

JEAN-NOËL GRANDHOMME, **LA ROUMANIE DE LA TRIPLICE À L'ENTENTE 1914-1919**, sous la direction de Frédéric Guelton, Éditions Soteca, coll. « Les Nations dans la Grande Guerre », 2009, 273 p.

L'ouvrage du professeur Jean-Noël Grandhomme, *La Roumanie de la Triple Alliance à l'Entente*, paru aux Éditions Soteca en 2009, représente une clef de voûte des publications sur le rôle de la Roumanie pendant la Grande Guerre et sur les relations historiques entre la Roumanie et la France. Fidèle à la promesse du titre, Jean-Noël Grandhomme offre une image saisissante des méandres parcourus par la Roumanie depuis les débuts de la Première Guerre mondiale et jusqu'au dénouement de la conflagration, dénouement qui a eu lieu bien plus tard dans ce coin de l'Europe que dans les pays de l'Ouest, mais où la Roumanie se trouve du côté des gagnants.

Jean-Noël Grandhomme ne s'attarde pas sur l'histoire éloignée du peuple roumain, mais jalonne le XIX^e siècle avec les étapes qui ont mené à la création d'un premier État roumain. Il souligne que même avant la Grande Guerre, le mobile premier des dirigeants roumains a été de maintenir l'indépendance de l'État et d'y réunir les autres provinces majoritairement habitées par des Roumains. Évidemment, cela contrevenait aux intérêts des grands pouvoirs qui l'entouraient. C'est pourquoi la prise de position de la Roumanie a été un processus lent et plein d'hésitations, chacun de ses grands voisins contrôlant un territoire habité par une population majoritairement roumaine.

Avoir un prince allemand à la tête du nouveau pays rend la question des loyautés encore plus difficile, car Carol I^{er} sera toujours fidèle à ses origines allemandes, contrairement à l'opinion publique, qui est fort opposée à la Double Monarchie et ses alliés.

Pour mieux expliquer à un lecteur étranger l'ambiance politique d'avant les débuts de la guerre mondiale, Jean-Noël Grandhomme prend le temps d'expliquer les relations ambivalentes de la Roumanie avec la Double Monarchie, la Russie et la Bulgarie, de même que sa position pendant les Guerres balkaniques. Pendant la crise balkanique d'août 1914, Carol se rend compte qu'il lui est impossible d'entrer en guerre du côté de la Double Monarchie, mais assure pourtant le ministre hongrois Czernin que son armée ne sera jamais en conflit avec l'Autriche-Hongrie. La situation est en effet très pressante et Jean-Noël Grandhomme tisse d'une manière suggestive le canevas de pressions et d'injonctions qui arrivent de toute direction, les hésitations du roi et de Ion I. C. Brătianu, de même que les projets de former un bloc de neutralité avec la Grèce et la Turquie. Pour mieux évoquer les états d'esprits qui divisent le pays, Jean-Noël Grandhomme donne le récit détaillé du conseil de la Couronne du 3 août, qui marque à son avis un échec du roi face au président du Conseil des Ministres.

Les deux années de neutralité, avec la politique fluctuante en dépit de l'avènement du nouveau roi, sont présentées avec minutie, l'accent étant mis dans cette partie du livre sur les relations avec la Russie et la situation des Roumains de Bessarabie. Nous remarquons surtout l'insertion d'une présentation de l'état de l'armée roumaine et de la situation économique du pays. L'année 1916 est décrite surtout du point de vue des négociations avec l'Entente et notamment la France pour une entrée en guerre de la Roumanie du côté des alliés.

Un troisième chapitre est consacré à l'échec militaire de la Roumanie en Dobroudja et en Transylvanie, les batailles étant présentées dans des synthèses riches en informations. La même période marque l'établissement d'une mission française en Roumanie, sous la direction du général Berthelot. En effet, nous remarquons l'abondance des sources documentaires françaises utilisées par l'auteur pour récréer le tableau désolant de la retraite en Moldavie et la période dure qui s'ensuit : les maladies, les relations difficiles avec la Russie qui demandait à la famille royale de se réfugier sur son territoire, de même que la nécessité de réformes plus profondes de la société roumaine. La mission médicale française représente une grande aide à la population, plusieurs infirmières et docteurs y perdent leur vie à cause du fléau du typhus. En même temps, des spécialistes militaires s'impliquent dans la préparation des soldats et des officiers selon le modèle français et dans le fournissement de nouvelles armes, toutes ces activités étant placées sous la direction du général Berthelot, conseiller fort apprécié par la famille royale roumaine (et – il faut le rappeler – dont Jean-Noël Grandhomme est l'un des grands spécialistes).

Par la suite, c'est le problème de la réorganisation de l'armée roumaine et de la logistique qui remplit une dizaine de pages d'informations condensées, qui culminent par une présentation de l'offensive de Mărăști, Mărășești et Oituz. La révolution russe et ses conséquences occupent également une partie importante dans le grand tableau, l'accent étant mis pourtant sur l'impact sur ce qui se passe avec les troupes russes activant sur le front roumain et la détérioration des relations diplomatiques jusqu'à l'armistice de Brest-Litovsk, qui entraîne un changement de position de la part de la Roumanie et le départ de la mission française du général Berthelot.

