslim population and the hostile conduct of the Greek Metropolitan of Bitola, Karavangelis,

---

[1] Telegram from the Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Conor to, No. 290, Foreign Office, 14th of October 1903, reference No. FO 78-5263.
[2] Telegram from the Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Conor to, No. 291, Foreign Office, 14th of October 1903, reference No. FO 78-5263.

interpreting the humanitarian action as violation of his diocese.[1] While the Relief Society initiated and managed to collect financial donations of various sources: such as eighty thousands francs from Bulgaria, approximate five thousand British pounds, two hundred pounds from the Slav Benevolent Society from Odessa and one thousand dollars gathered in the United States, the Greek Bishop of Bitola was constantly submitting complaints to Hilmi Pasha, due to the involvement of the Bulgarian Bishops in the entire matter, interpreting such actions as an invasion of the Greek dioceses.[2]

Another of Brailsford's accomplishments was the publishing of the book "Macedonia – Its Races and Their Future", immediately after his returning in England, in 1903. This book represented a tremendous effort to perceive the essential problems of the Macedonian affairs, and asserted conclusions that will oppose the overwhelming British perception about the prevailing Bulgarian character of the people in Macedonia, namely recognising the core political struggle of the Internal Organisation in order to establish a separate Macedonian state – distinguished from any further Bulgarian submission. Furthermore, as one of the basic postulates of the activity of the Balkan Committee, it held the British policy directly responsible for the current state of the Macedonian affairs, as one of the responsible parties for the advocacy and the fulfilment of the undertaken obligations in the Treaty of Berlin, especially after failing to support the Russian proposals for autonomy of all Slav provinces under Ottoman rule, as presented at the Constantinople conference in 1876.[3]

The members of the Committee also issued a Manifesto, published in the British media, about the situation in Macedonia and the unwillingness of the Ottoman Government to implement the Murzsteg programme, serving as a warning to the European Powers. The manifesto openly declared dissatisfaction with the implementation of the reforms, due to the unwillingness of the Ottoman Government to accept any substantive changes. The text also warned that the Revolutionary committee had not been crushed, and if Europe continued to manifest indifference until the bloodshed repeated, the insurgents would had all the motives to continue fighting in the forthcoming period.[4] To understand the political significance of the Balkan Committee, especially in the view of influencing the British position towards the Macedonian question, it

---

[1] Telegram from the Vice Consul James McGregor to Her Majesty's Consul General in Salonica, R.W. Graves, No. 157, Monastir (Bitola), 9th of December 1903, reference No. FO 195-2157.

[2] Telegram from the Vice Consul James McGregor to Her Majesty's Consul General in Salonica, R.W. Graves, No. 157, Monastir (Bitola), 9th of December 1903, reference No. FO 195-2157.

[3] H.N. Brailsford, *Macedonia, Its Races and Their Future*, Methuen & Co, London, first published 1906, republished 1971, p. 334.

[4] Macedonia – Strong Manifesto by experts, Public Record Office 293, Reference No. FO 78-5355.

must be emphasised that the British Ambassador to the Porte at the time, Sir Nicholas O'Conor had was prone to the activities and political goals of the Committee, right on the contrary. Brought up in adherence with his firm unionist belief, he showed resentment towards the separatist national movement, as the Macedonian and the Armenian can be described in the terms of the Ottoman Empire, and such criticism was reflected in his consideration regarding the Balkan Committee as well. When the turmoil in Macedonian has culminated with the emergence of the uprising in 1903, and the Ambassador was called upon by the Sultan in order for an explanation of the activities of the Committee to be given, especially in the view of their supports and the public campaign against the actions of the Porte, O'Conor consented with the Sultan about the "misleading" activities of the Committee and even expressed an assurance that the British Government would enlighten Bryce and the rest of the members about the true nature of the affairs in Macedonia, in order to revert their opinion.[1] In such additional circumstances, when even the British official accredited to the Porte was unsupportive, the Committee had managed to influence the policy of Sir Edward Grey.

As far as the president of the Committee, Mr. Noel Buxton, is concerned, he also continued to address Lord Lansdowne and the Government in terms of imposing even greater political pressure on the implementation of the reforms as presented in the specific programme, and while forwarding the demands made by the Macedonian revolutionaries, he received a response by the Foreign Office in the diplomatic manner. More specifically, Lansdowne attempted to assure Buxton that, although the disappointments regarding the execution of the Murzsteg scheme were present, the successfulness of the plan depended on the mutual action of all interested Powers, and that the British Government could not be independent from their stances, and all diplomatic decisions had to be made with reference to the other Powers.[2] At this point it was clear that the Foreign Secretary attempted to refocus the pressure of the Balkan Committee to the real obstacles related to the failures of the reforms. And the Committee was not ignorant to the matters, maintaining awareness about the interdependent actions necessary for such ambitious projects to be carried away. In the years to come, their approach manifested their awareness. The Porte was adherently vigilant about the activities of the Balkan Committee, being aware of the political leverage of their membership, as the Embassy in London paid special attention to the proclamations of the Committee, outlining Mr. Buxton and the affiliating members of the Parliament, in their calls of

---

[1] John Burman, *Britain's Relations with the Ottoman Empire During the Embassy of Sir Nicholas O'Conor to the Porte, 1898-1908*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 2010, p. 214.
[2] Draft telegram of the Foreign Office to Mr. Buxton, London, 2nd of May 1904, Public Record Office 293, Reference No. FO 78-5355.

introduction of a Christian Governor of Macedonia, legitimized by the Great Powers. In this respect, the personal contacts and the detachments of the Committee members to Sir Grey were especially dealt with and reported.[1]

After the policy of Sir Edward Grey had came to place in 1906, the Balkan Committee continued their policy more consistently than ever, perceiving a ripe time for achieving more significant progress on the matter, with the fresh vigilance of the new Foreign Secretary. The Committee had continued to organise gatherings, to call meetings and conferences and issue resolutions on the affairs in Macedonia, before the programme of Sir Gray was put in place, and in this respect, enhanced the public opinion on the issue. In January 1908, the Committee called upon a conference in the Westminster Palace, resulting with three resolutions on the Macedonian question, and a necessity of reforms, addressing the British Government and the Foreign Office. The first resolution presented the fact that the Murzsteg programme had proved its inefficiency, hence, during the period of five years since its introduction, the outrages in Macedonia had continued, resulting with more than ten thousand violent deaths within a population estimated of approximately one and a half million. The second resolution called to immediate transference of all executive control in Macedonia, both civilian and military, to the Financial Commission, which was to be responsible exclusively to the Great Powers. Furthermore, the resolution expressed disappointment that the successor of Lansdowne had failed to proceed with the policy of imposing this projection to the initiating sides, Russia and Austro-Hungary, whose failure had extended for the five years period. The resolution, thereof, called for a decisive and unambiguous execution of Lord Lansdowne's European executive control proposal of 1905. Finally, the third resolution certified the fact that copies of the resolution had been dispatched to the Prime minister, Foreign Secretary and the Committees of both houses of the Parliament, demanding energetic action on the matter.[2]

Furthermore, the actions and personal efforts of the members of the Balkan Committee triggered a number of similar gatherings and adoption of resolutions, directly addressing the Foreign Office about the intolerance of the situations in Macedonia, and urging a decisive response: first, it was the Woolwich Tabernacle Men's own Brotherhood and their resolution of February

---

[1] Musurus Pasha to Tevfik Pasha, No. 230, London, 10th of July 1907, Sinan Kuneralp, Gul Tokay, editors, *Ottoman Documents on the Origin of World War One, The Macedonian Issue 1879-1912*, Part II *1905-1912*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 2011, p. 205.
[2] Balkan Committee to Sir Edward Grey, London, January 31st 1908, reference No. FO 371/536.

1908[1]; second a resolution adopted at the meeting of the Lidget Green Liberal Club from Bradford, addressed on the same date[2], evoking the responsibility of England for the situation in Macedonia upon the restoration of the Turkish rule with the Treaty of Berlin; third, the address of the Deptford's Women Liberal Association in mid – February 1908[3]; then, the resolution of the Young British Liberal Society of Bradford, demanding decisive response on behalf of the Government regarding restoration of the peace and tranquillity in Macedonia, in consistence with the agreements made with the other Powers.[4] Actions of this nature significantly influenced the decisiveness of the steps that followed, resulting with the proposition of the Foreign Secretary Grey in March 1908, asserting the idea of establishing a Governor in Macedonia and strengthening the authority of the Inspector General and the Financial Commission. In this reference, the Balkan Committee proved their political consistency. First by expressing their gratitude to Sir Grey for the undertaken action addressing the reforms in Macedonia, by sending an open letter, addressed to the Foreign Office and the media as well.[5] Then, they sought further political support from the British Parliament, in order to ensure the effectives of the undertaken policy and to ease the conduction of Sir Grey's foreign policy on the matter. In this instance, their effort resulted with an adoption of a Statement, signed by one hundred and eight members of the House of Commons, in April 1908. The Statement expressed their satisfaction with the decisive policy of Sir Edward Grey of pressurizing the countries of the Concert of Europe in the direction of appointing Governor of Macedonia, with terms under the consent of the Powers. Moreover, the parliamentarians affirmed that the presented proposals only presented the minimum of the required reforms, and warned that the inactivity of the Concert on this issue could lead to its own perish.[6]

Their activity had also a necessary media exposure, which was required in the context of recruiting the public opinion on the Macedonian matter. Their policy had eventually encouraged the presentation of the Macedonian question at the meeting in Reval, between the British king, Edward and the Russian Tsar,

---

[1] Woolwich Tabernacle Men's Own Brotherhood to the Foreign Office, no. 4953 from 12th of February 1908, London, reference No. FO 371/536.

[2] Lidget Green Liberal Club to Sir Edward Grey, no. 5145, London, 12th of February 1908, reference No. FO 371/536.

[3] Deptford Women Liberal Association to Foreign Office, no. 5357, London, Public Record Office reference no. FO 371/536.

[4] Bradford Young British Liberal Society to Sir Edward Grey, no. 5358, London, 15th of February 1908, Public Record Office, reference no. FO 371/536.

[5] Resolution of the Balkan Committee to Sir Edward Grey, no.12387, London, 10th of April 1908, Public Record Office, reference no. FO 371/536.

[6] Statement of the Members of House of Commons, no. 12491, London, 11th of April 1908, Public Record Office, reference no. FO 371/536.

Nicholas, in early June 1908. Presumably, the meeting had a much larger perspective and was projected by Sir Edward Grey in the direction of concluding the entente between the three countries: Britain, Russia and France[1] towards forming a solid bulwark against the growing German predominance in Europe, which was also very tangible in the Middle East and, of course, Turkey. In this respect, the Macedonian question had been only a premise in the projected convergence of the two powers, a line of connection and understanding. The immediate alliance was required in the context of the Near East, since even Austria had presented its appetite of extending its sphere of influence in Macedonia, by building a railway[2] in Novi Pazar. The two emperors used the opportunity in Reval, of urging the required reforms in Macedonia, planning to impose to the Porte the afore-mentioned projection of introducing a Governor, responsible to the Great Powers. However, the Committee of Union and Progress, being aware of such large – scale diplomatic actions that had taken place, due to caution of possible repercussions in respect of Macedonia, since the news about the new entante circulated around Europe very fast[3], urged the commencing of the Young Turks revolution only a month later, in July 1908. In this instance, the Reval meeting might have had a significant historical role in the constituency of a presupposed future Macedonian autonomy; however, its possible outcome was prevented by the Committee of Union and Progress.

The progressive and predominantly liberal British political force, and in this respect, the Balkan Committee supported the effort of the Young Turks and had greeted their determination to stop the bloodshed and terror in Macedonia once and for all.[4] This was true, because Macedonia had been utilized as base of operations for the Young Turks movement, and the revolution commenced in Bitola. For the purpose of success, the Young Turks Committee of Progress and Union had used the activity scheme of the Macedonian Revolutionary Committee itself, and their demand of restitution of the 1876 Constitution in Turkey was praised and celebrated by all nationalities of the Empire, especially in Macedonia. Niazi Bay, the young Turkish officer who was to become an outlaw, and raise the banner of revolt in the town of Resna, Macedonia, had addressed a proclamation to all Christian subjects of the Empire, declaring a new era of equality of all people, blaming the incumbent Government about the

---

[1] Oron James Hale, *Publicity and Diplomacy: With Special Reference to England and Germany, 1890-1914*, D. Appleton-Century, New York, 1940, p. 310.
[2] Robert Gildea, *Barricades and Borders: Europe 1800-1914*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 402.
[3] Hanioĝlu, M. Şükrü, *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908*, New York, 2001, p. 237.
[4] British Library, The Devon and Exeter Gazette, Exeter, 28th of October 1908.

intolerable state of existence in the Empire.[1] In this sense, after the revolution had finally succeeded and the parliamentarian democracy had been introduced in the Empire in conciliation with the rule of the Sultan, the new state of affairs was praised by the members of the Balkan Committee, who believed that the Macedonian question had finally found its best manner of resolution, within the interior framework of the Ottoman Empire. Members of the Committee, such as Charles Buxton, travelled through Macedonia and the Empire in 1908, in order to convince themselves about the positive changes and the reformation of the country. In September 1908, his brother, Noel Buxton, another prominent British Liberal and member of the Committee, even asserted the Internal Organisation that the Macedonian Christians would be expected to demonstrate their loyalty to the constitution and the Committee of Union and Progress, as a prevention, in case that Bulgaria seized the opportunity of waging a war on the weakened Ottoman military forces.[2]

The process of demilitarization was accomplished, and in this respect, these aspirations, long demanded and agitated by the British foreign policy, as well as the liberal elements culminated with the Reval meeting were achieved. Recognising that there was no need for further intervention, the Reval project was abandoned[3], and the British advocates of peace in Macedonia, the Balkan Committee included, felt that their ultimate objective had become a reality. Furthermore, the Macedonians proved their loyalty to the Young Turks even later, during the efforts undertaken towards the suppression of the counter-revolution, led by the regressive elements, loyal to the Sultan Abdul Hamid. Again, Macedonia was the base for the responsive military forces, led by Niazi and Enver Bay, and a lot of Macedonian volunteers, including the combatants of prominent Macedonian revolutionary leaders, as Sandansky and Panitza, joined the ranks of the Ottoman troops and marched together on Constantinople, in order to reclaim it. Such efforts were recognised by British authors of the period, describing the revolutionary force marching on Constantinople as the Macedonian garrisons, and affirming the Macedonian loyalty to the Young Turks[4], as well as recognising and acknowledging the German discomfort with the new regime, since the entire concept of German – Turkish allegiance had been based on the support of Abdul Hamid's authoritarianism.

---

[1] Charles Roden Buxton, *Turkey in Revolution*, London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1909, p. 58.
[2] Douglas Dakin, *The Greek Struggle in Macedonia, 1897-1913*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1966, p. 399.
[3] E.F. Knight, *The Awakening of Turkey – A History of the Turkish Revolution*, Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott Company, London, John Milne, 1909, p. 249.
[4] *Ibidem*, p. 339-340.

So, in this respect, the members of the Balkan Committee shared a common enthusiasm about the state of affairs in Macedonia after the revolution of 1908. Nevertheless, some of them, as the aforementioned Sir Charles Buxton, following his visit to Macedonia, right after the revolution, also expressed a certain extent of scepticism on the matter of substantive changes that the revolutionary Government had been ready to introduce. Primarily, although a significant scale of civil rights had been implemented, concerning not only the Christians, but other non-Muslin confessions as well, still no word of administrative autonomy of any part or portion of the Empire was ever legally defined. Buxton himself ascertained the challenges lying ahead, for the revolution to be successful, as the long years of social backwardness had taken its toll. The failure to completely reform the administrative apparatus and the judicial courts, to deal with the deeply rooted corruption or even the challenge of sustaining the granted political rights to the Christians had been some of these concerns[1], duly to the orthodox Turkish views of stagnance, unwillingness to introduce fundamental changes, especially as far as the liberties of the other religious entities in the Empire were concerned, originating from the centuries-long tradition of misbelieve and distrust in the ones different than the Ottomans, especially the Christians.[2] In a long-term view, these sceptical thoughts proved to be correct.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Sources:

Brailsford, H.N., *Macedonia, Its Races and Their Future*, Methuen & Co, London, first published 1906, republished 1971

British Library Newspapers Archive (*"The Evening News", "The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser", "The Citizen", "North Devon Journal", "The Derby Daily Telegraph", "The Devon and Exeter Gazette"*)

British Museum Microfilm Service, London (*L'Autonomie*)

Burman, John, *Britain's Relations with the Ottoman Empire During the Embassy of Sir Nicholas O'Conor to the Porte, 1898-1908*, The Isis Press, Istanbul, 2010

Buxton, Charles Roden, *Turkey in Revolution*, T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1909

Dakin, Douglas, *The Greek Struggle in Macedonia, 1897-1913*, Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki, 1966

Gildea, Robert, Barricades and Borders:Europe 1800-1914, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996

---

[1] Charles Roden Buxton, *Turkey in Revolution*, London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1909, p. 260-263.
[2] *Ibidem*, p. 248-249.

Hale, Oron James, *Publicity and Diplomacy: With Special Reference to England and Germany, 1890-1914*, D. Appleton-Century, New York, 1940

Hanioĝlu, M. Şükrü, *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908*, New York, 2001

Knight, E.F., *The Awakening of Turkey – A History of the Turkish Revolution*, J.B.Lippincott Company, Philadelhia, John Milne, London, 1909

Kuneralp, Sinan, Tokay, Gul, Editors, *Ottoman Documents on the Origin of World War One, The Macedonian Issue 1879-1912, Part II 1905-1912*, The Isis Press, Istanbul, 2011

Public Record Office, London (*Reg. No. FO 78-5289, FO 78-5263, FO 78-5355, FO 195-2157, FO 371/536*)

THE CHURCH DEDICATED TO THE "PRESENTATION"
FROM ROŞIUŢA – MOTRU

Dumitru-Valentin Pătraşcu[*]

Abstract

The present study is based on a series of unpublished documents belonging to the Roşiuţa parish archive, as well as on documents recently added to the document collection of the "*Alexandru Ştefulescu*" Gorj County Museum from Tg-Jiu. All these documents, combined with the field research, allowed us to try to outline as truthfully as possible the story of the Roşiuţa village church, an area which is now included within the territory of the Motru municipality.

The construction of the Roşiuţa wall church was initiated in the timeframe 1910-1911 by an initiative committee founded even since 1896, a significant role in its appearance being played by Architect Statie Ciortan, originated in the Roşiuţa village. This initiative was later joined by priests Grigore Roşieţeanu and Alexandru Ciortan, by numerous local people, as well as by Professor Teodor Costescu, former prefect of the Mehedinţi County, and Dincă Schileru, Gorj deputy in the Parliament of Romania.

Key words: *Statie Ciortan*, *Church*, *Roşiuţa Village*, *Architect*, *Restoration*

The present study is based on a series of unpublished documents regarding the initiative to rebuild the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from Roşiuţa, part of the Motru municipality, Gorj County. The cited documents entered the patrimony of the "*Alexandru Ştefulescu*" Gorj County Museum from Targu-Jiu in July 2013, when they were donated by Mr. Mihai Osnaga, originated in the Roşiuţa village.