Dans sa vision panoramique, Jean-Noël Grandhomme n'oublie pas la Valachie occupée, y compris les projets des Puissances centrales en ce qui concerne le pays et la maison royale. Il y a des pourparlers en vue d'un armistice, qui aboutiront à la paix de Bucarest. Les relations franco-roumaines ne sont pas détruites complètement par cet armistice, car plusieurs personnalités vont à Paris pour déclarer leur fidélité à l'Entente, tandis que l'offensive Franchet d'Espérey en Macédoine en automne 1918 et une deuxième mission de Berthelot prépare le retour de la Roumanie dans les rangs des Alliés, au mois de novembre.

La dernière partie du livre est consacrée à la retraite allemande, à l'union de la Transylvanie et de la Bucovine et aux négociations pour la Dobroudja, tandis

que la conclusion rappelle que l'armistice du 11 novembre n'est pas la fin de la guerre pour les pays de l'Est. La Roumanie a encore des conflits avec les Russes bolcheviques et l'armée de Béla Kun afin de garder son territoire nouvellement acquis par « un concours de circonstances exceptionnel » et qu'elle gardera en grande partie jusqu'au présent. Le livre s'achève ainsi sur la prémisse proposée déjà dans l'introduction, ayant impeccablement établi une synthèse complexe de sources et de points de vue, ouvrage de référence pour tout passionné par l'histoire.

Marius Eppel

Marius Eppel est enseignant-chercheur au Centre d'Études sur la Population et à la Faculté d'Histoire et de Philosophie (Université Babeş-Bolyai de Cluj-Napoca), respectivement au Centre de Recherches Historiques (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales de Paris). Il a notamment publié : *Politics and Church in Transylvania 1875-1918* (Frankfurt am Main, etc., 2012) et *La frontiera ortodoxiei româneşti. Vicariatul de la Oradea. 1848-1918* (Cluj-Napoca, 2012).

DUMITRU PEDA, NICOLAE CIOBANU, **BĂTĂLIA DE LA MĂRĂŞEŞTI. 24 IULIE/6 AUGUST–21 AUGUST/3 SEPTEMBRIE 1917** [The Battle of Mărăşeşti. 24 July/6 August–21 August/3 September 1917], Bucureşti: Editura Militară, 2017, 272 pp.; with illustrations, map, sketches, and tables.

The present work was printed under the aegis of the “Mărăşeşti-Mărăşti-Oituz” Cultural Foundation, in the series “Mari bătălii din Războiul de Întregire Naţională” [“Great Battles of the National Unification War”] (editor: Dumitru Preda). It is designed and structured in accordance with the usual scientific requirements. After the introduction (pp. 9–12), the volume is divided into three thematic sections; it also comprises annexes, a selective bibliography, a name index, and illustrations.

The first section with the title *În ajunul bătăliei...* [On the Eve of the Battle...] (pp. 13–58) is subdivided into four thematic parts: *Modificarea planurilor de operaţii ale beligeranţilor pe frontul român* [Modification of the Operative Plans of the Belligerents on the Romanian Front], *Realizarea dispozitivului operativ al forţelor Puterilor Centrale în vederea trecerii lor la ofensivă* [Realization of the Operative Device of the Central Powers Forces for Starting the Offensive], *Gruparea forţelor aliate ruse şi române în ajunul Bătăliei de la Mărăşeşti* [The Grouping of the Russian and Romanian Allied Forces on the Eve of the Battle of Mărăşeşti], *Caracteristicile terenului de luptă. Structura defensivei române* [The Characteristics of the Battlefield. The Structure of the Romanian Defensive].

The second section, *Bătălia de la Mărăşeşti* [The Battle of Mărăşeşti] (pp. 59–188), is also divided into four parts—*Etapa I a Bătăliei de la Mărăşeşti: 24 iulie/6 august–30 iulie/12 august 1917* [Stage I of the Battle of Mărăşeşti: 24 July/6 August–30 July/12 August 1917], *Etapa a II-a a Bătăliei de la Mărăşeşti:*

31 iulie/13 august–6/19 august 1917 [Stage II of the Battle of Mărășești: 31 July/13 August–6/19 August 1917], *Contraatacul din 6/19 august dintre Mărășești și pădurea La Răzoare* [The Counterattack of 6/19 August between Mărășești and the La Răzoare Forest], *Etapa a III-a a Bătăliei de la Mărășești: 7/20 august–21 august/3 septembrie 1917* [The Third Stage of the Battle of Mărășești: 7/20 August–21 August/3 September 1917].

The third section is entitled *Rezultatele operației defensive de la Mărășești* [The Results of the Defensive Operation at Mărășești] (pp. 189–211).