Thus, during the year 1896, the village of Roşiuţa, commune of Roşiuţa, Mehedinţi County, witnessed the foundation of a committee for the reconstruction of the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*". This committee's head was Mr. Gheorghe Ciortan.[1] Deputy head of the committee was Mr. I.D. Băcescu and the members included: Priest Grigore Roşieţeanu, Constantin Pârvulescu, Vasile Băcescu, Alexandru Ciortan, Gheorghe C. Vasilescu, I.I. Ciortan, I.C. Băcescu, Constantin Croitoru, I.M. Bobic, Grigore Pârlea, R. Osnaga and Gheorghe Prodan.[2]

---

[*] History PhD, The "*Alexandru Ştefulescu*" Gorj County Museum from Tg-Jiu, Geneva Street, no. 8, tel. 0760825135, e-mail: valentinpatrascu83@yahoo.com
[1] Document Collection from the "*Alexandru Ştefulescu*" Gorj County Museum from Tg-Jiu, doc. inv. no. 26 151.
[2] *Ibidem*.

As a result of the decease of the first committee's head for the reconstruction of the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from the Roşiuţa village, in 1901 the committee self-dissolved.[1]

Later on, during the year 1907, a new committee was formed, headed by Mr. Constantin Pârvulescu and having as deputy head Mr. Gheorghe C. Vasilescu and Mr. Constantin Croitoru.[2] Architect Statie Gh. Ciortan was appointed censor of the initiative committee, the cashier position was assigned to Năstase Călieanu, while among the members were included: Priest Grigore Roşieţeanu, I.D. Băcescu, Alexandru Ciortan and M. Mihart.[3]

In a letter addressed by the committee's head, Mr. Constantin Pârvulescu, to Mr. Ion V. Osnaga, from the Roşiuţa commune, Mehedinţi County and dated March 1910, he declared: "*With a heart full of desire for the achieving everyone's dream, the committee (...) made all efforts in order to raise the necessary sums, acting in full observance of the rules, as each person can rest assured regarding the way the donations you may warm-heartedly agree to make will be used*".[4]

Through this letter, Mr. Ion V. Osnaga was announced that, following the village gatherings on 26 October 1909 and 3 January 1910, it was ascertained by Mr. Statie Ciortan, within the village gathering on January 1910, that "*we have secured the funds for constructing the church in the amount of 928 Lei and 70 Bani, deposited at the C.E.C. institution*"[5], as well as the sum of 4 349 Lei and 10 Bani deposited at the "*Bujorăscu*" People Bank from the Roşiuţa commune, Mehedinţi County.[6] As a result, in March 1910, the committee held a total amount of 5 277 Lei and 80 Bani[7] for the reconstruction of the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from the Roşiuţa commune.

In the aforementioned letter's ending, Mr. Constantin Pârvulescu expressed his conviction that "*considering the products which are currently gathered could lead to an amount of up to 2 500 Lei (...) relying on (...) the support which you will warm-heartedly give henceforth, it has been irrevocably decided that the works should definitely start in the spring of the current year*".[8] As a result, "*for this reason, the Administration of the Church House has been requested to approve the designs, executed and offered to the community by Mr.*

---

[1] *Ibidem.*
[2] *Ibidem.*
[3] *Ibidem.*
[4] *Ibidem.*
[5] *Ibidem.*
[6] *Ibidem.*
[7] *Ibidem.*
[8] *Ibidem.*

Architect Ciortan, our fellow villager, as well as to issue the authorization to start the works".[1]

At the end of the letter, the committee's head, Mr. Constantin Pârvulescu, stated that "*we would like to strongly thank to the initiators of this enlightening feeling endeavor, as well as to all your lordships who, so kindly and whole-heartedly, contribute to the timely construction of the greatest building our commune has ever had*".[2]

In January 1910, on the expense of Architect Statie Ciortan, the list of all the 150 inhabitants of the Roşiuţa commune who had undertaken to donate money for the reconstruction of the village church, also comprising the amount of money each had offered for the reconstruction of the locality's church dedicated to the "*Presentation*", donations which had been undertaken during the village gatherings of October 26, 1909 and January 3, 1910.

The total amount of money which was supposed to be donated by the 159 inhabitants of the Roşiuţa commune reached a total of 16 680 Lei[3], as Architect Statie Gh. Ciortan donated 1 000 Lei, while Priest Grigore Roşieţeanu and primary school teacher Ion D. Băcescu each donated 500 Lei for the reconstruction of the Roşiuţa church.[4]

Primary school teacher Mihail Gh. Ciortan, Vasile Gh. Ciortan, Ion M. Bobic, Mihail N. Mihart and Anastasie Călieanu each undertook to contribute with 400 Lei for the reconstruction of the Roşiuţa church.[5]

Important sums of money were also to be donated by: Constantin Pârvulescu, Vasile T. Băcescu, Ion I. Ciortan, Constantin Croitoru, Gheorghe C. Vasilescu and Ioniţă C. Băcescu, each of them undertaking to donate 300 Lei for the church reconstruction.[6]

Grigore Menţianu and Gheorghe V. Osnaga undertook to contribute with 250 Lei each for the church reconstruction while Alexandru V. Băcescu, "*CFR clerk*"[7], Drăgostin Băcescu, Constantin Vasilescu, Alexandru I. Ciortan, Maria Gh. Ciortan, Mihail Vasilescu I, Mihail Vasilescu II, Grigore C. Vasilescu, Constantin Osnaga, Grigore Pârlea and Răducan Osnaga committed themselves to contribute each with 200 Lei for the reconstruction of the Roşiuţa church.[8]

Contributions of 150 Lei each were also undertaken by gentlemen: Ion V. Osnaga, Dumitru V. Osnaga, Ion Drăgoi, Ion Albici, Ion Gh. T. Băcescu and

---

[1] *Ibidem.*

[2] *Ibidem.*

[3] Idem, doc. inv. no. 26 162, f. 4.

[4] *Ibidem*, f. 1.

[5] *Ibidem.*

[6] *Ibidem.*

[7] *Ibidem.*

[8] *Ibidem.*

Ion Vâlcu[1], while Priest Vasile Osnaga undertook to contribute with 100 Lei reconstruction of the Roşiuţa church.[2]

In the document elaborated in January 1910 there was the declaration that "*Mr. Architect Statie Ciortan was honored to obtain commitments from certain people, who voluntarily and kindly undertook to contribute for the full accomplishment of the works for our church*"[3], Teodor Costescu, Professor, former prefect, Dincă Schileru, Gorj Deputy in the Romanian Parliament, Aristotel Schileru, Gorj Judge, Tănasie Ştiucan, Miculeşti land owner, Constantin I. Cercel, people bank controller, Ion C. Ungureanu, Ploştina land owner, Mihail C. Bănescu, primary school teacher, Constantin Trotea, land owner from the Valea cu Apă commune, Gorj County, Ion C. Carlaonţ, Miculeşti land owner, Eftichia Trotea, Runcurel land owner, Iorgu Gavril Grecescu, Covrigi land owner, Elena Gavril Grecescu, Miluta land owner, Constantin N. Popescu, Zegujani land owner, Constantin B. Vasilescu, CFR mechanic, each of them undertaking to contribute with 100 Lei for the reconstruction of the Roşiuţa church.[4]

As a result, on 3 January 1910, the intiative committee chaired by Mr. Constantin Pârvulescu could rely on "*the amount resulted from all the subscriptions made by the villagers*"[5], which "*cumulated with what we had been promised by the aforementioned people, result in a total of 18 180 Lei*".[6] Under these conditions, the members of the initiative committee "*decided that is absolutely necessary that the works should start in the spring of the current year*".[7]

The construction works begun during the year 1910 remained unfinished as result of the start of the Balkan Wars, the Romanian Army participating at the second Balkan War in the summer of 1913, and, subsequently, as the First World War broke out in summer of 1914.

The church was built in the years 1910-1911 by master mason Gheorghe Cioroboiu from Turcenii de Jos. As a proof, the stone belt on the church façade it reads: "*In the year 1911, worked by me, Gheorghe Cioroboiu from the Turceni commune*".

The painting of the wall church from the Roşiuţa village was made by Dumitru Norocea, church painter from the Argeş County, born in the Gorj

---

[1] *Ibidem*.
[2] *Ibidem*.
[3] *Ibidem*, f. 4.
[4] *Ibidem*.
[5] *Ibidem*.
[6] *Ibidem*.
[7] *Ibidem*.

County. The reredos of the Roşiuţa wall church was executed from the wood coming from former wooden church existing in Ştirbeţu, the Roşiuţa village.

Under these conditions, in a document edited in April 1925 by the initiative committee for the reconstruction of the Roşiuţa village church, document which was edited in 300 copies on the expense of Mr. Architect Statie Ciortan[1], it was mentioned that the church had remained *"even since the war* [the First World War – author's note][2], reason for which a new subscription list had been opened, because *"it's time to offer, one more time, proof of our will and strength, by overcoming all difficulties. So, elevate your spirits and Godspeed!"*[3].

In March 1925, *"wishing to restart (...) the works for completed the church building started in 1910, but unfinished due to the war, a new table has been drafted, consisting in your written donations, varying with each person's wish and possibilities"*[4], a table which comprised a total of 239 people who had contributed with sums of money for the resuming of the works for the reconstruction of the church dedicated to the *"Presentation"* from Roşiuţa.

The greatest contributor was Architect Statie Ciortan, who undertook to contribute with sum of 10 000 Lei for continuing the construction works at the Roşiuţa church.[5]

Moreover, Statie Ciortan together with his son Emil-Ionel, with Mariana and Ecaterina Ciortan, subscribed another sum, of 15 000 Lei, so that, in total, Architect Statie Ciortan and his family members undertook to contribute with the amount of 25 000 Lei for the reconstruction of the Roşiuţa church.[6]

Following their brother's example, Vasile G. Ciortan, Iorgu G. Ciortan and Maria G. Ciortan donated 1 500 Lei each for the same purpose. As a result, the Ciortan family would contribute with the total amount of 29 500 Lei for the effort to build the new church of the Roşiuţa church.[7]

Primary School teacher Mihail G. Ciortan undertook to contribute with 3 500 Lei for the church reconstruction while Ion I. Ciortan donated 2 000 and Alexandru I.I. Ciortan contributed with 1 000 Lei. Along with the Ciortan family members, significant money contributions were offered by families: Băcescu, Vasilescu, Osnaga, Croitoru and Brânduşescu.

Thus, from the Băcescu family members, primary school teacher Ion D. Băcescu undetook to contribute to the church reconstruction works with the

---

[1] Idem, doc. inv. no. 26 154.
[2] *Ibidem*.
[3] *Ibidem*.
[4] Idem, doc. inv. no. 26 161.
[5] *Ibidem*.
[6] *Ibidem*.
[7] *Ibidem*.

sum of 3 000 Lei, Alexandru V. Băcescu, CFR clerk, contributed with the sum of 1 500 Lei, Gheorghe I. Băcescu subscribed 1 400 Lei, Teodor V. Băcescu and Pantelimon G. Băcescu donated 1 200 Lei each, while Ion Gr. Băcescu donated 1 000 Lei.[1]

Another family, whose members financially contributed to the reconstruction works of the Roşiuţa church, was the Osnaga family, among whom the following were mentioned in the document dated March 1925: Tănase R. Osnaga, Grigore R. Osnaga, Dumitru V. Osnaga, Ion V. Osnaga, each donating 1 000 Lei, as well as Alexandru D. Osnaga, Dumitru Grigore V. Osnaga, Gheorghe D. Osnaga, Alexandru Gheorghe D. Osnaga, Constantin Osnaga, Ion C. Osnaga and Dumitru Gheorghe V. Osnaga, each contributing with the amount of 700 Lei for financing the reconstruction works for this church dedicated to the "*Presentation*".[2]

In March 1925, a number of 239 inhabitants of the Roşiuţa village undertook to contribute for the reconstruction of the local church with the total amount of 203 100 Lei.[3] The table comprising the list of the 239 inhabitants of the Roşiuţa commune "*was printed in 250 copies on the expense (3 300 Lei) of Mr. Architect St. Ciortan, for each contributor to have knowledge of the sums to be received*"[4] and was signed by the initiative committee's head, Mr. Constantin Pârvulescu, and by the deputy head Mihail Vasilescu I and Constantin Croitoru, by the committee censor, Statie Gh. Ciortan, by cashier Mihai Ciortan, by the cashier aid, Mr. Nicolae Bobic, as well as by the committee's members, respectively, the gentlemen: Ion D. Băcescu, Ion I. Ciortan, D.I. Menţianu, Ion Albici, Ion Vâlcu, Gr.I. Menţeanu, Ion Drăgoi and M. N. Mihart.[5]

On April 25, 1925, a general assembly was organized by the initiative of Architect Statie Ciortan from Bucharest, who also addressed a letter to Ion V. Osnaga in June 1925 stating that "*I was deeply moved when, as one (...) you answered you would give all the help for finishing our village church*".[6]

After this gathering, "*the contractor has been hired and the works have resumed*"[7], but "*in order for this works to be successfully completed on September 1, according to our commitment, and for each of you to be proud of having contributed on time with work and money for the completion of the church, it is now necessary to offer all your help to the committee. It is time to*

---

[1] *Ibidem.*
[2] *Ibidem.*
[3] Idem, doc. inv. no. 26 160, f. 2r.
[4] *Ibidem*, f. 2v.
[5] *Ibidem.*
[6] Idem, doc. inv. no. 26 158.
[7] *Ibidem.*

prove to those who will come after you that you were worthy! Now it is the time for all the efforts to be made so that our commitments to be fulfilled exactly, without us succumbing to the sin, and for the Holy Church to be stand tall, as a testament to our energy and industriousness!".[1]

At the end of the letter addressed to Mr. Ion V. Osnaga from the Roşiuţa village, Mehedinţi County, Architect Statie Ciortan advised to village people "*to make, with all the love, all the sacrifices demanded by the committee for the church's definitive elevation*"[2] and "*to avoid that, by the lack of interest you may show, the committee to be prevented from fulfilling its commitments, which would lead to the ceasing of the works, to damages payments and to the great dishonor of leaving the church unfinished again*".[3]

In April 1925 a new list was edited, comprising the subscriptions of 290 people with a total amount of 243 400 Lei, amount which "*will be deposited in the local <<Bujorăscu>> People Bank, where it will be withdrawn from when the committee will cease its activity and only for the construction of the church*".[4]

The construction works started in 1910 were executed – as it results from the consecration act dated 20 September 1931 – by "*master Cheorghe Cioroboiu who constructed the church except for the steeples, as the works stopped due to the wars* [the Second Balkan War and the First World War – author's note] *(...) and the privations triggered by them*".[5]

The construction was resumed by the initiative of a committee headed by Constantin Pârvulescu, a committee which was reconstituted in 1924 and formed by: Mihail Vasilescu and Constantin Croitoru, vice-chairmen, Architect Statie Ciortan, censor, Mihai I. Ciortan, primary school teacher, cashier and secretary, Priest Grigore Roşieţeanu Ion Băcescu, Ion I. Ciortan, Dumitru Menţanu, Ion Albici, Ion Vâlcu, Ion Drăgoi, Nicolae Bobic and Ion Ghigulescu.[6] They "*spared no effort so the works resumed, in 1925, by master builder George di Bernardo from T-Jiu, who finished the masonry and plaster until the following year*".[7] Meanwhile, "*the covers, carpentry, ironworks, ornamentations and windows were executed by masters Alex. Manu and*

---

[1] *Ibidem.*
[2] *Ibidem.*
[3] *Ibidem.*
[4] Idem, doc. inv. no. 26 154.
[5] Document from the document collection of the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from Roşiuţa.
[6] *Ibidem.*
[7] *Ibidem.*

Minculescu, Chmidinger, Ion Socu and Teodorescu from Bucharest"[1], while "*the belfry works were executed by constructor Doppelreiter from Tg-Jiu*".[2]

According to the same document, "*in the years 1927, 1928 and 1929, the reredos, the furniture and aisle were executed by master craftsmen Miertoiu and Goga from Craiova, while the church painted was executed by the master painter Norocea from Curtea de Argeş*".[3]

Referring to this period, the parish priest Alexandru Ciortan noted in a memoir in 1946, document belonging to the collection of the church dedicated to the "*Ascension*" from Roşiuţa-Motru: "*In the month of February 1928, I was ordained deacon and then priest in the Roşiuţa parish, my home village, as successor of priest Grigore C. Roşieţeanu, who resigned several months later. I received an excellent spiritual heritage, material but incomplete, the parish church, under construction, with the roof broken and many other missing assets inside. (...) The parish church, started in 1910, was caught with works into the red, close to the roof construction, when the mobilization was initiated. Temporarily covered, it stayed like this until 1926, when the works were resumed*".[4]

In the autumn of 1930 the church was covered with galvanized plate, all the necessary materials and builders being paid with the amount of 35 000 Lei, resulted from donations made by the Roşiuţa village inhabitants after selling a part of the harvest from the autumn of 1929.

According to the consecration act elaborated on 20 September 1931 "*the church adornment and the preparation for the consecration were made during the summer of year 1931*".[5] When the Roşiuţa wall church was consecrated, it possessed a library consisting in 210 volumes.

In the autumn of 1933, cereal collects were organized in the Roşiuţa village in order to mold a bell for the village's church wall. The bell was molded at Arad and the cost of its execution mounted to 14 000 Lei; it was installed in the wooden belfry of the Roşiuţa church in the autumn of 1934.

A wooden church had been built in the Roşiuţa village even since 1801 by the free peasants who inhabited the village. In the survey performed in 1840 it is mentioned that the wooden church from the Roşiuţa village had been consecrated on 30 March 1801 by priests: Dumitraşcu Roşianu, Ion Menţanu and Radu Forlafu.

---

[1] *Ibidem*.

[2] *Ibidem*.

[3] *Ibidem*.

[4] The construction works were resumed during the year 1925; Roşiuţa Parish Archive, file no. 1/1946, ff. 25-28.

[5] Document from the document collection of the church dedicated to the "*Ascension*" from Roşiuţa.

In 1876, the Ploştina commune consisted of the following villages: Cireşu, Merişu, Leurda, Roşiuţa, Lupoiţa, Lupoaia and Valea Mânăstirii. The Roşiuţa parsish comprised 100 families and the wooden church dedicated to the "*Presentation*".

In the year 1906, the Roşiuţa parish had 325 families and it was composed of the Roşiuţa village and the Lupoiţa hamlet. The wooden church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" was led by Priest Gheorghe Roşieţeanu, graduate of the theology seminar, first degree, ordained on 22 April 1880.

The former wooden church from the Roşiuţa village, dedicated to the "*Presentation*" was located in the Ştirbeţu border. The wood from this church was used to execute the reredos of the current wall church from the Roşiuţa village.

In 1941, the Roşiuţa village had 235 families, the parish priest was Alexandru I. Ciortan, while singers were Ion I. Osnaga and Vasile Drăgătoiu.