As one of the authors shows, namely the laborious researcher (and diplomat) Dumitru Preda, author of numerous volumes and studies mainly of Romanian military history (the other author, the well-known military historian, Professor Nicolae Ciobanu died in 2015): “For a century, the Battle of Mărășești has represented a symbol of the virtues of the Romanian nation and an example of national solidarity that stood at the foundation of the Great Union of 1918. In chronological order, it is the second great military confrontation on the Romanian front in the summer of 1917 and, at the same time, the most important battle on the Eastern front during that year. Going on for 29 days and nights, between 24 July/6 August and 21 August/3 September, the greatness and complexity of the engaged forces and confrontations, the exemplary tenacity of the Romanian troops in defending the existence of their independent state, the heroism of the entire army, and the capability of the commanding officers, proven despite the experience and powerful war machine of the Central Powers—to which they opposed categorically ‘You cannot trespass here!’, the patriotic slogan of the Romanian 1st Army from the region of Vrancea, from the ‘gates’ of Moldova, remain the most dramatic and magnificent moments in the history of the National Liberation and Reunification War” (p. 9).

The volume of the two scholars, a particularly useful synthesis for today’s generations of readers—especially for young people—is based on archival documentary sources, and explores both their own and also older research: “And the direct collaboration started in the 80s of the last century, with the Department of Military Art History of the prestigious [Military] Academy of Bucharest, for the preparation of the most comprehensive monograph dedicated to the National Unification War, published in the summer of 1987, underlying this synthesis, was to be materialized in studies, articles, and conferences” (p. 11).

Of course, as expected in such thematic synthesis, the description of military operations is scrupulous, without “crushing” the reader with strictly technical details; the authors use an agreeable narrative style, embossed with footnotes (including useful biographical notes of some commanders); fragments of military documents issued during the battle or immediately after its completion are inserted—as was the Order no. 105 of the Commander of the 1st Army, General Eremia Grigorescu: “Soldiers of the 1st Army! For almost two months, through the stubborn resistance you opposed with your chests in Mărășești and Muncel against the invading

enemy, you shattered the dreams about an easy conquest of the part that is left of our dear country. You have revived all the glorious memories of our ancestors' deeds. You have attracted the admiration of the whole world. Be constantly on duty; strengthen your physical and moral powers. Be ready to show that the Romanians do not have to give away the precious land of their country other than as a burial place. From your blood there will rise the clean and great Romanian Country of all Romanians" (pp. 187–188).

Extensive and consistent considerations are made on "the results of the defensive operation at Mărășești." There are some appreciations of senior military and politicians of the epoch, from both combat camps, regarding the relations with the Russian allies ("Although there have been critical moments in the cooperation relations, especially at the level of army headquarters, some of them and these measures were well overcome in a wise manner, to the benefit of both parties," p. 201). The authors emphasize the sacrifice of the Romanian military: "Forcing the Supreme Command of the Central Powers, following the failures on the Romanian front, to abandon the offensive in Southern Ukraine and weaken their combative force on the Eastern Front, Romania has made an essential contribution to the final victory. It was rightly appreciated at that time that the defeats of the Central Powers on the Romanian front in the summer of 1917 constituted 'the most important blow that the Germans had received in Eastern Europe'" (p. 192).

Published on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the great Romanian epic of Mărășești, the volume of the historians Dumitru Preda and Nicolae Ciobanu is a valuable and useful work of our contemporary historiography (its translation into at least one foreign language is highly recommended).

Stoica Lascu

IOAN-AUREL POP, TRANSILVANIA, STAREA NOASTRĂ DE VEGHE [Transylvania, Our Waking State], foreword by Mircea Muthu, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Școala Ardeleană, 2016, 298 pp.

A young Transylvanian publishing house (in business since 2014) inaugurates this year a promising author series dedicated to the well-known historian and scholar Ioan-Aurel Pop, member of the Romanian Academy. The volume comprises articles and essays published during the last years, gathered suggestively under the emblematic title of *Transilvania, starea noastră de veghe* [Transylvania, Our Waking State], "now, that the centennial of the most important gesture in the entire history of the Romanian nation (our emphasis) is approaching" (p. 16). The author of the foreword, the essayist and literary historian Mircea Muthu, says: "By presenting the written testimonies, some of which were inscribed on the edges of documents, 'for information purposes,' as an unknown chronicler [*diac*] from Transylvania declared, Ioan-Aurel Pop turned to this endeavor scientifically, but

also affectively, with an autochthonous *forma mentis*, thus continuing the reference line of Transylvanian historians and academics” (p. 9).

In fact, the polyvalent Transylvanian historian—also Rector of the Babeş-Bolyai University—captivates his readers with memorable formulations, appealing to narrative descriptions accessible to any history fan, based on documents and testimonies of the epoch; at the same time, we are faced with an explicit, firm, and consistent attitude *pro* Transylvania, in the more general context of its historical evolution: “There is in this generous Transylvania a place for increasing variety and diversity, but with one condition, i.e. to guarantee the perpetuation of the region’s personality, its historical dowry, the traditional values that have consecrated it and which have created its specificity”; he suggests that “by this book, we should think together in Transylvania using our minds and spirits, increasing and praising ‘the world’s mystery,’ now that the centennial of the most important gesture of the Romanian nation in its entire history is approaching” (p. 26).