The wall church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from the Roşiuţa village undergone restoration works, initiated and performed under the surveillance of parish priest Ion Fotescu in the period 2009-2010. After these restoration works were finalized, the church was re-consecrated on 31 October 2010. On this occasion, a special issue of the "*Porţile de Fier*" was edited[1], a publication edited by the "*Porţile de Fier*" History and Culture Society from the town of Drobeta Turnu-Severin. The special issue highlighting the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from the Roşiuţa village was edited under the guidance of Mite Măneanu Ph. D from the Porţile de Fier Region Museum from Drobeta Turnu-Severin. This special issue of "*Porţile de Fier*" magazine reunites studies and articles about both the Roşiuţa village church and the free peasants from Oltenia and the villages in the Motru area.[2]

***

ADDENDUM 1

Rotive on the "*Ascension*" Church from Roşiuţa

This Holy and Godly Church meant to Honor and Praise our Savior Jesus Christ was constructed entirely onto God's Glory, XC, built and adorned through the efforts of the Roşiuţa commune villagers and with the moral and material help of the good Christians Architect Statie Ciortan and his wife Ecaterina, foremost founders, may they Forever Be Remembered. The construction began in the spring of 1910 during the reign of Our Wise King Charles I and ended after the War for the

---

[1] See "*Porţile de Fier*", year XII, no. XII/2010.
[2] Dinică Ciobotea, *Moşnenii în istorie*, în "*Porţile de Fier*", year XII, no. XII/2010, p. 14-18.

Unification of the Romanian Nation, with the consecration act being performed on 20 September 1931 during the reign of King Charles II and of the Archbishop Office of The Holy Custodian Vartolomeu of Râmnic-Noul Severin and of the Patriarch Office of his Sanctity Dr. Miron Cristea.

ADDENDUM 2

THE COMMITTEE
   March 1910
      for
rebuilding of the church
   dedicated to
  "*Presentation*"
     from
Roşiuţa Commune – Mehedinţi

Dear villagers,

The idea to rebuild our village church was born even since 1896, when the first iniative committee, composed of Gh. Ciortan, chairman, I.D. Băcescu, vice-chairman, Priest Gr. Roşieţeanu, C. Pârvulescu, V. Băcescu, Al. Ciortan, Gh.C. Vasilescu, I.I. Ciortan, I.C. Băcescu, C. Croitoru, I.M. Bobic, Gr. Pârlea, R. Oznaga and Gh. Prodan as members, tried to fulfill your general wish.

As this committee was dissolved in 1911 due to the chairman's decease, it was only in 1907 that an agreement to continue the initiative was reached, thus entrusting the current committee.

With the heart full of desire to accomplish the dream of many, your committee spared no effort to raise the necessary sums, acting in full compliance of the rules, as each of you to rest assured about the way the donations you would kindly make would be used.

We are honored to send you, attached, the table compiled by the committee, based on your declarations on the occasion of the assemblies on 26 October 1909 and 3 January 1910, comprising all who whole-heartedly agreed to subscribe with sums for rebuilding our church.

We also take this opportunity to inform you that, as result of the verification performed by Mr. Statie Ciortan, the Committee Censor, and according to the report his Honor presented within the village gathering on 3 January 1910, we have a secured fund for reconstructing the church of 928 Lei and 70 Bani deposited on the CEC financial institution, while 4 349 Lei and 10 Bani are deposited in the People Bank "*Bujorăscu*" from our locality, document no. 82. In total, our capital mounts to 5 227 Lei and 80 Bani.

Considering that from the current harvest there could result another 2 500 Lei and relying, in special, on the support you might kindly agree to offer from now on, the decision to start the works in the spring of the current year has been irrevocably taken.

For this reason, The Administration of the Church House was required to approve the plans, designed and offered to our Commune by Mr. Architect Ciortan, our fellow villager – as well as the authorization to start works.

On this occasion we bring you the warmest thanks to the initiators of this elevated work as to your Honors who, so benevolently and whole-heartedly, are contributing to the earliest realization of the most impressive construction our commune has ever had.

Chairman of the Committe,
C. PÂRVULESCU
Vice-chairmen
Gh. C. Vasilescu
C. Croitoru
Members priest
Gr. Roşieţeanu
I.D. Băcescu, teacher
Alex. Ciortan
Mih. Mihart
Censor of Committee,
Architect Statie Gh. Ciortan
Cashier Năstase Călicanu

To His Honor
Mr Ion V. Oznaga

The document collection of "*Alexandru Ştefulescu*" Gorj County Museum from Târgu-Jiu, inv. no. 26 151.

ADDENDUM 3

Bucureşti, Iunie 1925

Dear villagers,

I was deeply moved when, as one, during your general assembly on 25 April current year, you answered you would give all the help for finishing our village church. By the help of God and your decision taken then, the contractor was employed and the works have restarted.

In order for these works to finish well on 1 September, as the contract states, and for each of you to be proud of having contributed on time with money and labor for the completion of the Church, it is now necessary to offer all the possible help to the Committee. Now it's time you proved those to come that you had been worthy. Now it's time you spared no effort for our commitments to be fully achieved, without

us falling to the sin, and for the Holy Church to rise majestically, as testament to our *energy and industriousness*.

As one who has watched carefully over our Commune, working along your side and offering all the moral and material help for the church construction, following the example set by my father Gh. Ciortan, who was the initiator and the first chairman of the committee, I feel obliged to offer you my advice:

a) *Whole-heartedly make all the sacrifices the Committee will ask you to for the church's definitive construction*;

b) *Avoid the dishonor that you may draw upon you by indifference of not contributing to a great deed and of incapacitating the Committee to fulfill its commitments, which would lead to the ceasing of the works, to damages payments and to the dreaful situation of leaving the church unfinished again*;

c) *Do not lend your ear to some ill advice and trust the Committee, unquestionably offer your help, convinced that it shall be taken into consideration, both when the accounts of the construction fund have been finished and before God, Who shall come to your help, as you have helped Him see His House finished.*

Hoping that my word will be listened to as always and that, by your deeds, you will prove your faith in God and His Church, I thank you in advance, assuring you of my consideration for you.

Yours Truly
Architect Statie Ciortan

The document collection of "*Alexandru Ştefulescu*" Gorj County Museum from Târgu-Jiu, inv. no. 26 158.

ADDENDUM 4

CONSECRATION CHARTER

In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Trinity as one, by the will of our Lord God, ruler of all things, today, the twentieth of September, year of our redemption one thousand nine hundred thirty one, the fifteenth after the great victory of the Romanian nation unification, during the reign of our Exalted and Faithful King Charles II, heir to throne being Mihai I, voivode of Alba Iulia, Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church being Miron Cristea, while Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Public Education being the great Romanian scholar Nicolae Iorga, in the presence of the Ministry's delegate, Priest Nicolae N. Popescu, university professor and member of the Romanian Academy, Secretary General for Faith Groups.

With the blessing of His Holiness Vartolomeu, Bishop of Râmnic-Noul Severin, we have been deigned to consecrate this Holy and Godly Church, to praise the Ascension of our Redeemer Jesus Christ, after it has been built from its very foundations, having been constructed and adorned by the efforts of the Roşiuţa village

people and with the moral and material help of the good Christians Statie Ciortan and his wife Ecaterina, as founders, who devoted all their care for its accomplishment and consecration.

Let it be known by those to follow that in the year 1896 the inhabitants of this commune, concerned by the state of ruin of the old wooden church dedicated to the "Presentation", built between 1800-1801 in another part of the village and repaired in 1856, held counsel and decided to build a wall church and chose a committee from our head villagers, composed of Gheorghe Ciortan, chairman, Ion Băcescu, primary school teacher, vice-chairman, Priest Grigore Roşieţanu, Constantin Pârvulescu, Vasile Băcescu, Alexandru Ciortan, Gheorghe C. Vasilescu, Ion I. Ciortan, Ion C. Băcescu, Constantin Croitoru, Ion N. Bobic, Grigore Târlea, Răducan Osnaga şi Gheorghe Prodan, members who decided upon the location and took the first measures to raise the construction funds.

As result of the chairman's and other members' decease, a new committee was elected in 1907, composed of Constantin Pârvulescu, chairman, Gheorghe C. Vasilescu and Constantin Croitoru, vice-chairmen, Architect Statie Ciortan, censor, Năstase Călianu, cashier, Priest Gr. Roşieţanu, Ion Băcescu, Alexandru Ciortan, Mihail Mihart and Alexandru Bărbulescu, members who persevered and laid the foundations of the church in 1910, following the designs made by Architect Statie Ciortan, executed by master builder Gheorghe Cioroboiu, who constructed the building up to the belfries, as the works stopped because of the wars from 1913 and 1916-1917, as well as of privations triggered by these wars. It was only in the year 1924 that construction committee was reunited and composed of: Constantin Pârvulescu, chairman, Mihail Vasilescu (Iosif) and Constantin Croitoru, Vice-chairmen, Architect Statie Ciortan, Censor, Mihai I. Ciortan (primary school teacher) cashier and secretary, Priest Gr. Roşieţanu, Ion Băcescu, Ion I. Ciortan, Dumitru Menţanu, Ion Albici, Ion Vâlcu, Ion Drăgoi, Roşenţanu, Nicolae Bobic and Ion Ghigulescu, members, who spared no effort so that the works were resumed in 1925 by master builder George di Bernanrdo from T-Jiu, who finished the masorny and the plasters until the following year. Meanwhile, the covers, carpentry, ironworks, adornments and windows were executed by master craftsmen Alex. Manu and Minculescu, Chmidinger, Ion Socu and Teodorescu from Bucharest and the belfry works were executed by constructor Doppelreiter from T-Jiu. In the years 1927, 1928 and 1929 the shrine's reredos, the furniture and aisles were executed by master craftsmen Miertoiu and Goga from Craiova, while the church painting was executed by artist Norocea from Curtea de Argeş.

The small works for finishing, church adorning and consecration preparations were done in the summer of 1931.

Besides accomplishing the aforementioned deeds, Architect Statie Ciortan, in addition to the designs, details and work surveillance throughout all the execution duration, together with his wife Ecaterina, had the greatest contribution to the completion of this magnificent building, covering the expenses for: the main entrance motif, the choir stairs, the oak carpentry at the doors, the iron crosses and window frames, the belfries' special covers, the reredos, the sculpted oak furnitures and aisles, the entire painting of the church, the marble plaque, the bell tower, the large bell, The Holy Gospel, the glasses and the carpets. This significant help, offered out of love for

God and His House, shall be forever be remembered and cherished. Also, primary school teacher Mihail Ciortan took great care in seeing the works finished.

May God Almighty help this holy church, well endowed, to offer solace and the bright light of life to all the faithful, so that they may prove of use to their families and the Romanian Nation.

Document from the document collection of the church dedicated to the "*Presentation*" from the Roşiuţa village.

VISION OF METROPOLITAN MIRON CRISTEA, PRIMATE OF ROMANIA, ON REFORMING THE ROMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

Lucian Dindirică[*]

Abstract

Miron Cristea was born on the 18th of July 1868, in Topliţa. Between the years 1887-1890 he attended the Theological Institute of Sibiu, so that in 1891 he enrolled The Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at the University of Budapest, where he would get a Ph.D. As bishop of Caransebeş he participated in the Great National Assembly in Alba Iulia on December 1, 1918 and he was part of the delegation which presented the Unification Act of Transylvanian Romanians at Bucharest. On June 7th, 1919 Miron Cristea was elected honorary member of the Romanian Academy. At the end of that year, on 18/31 December he was elected Primate of Unified Romania, and on 19th December 1919 / January 1st, 1920 Miron Cristea was invested and enthroned in the highest office at that time, in the Romanian Orthodox Church. In August 1920, found the monastery Căldăruşani, Miron Cristea wrote a work that included his view on the organization of the Romanian Orthodox Church after the Great Unification, which was printed in the same year. Miron Cristea developed in 1922, a document entitled *Memoriu cu privire la trebuinţele Bisericii Ortodoxe Române din ţară* (Memorandum on the needs of Romanian Orthodox Church in the country), the document was analyzing the existing problems within the Church, proposing solutions for the most part.

Key words: *Reform, Reorganization of the Church, Patriarch, Carol II, Mihai I*

Miron Cristea was born on the 18th of July 1868, in Topliţa[1] and received at his baptism the name Elie, his godfather wishing him "to grow big, to be healthy and to be made a priest".[2] Very important for knowing about the first years from the life of Miron Cristea is a document elaborated by himself on the 25th of November/8th of December 1909, called *Tabela de cualificaţiune (The Qualification Table)*, in which he describes the main stages of his life, his

---

[*] PhD in History, Public Library "Alexandru & Aristia Aman" County Dolj, no. 9, M. Kogălniceanu Street, tel. 0251/532267, e-mail: lucian_dindirica@yahoo.com
[1] Mircea Păcurariu, *Dicţionarul teologilor români*, ediţia a II-a, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 2002, p. 141.
[2] Ilie Şandru, Valentin Borda, *Un nume pentru istorie – Patriarhul Elie Miron Cristea*, Târgu Mureş, Casa de Editură Petru Maior, 1998, p. 27.

studies and the evolution of his professional activity up to that time.[1] In addition to his birth date, the 18th of July 1868[2], Miron Cristea gives us the date of his baptism, the 20th of July 1868[4], the day the Orthodox Church was celebrating the Holy Prophet Elijah The Tishbite. Although the baptism was scheduled in the fall of that year, the parents have postponed it at the request of the future godfather, Ioan Herţa – a shepherd from Săliştea Sibiului.[3]

He began the studies in 1879, at the Saxon Gymnasium in Bistriţa, remaining there until 1883; he spent the next four years at the Frontier Guards Gymnasium in Năsăud. Between 1887 and 1890 he attended the Theological Institute in Sibiu, so that in 1891 he would be sent by the Metropolitan Miron Romanul, from Sibiu, to enroll to the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at the University of Budapest[4], where he would get, four years later, a Ph.D. with a thesis on the life and work of Mihai Eminescu.[5]

The thesis, presented in Hungarian, shortly after the death of the great poet (only six years had passed), was printed with the title *Eminescu, viaţa şi opera. Studiu asupra unor creaţii mai noi din literatura română* (*Eminescu, the life and the work. A study of the newest creations of the Romanian literature*), at the publishing house "Aurora" in 1895[6] and subsequently translated into Romanian.[7]

Ever since the study period, the young Elie Cristea began to practice as a teacher at the Primary School from Orăştie between 1890 and 1891, by the decision of the Archdiocesan Consistory of Sibiu, also being named the director of the same school.[8] After graduating in Budapest, the Metropolitan Miron Romanul offers him the position of Secretary of the Archdiocese of Sibiu, a position he would hold until 1902, when he would become, for seven years, adviser (assessor) in the same Archdiocese.

Besides doing his administrative work in the Archdiocese of Sibiu, the future patriarch of Great Romania climbs, one by one, all the pre-Episcopal Orthodox clerical hierarchy steps: reader (September 8/20, 1897)[9],

---

[1] Central Historical National Archives Service (further will be cited C.H.N.A.S.), Miron Cristea fund, file no. 1, f. 65-66.

[2] *Ibidem*, f. 66.

[3] Constantin I. Stan, *Patriarhul Miron Cristea: o viaţă – un destin*, Bucureşti, Editura Paideia, 2009, p. 7.

[4] *Ibidem*, p. 35.

[5] A brief sketch of Miron Cristea's at Mircea Păcurariu, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

[6] *Pagini dintr-o arhivă inedită. Documente literare*, http://ebooks.unibuc.ro/filologie/melian/44.htm

[7] Elie Miron Cristea, *Luceafărul poeziei româneşti. Mihai Eminescu*, ediţie îngrijită şi prefaţată de Maria Roşca, Bucureşti, Ginta Latină, 1997.

[8] Ilie Şandru, Valentin Borda, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[9] Cristian Vasile Petcu, *Guvernarea Miron Cristea*, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 2009, p. 111.

hypodeacon[1], deacon (January 30, 1900)[2], monk (June 21, 1901 at the Monastery Hodoş Bodrog), archdeacon (September 8, 1901), hieromonk (1902) and prottosyngellos (June 1, 1908).[3]

In parallel, he has a journalistic activity, being, between 1898 and 1900, editor for the "Telegraful Român" and in 1905 he becomes president of Sibiu partition, "Despărțământul", of Astra.[4]

In 1909, on the 21th of November/3rd of December he is elected bishop of Caransebeş and enthroned on the 25th of April/8th of May 1910. He participated in the Great National Assembly in Alba Iulia, on the 1st of December 1918, and he was part of the Transylvanian Romanians' delegation which presented the Union Act in Bucharest.[5] On this occasion, King Ferdinand addressed a speech "at receiving the Unification Act of Transylvania".[6] Here is the part of King Ferdinand's speech addressed to the Transylvanians: "on behalf of the Romanians from the Old Kingdom, from Bessarabia and Bucovina, now united, with deep gratitude I receive our brethren's across the Carpathians decision to commit national unity of all Romanians and declare ever united, in the Romanian Kingdom, all lands inhabited by Romanians, from the Tisza to the Dnieper. With boundless love I dedicated my life to my dear people, full of faith in its historical mission. Through struggles and sacrifices God gave us to achieve today our most holy aspirations. Thanking him from the depths of the soul, we turn our thoughts to those who have built with their blood the new basis for our national development. Through unwavering devotion to their creation we will show our gratitude, through them we will show the beneficial bearings of those cruel attempts. On this basis of a strong democracy and a fraternal life among nations, we will respond to the feelings of our allies with whom we fought for the great cause of justice and freedom in the world. Forever live united Romania!".[7]

On the 7th of June 1919, Miron Cristea was elected honorary member of the Romanian Academy. At the end of that year, on the 18th/31st of December he was elected Primate of unified Romania and on the 19th of December 1919/

---

[1] *Ibidem*.
[2] C.H.N.A.S., Miron Cristea fund, file no. 1, f. 66v. In his memoirs stated that Miron Cristea was ordained as "unmarried deacon" (Elie Miron Cristea, *Note ascunse. Însemnări personale (1895-1937)*, Cluj Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1999, p. 47.)
[3] C.H.N.A.S., Miron Cristea fund, file no. 1, f. 66v.
[4] Mircea Păcurariu, *op. cit.*, p. 141.
[5] *Desăvârşirea unificării statului naţional român. Unirea Transilvaniei cu vechea Românie*, red. Miron Constantinescu, Ştefan Pascu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1968, p. 424.
[6] Ion Scurtu, *Regele Ferdinand (1914-1927), activitatea politică*, Bucureşti, Editura Garamond, f.a., p. 152.
[7] *Ibidem*.

1st of January 1920 he was invested and enthroned in the highest function existing at that time in the Romanian Orthodox Church.[1]

In August 1920, found at the monastery Căldăruşani, Miron Cristea was writing a paper that included his view on the organization of the Romanian Orthodox Church after the Great Union, printed in the same year.[2] Divided into 18 chapters, the writing proposes an analysis of the general context and of the main issues, which, at that time, existed within the Romanian Orthodox Church. To summarize what seemed important issues, we will enumerate the titles of these short chapters: "The unity and the autocephaly of the Church", "National Church of the Romanian state", "The new division of dioceses", "The Church and the State", "The Church Constitution", "The collaboration of laity with the clergy", "The Independence in the economy", "The Church Justice", "The right to choose", "The control", "The Holy Synod", "The Bishops", "The Monasteries", "The establishment in offices", "The accumulation of offices", "The church and the charity and public education problem" and "Clergy Education".[3]

The new political conditions resulting from the unification of the historical provinces, found outside the borders, with Romania, have determined the structural rethinking of the Romanian Orthodox Church, an administrative reform, and not only, being more urgent than ever. In this situation, Miron Cristea developed in 1922, a document entitled *Memorandum on the needs of Romanian Orthodox Church within the country,* document which analyzed the existing problems within the Church, proposing solutions for the most part of them.[4]

A brief analysis of this statement demonstrates the Primate's ability to synthesize the real difficulties of the Romanian Orthodox Church. From the very beginning the future patriarch observes the difficult situation of the church: "It was left entirely behind; it was given almost nothing; by contrast, the church from the old kingdom was left in a situation, which made it be almost incapable of any important work".[5] After exemplifying administrative and financial difficulties, Miron Cristea highlights the main important points he wanted resolved or, where appropriate, reformed: "The Church of the Salvation of the Nation"[6], "the metropolitan residence"[7], "The Biblical Institute"[8],

---

[1] Mircea Păcurariu, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
[2] *Principii fundamentale pentru organizarea unitară a Bisericii Ortodoxe Române din Regatul Român de I.P.S.S. dr. Miron Cristea*, Bucureşti, Tipografia Cărţilor Bisericeşti, 1920.
[3] *Ibidem, passim.*
[4] The document is kept at C.H.N.A.S., Miron Cristea fund, file no. 3, f. 88-94.
[5] *Ibidem*, f. 89.
[6] *Ibidem*, f. 90v.
[7] *Ibidem*, f. 91.
[8] *Ibidem*, f. 91-91v.

"scholarships"[1], "theological seminaries"[2], "schools for church singers"[3], "Byzantine painting"[4], "new bishoprics"[5], " church museum"[6], "The Romanian church in Sofia"[7], "restorations"[8], "Typography of Religious Books"[9], "wax candle factory"[10], "workshops at the monasteries"[11], "The Metropolitan Library"[12], "world church congresses"[13], "increasing number of deans"[14] and "the wages of priests".[15]

For Miron Cristea follows a fundamental step in the involvement in public life. The first step was the Patriarchy – on the 4th of February 1925 he comes to occupy the newly founded chair of Patriarch of Romania, so that on the 1st of November 1925, in a ceremony which deeply impressed him, he would invested in the new state; of this investiture Miron Cristea himself noted in his personal notes: "It was certainly something grand. Bucharest's population had gathered, of course hundreds of thousands, across the streets from the Metropolitan Church to the palace (...) The Throne Room was overcrowded, something all refined. I was surprised that all foreign plenipotentiary ministers came, led by the Minister of France (...) The King's gesture, the Queen's gesture, Prince Charles' and his wife Elena's gesture, to kiss my hand after the speech, impressed not only those present, but the whole country".[16]

After centuries in which the Romanian space was led by metropolitans, the twentieth century brought a patriarch at the head of the Romanian Orthodox Church. The end of World War I and the Great Union of 1918, confirmed internationally by the Paris Peace Conference, brought the Romanian territorial expansion. The church, in turn, had to be reorganized, this reorganization being done by transforming the function of Primate in the function of Patriarch.

Less than two years from his settlement on the patriarchal throne of Romania, Romania's domestic political situation allows the patriarch to longer climb a step in the impressive *cursus honorum* of his public life. On the 20th of

---

[1] *Ibidem*, f. 91v.-92.
[2] *Ibidem*, f. 92.
[3] *Ibidem*, f. 92-92v.
[4] *Ibidem*, f. 92v.
[5] *Ibidem.*
[6] *Ibidem*, f. 93.
[7] *Ibidem.*
[8] *Ibidem*, f. 93-93v.
[9] *Ibidem*, f. 93v.
[10] *Ibidem.*
[11] *Ibidem.*
[12] *Ibidem*, f. 94.
[13] *Ibidem.*
[14] *Ibidem.*
[15] *Ibidem*, f. 94 v.
[16] Elie Miron Cristea, *Note ascunse…*, p. 99.

July 1927, King Ferdinand died, and the same day, Prince Michael became the new king of Romania. Since he was a minor, monarchical powers were taken over by newly established Regency, in which Patriarch Miron Cristea was also a party.[1]

Charles II gives the prime minister chair to the patriarch[2], Miron Cristea's public career being now complemented: Patriarch – member of the Regency – Prime Minister.

On the 6th of March 1939, the Patriarch Miron Cristea dies in Cannes, France, where he had left "with good will and hope to heal fully, for nobody guessed the evil that would happen, perhaps because of the fatigue and the too long journey".[3]

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

<p style="text-align:center">**ANEXĂ**</p>

<p style="text-align:center">*MEMORIU*[4]</p>
<p style="text-align:center">**Cu privire la trebuinţele bisericei ortodoxe române din ţară**</p>

Suntem conştii de îndatorirea tuturor guvernelor de a face toate cruţările posibile în finanţele ţării, spre a putea face faţă nevoilor absolut necesare, şi mai ales spre a putea plăti datoriile în afară. În scopul acesta, modesta Noastră părere este, că există şi azi resoarte ministeriale şi oficii cu sinecure, inspectorate şi posturi de prisos. Un control absolut sever în modul de întrebuinţare a banului public asemenea cred, că ar avea de resultat cruţări însemnate.

Un lucru însă rămâne cert, că faţă de biserica ortodoxă română nu putem cruţa nimic. Ea a fost lăsată cu totul în urmă; nu i s'a dat aproape nimic; din contră biserica din vechiul regat a fost lăsată într'o situaţie, care s'o facă aproape incapabilă de orice muncă mai însemnată. Deci acestei biserici, care atât de mult a contribuit până acum la crearea sufletului românesc unitar şi care trebue să aibă un rol important şi la consolidarea din viitor a ţării: – trebue să i se pună la dispoziţie toate mijloacele, pentru a putea corespunde misiunii sale mai ales azi, când cultele streine au faţă de ea o situaţie princiară, în cât lăsarea bisericei statului în situaţia umilită de azi atinge însuşi prestigiul ţării şi al neamului românesc şi mari interese ale lui. Biserica se conduce de

---

[1] *Istoria românilor*, vol. VIII, *România reîntregită (1918-1940)*, coord. Ioan Scurtu, secretar Petre Otu, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 2003, p. 262.

[2] About naming Miron Cristea in the function of Prime Minister and the transformation of the monarchal regime of Romania, see Ioan Scurtu, Gheorghe Buzatu, *Istoria românilor în secolul XX (1918-1940),* Bucureşti, Editura Paideia, 1999, p. 343 şi urm., as aslo an older writing of Al.Gh. Savu, *Dictatura regală (1938-1940)*, Bucureşti, Editura Politică, 1970.

[3] Gheorghe I. Moisescu, *Moartea şi îngroparea Prea Fericitului întru pomenire Miron, Patriarhul României*, în "Biserica Ortodoxă Română", an LVII, 1939, nr. 3-4, p. 130.

[4] The document is kept at C.H.N.A.S., Miron Cristea fund, file no. 3, f. 88-94.

chiriarhi. De la episcopii şi mitropolii trebue se mânece iniţiativa, duhul de activitate şi însufleţire. În scopul acesta trebuesc organisate cancelariile de la Mitropolii şi episcopii din vechiul regat, cari azi numai vegetează, fiindcă n'au oficiali stabili şi fiind-că plăţile lor sunt derizorii şi sunt şi puţini. Din cauza micimii plăţilor nu se pot afla şi angaja oameni întregi cari să nu aibă alte ocupaţiuni principale, ci chiriarhii să ajutoreză în cele mai multe cazuri cu preoţii, cari au alte slujbe; şi astfel – când pot – mai dau şi pe la cancelarie. Aşa de ex. Directorul mitropoliei din Bucureşti are ceva peste 900 Lei lunar, subdirectorul 550 lei, registratorul 300 lei, secretarul 300 lei etc. În astfel de împrejurării, la ce ore de birou şi la ce muncă te poţi aştepta? Oamenii trebue să se împartă la celelalte slujbe principale, după care trăesc. Astfel se întâmplă, că zile întregi nu este nimeni la cancelarie şi absolut toate nimicurile trebue să ajungă la mitropolitul. Închipuiţivă un minister, unde nu găseşti pe nimenea, decât pe ministrul. Trebuesc deci oameni întregi, fără alte ocupaţii, cari să se dedice exclusiv mitropoliei şi bisericei. Aceasta se poate iară-şi numai <u>cu plată întreagă</u>. Şi este de mirare, că Romano-Catolicilor, li se dă din vistieria ţării plata întreagă şi frumoasă la un număr mare de slujbaşi din jurul episcopiilor, şi – pe lângă aceştia – plăţi mari la câte 6- 8-10 canonici, cari sunt sfetnicii episcopilor. Episcopia catolică din Satumare şi Timişoara etc. au averi mari proprii şi pentru plata canonicilor şi totuşi sau luat plăţile lor integral în bugetul statului, iar venitele proprii le rămân dispensabile. Cu esemenea puteri ce nu se poate lucra? Asemenea sau dat plăţi bune pentru un număr mare de oficiali de la cancelariile tuturor cultelor streine Luterani, Calvini, unitari, Greco-catolici. O comparaţie cu noi, te umple de uimire, de ce rugările celor ce slujim aşa sincer ţara şi neamul sunt tratate aşa maşter? faţa de toţi neromânii cari au eparhii cu averi de multe milioane şi chiar miliarde? Cum vom putea deveni noi superiori streinilor în asemenea împrejurări

A. – Trebuesc deci votate la Mitropolia Noastră din Bucureşti plăţi – ca la Ministerul Cultelor – următorilor funcţionari:

1. Unui secretar general al mitropolitului, care să poată fi om cu pregătiri superioare şi cu experienţe administrative etc.
2. Unui Director
3. Unui Subdirector
4. Unui Şef de service
5. Unui Registrator
6. Unui Arhivar
7. Unui Bibliotecar
8. Unui Subşef de birou
9. La 4 impegaţi
10. Unui intendent
11. Unui grădinar
12. Unui portar
13. La doi servitori de cancelarie
14. La trei servictori de la reşedinţa.

Sporul ultim de scumpete a ameliorat ceva situaţia celor mici.

Ceia ce cere Mitropolitul Primat aicia, este mai puţin decât ce se dă deja Saşilor luterani cu 240 000 credincioşi şi ungurilor unitari cu 70 000 suflete.

B. – Asemenea este sub toată critica şi cu totul neorganizată cancelaria Sf. Sinod, unde azi vin chestii grele şi multe de rezolvat. Ceiace e azi, este egal cu zero. Nu există nici un funcţionar, care să ştie concepia răspunsul la o adresă cât de cât mai serioasă. Mitropolitul Primat e silit să lucre însuşi sau să invite 1-2 episcopi, ca să ajute.

La cancelaria Sf. Sinod trebuesc:

1. Un director cu plată de episcop, ca să poţi numi un om, care să ştie lucra şi nu să fii silit a-i da îndrumări până şi în cele mai simple şi elementare chestii de birou.

2. Un secretar

3. Un registrator – arhivar – bibliotecar

4. Doi copişti

5. Un intendent

6. Un servitor

7. Cheltueli de cancelarie

8. Cheltueli de întreţinere.

Fără plăţi, cari să permită angajarea de persoane folosibile, nu se poate lucra.

II

„Biserica Mântuirii Neamului”

E de prisos a mai motiva necesitatea unei biserici catedrale în Bucureşti. Biserica de azi e în stare deteriorată, în cât nu se mai ţine nici tencuiala de cărămidă ci cade în felii descompusă de agenţii chemici şi de dintele timpului, care o roade de câteva veacuri; numai corespunde. Numai noi ştim, cum am acoperit mizeria cu ocaziile festive ale nunţilor şi logodnelor princiare, ale încoronării şi a multor alte ocazii. Firme neromâne ne împrumută covoarele, ca să acoperim sărăcia şi aceşti streini se miră de strea umilă, în care românii îşi ţin catedrala ţării. Este gata apelul către ţară pentru începerea unei mari colecte şi se va lansa, după Majestatea Sa Regele Va binevoi a-l aproba, eventual iscăli. Dar trebue şi onor Guvern să facă un prim vărsământ de vr'o 10,000,000 Lei şi cu ce se va aduna – să se poată începe lucrările, cari şi aşa trebue să dureze mulţi ani. Asemene Gest al Guvernului ar împintena la jertfe pe toată lumea.

III

„Reşedinţa Mitropolitană”

În legătură cu catedrala trebue începută şi clădirea unei reşedinţe corespunzătoare pentru Mitropolitul Primat, adaptându-se eventual – ca să nu coste pre mult – casa veche după un plan existent al arhitectului – Trajanescu, sau trebue făcut un plan nou de un arhitect disptins al ţării. Guvernul anterior a promis un prim-vărsământ de 2 000 000 Lei şi Comisia Monumentelor Istorice începuse a se interesa; dar a adormit iar lucr (...) Începerea lucrărilor e cu atât mai urgentă, cu cât n'avem local pentru cancelarii şi toţi sunt îndesuiţi în două odăi mici.

Tot ce vine mai distins în ţară din alte ţări din familiile domnitoare, bărbaţi de stat, învăţaţi etc. Dau pe la Mitropolie şi rămân nemulţumiţi de ce văd. Generalul Joffre

şi-a exprimat pe faţă nemulţumirea. Zilele trecute sʼ a anunţat Majestatea Sa Regina Maria a Jugoslaviei şi Alteţa Sa Principesa Elena că vin cu suitele Lor la slujbă în paraclisul meu de la reşedinţă. Dispun a se face foc cu zile nainte; dar – spre mirarea mea- nu se încălzeşte. Examinez cauza şi aflu uşi, ferestre deteriorate, crăpate. Astfel ajung în cea mai mare perplexitate, ceia ce mi se întâmplă foarte des în felurite variante. Deci demnitatea ţării nu mai admite această stare.

IV
„Institutul Biblic”

Ne inundează propaganda religioasă streină cu broşuri şi cărţi. Ea e adese ori numai masca unei propagande politice contrare României. Chiar – abstrăgând de aceasta, o educaţie mai vie a poporului prin broşuri religioase, moralizatoare, instructive se impune. Ele trebuesc puse la îndemâna clerului. Pentru conducerea acestei importande mişcări bisericeşti şi pentru tipărirea părţilor mai însemnate din Sf. Scriptură, am întemeiat "Institutul Biblic Român" din oameni de specialitate în materie de biblie. Avem şi gata nouă broşuri revizuite de Sf. Sinod. Exemplarele din Testamentul Nou sunt pe sfârşite şi trebue retipărite. Dar trebuesc speze de tipar.

Domnul Ministru de Culte a promis pentru acest institut biblic un prim vărsământ de 1,000,000 Lei. Pentru hrana sufletească a poporului trebue să se afle aceşti bani. Colectăm şi noi de la preoţi şi episcopi în acest scop; dar în scumpetea de azi abia am încasat până acum 82,000 Lei. Propagandiştii streini primesc bani din streinătate şi răspândesc broşuri gratuite cu lăzile, din casă în casă.

V
„Burse”

Avem lipsă însă de propagandişti bine pregătiţi, adică de preoţi superiori. Aceştia nu se pot creşte numai în ţară. Trebue să adape la cultura apusului, fiind orientul azi în nelinişte. În scopul acesta ne trebuesc Burse pentru teologi în număr mai mare, căci şi ţara e mare şi lipsa de preoţi bine pregătiţi e mare.

Din America ne vine vestea, că sectele streine, mai ales baptiştii, cresc 40-50 tineri români teologi, pe cari să-i trimită în România pentru lăţirea sectelor. Aceşti tineri din neamul nostru, pregătiţi bine din punctul lor de vedere, vor deveni ca români foarte periculoşi faţă de predicatorii sectari de azi – streini – .

Ne trebuesc teologi cu pregătire de studii biblice, cari în ţară la noi lasă mult de dorit. Deci trebuie să-i pregătim în streinătate, mai ales în Oxford, unde anglicanii ne sunt binevoitori şi se apropie de noi. Numărul bursierilor de azi nu-i suficient.

VI
„Seminarii Teologice”

Lipsa de preoţi – buni – răi – e mare. Peste 1 000 parohii vacante. Numărul lor creşte mereu. Deaceia nou – înfiinţatele seminarii teologice la Câmpulung, Constanţa şi Craiova trebuesc luate în buget cu toate cheltuelile inherente: Profesori, clădiri etc.

Mai trebuesc seminarii noi. Aşa la Bălţi şi cel din Ismail (Basarabia) trebueşte complectat. Acolo – în Basarabia – lipseşte în multe părţi duhul românesc. Se cunosc demonstraţiile rusofile chiar din seminarul de la Chişinău. Ne trebuesc acolo la noile seminarii profesori din vechiul regat, cu duh şi limbă românească frumoasă. Fără un cler român bine cunoscut, în Basarabia reorganisarea va progresa greu.

Când bugetul va permite, mai trebuesc seminarii teologice noi la Turnu Severin; în nordul Transilvaniei, cum e de exemplu în eparhia Clujului la un loc potrivit. Cei mai mulţi tineri – absolvenţi de seminarii teologice – apucă alte cariere, unde au devenit buni funcţionari. De aceia asemenea seminarii – licee pot exista cât de multe în loc de alte licee, căci se dă în ele tineretului o educaţie mai bisericească, care e bună pentru oricine.

Deci absolvenţii seminariilor teologice, trecuţi în alte cariere numai de folos pot fi ţării, devenind funcţionari zeloşi şi conştiincioşi .

VII
„Şcoala de cântăreţi bisericeşti"

Cântările bisericeşti au un mare rol. Ele au început a decădea. Trebuesc organizate, luându-se în buget cheltuelile barem pentru vr'o patru şcoale bune de cântăreţi. În lipsă de clădiri se pot plasa prin mănăstiri, întru cât s'ar găsi acolo profesori pentru toate studiile.

De ex. la Căldăruşani, Cozia etc. Asemenea trebuesc create catedre de musică bisericească la Conservatorul din Bucureşti (s'a făcut deja) şi Iaşi, căci de la Conservator trebue să purceadă directiva acestor cântări, de la specialişti bine pregătiţi şi cunoscători ai muzicii orientale.

VIII
„Pictura Bizantină"

Asemenea ne trebuesc mai mulţi specialişti în pictură bizantină. Pictura bisericească a decăzut grozav. Trebuesc burse la cât mai mulţi tineri cu aptitudini şi cu bune îndrumări în această privinţă: dar trebuesc şi catedre de pictură bizantină la Şcoala de Arte Frumoase. Arta bisericească era odată atât de înfloritoare. Trebue să o reînviem.

IX
„Episcopii Noui"

Viaţa bisericească românească e în unele părţii ale ţării neglijată. Aşa în Basarabia nu e destul o eparhie la 3 milioane de ortodoxi. Catolicii au la 40-60 mii suflete un episcop şi guvernul dă cheltuielile organizării centrale ale acestor episcopii, în sume mai mari ca unui episcop român, care are şi xx 1- 2 -3 milioane suflete în eparhia sa. Sfântul Sinod a decis a se înfiinţa episcopii noi: La Bălţi, la Cetatea Albă, la Constanţa.

Corpurile Legiuitoare trebue să le voteze urgent, ca să se înceapă cât mai curând în acele părţi formarea de centre de viaţă bisericească românească mai intensă. Şi aceasta în folosul şi a celor mai vitale interese ale statului român.