The 21 contributions refer mainly to Transylvania, but not exclusively. They are entitled: *Argument pentru Transilvania sufletului meu* [Argument for the Transylvania of My Soul] (pp. 11–16); *Ce este Transilvania* [What is Transylvania] (pp. 17–33); *Școala Ardeleană și națiunea română din Transilvania în Secolul Luminilor* [The Transylvanian School and the Romanian Nation of Transylvania in the Century of Enlightenment] (pp. 34–42); *Dimitrie Cantemir și Transilvania. Câteva considerații* [Dimitrie Cantemir and Transylvania. Some Considerations] (pp. 43–58); *Românii și România în Europa: între Occidentul latin și Orientul bizantin* [Romanians and Romania in Europe: Between the Latin West and the Byzantine East] (pp. 59–84); *Marea Unire și Sărbătoarea Națională* [The Great Union and the National Holiday] (pp. 85–96); “Maramureșul... intrând pe furiș la moldoveni.” *Reflecții pe marginea unei idei de unire românească din secolul al XIV-lea* [“Maramureș... Entering Stealthily at the Moldavians.” Reflections on an Idea of Romanian Unity in the 14th Century] (pp. 97–116); *Contribuția transilvănenilor la fondarea Academiei Române* [The Contribution of Transylvanians to the Founding of the Romanian Academy] (pp. 117–122): This is an occasion for celebrating our “Romance” language, Romanian Language or “Danubian Latin” that is “nothing else than Latin as it has evolved over two millennia. How small and eccentric are, in comparison to these titans who have ensured our cultural existence, those who endanger our language, even destroying it! We owe our dignified spiritual life to the generations of scholars of the Romanian Academy, who believed in the eternity of our language, in its value as a binder and promoter of values. For about a century, the Academy has successfully continued its normative and creative work, expanding its preoccupations into all fields of culture and receiving members from all over Romanianism” (p. 122); *Istorici transilvăneni la Accademia di Romania din Roma în perioada interbelică. Câteva evocări* [Transylvanian Historians at the *Accademia di Romania* in Rome During the Interwar Period. Some Evocations] (pp. 123–142); *Câte ceva despre români și*

maghiari în trecut [Something About the Romanians and Hungarians of the Past] (pp. 143–150); *Influența modelelor germane și germanofone asupra românilor. Câteva considerații* [The Influence of the German and German-Speaking Models on the Romanians. Some Considerations] (pp. 151–159) as well as *Să ne amintim de marii istorici: Hadrian Daicoviciu (1932–1984)* [Let Us Remember the Great Historians: Hadrian Daicoviciu (1932–1984)] (pp. 207–215); *Hașul* “was the rare erudite, gifted with the grace of rebuilding and explaining the past as if it were present, turning it into an intelligible past for the most sophisticated scholar as well as for the man on the street, curious to know” (p. 211); *Pompiliu Teodor. O evocare prin vorbe și fapte antologice* [Pompiliu Teodor. An Evocation through Words and Anthological Facts] (pp. 214–226): “He has modernized, as no one else of his generation, the field of historical research, introducing new ways of approaching the past, new disciplines, accents from the field of Western innovations, etc.” (p. 219); *Ștefan Pascu. O evocare* [Ștefan Pascu. An Evocation] (pp. 226–227): “However, I would like to tell the young generation not to be fooled by appearances. We should not believe that the communist regime itself has produced good or bad people. There were even then, as now, exceptional people and despicable people, most of whom were common beings in a tern society without color and contour. Professor Ștefan Pascu has been a personality throughout his life, and he was created neither as a scholar nor as a leader of the ruling party” (pp. 233–234).

But there are also other contributions that are not less relevant when considering their titles which illustrate the fertile involvement of the Romanian scholar born in Transylvania in contemporary social and cultural debates, continuing the clear patriotic attitude of his predecessors and serving the historical truth: *Miturile naționale și educația românilor prin istorie* [National Myths and the Education of Romanians Through History] (pp. 160–172): “There are many who believe that this Europe fails because it is too varied, because it keeps too many old, obsolete values, because it is cramped by national identities. As a solution, it seeks forms of globalized education and tries to create an ‘European conscience,’ homogenized, devoid of nuances, and obedient. Forcing the note in this sense has generated disproportionate reactions, either by rejecting integration *de plano* or by reviving some narrow and selfish nationalist formulas, characteristic for the extreme right movements of the past” (p. 238); *Poezia lui Eminescu și Evul Mediu românesc* [The Poetry of Eminescu and the Romanian Middle Ages] (pp. 173–195); *Eminescu și străinii. O reconsiderare* [Eminescu and the Foreigners. A Reconsideration] (pp. 196–206); *Despre educația prin limbă și istorie* [About Education Through Language and History] (pp. 237–249): “The identity discourse is oriented in preconceived or very general directions, and the historical dimension is almost completely ignored or deviated” (p. 240); “What should students and even teachers understand in this random mixture of lessons and themes? The teachers who have taught in college that history means studying the past of mankind from ancient

times until today, according to the specificity of geographical spaces and communities, see that space and time no longer play any role in these ‘modern approaches.’ And the fertile idea that facts, events, historical processes would be somehow connected to each other (for example, we cannot understand the Renaissance without the Middle Ages and the Revolution of 1848 without the French Revolution), that they often result from each other *is considered to be indeed subversive* (our emphasis), as if all those who, from Polybius to Giovanni Battista Vico and from Xenopol to Toynbee had sought certain constants in the past, were impostors!” (pp. 245–246); *Povestea unui manual unic de educație europeană* [The Story of a Unique Manual of European Education] (pp. 150–264); *Atentatul împotriva educației naționale și consecințele acestuia* [The Attempt against National Education and Its Consequences] (pp. 265–282).