X
„Muzeu bisericesc”

Ne trebue un muzeu bisericesc, căci obiectivele vechi din bisericele noastre au ajuns prin abuzuri în mâna tuturor, numai nu acolo, unde trebue. Zilnic se pierd încă obiecte de mare valoare pentru trecutul nostru în lipsa unui asemenea muzeu care să stea sub stăpânirea Sf. Sinod sau al unui mitropolit.

XI
„Biserica Română din Sofia”

Biserica română din Sofia e gata demult. Trebue luat în buget plata
Unui preot
Unui diacon
Unui paraclisier
Unui cântăreţ
Unui speze de întreţinere
Ca să poată Sfinţi şi preda destinaţiunii, cum aşteaptă Legaţiunea Română şi românii de acolo.

XII
„Restaurări”

Ni se prăpădesc monumentele istorice ale părinţilor.
Până se va face o catedrală nouă la Bucureşti, trebue restaurată vechea Mitropolie.
Cade tencuiala, scorburită de dintele timpului.
Pictură trebue nouă.
Tronuri pentru suverani, covoare etc.
Catedrala din Târgovişte, gata din zid de zeci de ani, aşteaptă să fie pictată. Asemenea biserica Stavropoleos din Bucureşti şi Sf. Dumitru din Craiova. Mănăstirea Cozia cu mormintele lui Mircea cel Bătrân şi mama lui Mihai Viteazu (maica Teofana) e în ruină.
Asemenea Arnota cu mormântul lui Neagoe Basarab; biserica Antim din Bucureşti şi multe altele.
Cine nu-şi preţuieşte strămoşii prin monumentele şi mormintele lor, e aspru judecat de viitorime.
Scumpetea de azi nu permite lucruri mai multe deodată de aceea trebuesc examinate toate monumentele în ruină şi reparate învelişurile şi părţile, cari să împiedice continuarea ruinării până la vremuri mai bune.

93

XIII
Tipografia Cărţilor Bisericeşti

Tipografia asta creată de Mitropolia din Bucureşti şi dezvoltată de Sf. Sinod au luat-o sub guvernul anterior Ministerul Cultelor are vr'o 7 culte, deci ea a devenit a tuturor. Venitul ei din cărţi bisericeşti rituale trece la stat, pe când biserica noastră nu are o para să tipărească o broşură contra unei secte. O anomalie, care n'are pereche în lumea întreagă. Toate cultele au tipografiile lor, numai bisericei noastre i s'a luat.

Să fie complectată cu mari ateliere de icoane bisericeşti căci provinciile alipite, afară de Basarabia n'au decât icoane heterodoxe, cari au început a trece şi în vechiul regat; să se redeee bisericei.

XIV
„Fabrica de lumânări de ceară”

Guvernul trebue să înlesnească înfiinţarea la o mănăstire a unor fabrici mari pentru lumânări de ceară, cari să se folosească în biserică. Guvernul anterior a promis bisericei monopolul acestor lumânări, cari în Basarabia aduc bisericei venit de milioane Lei.

XV
„Ateliere la mănăstiri”

Mănăstirile de maici trebuesc îndemnate şi spre ocupaţiuni pentru binele obştesc, ca să nu fie preocupate numai exclusiv de ele. Am înfiinţat la Pasărea şi la Susana orfelinate de orfane de război cu şcoale primare. Guvernul trebue să ne dee ajutor pentru a întemeia felurite ateliere de lucru, cari să ocupe şi pe maici şi pe eleve.

XVI
„Biblioteca Mitropoliei”

La Mitropolie au existat o biblioteca de mare valoare. Ce-a fost mai bun s'a dus la Academie; ori s'a pierdut, luat de Nemţi etc. de la Seminarul Central, unde s'a strămutat. Azi a mai rămas puţin. Cum poate exista o biserică – ca a noastră – fără o bogată bibliotecă cu tot ce are teologia, şi cele aparţinatoare ei, mai bun în toată lumea?

Pentru bibliotecă an de an trebue luat în buget o sumă corespunzătoare. O lege trebue făcută urgent, ca întreaga bibliotecă a episcopilor şi mitropoliţilor o moşteneşte eparhia.

XVII
„Congrese mondiale bisericeşti”

România a devenit un stat, al cărui cuvânt în lumea mai mare începe să aibă greutate. Să ţin multe congrese mondiale cu caracter bisericesc. Duşmanii ne defaimă pretutindenea, căci lupta în provinciile alipite s'a transpus pe teren bisericesc-cultural.

Astfel trebue să avem în tot locul reprezentanţi bine pregătiţi. Alte feluri de misiuni în streinătate ai cheltuit bani mulţi. Să se iee la buget sume potrivite şi pentru asemenea esmisiuni în afară.

<div align="center">

XVIII

„Protopopii sporite”

</div>

Nimic nu progresează pe terenul administrativ, fie civil, fie bisericesc – fără control –. Protopopii din vechiul regat au cercuri prea mari de controlat – judeţe întregi. Greco-catolicii au şi protopopii cu 3 parohii. Trebuesc luate în buget sumele pentru sporirea protopopiilor, la 50 parohii un protopop.

<div align="center">

XIX

„Plata preoţilor”

</div>

Viitorul bisericei va atârna de la valoarea apostolilor ei, cari sunt preoţii. Dar la plată slabă nu se găsesc muncitori buni. De aceia tinerii fug de preoţie. Absolvenţii facultăţii teologice nu se mai fac preoţi. De aceia trebue să li se asimileze plata cu a celorlalţi funcţionari de stat cu studii asemănătoare. Atunci se vor găsi mai uşor tineri cari să nu fugă de cariera preoţească; iară fără preoţii buni concurenţa între confesiuni în lupta pentru existenţă e pierdută.

Am indicat în resumat necesităţile mai urgente ale bisericei, fără a le motiva în amănunte, căci toate aceste nevoi – şi numai indicate pe scurt – se evidenţiază în faţa ori cărui fiu al bisericei.

<div align="right">

Bucureşti, 1922

</div>

Miron Cristea
Mitropolit primat

HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ETHNIC COHABITATION IN MACEDONIA UNTIL THE 2001 CRISIS

Irina Simonovska-Spirkovska[*]

Abstract

This article offers a historical overview on the aspect of coexistence and cohabitation in Macedonia. The country, seen from a geostrategic aspect is a region where, the cultural historical pattern was in fact a crossroads. Many nations and ethnicities interbred, thus acquiring a superficial, yet sufficiently descriptive picture of the cultural-plural influence in Macedonian history. The principle of cohabitation represents a state of unification and leveling of many different social aspects, which, throughout history, has faced and still faces certain problems. Throughout the middle ages, the Ottoman rule and the more recent Yugoslav history, gaining of independence and transition, that historical pattern has somehow repeated, showing a relatively high degree of readiness for cohabitation in the Macedonian case.

Key words: *Ethnic Cohabitation, Cultural Diversity, Ottoman Rule, Yugoslav Federation, Transition*

Introduction

All types of social organization, primarily the state as the strongest kind, must rely on its people's consent to live and organize their life on a certain territory. It includes their mutual acknowledgement on the means to improve their social life, realize and respect the common goals and values. Thus, this type of organizing respects same traditions and eventually strives to building new ones.

Macedonia, perceived from historical – political and geostrategic aspect is a region where, over the centuries, the cultural historical pattern was in fact a crossroads. Many nations and ethnicities interbred, thus acquiring a superficial, yet sufficiently descriptive picture of the cultural-plural influence in Macedonian history. The country, in the last few centuries, has twice been part of such large social organizations (first the Ottoman Empire, then the Yugoslav Federation). Two strong assertions can be immediately identified; the many cultural influences and the need to cohabitate. The above could be deduced

---

[*] Researcher with a MsC in legal history at the Faculty of Law in Skopje and PhD degree at the Faculty of Political Sciences at University of Bucharest. Teaching assistant on the Faculty of Skopje and at the Embassy of the Republic of Macedonia in Bucharest. Secretary General of the NGO "European Movement-Macedonia" in 2008. E-mail: eirenika@yahoo.com

exactly from the way people organize their everyday life, further transmitted to the field of ethno-cultural differentiation.

Hence, the five centuries of Ottoman rule (representation of a religious community), demonstrated a high degree of cultural tolerance and cohabitation within the Empire, thus for Macedonia, which enjoyed cultural, religious, and to some degree, administrative – legal autonomy. A good example of the above would be the rich activity of the church-school communities, supporting the process of learning how to cohabitate with other cultures and ethnicities, pulling in its favor a lot of positive experiences, especially in the field of administrative management and law. Thus, it has opened a good prospect for the concept of cohabitation, with excellent examples throughout the older and more recent Macedonian history.

1. Homogenization in Eastern Europe and Balkans and Influence on the Cultural Diversity

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe, in the communist and socialist period, held a very rigid position on the recognition of ethno-cultural differences, seen as a threat to their own national – state territory. Countries have taken steps towards homogenization of its societies, specified in the terrifying and still unfinished sequence of events, thus offsetting the cohabitation process. The large historical period is marked by the processes of assimilation, expulsion, organized resettlement, deportation, ethnic cleansing and wars, genocide, restoration, creation of so-called "ethnically pure" communities, and so on.

This article puts emphasis on interesting comparative specification between the East and West: it casts light on the common cultural-historical source of most Western countries, where over several centuries, joint democratic perspectives (based on respect for equality for all) have molded, differing significantly from the traditional "tribal" understanding of the social relations' regulation, most evident in ethno-cultural collective segment of some Eastern societies.[1]

Besides the undeniable fact of the very complex diversity in the Balkans, the historical perspective offers a large number of ethno – cultural homogenization examples. C. Giordano offers a view on few periods in which

---

[1] The separation factor was very negligible in the early nineties, when the ethnic background almost did not matter, but that image has changed radically in the nineties, when the concerns about belonging to other ethnic groups were growing and beginning to occur in almost all segments of society. The religious affiliation, which in the traditional spirit of multicultural and multiconfessional living in Macedonia had never previously represented the cause of intolerance among different groups, had apparently become a divisive factor.

the ethnic issues and strives for ethnic homogenization[1]: the first major ethnic cleansing comes precisely from the Balkans, in the process of establishing the Balkan states and their rejection of the government of the Ottoman Empire, when large areas are "cleansed" from Turkish and other Muslim population.[2] The second larger stage is the period between 1913 and 1925, marked by exchanges of population, as an internationally recognized "concept", followed by forced evictions of residents. The third stage of ethnic displacement pair comes few decades later, in the period immediately before and after the Second World War, when under the flood of various national-socialistic movements, a violent resettlement occurred, followed by deportation and cleansing;[3] the fourth stage begins with the Bulgaria's cruel treatment of the question towards the Turkish minority in the 80's of the last century. Soon after that, the well-known events of the great socialist federations followed: Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. The bloody ending of Yugoslavia – the war in Bosnia, formally ended with the signing of the Dayton Agreement, in a similar manner as Lausanne, having oficialized the establishing ethnically pure areas, designated in a bloody manner.

These stages are few good examples of striving towards creation of national states, through the elimination of ethnic diversities. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe nowadays are more "homogeneous" than they were in the fifties and sixties' years of the last century. Ethnicity, as a category, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, is often rather viewed through a territorial, than any other perspective. Each cultural group has a right to its own territory, space that would have the opportunity to realize their specific properties.

The aforementioned does not obliterate the fact that ethnic and political adjectives, (as terms of defining a sense of belonging), in fact denote a quite different effect. The political community, as a form of identification becomes affordable in recent history of Central and Eastern Europe in this case. The

---

[1] Christian Giordano, *Views on Intercultural Communication*, Library of the XX century (in Serbian), Beograd, 2001, p. 223-226.

[2] The Turkish population was representative of the dominant political group for a very long time, at least until the second half of the XV century, but during the Eastern crisis, nearly a million and a half inhabitants have been forcibly moved out from the Balkan Peninsula. This is the reverse process of the Islamization settlement-process, undertaken by the Ottoman Empire, from the early XV century onwards. *Ibidem*.

[3] For example, parts of the Albanian population from Kosovo and Metohija after the Western Balkan wars moved to Turkey, mainly because they were Muslims. Then, rural assets, which the Albanians have fled, through the agrarian reform, were given to Serbian colonists, who had to "correct" the ethnic demographic picture in the region. Western experts had interpreted that as "progressive act of modernization", for removing the anachronous Turkish chiflik system, through the strengthening of "national element" of those areas. Here, the exchange of population between Greece and Turkey has to be mentioned, sanctioned by the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923, as an act of recognition of the displacement has to happen. *Ibidem*.

primary form of identification is still ethno-cultural, and that such policy is tied to the territorial concept. Thus, the political communities in the wide Eastern European area have adopted the ethnic aspect as a primary form of identification after respective gaining of independence.

2. Ethnic Issues and Cohabitation Elements in the Period of Ottoman Rule; the Macedonian Case

The territory of the modern Republic of Macedonia has a specific geostrategic position. Put in a wider historical perspective, it represents a place where, over a long historical period, roads of many people, nations and cultures have crossed. Just a simple observation of historical artifacts can witness the aforementioned.

One of the most important periods in this respect is the XIV century, the period of penetration of the Ottoman rule in Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the territory of Macedonia. In fact, the above can be considered as the first cultural-plural impulse on the territory. Gradually but surely, over the next few centuries, it has molded the ethnic picture of Macedonia, similar in many ways to the one we witness today. Within this process, the colonization of the Turkish and Albanian population played a main role, quite understandable, followed by both violent and nonviolent islamization of the Macedonian population (around the XVII century).

The ethno-cultural, religious and territorial concepts are tightly bound to the respective region. The long process of cultural identification of many nations is reflected in the antagonism of the two major religions, the Christian and the Muslim. The primary assimilation does not involve absorption of the Christian religion and culture into the Muslim, and it is perhaps one of the crucial features of forming the specific cultural identity on this broad geographical area.

Another suitable example of the above colonization process is the case of Serbian people, who had settled thousands of Serbs from the early XIX century. It is very similar to the Macedonian case, whereas the migration of the Macedonian population in other region primarily comes as a consequence of economic, social and more specifically – educational reasons, especially obvious in the mid – XIX century.

According to various historical sources, in the XIX century, on the territory of present-day Macedonia, the ratio of the Macedonian population and other population was two thirds in favor of the Macedonian (in the Turkish official documents often named Christian). There are other historical documents, in which the same is called differently, depending on national and political interests of the various modes of propaganda and neighboring states

over their territorial claims and aspirations in the Balkans.[1] Within this complex constellation, a religious tolerance in the former Ottoman Millet – system has played one of the main cohabitation roles, by not favoring the Turkish nation as the only legitimate constituent of the Empire, but rather, regarding it as a community of people. Under the protection of Islam and Sharia law, a broader religious community was promoted (in which nationality did not play statehood role).

In addition to the rights of communities – there were the specific rights of practicing religion and customs. But, most important, an autonomous legal system through the church-school communities was introduced, whereas the regulation and management of the cultural (and even many of the other social relations) were possible. One good example of the interesting contrast, regarding the common multicultural past, would be the quite common practice of concluding marriages between people of different religions, especially between Muslims and Christians.[2]

The cohabitation in Macedonia, as a historical category, has drawn its historical root from the Ottoman Empire. In this prospect, the indirect antagonism has existed between two major religious groups (Muslim and Christian); the interesting fact is that the direct conflict can be detected between two Christian groups. On the one side, there was the rich, Graecized strata, being influenced by the Constantinople Patriarchate; the other was represented by lower Slavic Macedonian clerical layers and Macedonian intelligentsia. In this regard, an intensive process of strengthening the Macedonian consciousness can be identified.

---

[1] Marija Tasheva, *Ethnic Groups in Macedonia – The Historical Context*, Faculty of Philosophy (in Macedonian), Skopje, 1997, p. 115.
[2] According to many Turkish documents, the Christian population sometimes gave preference to the Sharia law, instead of the Orthodox Church law, namely of convenience reasons. The first was much more severe regarding the norms and their practice, while the second was much more tolerant. This phenomenon, namely, existed not only among Christians, but among Catholics and the Jews as well. It must be stated that, between the Sharia, Jewish and Christian religious law existed kind of "accord", because the marriage and family relations were regulated according to the rules of their churches whose acts were legitimate in front of the Ottoman authorities. The legal status of Christians in the Ottoman state was more favorable in comparison with the non-religious subjects (i.e. those who were not people of the Book). As already known, all churches on the territory of the Ottoman Empire had certain rights (officially recognized) to regulate the marital and family relations of its believers. Ottoman authorities have not intervened in the canonical rules of the churches. Besides the Sharia law, there was enough space for each confession and church (Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish), who have had their own norms, practiced by the priests of those churches. For this, see: Aleksandar Matkovski, *Civil Marriages and Divorces of Christians in Macedonia and the Balkan Peninsula at the Time of Turkish Rule* (in Macedonian), Herald of The Institute for National History, Skopje, 1973.

The aforementioned church-school communities are an excellent example of cohabitation between the Slavic, Macedonian people and the official, Turkish rule in the Ottoman Empire. Their versatile competences include educational and cultural activities, health and social work, humanitarian work and, ultimately and most important, development of an extensive legal and judicial activity.[1] Besides the primary social organization of a particular area, the competences addressed the ensuring of the unimpeded functioning of the economy in general. They aimed at another very important goal-unification of the Macedonian people in cultural, educational, political, ethnic and other terms. They also emphasized the process of defining the social and political awareness of self-determination and autonomous regulation of life in a certain area. For example, after the abolition of the Ohrid Archiepiscopate in 1767, the local residents have settled their civil (i.e. family law, marriage, divorce and similar) issues and disputes – on the basis of common law.

These considerations display a fair degree of historical-social development, including the use of indigenous normative activity, as part of the overall rise in idiosyncratic direction of building their own institutions. They have remained as a certain norm of the "national capital" created in the past. The modern conditions impose a significant need to preserve the benefits of important historical processes for successful and smooth continuation of state-legal development and further comprehensive national prosperity. Thus, through this Ottoman union *sui generis*, a conclusion of the first significant social integration of people of the Balkans can be drawn.

3. The Yugoslav Federation and the Republics' Breakthrough. Macedonian Specifics

The second significant period of the Macedonian tradition of ethno-cultural coexistence in historical context, comes at the end of World War II, when Macedonia had gained statehood within the wider Yugoslav federation.

Yugoslavia under Tito had recognized Macedonia as an equal federal unit, along with five other republics. The federalist idea also advocated for multinational state, where each republic would have its own national identity, besides the unifying Yugoslav identity, recognizable under the maxim "brotherhood and unity". Subsequently, the Macedonian identity had

---

[1] For more detailed references on the church- school communities, see: Aleksandar Trajanovski, *The Church-School Communities in Macedonia*, (in Macedonian), Institute for National History, Skopje, 1988.

strengthened, and as followed with the other republics, sought for bigger autonomy from the Serbian center[1], fully achieving that in 1991.

In this regard, the article emphasizes two aspects. The first is the negative aspect of the respective issue, shedding light on the communistic character of the federation. The national structures, instead of cohabitation, have chosen antagonism and later, conflict. The positive aspect of the "supranational" Yugoslav identity had actually proved very useful for strengthening of the specific Macedonian national identity and raising the national consciousness.

However, the religious union of the previous era was now replaced by a strict centralist edited course. The multi-ethnicity on the territory remained present, except that the presence of Turkish population had declined in favor of the Albanian population. On one side, the population majority was consisted of Macedonians, and on the other hand, the members of other ethnic communities created the minorities' department.