As a historian who specialized mainly in the Middle Ages, Professor Ioan-Aurel Pop does not limit his field of interest only to the study of this epoch, a fact testified not only by his elaborated studies and syntheses, but also by the pages of the present tome that reveal the development of the creative sides of a polyvalent personality. He expresses constant and unequivocal convictions that reflect the intellectual fiber of a true citizen of the City and his nation: “We are therefore the product of the West and the European Orient alike. But we must not forget that from the West came our being—*Vocația occidentală a românilor* [The Romanians’ Occidental Vocation] (pp. 283–298)—our name and language, that we have built our good destiny with Western support and that, as it seems, we are also preparing for the future on the Western side. In the end, the circle will close: From the West came our name, origin, and language and, in spite of all mistakes, we must find our place in the Western world (as long as it will last)” (p. 298).

Stoica Lascu

ROMULUS CÂNDEA, **STUDII ȘI ARTICOLE** [Studies and Articles], edited by Mircea Tomuș and *Cuvânt către cititor* [A Word to the Reader] by Ioan-Aurel Pop, București: Editura Academiei Române, 2015, 352 pp.

Reading, recently, a selection of studies and papers authored by Romulus Căndea (*Studii și articole* [Studies and Articles], București: Editura Academiei Române, 2015)¹ I had the revelation of encountering a Romanian historian who is barely known even to his peers. His assessments usually regard ecclesiastical issues, insisting on the role of the Church in redefining national projects, especially the ones that fundament the strategies of the leaders of the generations preparing the state union. In other words, while reading this beautifully composed book that renders the thinking of a historian who was profoundly engaged in the national

¹ The editor is the prestigious historian and literary critic Mircea Tomuș, and the volume enjoys a favorable presentation made by the Academician Ioan-Aurel Pop.

project, there emerged a firm and distinct conceptual profile of an intellectual not at all inclined to compromise in matters of major Romanian interests and who also looks intently at the near future. If in the eve of the First World War, a remarkable political figure—I. G. Duca—was still considering the Great Union “a dream” and was regarding it as nothing less than a foundation generating national progress,² a historian like Romulus Cârdeș reveals many generous ideas concerning the fulfillment of the national ideal. By lecturing at the university, by publishing in the papers and magazines of that time, and by giving a long series of lectures, the scholar has engrained in the memory of the elites veridical explanations concerning those who contributed in the preparation of the union, especially regarding those who served at the altar and preached about the union in church, spreading parables and teachings. His wisely gathered examples depict not only well-named grievances for solving historical injustices, but also their propagandists inside the Church. Each contribution illustrates cases of enlightened hierarchs, able to see the essential and the direction of spiritual action in the turmoil of economical, political, and cultural aspirations. The attention payed to the leaders of the Church appears fully justified by the simple cause of its role and position in the society, in which the Orthodox but also Greek-Catholic Romanian believers represented the majority in their historical Transylvanian and Bukovinian spaces, while being considered to be a minority with less rights in the context of the Dual Monarchy. By looking at the Ardeal Church in its secular history or assessing it in the time of the hopes,³ when only stoutness and assumed bravery could save the Romanian people, Romulus Cârdeș proves himself to be honest in his assessment, constant in his faith, and with an optimistic outlook concerning the future. Spiritual coagulation was not easy even after the fulfillment of the Union, being very aggravated by the economical consequences of the conflagration, but also by the large material and especially by the human losses. The fervent Orthodox Romulus Cârdeș shows that it happened again that the Church of the majority has stimulated, caressed, and gathered around it the ones who were apart for such a long time, supporting the new state in its efforts of coagulating national energies, explaining and proposing

² I. G. Duca wondered, in the paper “Un vis” [A dream] published in *Arhiva* 25, no. 7–8 (1914): 259: “Indeed, let us suppose that the great national ideal would be an accomplished deed. What will we do with our powers, because I believe that no one can consider this right other than a phase in our evolution as a people? Will we be content with the bourgeois ideal of a better condition? Our aspirations can be reduced to a more ordered and right social organization?” And he answered: “I cannot believe this. Besides, our past itself excludes the idea of an ‘aurea mediocritas’ future,” revealing his hope that “the destiny of our people is a cultural one.”

³ Like in *Biserica ardeleană în anii 1916–1918* [The Ardeal Church During 1916–1918], where he names and assesses the trial moment of the 2/15 May 1918, when the diocesan deputies voted (24) protesting against the violation of church autonomy (12 in favor) by the Budapest authorities, thus supporting not only the church institution, but also its rights earned with great effort along the time (in *op. cit.*, 264, see note 684). An important role in the decision was played by Ion Lapedatu, Director of the “Albina” Bank and diocesan deputy, an energetic supporter of the autonomy.

solutions. As historian, he detected the significant infusion of intelligence and creativity by means of which Transylvanian Orthodoxy has contributed to the fulfillment of post-war efforts. Even the help provided to Octavian Goga, as a minister in a new, central organism—the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Arts—and the support given to him can be included among the direct contributions to the reestablishment of a good public climate, for the proper functioning of the administrative system of Great Romania. Romulus Cârdea is a vigorous supporter of this endeavor, given the fact that during the third decade of the past century, the need for normalization and spiritual coagulation was essential. For this kind of reasons, he understood the importance of the Orthodox contribution to the progress of society in a Christian Romania, with generous rights provided to the state-recognized religions.⁴

Through his valuable historical approach, Romulus Cârdea pointed out the importance of the huge albeit unquantifiable consequences of faith, the people's natural and continuous support in the realizations that developed Romanian society, able to surpass, through Christian thinking and moral, obstacles, adversities, and dangers.

In such an optimistic and realistic endeavor, other contemporaries of the Avrig historian believed and also hoped that their generation would be able to use its power to consolidate what it had gained on the 1st of December 1918. A voice, to which we have already appealed, had envisioned the accomplishment of the union dream: “We can increase the patrimony of universal thinking through immortal works, we can carve in marble and cast in bronze the eternal beauty of human shapes. I do not see why we would not cover the earth with edifices of a faultless harmony of lines and would not enrich the museums with matchless paintings. What would stop us from telling, in wonderful verses, all the secrets of the human soul and from reviving something from the glory of Hellenic arts and Latin literature? This is the future that I dream for our people, and it seems to me that we have all the needed virtues to fulfill such a call.”⁵ Thus, in another form and way, in another registry, the hopes and expectations of the ones who waited and fought for the Union were well and clearly defined. When this secular project was successfully accomplished, its refinement and consolidation became the priorities of the Union generation. Each citizen was expected to support them, to add to the stability and well-being of the country. And, of course, the Church in its entirety, was expected to bring its spiritual share to their fulfillment, strengthening the fellows for playing the great role each of them was supposed to play for obtaining social harmony.

⁴ See in *Pentru apărarea ortodoxiei* [For Protecting Orthodoxy] the role of Octavian Goga (and also of Miron Cristea); the essential part was played by Alexandru Lapedatu (with repeated mandates and exceptional contributions: the law of religious affairs, the Concordat with Rome, the foundation of the Patriarchate of the Romanian Orthodox Church, the organization of theological education, the general regime of religious affairs, etc.).

⁵ Duca, “Un vis,” 260.

The fourth decade of the 20th century, the one during which the Union generation has seen its hopes becoming true due to the great development of the unified country, was merely a temporary interlude of peace, a short one, bringing confrontations and threats, announcing a future global disaster. All kind of dangers appeared at the Romanian borders, but also inside the country.

Again, the historian Romulus Cândea joined his voice for protecting what was so difficultly gained. The ones who came to listen to him caught his ideas: On the 8th of March 1937, at 5 pm, in the festive hall of the Orthodox Seminary in Râmnicu Vâlcea, Professor Cândea lectured on “The origin and importance of Romanian Orthodoxy,” considering Orthodoxy as “a shield and support for the Western civilization during all centuries,” condemning the governmental measures taken against the universities, asking “to combine this faith represented by the Church with Romanian nationalism, to protect this people against all the foreign trends that dig at its foundation.”⁶

The historian named and highlighted the most important dangers in that context, teaching his people principles that will always remain valid. In the disquietudes and dramas brought by the Second World War for Romania also, he did not waste time for details, but named realities very exactly: “The great danger for Europe and for us are the Russians, not because of Orthodoxy or Communism, but because of their imperialist aims that lead them over the Danube Mouth and the Balkans towards Constantinople. Here is our mission, due to our geographic position, to our qualities, especially the military ones, to our specific Romanian national sentiment; we are suitable to become a barrier for stopping the Russians and protecting Europe against this invading flood of Russian imperialism represented by a mixture of 890 subdued nations. We have fought in the past and have united, all Romanians all over the world, for the sake of Europe and civilization, we are destined to fight in the future too.”⁷

Appreciated at that time, too, by his listeners, the historian concluded: “We, Romanians, should try to assert ourselves through our specific Romanian national sentiment. We will be able to fulfill our mission only if all Romanians will be able to exercise their indisputable rights and will build, tightly united with all Romanians from everywhere, a strong block, an Eastern barrier.”⁸

Patriot by his deeds, with his firm convictions based on the lessons of history, “known as a relentless enemy of the Germans and especially of the Saxons in

⁶ According to the report of the General Inspectorate of Craiova Police, no. 1970/12.3.1937 addressed to the General Police Manager, Security Police Department, Bucharest; in the Archives of Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității (CNSAS).