Within the three Yugoslav federal constitutions (1946, 1963 and 1974) existed a declarative guarantee of the minorities' rights to use their language and develop their culture, supplemented by a ban on propaganda or enforcement of national inequality. Thus, intolerance and hatred were curbed.[2]

The concept of cultural pluralism as a politics, at least for Macedonia as a member, in this historical period is relatively unknown. The nearest concept to the ordinary masses was the famous slogan of "*brotherhood and unity*", an ideological matrix of the political model of the state, meaning an equal respect for the cultural diversity in society, but to praise its highest level in interest in survival.[3]

---

[1] The Macedonian neighbors, Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia had won independence from the Ottoman rule in XIX and XX century and were always in struggle of who would control the Macedonian territories.

[2] In this regard it is useful to offer a brief overview of the development of the Macedonian constitutionality. Macedonia has had four constitutions (1946, 1963, 1974 and 1991). From 1946 to 1991, the development of the constitutionality gradually passes from purely centralized homogenizing line to greater autonomy of the republics. The 1991 constitution proclaimed an independent and sovereign state. After the 2001 conflict, the Constitution, as well as the majority of society-political organization was changed by a system document called Ohrid Framework Agreement, which had promoted collective rights of ethnic groups and had introduced a greater protection and promotion of ethnic minorities. For this, see: Vladimir Mitkov, *ASNOM and the Constitutional Development*, Republic of Macedonia, 60 Years after ASNOM (in Macedonian), Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje, 2005, p. 91-105.

[3] The ethnic and especially national hatred is an ever present question in Yugoslav history, pulling roots many centuries before. One of the best examples is the situation in XIX century Bosnia, and the Muslim ethnic group, called Bosniaks (which separates the Bosnian Muslims of Turkish Muslims). According to sources from the XIX century, the relations between Bosniaks and Ottomans were dominated by mutual hatred and disdain. For this, see: Leslie Benson,

This relatively short historical period features a fairly high degree of homogeneity in Macedonia (although, later proved as illusory), but also a large degree of ethnic cohabitation absence. This homogeneity was due (to some extent), to the relatively stable economic situation in the country, as one of the most important means for inducing general social security. The latter was complemented by the feeling of equality among the citizens. It can be asserted, that the feeling of equality somehow suppressed the need for cultural diversity. This assertion can sustain only in specific conditions, liberated from other factors, such as social exclusion and marginalization (for example). The illusory homogeneity had not produced the need to exceed the actual social inequality, inspired by ethno-cultural diversity.

It is worth mentioning that, in the mid-eighties of the last century, after the death of Josip Broz Tito, a change was evident, in relation of the national identity and insisting of the usage of adjective "Yugoslav" to the people and nation, causing a feeling of resistance the members of various nationalities, including the Macedonian. The latter can be considered as one of reasons for the collapse of Yugoslavia, i.e. the unpopularity of artificially generated Yugoslav identity.[1]

As already elaborated, Yugoslavia was in fact a very heterogeneous ethno-national country under a homogenous cloak. In this regard, emphasis is put on the geopolitical position, the different historical traditions, different historical influences, different religions, and the level of general economic development.[2] The dissolution of Yugoslavia in fact, primarily reflects the ethnic breakdown in each republic in 1991.

Enemies and Neighbours: Serbs and Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans, Ashgate, Great Britain, 1999, p. 295. Also, see: Petar Atanasov, *Multiculturalism as Theory, Policy and Practice* (in Macedonian), Skopje, Evro Balkan Press, 2003, p. 137.

[1] Some authors emphasize the feeling of fear of Yugoslav Stalinist policy, i.e. centralist tactics against non-Serb nationalities. Sources point to the examples of Croatia and Kosovo in 1981 and Bosnia in 1983, when rioting had occurred and numbers of notables (such as later Bosnian president Alija Izetbegovic) were put on trial for alleged conspiracy to undermine the state through their Pan-Islamic activities. For this, see: Benson, Leslie, *Ibidem*, p. 307. Also, see: Ganka Cvetanova, *Cultural Differences and Social Integration (Macedonia Before and After the Framework Agreement)*, Institute for Economic Strategies and International Relations Ohrid, Skopje, 2007, p. 97-100.

[2] Within this context, though not very relevant for the main article, it is useful to mention the religious cohabitation in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The creation of the Kingdom in 1918 had also provided freedom of conscience and equality of all religions. That was also a moment for an application for a single Muslim religious community. By then, two had existed, one for Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo and Macedonia, and the other for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. The single community had been created in 1930, by the name of Islamic Religious Community, whose main leadership had been stationed in Belgrade. However, this community had existed only in nominal terms. For this, see: Dimitar

Only one republic, Slovenia, was substantially mono-ethnic (while only a negligible number of Slovenes lived outside their own republic). All the other Republics had sizeable minorities, and in one republic (Bosnia-Herzegovina), none of the three groups (Serbs, Muslims, Croats) actually had a majority.[1]

The Yugoslav dissolution, among other factors can be attributed to the nationalism, seen as a form of perceiving the members of a certain nation and their respective creations are seen as better than other people and their creation.[2] This was the case with the Serbian and Croatian nations in comparison to the other members of the federation.

The Yugoslav war that had started in the early 1990's had further emphasized the effect of gradual separation of nations (factually and declaratively – through the Yugoslav constitutions). The above cannot only be regarded through a clear nationalistic prism, but also, the religious notion should be implemented. As already asserted, historically, the religion has always been present as one of the primary identification form of the groups, defining their sense of belonging.

Put in Yugoslav conditions, it had reflected the need for protection within their own "circle" of people and put all the blame on the "other" group, implying a production of relatively high degree of ethnocentrism, nationalism and prejudices. [3]

Complemented with the ethnicity issues, the separation of nations can be regarded as a very powerful triggering point for major social changes, unfortunately having gone through a bloody war and overlong transition process. The "newly" molded different national identities of the respective republic are perceived as capable of cohabitation amongst each others, but with the collapse and dissolution of Yugoslavia, they are regarded as trademarks of the new beginning.

The national "cohabitation" in Yugoslavia reflects the useful, but still, somehow pale concept of national identity, not of one nation but of all nations.

Mircev; Hristo Kartalov; Ilija Aceski; Antoanela Petkovska; Mileva Gjurovska; Vasil Plushkoski, *Sociological Aspects of the Ethnic Coexistence in Macedonia*, a Project (in Macedonian), Institute for Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Skopje, 1996, p. 169.

[1] John Coakley, *Territorial Management of Ethnic Conflict*, London, F. Cass, 2003, p. 275-276.

[2] For further references, see: Aleksandar Boskovic, *Nationalism as Destiny: Few Opinions of Serbian Intellectuals on the Yugoslav Dissolution* (in Serbian), web source: http://www.gape.org/sasa/boskovic-nacionalizam_kao_sudbina.pdf

[3] The changes and consequences that the economic sphere has produced – is comprised in nothing else, but in a rapid enrichment for one social layer, leaving the other social strata with feeling of uncertainty, aided by the (in)ability of the respective governments to find a transitional political option for the management of structural inequalities and tectonic shifts in the social sphere, proving so critical for the loosening of potential danger for intercultural tensions that almost always follow the same structural inequality and the shifting of the ethnic field.

That is identified by S.Jansen, as a state with "...shaky foundations of a precarious balance between a number of decentralized units whose very existence was legitimated by their 'national' identity...".[1]

The constitutional guarantee of equal rights and freedoms of citizens, which are to be subsequently found in every Yugoslav and Macedonian constitution, had not depicted the real picture of cohabitation between different national and more importantly, ethnic groups. Due to those reasons, the region has witnessed tremendous conflicts and social turbulences.[2]

4. Historical Aspects of Macedonian Ethnic Picture in the Transition Years until the 2001 Conflict

Regarding the continuing existence of many ethnic communities on the territory of Macedonia in the period after its independence, the somehow "hidden" issues of cultural diversity must be mentioned. Whatever the historical context is, the territory of Macedonia has always been an embracing cradle for a number of differences that produce a high degree of ethno-cultural diversity. That diversity is not unilateral, but is being reflected in many religious, cultural and ethnic nuances.

The above complexity could also be viewed after the breakup of Yugoslavia and Macedonia's gaining of independence. Two levels could be distinguished: one is the political-economic, and the other is perceived through the notion of nationalism and emergence of different ethnic identities.[3]

---

[1] Jansen identifies the national identities as useful tools in the Titoist strategy: "…they served as vehicles for expressing regional conflicts which did not fit in with the communist ideology of brotherhood and unity, and were therefore subject to ambiguity; they were both encouraged – insofar as they were thought to be necessary for the survival of Yugoslav unity, and discouraged – insofar as they were incorporated in separatist discourses…". Stef Jansen, *Against Cultural Anesthesia*, Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans, Ashgate, Great Britain, 1999, p. 278-279.

[2] There are two interesting examples in Yugoslav Macedonia; the first one is the existence of tension between the Turkish and Macedonian community and the migration of the first to Republic of Turkey, where sources say that in 27 years' span, 117.247 Turks moved from Macedonia. The second example is the inter-ethnic relations with the Albanian community in 1968/69, with requirements of a broader cultural autonomy and use of national symbols. For this, see: Ivan Katardziev, *Macedonian State, the Republic of Macedonia, Sixty Years after ASNOM – One Possible View* (in Macedonian), Republic of Macedonia, 60 Years after ASNOM (in Macedonian), Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje, 2005, p. 36; also Dragan Kljaic, *Time of Kolishevski* (in Macedonian) Skopje, 1994, p. 294-350.

[3] This period was marked by the introduction of pluralist system in Macedonia. The latter can be considered as one of the factors which helped bringing to the light of the problems with cultural differences, crossing the period of the narrow-minded policy and banning the emphasis on otherness. As in the other post-socialist countries, radical changes were introduced. The society had to be quickly transformed into a completely new system, based on well known principles of parliamentary democracy and political pluralism, as well as a transition to a

106

With regard to the above political-economic and cultural level, Macedonia had to deal with a general transformation, whereas many social categories had to leave, in order of the new ones to be set on stage. The very process of turning the socialism into capitalism has an inevitable effect on shaping the social entities. Thus, it affects not only their existence, their relations among themselves, as well as the relation between the individual subject and society. The market economy, viewed in the broader picture, likely had more negative impact on the majority of citizens, as it enhanced enrichment of a very small social layer of people at the expense of the majority, producing a feeling of injustice and discontent and increasing the number of poor and unemployed citizens, regardless of which nationality they belonged.

In the first years after gaining independence, the Republic of Macedonia has been found in the center of the structural reorganization of the state and society, leaving the Yugoslav federation with weaker prospects in every possible respect, primarily economic and social. In fact, many social categories had to make way for new ones, thus producing many social changes and tangling the social entities, communities, as well as their inter relations.

The socio-political situation in Macedonia in that period will be assessed as relatively politically stable, due to the political history and experience of Macedonia. The country, until 2001, was released from interethnic wars; a negative historical collective memory among ethnic communities was clearly absent. Even when there were tensions, communities knew, i.e. had learned how to live beside each other.

In this context, there is strong presence of capacity for cohabitation, as an indigenous, essential part of the Macedonian culture. Some authors even argue that the latter cannot be "…deduced or derived directly from cultures of its neighbors…" influencing the country to make alliances "…the alliance with the Vatican, in spite of absence for recognition of the Macedonian Orthodox Church on the behalf of the wider family of Orthodox churches)…"[1]

Generally, the above may be said to have a certain effect on all ethnicities or nationalities. However, the national minorities were in more discriminated position than the majority, and thus the "*upgrade*" of their cultural identity was somehow inhibited or slowed down. Although it sounded

---

market economy (and the respective transformation of social capital into private one), placing on the first place (and thus raising the level of) the constitutional priority of human rights and freedom. However, the overlong process of transition primarily addressed the market economy, and most likely, had slightly negative social impact on the citizens' majority, since (as in most of the other countries of the region) enhanced the enrichment of a small social strata at the expense of the majority, thus producing a deep feeling of insecurity, discontent and injustice.

[1] D. Ljubomir Frchkoski, *Republic of Macedonia: A Stable Model of Interethnic Relations*? (in Macedonian), Yearbook of the Faculty of Law, Skopje, volume 39, 2001 (in Macedonian), p. 276-277.

good, it was still one of the factors contributing to the emergence of latent issues. One of the most important issues in this regard is the interrelation of cultural differences in the formation of identity among ethnicities or nationalities, crossing the period of the narrow-minded policy and banning the emphasis on otherness.

5. Gaining Independence and Transition Years
Regarding the following transition period, the article sheds light on few periodical premises: In the period from 1990 to 2000, viewed year after year, the trend in the field of ethnic relations and cohabitation was obvious going downwards, showing dynamic changes in intensity. The early nineties (1991/1991) are marked by feelings of prejudice and ethnic distance of minority towards the majority. The majority was not feeling "threatened" by the minority's negative feelings. The next two years (1992/1993) are being marked by mutual accusations and evaluations of ethnic groups, as well as overall loyalty to the system. In the next following years (1994-1996), the feeling of threat had been more pronounced.[1]

Another important aspect of the cohabitation discourse is the level of social cohesion. In Macedonia, the level of social integration in the period of the 1990's, until the armed interethnic conflict in 2001, can be assessed as *non satisfactory*. In fact, the relative non-integration of ethnic Albanians in the Macedonian social trends in the period before and around gaining of the independence, had escalated into interethnic tensions in 2001. The aforementioned assertion is an outcome of subjective and objective factors: first, the positive or negative attitude of official state policy towards an ethnic community; it can also been regarded as a logical consequence of the historical and geopolitical factor. The field of constitutional protection has been done quite fairly, still several steps in front of terms of real inclusion of ethnic minorities in the social mainstream. This, after all, had been considered as a very advanced approach to minority treatment regarded in wider regional aspect.

The cohabitation as a term is possible at two levels. The first is the declarative, generally establishing a normative – legal possibility for coexistence between groups. It is accompanied by the absence of major tensions. The second one is reflected in everyday life, institutions, participation of certain groups in a joint public field. The paper argues that there must be a clear distinction between a declarative and real cohabitation. Besides the undisputed declaration for peaceful coexistence between ethnic communities,

---

[1] For this, see: Ganka Cvetanova, *Cultural Differences and Social Integration, Macedonia Before and After the Framework Agreement* (in Macedonian), Institute for Economic Strategies and International Relations, Ohrid, 1997, p. 100.

supported by transitional floscule for regional "*oasis of peace*", the social-demographic structure was primarily concerned with attempts for creation of ethnically clean territories along ethnic lines, normally seen in smaller and rural territories[1]; another important factor in "undermining" the cohabitation, would be the creation of organizations by ethnic structural pattern, in fact, a formation of parallel segments of society and a clear capacity to lead a parallel social life. Even though this process has had some positive features, however, those ones which prevailed over others were stronger, thus manifesting a strong desire and willingness to work on retailoring or redistribution of the centers and mechanisms of political power in the political society.

Macedonia passed several stages in their ethno-cultural and cultural-plural process: The first phase would be the phase of disintegration of the plural-cultural unity with the absence of democratic means to resolve differences; the second phase of relative isolation is the so-called phase, "*turning on the inside*". It is a period of painful shaping and reshaping of the ethno-cultural figures; the third phase, which according historical experience can be considered as the forthcoming, could be called "*turning to the other*". J. Corubin explains this as a "…consequence of the inability live in an own ethno-cultural shell".[2]

Out of the above, two moments can be distinguished. The first is the "politics of distorted ethnicity", and the second one is the "mutually exclusive communities"[3], that perhaps are the key explanation to the escalation of ethnic relations in the ascending line and denying the principle of cohabitation.

This article argues that, this degree of social historical development is somehow representing a negation of previous cultural-historical trends of cohabitation (both in the public, as well as in the private sphere). The negation is represented by the term of "re-popularization" of the ethnicity and ethnic divisions in many socio-political segments, ranging from "ordinary-everyday", spheres of living, to education, politics, economics, administration and so on. Hence, instead of continuation of this trend, the opposite had happened, the relationship between ethnic groups created a slot for each group, finalized by the 2001 crisis. In this sense, it can be concluded that parallelism, which in the

---

[1] The original culture, which can be described as pre-urban, is largely opposed to the firm ground of the closed group. In contrast, in the urban areas, the concept of the group is relatively vague. In the "old" group, the feeling of kinship, the spirit of tribal consanguinity, was still strongly expressed – almost regardless of whether the concept is based on race, people or nation.

[2] Jovan Korubin, *Transition, Cultural Pluralism and the Intellectuals* (in Macedonian) Cultural Pluralism and Social Integration, Sociological review, 1/1, Skopje, 1995, p. 33-34.

[3] For this, see: Petar Atanasov, *ibidem*, p. 119-121; also: Tchavdar Marinov, *The Multiculturalism in the Balkans: Is it necessary? The Use of the Term in the Context of the Balkans* (in Macedonian), Article in the Journal of Politics, Gender and Culture, vol. 5/no. 2, Institute Euro Balkan, Skopje, 2006.

past was a mechanism for coexistence, in the years before the conflict turned into a mechanism of separation.

The treatment of ethnic communities within the Constitution of 1991 can be assessed as "mild", it lacked a real protection of the ethnic group rights, which in some way contributed to the dissatisfaction of the citizens of other ethnic communities, igniting the sense of "*second-class citizens*",[1] lacking a genuine space for cohabitation.

Three interrelated assumptions offered by multiculturalists Kymlicka and Opalski, can be attributed to Macedonia's situation in the years until the conflict: first, the disloyalty of the minorities; strong and stable state requires weak and powerless minorities; and that the treatment of minorities, above all, is the treatment of issues of national security.[2]

The aforementioned period can be described as a period of declaratively prominent, but still illusive ethnic homogeneity and latent, seemingly relaxed political relations, mainly due to stable economic position in society and relatively high sense of social security that the same provides. Thus, quite logically, a lack of wider socio-political agenda in that direction had occurred. That can also be explained by the sanctioning of public expression of opinion and taking action in that sense.

In the period near and immediately after the conflict in 2001[3], a clear and relatively defined polarity between these two relatively non-integrated segments was expressed. This process can be defined as, social "*non-integration*" or the "*unfinished integration*"[4]. The terms were triggered by an actual lack of certain prerogatives such as equity, inclusion and real coexistence. Although

---

[1] These efforts, naturally did not find its place in practice, because of the exclusivist favoring of the principle of equality among citizens, as well as the unitary character of the state. Of course, strictly from a declarative perspective, the purpose of differentiation was performed; some kind of "chance for preservation and extension of various social identities" was given, which obtained a qualification of "tolerant" and "ready to promote multiethnic relations" for Macedonia, which in turn had a very positive (especially in time of war in ex-Yugoslav territories) effect (which, as already known, was religiously inspired). This could be considered as one of the factors which, among other things, prevented the spillover of the Bosnian war on the territory of Macedonia. That contributed to the recognition of the state as a modern society, where the respect for fundamental rights is a categorical imperative, but also, where diversity was not denied, but rather included in the wider social picture.

[2] Will Kymlicka, Magda Opalski, *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported? Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relationships in Eastern Europe*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 74-75.