⁷ According to the note of the Ardeal-Aiud Agency II, no. 4659/30 November 1943, transmitted to SSI following R. Cândea’s lecture presented on 27 November 1943, 6 pm, at ASTRA-Sibiu, on the occasion of the conferences of the University Extension of the Dacia Superior University of Cluj, retreated to Sibiu after the Vienna Dictate. The historian spoke about “The Mission of the Romanian People in South-East Europe.” After the lecture and the above-mentioned note, the specification of the historian’s political orientation and the specific pursuit card were requested. See the CNSAS Archives.

⁸ Ibid.

Ardeal, Professor Romulus Cârdea usually based his lectures on the old conflicts between Romanians and Saxons—and between Transylvania and the Vienna Court”; he inaugurated at Avrig a series of lectures held in villages in order “to prepare the people for our switch to the Allies’ side.”⁹

Reading his works, so precious for those who now experience other confrontations regarding our country, we observe once more the theme registries regarded by the historian as parables due to their fairness. Thus, one can easily notice that the process of historical investigation reveals not only his ability to interpret facts, events, and the roles played by personalities, but also his reflections on them, his capacity of understanding them, and of providing his conclusions to those who, in his belief, could or should follow them. Through the restitution work that was made available to us through the efforts of Professor Mircea Tomuș, a just tribute is paid to the historian Romulus Cârdea and, through it, to those who contribute to the development of their people.

From Gheorghe Lazăr’s Avrig, the intelligence and love for his people were transmitted to great personalities—such as Romulus Cârdea and Vasile Stoica—who, above all, served their nation and their country.

Ioan Opreș

Ioan Opreș, PhD University Professor, Valahia University of Târgoviște. Among other works, author of the volumes *Muzeograme vechi și noi* [Old and New Museograms] (București: 2014), *Muzeele din România* [The Museums of Romania] (București: 2015), *Gemenii Alexandru și Ion Lapedatu. Istorie și finanțe* [The Twins Alexandru and Ion Lapedatu. History and Finances] (București: 2016).

STOICA LASCU, ED., MARIAN ZIDARU, AND GEORGE LASCU, **ROMÂNII BALCANICI (AROMÂNII ȘI MEGLENOROMÂNII) ÎN ARHIVELE NAȚIONALE BRITANICE (1850–1950)** [The Balkan Romanians (Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians) in the UK National Archives (1850–1950)] (Societatea de Cultură Macedo-Română), București: Editura Etnologică, 2016, [L+246 pp.] /296 pp./; with facsimiles and illustrations.

The research project *The Balkan Romanians (Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians) in the UK National Archives (1850–1950)*, conducted by the Macedo-Romanian Cultural Society and funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Policies for Relations with Romanians Everywhere resulted in the above-mentioned volume.

This project is based upon an intense and fruitful research period (ten days during August 2016) in the British National Archives. There were investigated also

⁹ According to the note of the Ardeal-Sibiu Agency, no. 6122/5 February 1944; in the CNSAS Archives.

the Foreign Office funds, especially those of the consular offices (from Monastir [Bitolia], Ioannina, Thessaloniki). The selection of documents (whose resolution is not always the best, since the employed cameras were not very efficient) covers mainly the period up to World War I; of course, other documents together with the present ones can constitute the basis for future studies, reviews, and a separate volume, designed according to scientific requirements.

The UK National Archives (a recent institution as such, a non-ministerial government department, organized in this manner since 2003; it was founded by the Public Record Office Act of 1838) are organized in a quite modern manner; since 1977 they are located in a very modern building, specially arranged for this purpose, and very functional; during the last three decades—and especially in the last years—it has represented a documentary exploratory basis for many Romanian researchers. Broad thematic areas concerning the entire modern and contemporary world history and which are relevant for the history of Romanians and Romania can be investigated by consulting the documents preserved in the building on the Thames, at Kew, Richmond, in South-East London. These documents include also information on the history of the Vlachs/Balkan Romanians.

After the two Balkan Wars (1912–1913; 1913), when the respective Balkan space—inhabited by Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians—was divided between the states in the area (Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Albania) and especially after the First World War, the interest of British diplomacy in them has decreased. We possess little information given the short investigation time, but it is nevertheless of the relevant kind. In this volume we thought that, within a reasonable printing space, we could show especially samples of documents from the early 20th century. During the next period, we are planning to publish also many documents not included in this volume, by means of various scientific works (based on the documents in this volume and on the research of our peers).

The volume is composed in accordance with the generally accepted scientific structure: *Introducere* [Introduction], *Lista Documentelor* [List of Documents], and *Anexe* [Annexes]. The 71 selected documents (including most of the pages, some of which are even stand-alone documents) fall between 1852 and 1919. They are very precious archival documents for the history of the Balkan Vlachs; they were all issued by the consulates of the Ottoman Empire in Great Britain (Monastir [Bitolia], Thessaloniki, Ioannina), by the British Embassy in Constantinople, and the British Legation in Bucharest. The documents (in scanned format) presented in the volume point out the interest of British diplomacy in the internal life of the Balkan regions of the Ottoman Empire, especially in the issues of the various nationalities, education in the languages of the Christian peoples, the national movements, and the cultural ethnic aspects. Among these concerns of British diplomacy were also those regarding the representatives of Balkan Romanity—the *Koutzo-Vlachs*, *Vlachs*, *Romanians*, as they are called in the diplomatic reports.