[3] The 2001 conflict had been ignited by the National Liberation Army, a paramilitary formation of ethnic Albanians, seeking a wider range of ethnic rights. The 2001 Ohrid Framework Agreement (signed by the representative officials of the Macedonian and Albanian ethnic communities, as well as representatives of the international community) ceased the battles and offered a reconstruction of the Macedonian society, promoting the principle of greater inclusion of ethnic minorities in the public life.

[4] Petar Atanasov, *ibidem*, p. 119-120.

Macedonia has passed the Yugoslav political turmoil relatively unharmed, the actual absence of coexistence and inclusion were vaguely "masked'' behind the universality, nested in the core of the classical democratic postulates for equality.

Conclusion

The Macedonian case is unique in many aspects, regardless of the historical period. The concept of cohabitation, taking into account the many differences and matters arising from the ethnic, national, linguistic, religious and other characteristics, cannot be treated as unilateral issue. It represents a state of unification and leveling of many different social aspects, which historically, has faced and still faces certain problems. In this sense, one of the most obvious characteristics of societies with cultural diversity is the emergence of so-called resistance of the various national or ethnic groups. Despite the efforts for cultural and political unification or civil union, the attempt to maintain their own cultural uniqueness and code linear inherent to their traditional experience is ever present. The aftermath of 2001 conflict initiated and inspired a brand new social reading. It actually led to combining of the consotional with the policy of liberal democracy, or an attempt to balance individual and group rights. The Framework Agreement, the document which closed the armed conflict, establishes a good basis for the principle of consensus in the society. Although Macedonia cannot be defined as a strict consensual society, it addresses the area of issues which concern the ethnic communities and thus opens an excellent field for cohabitation.

<p style="text-align:center">*******</p>

Selected Bibliography:

Atanasov, Petar, *Multiculturalism as Theory, Policy and Practice* (in Macedonian) Evro Balkan Press, Skopje, 2003

Benson, Leslie, *Enemies and Neighbours: Serbs and Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans, Ashgate, Great Britain, 1999

Boskovic, Aleksandar, *Nationalism as Destiny: Few Opinions of Serbian Intellectuals on the Yugoslav Dissolution* (in Serbian), web source: http://www.gape.org/sasa/boskovic-nacionalizam_kao_sudbina.pdf

Coakley, John, *The Territorial Management of Ethnic Conflict*, F. Cass, London, 2003

Cvetanova, Ganka, *Cultural Differences and Social Integration (Macedonia Before and After the Framework Agreement)*,(in Macedonian), Institute for Economic Strategies and International Relations Ohrid, Skopje, 2007

Frchkoski, D.Ljubomir, *Republic of Macedonia: A Stable Model of Interethnic Relations?* (in Macedonian),Yearbook of the Faculty of Law, Skopje, Volume 39, 2001

Giordano, Christian, *Views on Intercultural Communication* (in Serbian), Library of the XX century, Beograd, 2001

Jansen, Stef, *Against Cultural Anaesthesia*, Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans, Ashgate, Great Britain, 1999

Katardziev, Ivan, *Macedonian State, the Republic of Macedonia, Sixty Years after ASNOM – One Possible View* (in Macedonian), Republic of Macedonia, 60 Years after ASNOM, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje, 2005

Kljaic, Dragan, *Time of Kolishevski*, (in Macedonian), Skopje, 1994

Korubin, Jovan, *Transition, Cultural Pluralism and the Intellectuals* (in Macedonian), in the Edition: Cultural Pluralism and Social Integration, Sociological review, 1/1, Skopje, 1995

Kymlicka, Will; Opalski, Magda, *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported? Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relationships in Eastern Europe*, Oxford University Press, 2001

Marinov, Tchavdar, *The Multiculturalism in the Balkans: Is it necessary? The Use of the Term in the Context of the Balkans*(in Macedonian), Journal of Politics, Gender and Culture, Vol. 5/no.2, Institute Euro-Balkan, 2006

Matkovski, Aleksandar, *Civil Marriages and Divorces of Christians in Macedonia and the Balkan Peninsula at the Time of Turkish Rule* (in Macedonian), Herald of The Institute for National History, Skopje, 1973

Mircev, Dimitar; Kartalov, Hristo; Aceski, Ilija; Petkovska, Antoanela; Gjurovska, Mileva; Plushkoski, Vasil, Sociological Aspects of the Ethnic Coexistence in Macedonia, a Project (in Macedonian), Institute for Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Skopje, 1996

Mitkov, Vladimir, *ASNOM and the Constitutional Development*, Republic of Macedonia, 60 Years after ASNOM (in Macedonian), Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje, 2005

Tasheva Marija, *Ethnic Groups in Macedonia – The Historical Context*, Faculty of Philosophy (in Macedonian), Skopje, 1997

Trajanovski, Aleksandar, The Church-School Communities in Macedonia (in Macedonian), Institute for National History, Skopje, 1988

PROGRESS: A TWO-EDGED SWORD

Bruce A. Little[*]

Abstract

This paper reviews the power and consequences of the Enlightenment on western culture, particularly by its view that what is new is always preferred over the old. Beginning with Francis Bacon and his idea of progress, this paper examines how eventually the idea of "progress" created a cultural ethos of consumerism where efficiency and convenience become the only measure of human progress especially in terms of technological progress. In the end this means that all human progress is determined only in quantitative terms ignoring or devaluating the qualitative or what one might think of as the spiritual aspect of human life. This is seen particularly in the power of media technology which encourages and supports the ethos of consumerism making possessions, not character the goal of humanity. Without dismissing the merits of progress, the western world must seriously ask not only what technology does for us, but in a real way, what is it doing to us if it is not to end up reducing man to a machine.

Key words: *Enlightenment, Progress, Technology, Consumerism, Efficiency*

For the last several years I have been studying the phenomenon of what we call Progress. Progress has become the byword of western cultures in the last two centuries. On every hand one hears of progress in this or that area. We justify crossing moral lines in the name of progress. We get excited with the announcement of the next new thing. It is within the context of the Enlightenment that the notion of progress has become firmly embedded in the cultural consciousness of the western world. In fact, it is one of the more prominent ideas of the Enlightenment – we might even say it is the poster child for the enlightenment. While many have analyzed the impact of the Enlightenment's epistemological and ontological commitments on western culture, here I examine two other concerns.[1] The corrosive ethos of consumerism that has been created under the influence of progress.[2] The mediated reality that has been created by media technology. Coincidently or

---

[*] Senior Professor of Philosophy, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, President of Forum For Christian Thought, Director of the Francis A. Schaeffer Collection, Wake Forest, NC, e-mail: Blittle@sebts.edu
[1] Henry E. May, *The Enlightenment in America*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1976, p. xiv.
[2] Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum and Other Great Pars of The Great Instauration*, translated and edited by Peter Urbach and John Gibson, Chicago, Open Court, 1994, p. 292.

not, this has come at a time when moral uncertainties seem to be multiplied leaving humanity vulnerable to the negative side of progress. We are all aware of the good Progress has brought to humanity. I, however, am calling attention to some of the negative dimensions of Progress not because I wish to stop progress, but to help us avoid some of the dangers that come with it. I maintain that the cultural ethos of consumerism and mediated reality threatens the flourishing of humanity. In this way, progress is a two-edged sword which has happened in part because of its obsession with the particulars.

By the mid-20th century, the idea of God became implausible in the minds of many. It was not that people stopped believing in God, but rather that belief in God was restricted to one's personal space. At the same time, science increased its grip on the hearts and minds of those in the west as it successfully pushed hard against the physical torments of life. Surely, over the last 100 years or more, many of those achievements have brought good things to life (at least in the west) revealing the amazing control science has gained over nature. Such gains by science reinforced the notion that God was no longer needed. As an idea, God simply belonged to a more primitive, less enlightened time, hence implausible for people of the Enlightenment. Of course, people were still free to believe in God as a religious exercise and go to church, but not because God was a proper part of reality or that His revelation spoke meaningfully to this life. Belief in God was not outlawed; it was just made invisible, irrelevant in the public square. Naturalism became the worldview of choice.

Without transcendent principles governing the limits and nature or Progress, Progress became its own standard. We might say Progress for Progress sake. If something was understood as Progress then it was not to be denied. It was assumed that whatever could be done should be done. This view assumed that technological advance always meant a gain for humanity. It was not that moral notions were abandoned; they were simply redefined in quantitative terms rather than qualitative terms. In fact, the shift from qualitative concerns to quantitative concerns is part of the present concern with Progress. Moral matters are now decided in terms of quantitative gains with little or no thought to qualitative concerns. Everything is determined by polls and surveys, increased numbers and both line profits. In order to make the argument here, I will focus on media technology to illustrate the two-edged sword of progress.

Understanding the nature of progress is necessary to appreciate its power over us. We begin by placing the idea of progress in its larger context. This requires a look at the Enlightenment itself. Henry May in his book, *The Enlightenment in America,* notes that the Enlightenment rested on two primary assumptions: first "the present age is more enlightened than the past; and second, "that we understand nature and man best through the use of our natural

faculties."[1] In practical terms this means that new is always preferred over the old and science is sole arbitrator of truth. The first assumption (new is preferred to old) served as the primary notion in securing the spirit of Progress as the byword for the west. Science is preferred over religion as if the two were in competition. Fact and value are confused.

The story of Progress begins in earnest with the vision of Francis Bacon in the 17th century. Bacon's inductive method provides the engine of Progress. He claimed that the application of his epistemological method (which would become the scientific method) would return to mankind his dominion over creation as given by God at creation, but lost at the Fall. As a theist Bacon wrote: "…I (like an honest and faithful guardian) may hand over to men their fortunes, their understanding now liberated and come of age. And from this an improvement of the estate of man is sure to follow, and an enlargement of his power over Nature. For man by the Fall fell both from his state of innocence and his dominion over creation. Both of these, however can even in this life be to some extent made good; the former by religion and faith, the latter by arts and science".[2] For Bacon, science would bring man true happiness as it would give him rightful dominion over creation. He expressed unquestionable confidence that his method of induction would return man's dominion over creation and this he called Progress. He wrote: "A fresh start must be made, beginning from the very foundations, unless we want to go round forever in a circle, making trifling, almost contemptible progress".[3] However, he warned: "Let the human race only recover its God-given right over Nature, and be given the necessary power; then right reason and sound religion will govern the exercise of it".[4]

Once Bacon's vision of Progress captured the western imagination science took on a life of its own, but what was eventually left out was Bacon's necessary theistic worldview. By the end of the 19th century Bacon's vision of Progress was inextricably linked to science shaping much of the cultural development. The messianic nature of Progress was accepted and so were the two assumptions of the Enlightenment: the new is preferred over the old and reason is the only way for man to understand nature. Both were assumed under the idea of Progress, so to accept the ideals of Progress was to endorse the two assumptions of the Enlightenment. As David Glasner writes: "Thus, in the Age of Enlightenment, it was possible to believe in progress and its inevitability, because progress seemed to be the necessary consequence of the discovery of

---

[1] Henry E. May, *op. cit.*, p. xiv.
[2] Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum and Other Great Pars of The Great Instauration*, translated and edited by Peter Urbach and John Gibson, Chicago, Open Court, 1994, p. 292.
[3] *Ibidem*, p. 51.
[4] *Ibidem*, p. 131.

truth, which, itself, was the inevitable result of the methodological application of reason".[1] Once the primary goal was progress, everything else followed in its train.

J.B. Bury, writing in the second decade of the 20th century wrote that Progress is "the animating and controlling idea of western civilization. For earthly Progress of humanity is the general test to which social aims and theories are submitted as a matter of course". Furthermore he suggested that "happiness which Progress is to bring has replaced, as a social power, the hope of felicity in another world".[2] This was a tremendous shift from what had been in the Middle Ages. According to Bury, "In the Middle Ages Europeans followed a different guiding star. The idea of life beyond the grave was in control, and the great things of this life were conducted with reference to the next".[3] In 1999, Neil Postman noted: "We learned *how* to invent things and the question of *why* receded in importance. The idea that if something could be done, it should be done was born in the nineteenth century. And along with it there developed a profound belief in all the principles through which invention succeeds: objectivity, efficiency, expertise, standardization, measurement, a market economy, and of course, faith in progress".[4]

In the spirit of Enlightenment, Progress is anchored in the first assumption (new is always better). Of course old is not necessarily better than new, but neither is new necessarily better than the old. Yet, uncritically accepting the first Enlightenment assumption practically supported the second assumption. After all, modern science is the engine of progress and if Progress delivers the new, what could be wrong with that. For one thing the ideals of Progress create an attitude where history loses its personal connection and importance – we stand alone in our time as if history began with our birth, as if only what we say has importance because it is new? Further, this depreciation of the past has resulted in a leveling in society. Nothing has meaningful status; there is little that is sacred, nothing to be respected as being above something else. Furthermore, the promotion of the new has reoriented humanity.

Furthermore, Progress has created an ethos of consumerism. Of course, it is true that this is not the fault of progress per se. But it is what happened within the context of Enlightenment thinking. Under the Enlightenment, the highest value for humanity is happiness and came to be measured in terms of

---

[1] David Glasner, *Science and the Idea of Progress*, in „Modern Age", Winter 2001, p. 61-70, 74.

[2] J.B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origins and Growth*, Gloucestershire, UK, Dodo Press, nd, Preface.

[3] *Ibidem*.

[4] Neil Postman, *Building a Bridge to the 18th Century: How the Past Can Improve Our Future*, New York, Vintage Books, 1999, p. 39.

convenience and efficiency. With this, the next turn was that human beings became only consumers and happiness is reduced to the practical materialism. Progress is measured in quantitative terms only. In the wake of quantifying everything, character, respect, and civility are still talked about, but have become second order realities at best. Such ideas have fallen by the wayside because they cannot be measured quantitatively. This has had serious impact on humanity in particular and society in general as the lack of civility and respect results in a disordered society. One is reminded of C.S. Lewis' quote: "We laugh at honor and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful".[1]

In light of Progress, the present serves only to usher in tomorrow because what is *new* is preferred to what is *old* and tomorrow is about the *new* – the modern. Moments are only means to the next moment which we anxiously await. Yesterday is easily discarded in order to make room for today – in no way is the past to be a rule for today. Restlessness plagues the soul, a restlessness for tomorrow to come with its new – whether a new car, a new house or a new electronic device. This encourages the ethos of consumerism whose mother is Progress. It is an ethos that drives us to purchase what we do not need and often cannot afford. It puts a premium on the new even if the new is no better than the old. The power of this ethos can be seen in the movie *The Joneses* where a materialistic ethos is created in order to motivate people to purchase the product that creates the ethos. The Joneses sell ethos, not a product. The product is only a way of achieving the ethos. Examples of this abound.

One can see a microcosm of the ethos of consumerism in our shopping malls – a child of modernity (efficiency and convenience). One only needs to take a walk through the mall to see how the ethos is generated; nothing is left to chance from the music played to the color of walls and floors to the architecture. It is the ethos of consumerism which has as its major justification that new is better than old. It survives on giving many options, always new options making us less satisfied with the old (by old we mean last week) – creating a restlessness in the soul. It is restlessness for something new and dissatisfaction with the old. Consumers breathlessly await more options to bring them something new, exciting to make life interesting. This ethos of consumerism makes us restless and feeds the desire for the new – new dress, new electronic gadget, a new program, a new slogan, a new vision etc. What it does is disorders us, interferes with the sense of peace and harmony. It makes us like a song sung off tune as it diminishes humanity to merely a consumer where person is sacrificed for profit. The ethos overpowers good judgment and

---

[1] C.S. Lewis. *That Abolition of Man*, New York, Macmillan Company, 1965, p. 35.

we do not ask: what is lost and what is gained. If that question is asked it is always answered by pointing to quantitative terms. The issue now is not *can* we rise above this, but *will* we.

A particular product of Progress is media technology. I am not suggesting that media technology is somehow evil, but it does come with serious implications for humanity. This is so when we fail to think about what it is doing to us. For example, we can text our friends, make Facebook entries, and watch reality TV all while we are doing our homework. These options made possible by media technology require multi-tasking. Studies now show that such multi-tasking has serious negative impact on our cognitive process. So this technology does not leave us as it finds us. An other growing concern today is how media technology has resulted in what has been called a mediated reality. Much of what we experience is reality reduced to images on a flat screen, which is not reality at all. This has seriously affected how we think about reality, how relate to reality, and how we view humanity.

The point to be made is that the danger in all of this is we have become so excited over what technology *gives to* us that we fail to see what it *is doing to* us. The mediated reality has removed much of the depth of reality by reducing reality to images a flat screen. Reality becomes only what appears on the screen and we get to fill in the context from our past experiences which may or may not be appropriate to the images we are viewing. A mediated reality deals with reality through something else which affects the way we experience the world and ourselves in it. In a mediated reality you are completely free to choose because it does not matter what you choose. That is why you are so free. You have options and you are in control. It is your music, your video. When popular American reality shows, like American Idol and The Apprentice, reach their climactic weeks, the news media cover them as real events, like they would an impending election – not just because of corporate synergy. It's because, on this new plane of being, they ARE real events. Movies now become infomercials as real product and place are woven into this mediated reality.

The creator of virtual reality in the 1980s, genius Jaron Lanier, now warns that social media is destroying political discourse and one might argue social discourse in general. The corruption of political discourse can be seen in the last presidential election in America. I must repeat, it does not mean that media technology is bad, but only that we need to understand that a mediated reality changes how we understand reality. Although there is not enough data at this time to make any assessments, there are those who are looking at the sustainability revolutions sustained by social media. This would be revolutions such as in Egypt and Lybia in contradistinction to what happened in the late 1980s in eastern Europe.

I am not saying, nor other responsible critics saying, that Progress is bad or that media technology is of the devil. So, I am not suggesting we should become Luddites or join some primitive community. Progress with its technology certainly has brought many wonderful advantages to the life. However, progress as developed within the context of the Enlightenment has led to an obsession with the particulars of life, with an insatiable desire for the new. In the end this has created the ethos of consumerism. It surrounds us; it is before us in all places. WE have the merchants of cool peddling the latest new product not because it will cause humanity to flourish, but because it increases some company's bottom line. Consumerism drives everything from status in society to electing political candidates. Every problem of society has an economic solution. The fact is, however, this ethos of consumerism is in fact part of the problem. We all like convenience and efficiency, but are those the only concerns when dealing with human beings. And social media, while serving a number of good purposes comes with serious challenges for humanity. It is altering what we think a friend is or how we view reality and what we expect from life. As I have said, it is not only what technology is doing for us, it is what it is doing to us. In the interest of humanity, I think it is time we give serious attention to the voices who are warning us of the two-edged sword of Progress.

NOTES AND REVIEWS

Bogdan Emanuel Răduţ, *Din istoria creştinilor după Evanghelie. Culegere de documente* (*From the History of the Brethren Assemblies (Plymouth Brethren). Collection of Documents*)**, Târgovişte, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2013, 232 p.**

The work *From the History of the Brethren Assemblies (Plymouth Brethren). Collection of Documents*, established by Bogdan Emanuel Răduţ, represents a contribution of importance and interest for a special community, with a presence aknowledged in the Romanian Society. The fact that along time the laic authorities or the hierarchs of other churches have actioned for the acceptance, support or the disallowance – after the event – of the activities belonging to the Evangelical Christians (implicit and especially of the liders and their guidance and leadership structure), represents an accreditation of a reality kept for a long time in anonymity and partially known or distorted by the society assembly.

The author has been debating in several ocasions this problematic and – although emotionally implied out of arguments of affiliation to the religion's belief – has the power to detach himself and to analyse the evolution of a phenomenon and the rute of a community united through the impartation of some common Christian values, for which he has understood to endure privations and tides in many situation more severe than the one of their neighbours.

The introductory study has all data for an historical reasoned excurssion, with reference to bibliographic domain-specific sources.

The selected documents represent a helpful corpus not only for the corpus existance; the extracts of constitutions and laws refer to the general problematic of the relationships between state and church. Out of this point of view, the collection of documents represents an easy instrument of work, disposable to the one interested in the legal frame and the experience of the Romanian society in its formal aspects.

The idea of separation between the documents issued by the state authorities and the ones issued by the religious leaders is to be enthuziastically accepted. The religious documents (generically defined like this!) introduced in the Collection show, undoubtly, interest for the adepts and believers of that religion. It is not less true that, in a wider sense, they are useful for those who are interested in the "knowledge of the others", for sociologs, cultural, spiritual areas etc.

In conclusion, I recommend the work, given the diversity of the approached problematic and the interest of various categories of beneficiaries.

Alexandru Oşca

Nicolae Enciu, *Tradiţionalism şi modernitate în Basarabia anilor 1918-1940,* **I,** *Populaţia Basarabiei interbelice. Aspecte demografice* (**Traditionalism and Modernity in Bessarabia during 1918-1940. The Population of Interwar Bessarabia. Demographic Assues**), **Chişinău, Academia de Ştiinţe a Moldovei, Institutul de Istorie, Stat şi Drept, 2013, 423 p.**

We do not know, whatever we say, much about Bessarabia. Most Romanian citizens are indifferent and, possibly, bothered by patriotic texts. They send, from time to time, an invective across the Prut. Others, a rather noisy minority, fill up the walls with the slogan "Bessarabia, Romanian land!" without having any idea what was going on during the two decades, of the last two centuries, when the region was actually part of the Romanian state. But I am not concerned, in particular, by neither of the two categories, but by a third: the academic-humanist cultural community. Relations with "Bessarabian brothers" are rather indifferent. Romanians looked at them, often with superiority and indifference. Bessarabian writer Vasile Ernu characterized the situation as a "complex siberian": "everything beyond the Prut is somewhere in Siberia, at the back of beyond [...] There is a point where in their minds the geography «ends», there is, beyond, only a sum of fantasies and clichés" (*Last heretics of the empire*, Polirom, Iasi, 2009, p. 21).

As one who, of necessity, leaned on the history of Bessarabia and faced scarcity and imprecision of sources, I was glad when, by the willingness of a colleague, I got to hand the book of the Bessarabian researcher Vasile Enciu, related to demography and social life of the region in the interwar period. Honestly, I did not take very seriously the promise of objectivity and moderation from the beginning! I have heard about this, I said to myself! Finally, I was glad to know that we ask ourselves the same questions, we face the same problems and think quite similar. I saw that beyond the prejudices from Old Romanian Kingdom, the historian across the Prut is not backward at all and can avoid nationalist deviations to one side or the other.

Based on archival sources in Bucharest and Chisinau and works published in that period, the author has created, to my knowledge, the most comprehensive monograph of interwar Bessarabia up to now. And it's only the first volume. The focus is initially on the century of Russian rule, what is hard to find much. For example, a census was conducted only in 1897; otherwise, all data are mere estimates. Therefore, known facts in 1918 were approximate and remain so until 1930, when the census was conducted in Greater Romania.

The frame is realistic, built mostly of quantitative information. We see an area with a Romanian majority, but with consistent minority groups and ethnic differences between urban and rural areas. As I knew, the rural is dominant. Most of the Bessarabians were peasants, engaged in agriculture, with a low cultural level (illiteracy was rampant), with poor living standards. It is worth noticing the difference in development between the Romanian villages and German ones and also Bulgarian villages in Bugeac (the southern part of Bessarabia, or Bessarabia itself as argues

Vasile Enciu). Over two decades the trend was to decrease, as in the case of birth rate, as well as for mortality, but less for the latter. We find in the book data regarding structure of the population by gender, age, occupation etc., the economic situation, health and cultural status...

The picture is quite dark. And to think that neither for the whole country is not very bright! Bessarabia was ranked last among Romanian provinces, like in all areas. Important is that the researcher did not set out to show that things were in a certain way. Most times, he simply recorded circumstances. He highlighted the progress, even if they proved insufficient. He did not hesitate to tell unpleasant truths sometimes bluntly – for some, perhaps blasphemous – like that "Romania, and therefore Bessarabia, was governed until 1930 without to know the structure of the population and its economy" (p. 147). He did not hesitate to speak of indifference and even government abuses and, normally, about discontent of the population. The formulas "New Siberia" (p. 187) or "California the Romanian " (p. 277) were used in that period, even if some people would like them to be forgotten today. "California" has a double meaning: on the one hand it expresses backwardness and central tendency of arbitrary colonization, and on the other hand the potential of the region (it was, by far, the largest arable land) (p. 113).

There are some omissions in the book and forced interpretations, caused perhaps by historiographical inertia, perhaps by fear, understandable to a point. Although the Versailles system is presented thoroughly, we do not find anything about the ratification of the Paris Treaty (October 28, 1920), which established – or ought to have established –from the point of view of international law the union of Bessarabia with Romania. Then, it seems to me unreasonable to believe that, in 1856, "The Great Powers recognized [...] membership of southern Bessarabia and, therefore, of the whole of Bessarabia, to the area of culture and civilization of the two Romanian Principalities" (p. 31). And in 1878 they change their mind? The most delicate issue is, however, the share of Romanian population in 1918. The author prefers the vintage version launched by Gheorghe Murgoci and Eugene N. Giurgea, namely that Romanians constituted 64% (p. 148). But it is not explained how, in less than a decade, in 1927, the Averescu government estimated 58.1% (p. 215), and the 1930 census results gave only 56.2% (p. 217). It's hard to believe that the number of Romanian ethnic dropped so much after Unification.

Such work is interesting for all the curious, but it's especially useful, even necessary, to Romanian contemporary historians. But how many will find it? Certainly not too many! It seems that science and culture cross the Prut River much harder than people!

Mihai Ghițulescu

Daniela Osiac, *Conflictul israeliano-palestinian. Proiecte de pace. 1947-2003* (*The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Peace Projects. 1947-2003*)**, Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 2013, 302 p.**

The work is of interest to the historiography given the amount of information regarding a territory – Palestine – which for millennia has been the subject of dispute among different peoples. The author analyzes at the same time some less or unknown issues of the Middle East conflict as well as the involvement of major powers – and Romania – in the peace process between Jews and Arabs. The author aimed as, within the limits of the possibilities for documentation and selection of historical material, to contribute to a better understanding of the extent to which the international community has shown and involved as a source of political and territorial changes in the Middle East. For this purpose, to achieve the objectives, the author has developed the study on several levels of scientific value and utility, namely: – one purely theoretical relating the right of peoples to live in peace and achieve national states – the other, from historical point of view referring to the description of events in Palestine conflict – and not least in the legal nature of international treaties and agreements designed to contribute to stability and peace in the Middle East. In the first chapter, *Palestine. Historical connections*, the author recounts the important events in Jewish history as well as the disputes and controversies of the main international actors on the territories of the Middle East, until the Second World War. Also, the objectives of Jews are highlighted in the study (e.g. immigration and the integration of newcomers in Palestinian structures, political emancipation of the Jews, the establishment of a national state etc.) and those of the Palestinians (e.g. opposition to Hebrew immigration, the fight for national independence etc.). The second chapter, entitled *Territorial disputes between Arabs and Jews*, presents the establishment of the State of Israel, the Palestinian organizations and the Arab-Israeli wars. All these events – highlights the author – will create a number of problems both in the region and on international level, namely: the problem of Palestinian refugees, border issues, the issue of Jerusalem and the Holy Places; the problem of establishing a Palestinian national state.

Given the complex issue of the Middle East, the author analyzes the third chapter, based on specialty papers, peace treaties and unpublished documents, the involvement of the international community in the peace process between Israelis and Arabs. The main objectives of UNO and other international organizations are: recognition of the existence of Israel by all Arab states, Israel border demarcation; solving the situation of Palestinian refugees, and, not least, the establishment of a Palestinian national state. All these objectives were discussed by the international community with Israelis and Arabs – respectively the Palestinians – in a series of meetings where they concluded and treaties (eg the Camp David Agreement, the Madrid Conference, the Oslo negotiations; Agreement "*Roadmap*" etc.). These were based on UN resolutions and negotiation No. 242 and 338. Analyzing these

documents/international treaties, the author manages to show us the stages, the fluctuations, difficulties and solutions – arose in the negotiations in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process – pointing out that "these projects can only be achieved provided that both people are willing to implementing the two-state solution, which is the establishment, next to Israel, of a Palestinian state".

The paper also includes an important chapter (IV) which refers to the involvement of Romanian diplomacy in the Middle East peace process, as well as the strong political and diplomatic ties with Israel, the Arab states in the region and the Palestinian organizations. Romania's attitude towards the Middle East conflict is analyzed and viewed in the historical context that characterized the period from 1947 to 1989. It highlights based on published and unpublished documents, that Romania never interrupted political and economic cooperation with Israel or the Arab states.

The paper concludes with an extensive bibliography divided into published and unpublished sources (we should note the many cases investigated in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or National Central Historical Archives), general and special papers, studies and articles.

The paper prepared by Dr. Daniela Osiac has originality and unique character in relation to papers known to date on the researched topic. Synthesizing and essentialization – adjacent major details in deciphering, understanding and solving problems in the Middle East – are elements of a clear, consistent, logical and varied discourse, which differentiates itself from some scientific contributions affected by subjectivity of their authors, who are interested in solving the complicated and complex problems in the area, in favor / benefit either of the parties involved in conflict.

Marusia Cîrstea

Reflections about 1ˢᵗ December 1918 – The National Day of Romania after 95 Years

Every time, for me December 1, 1918 is the fulfillment of the aspirations of a people for centuries tried hard and reward the efforts of several generations of Romanian politicians Nicolae Iorga said that of Michael the Brave, everyone who wanted to unite all Romanians have thought and acted like him.

I will not go into explanations about the day of December 1, 1918, which are known to all. I will say that Romania had started the war of reunification of the nation in 1916 to regain Transylvania Atanta ally. The fact that it was part of Tsarist Russia causes us to not bring about Bessarabia. However, go over the mountains, Romanian soldiers had until November 1916 to confront the specter of defeat. Coordinating failure Russians made the Bulgarians and Germans to attack the South and on 6 December 1916 Bucureşti hear Bulgarian and German soldiers march. Bucharest was installed government of Alexander Marghiloman collaborationist, while Romania was reduced territorial Moldova, its legitimate government, Parliament, the King and the army being established in Iasi.

In the summer of 1917, the Germans tried to take military Moldova, but imperishable pages of history written Mărăşti, Mărăşeşti and Oituz made Romania to resist, Romanian soldiers backed by French mission of General Berthelot.

Again, Romania was in a position to be the victim of not engaging the Russians, whose countries, ranging from fever Bolshevik separate out the war in the spring of 1918, forcing us to sign on the same spring, enslaving peace with Central Powers: reduced to Moldova Romania, Austria-Hungary conquering peaks of the Carpathians, Dobrogea became occupied by Bulgaria and German monopoly over the resources of Wallachia was a cruel reality.

However, amid insecurity and anarchy in Tsarist Russia, Moldova between Prut and Dniester united with Romania in March 1918, and must acknowledge agreement with Germany, the merit of Alexander Marghiloman, who received permission from the German Romanian army to enter into Bessarabia.

Western Allied counteroffensive and successful maneuvers on Thessaloniki made in the fall of 1918, influenced Romania to rejoin the war. On November 10, 1918 Romania re-entered the war, and on November 11, 1918, Germany surrendered devoid allies.

On November 15, 1918, Bukovina took since 1775 is back to Romania. On 1 December 1918, when the Romanian army was returning to liberated Bucharest, Transylvania, Banat, Crisana and Maramures, the People's Assembly plebiscite nature of Alba Iulia Romania expressed their memberships.

What I want to emphasize now is that national acts in Bessarabia, Bukovina, Transylvania, Banat and Maramures had Crişana recognized by the Great Powers and the road was just as hard. Ionel Brătianu Conferences fought hard for union recognition a reality. A threatened boycott, because the treaty with Austria we were asked to give minorities greater rights than they themselves Romanians. Treaty with Hungary was signed only after Romania had to deal Budapest, where installed a Bolshevik government led by Bela Kun, after Hungarians refused to comply with the terms of phasing.

Coming delegation in Bucharest Transylvania was a memorable event, uttering the famous words Brătianu "we waited a thousand years!" But things were not so good, as the Transylvanians wanted their government provisional Ruling Council to have as large an influence and United Romania, Transylvania have her army, under the Romanian independence conditions that Brătianu not accepted. An appointment, the main Transylvanian politician will act in Bucharest, until his arrest by the Communists, but was worshiped as the man of the Union, the more controversial were his initiatives in Romania Mare (among others in the country illegally bringing Caraiman Carol's former prince Charles, under the Romania Mare was badly mutilated).

It is appropriate to honor the memory artisans Greater Romania in 1918: King Ferdinand, Queen Mary, Ionel Brătianu, Vasile Goldis, Ion Nistor Ion Inculeţ Iancu Flondor, Eremia Grigorescu, Alexandru Averescu Constantin Prezan etc and the heroes who died for it to become reality and then to resist.

On December 1, 1918, Romania has reached its maximum territorial extent. Unfortunately missing the most important politicians like King Ferdinand and Ionel Brătianu led their followers do not know how to manage priceless legacy, so that on 7

September 1940, at the end of an ultimatum (the Soviet Union in June 1940) and a driven (Vienna, August 30, 1940) one third of Romania Mare to be taken by our enemies.

Only Northern Transylvania will return to Romania, the blood sacrifice of our soldiers after August 23, 1944, as confirmed by the Final Act of the Paris Peace Conference of 1947.

I want to end with an event narrated by Lucian Blaga in the moment when the Romanians returned from Alba Iulia, a child from a court yard, expressing his ingenuos joy, for that all Romanians lived, cried "Long live the round Romania!"

Florian Olteanu

Revista „Analele Universităţii din Craiova. Istorie" apare de două ori pe an şi este publicată sub egida Departamentului de Istorie al Universităţii din Craiova.

Revista este o publicaţie ştiinţifică a profesorilor şi cercetătorilor interesaţi de studiul istoriei.

Revista susţine abordările interdisciplinare din domeniul istoriei şi din alte domenii, precum: relaţii internaţionale, studii europene, ştiinţe politice, filosofie, teologie, geografie, drept internaţional etc.

Primul număr al revistei apare în luna aprilie, iar cel de-al doilea număr în luna noiembrie. Revista este publicată de Editura Universitaria din Craiova.

Peer-review

Fiecare articol prezentat spre publicare, urmează a fi recenzat de câte doi specialişti în domeniu, în sistemul blind-peer-review şi avizat de Colegiul de redacţie. Răspunsul pentru admiterea materialelor va fi adus la cunoştinţa autorilor în termen de 20 de zile. Manuscrisele nu sunt înapoiate autorilor în caz de nepublicare. Colegiul de Redacţie îşi rezervă dreptul de a selecta acele studii şi articole care se dovedesc a fi contribuţii originale în domeniul cercetării istorice.

Instrucţiuni pentru autori

Textele trimise Redacţiei spre publicare trebuie să fie în format electronic, în una din limbile de circulaţie internaţională: engleză, franceză, germană, spaniolă, italiană şi trebuie să aibă un rezumat şi cinci cuvinte cheie. Textul articolului trebuie să fie în format B5, Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, Dimensiune Font 12, Space 1. Articolele nu trebuie să depăşească 15 pagini. Notele de subsol vor fi redactate după cum urmează:

- pentru *cărţi*:

Dan Berindei, *Modernitate şi trezire naţională. Cultura naţională română modernă. Studii şi eseuri*, Bucureşti, Editura Fundaţiei PRO, 2003, p. 5.

- pentru *articole*:

Bruce Little, *Naşterea opiniilor postmoderniste şi sfârşitul lor*, în „Analele Universităţii din Craiova. Istorie", an XII, nr. 12/2007, p. 293.

- pentru *surse de arhivă*:

Serviciul Arhivelor Naţionale Istorice Centrale (în continuare, se va cita: S.A.N.I.C.), fond Casa Regală, dosar nr. 4/1866, f. 3.

Articolele trimise Redacţiei trebuie, în mod obligatoriu, să conţină următoarele date despre autori: numele şi prenumele, gradul ştiinţifico-didactic, instituţia, adresa, telefon, fax, e-mail.

În eventualitatea în care articolul conţine şi ilustraţii, acestea trebuie trimise în format JPEG.

Revista poate fi achiziţionată prin comandă pe adresa redacţiei: Universitatea din Craiova, Facultatea de Drept şi Ştiinţe Sociale, str. Calea Bucureşti, Nr. 107 D, tel./fax 0351/177103.

Adrese de contact:
sorin.damean@yahoo.com
cirsteamara@yahoo.com
cc_dinulescu@yahoo.com

A.U.C.H. ("Annals of the University of Craiova. History") is a bi-annually journal published by the History Department of the University of Craiova. A.U.C.H. is a peer-review academic publication addressed to professors and researchers interested in the study of history. A.U.C.H. supports interdisciplinary approaches of history, engaging the following domains: history, international relations, European studies, political sciences, philosophy, theology, geography, international law.

The first issue of the journal will be published in April and the second issue will be published in November. The journal is published by *Universitaria Publishing House*, Craiova, Romania.

Peer-review

Each article sent for publication will be reviewed by two specialists, in blind-peer-review system and will be approved by the Editorial Board. The answer for the admittance will be acknowledged in 20 days. The texts will not be sent back to the authors. The Editorial Board has the right to select the studies and the articles, which prove to be original contributions in the history research.

Instructions for authors

The texts written in English, French, German, Spanish or Italian must be sent by e-mail, in electronic format and have an *abstract*. The texts must be sent in B5 paper format, Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, Size Font 12, Space 1 and have to be preceded by five keywords. The articles must not exceed 15 pages. The references will be cited as follows:

- For *books*:

David Talbot Rice, *Art of the Byzantine Era*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1977, p. 100.

- For *articles*:

James Ross Sweeney, *Innocent III, Hungary and the Bulgarian Coronation: A Study in the Medieval Papal Diplomacy*, in "Church History", 42, 1973, no. 2, p. 320.

- For *archive sources*:

The Department of Central Historical National Archives of Romania, Royal House Fund, file no. 4/1866, folio 3.

The research paper should be divided into background, material and methods, results, discussions, conclusions, references.

The articles must have the following data about the authors: name, surname, scientific degree, affiliation, postal address, telephone/fax, e-mail.

The images must be sent in JPEG format.

The Journal can be ordered at the editorial address: University of Craiova, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, no. 107 D, Calea Bucureşti, tel./fax 0040351/177103.

The price for one copy is 20 EURO.

Contacts address:
sorin.damean@yahoo.com
cirsteamara@yahoo.com
cc_dinulescu@yahoo.com