As becomes obvious from the annotated *List of Documents*, British diplomatic officials were familiar with their existence because these people were reported by numerous British travelers through the Balkans. We have found out that the British were aware of their existence since the 50s of the 19th century (*Wallachians* or *Vlachs*, then *Koutzo-Vlachs* and *Romanians*); the numerous documents are from the first decade of the last century, in the context of the “Macedonian issue,” of the dispute of the neighboring states with the Great Powers regarding the reconquest of the Balkan territories from the Ottoman Empire. Some examples of the content of such documents are representative: *15 June 1852, General Report on the Trade of Monastir and its Dependencies*. In this context, reference is made to “the Wallachian race distinguished from the inhabitants of the Principality by the appellation of Sintsar. They are thrifty and industrious”; *31 October 1854*, “the Wallachians of the Pindus have risen again against the Porte”; *14 July 1894*, “the following information with regard to the Romanian or Vlach schools movement in the Vilayet of Monastir”; *21 March 1895*, about “the Vlach schools in the town of Monastir” and relationships between “Apostol Margaritti, the Romanian government inspector of schools, and the Romanian consul here”; *8 May 1905*, about the situation of education at Vovoussa, the intervention of the Ottoman governor, under “le pretexte que la propagande valaque trouble la tranquillité publique. Depuis longtemps les valaques de Vovoussa, village située dans le Pinde, qui en majorité ne sont pas grécisants, avaient l’habitude de chanter dans l’église l’*Apostolus* en langue valaque, et jamais la minorité du village grécisante n’avait songé à les l’empêcher”; *12 February 1906*, about “the Greco-Romanian conflict”: “Until the beginning of the persecution by Greek gangs, the Koutzo-Vlachs were the most law-abiding elements in Macedonia (our emphasis),” etc.

Also important are the *Introduction* (in Romanian and in English), which places the reader in the context of the modern history of the Balkan Vlachs/Balkan Romanians. The present documentary volume, structured according to scientific purposes, is one of the most important contributions to the scientific history of the Balkan Romanians in modern times.

Nistor Bardu

Nistor Bardu, PhD Assistant Professor, Ovidius University of Constanța (Faculty of Letters). Among other works, author of the volumes “*Lecturi vizuale*” *etnologice la aromânii din Albania. Zona Korçë* [Ethnological “Visual Readings” regarding the Aromanians of Albania. The Region of Korçë] (București: 2014), in collaboration with Iulia Wișoșenschi, Emil Țîrcomnicu, and Cătălin Alexa, and “*Lecturi vizuale*” *etnologice la aromânii din Albania. Gramsh, Elbasan, Pogradec* [Ethnological “Visual Readings” regarding the Aromanians of Albania. Gramsh, Elbasan, Pogradec] (București: 2017), in collaboration with Emil Țîrcomnicu.

STOICA LASCU, **ROMÂNII BALCANICI ÎN DOBROGEA. DOUĂ STUDII ȘI MĂRTURII ARHIVISTICE INEDITE. CU DOUĂ SCRISORI CĂTRE AROMÂNII DIN JUDEȚELE CONSTANȚA ȘI TULCEA** [Balkan Romanians in Dobrudja. Two Studies and Unpublished Archival Testimonials. With Two Letters to the Aromanians of the Constanța and Tulcea Counties], lucrare tipărită cu prilejul primului Congres Național al Istoricilor Români [book printed on the occasion of the First National Congress of the Romanian Historians], Cluj-Napoca, 25–28 August 2016, Academia Oamenilor de Știință din România, Secția de Științe Istorice și Arheologice, București: Editura Etnologică (Colecția de Istorie), 2016, 276 pp.

This volume, published last year, is a synthesis on the presence of Balkan Romanians (Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians) in Dobrudja, comprising two studies and original archival documents. The author has published numerous studies and articles on the modern history of Balkan Romanity, about the presence of Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians in the Romanian state and especially in Dobrudja. He used a very solid documentary base (local and national archives, local and national press—including publications edited by the Romanian intellectuals of Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian origins, especially memoirs), resulting in a profound and serious scientific research. In this volume, the two studies are *Românii balcanici în Dobrogea (până la Primul Război Mondial); și Mărturii din presa vremii* [Balkan Romanians in Dobrudja (up to World War I); and *Testimonies Taken from the Press of Those Times*] (pp. 9–29, 29–70) and *Așezarea românilor balcanici în sudul Dobrogei (1913–1940)—cauze, împrejurări, efecte* [The Settlement of Balkan Romanians in the South of Dobrudja (1913–1940)—Causes, Circumstances, Effects] (pp. 71–140).

The author shows that “the settlement of individual families of Aromanians in Dobrudja—constantly named in the documents of the time as ‘Macedonian Romanians’ or only ‘Macedonians’—would contribute, from the very beginning, to the strengthening of the Romanian nationality, especially in the commercial area, where the natives represented (especially in Constanța) a small percentage until the dawn of the 20th century, so that a contemporary was able to notice that ‘Romanianism lives only in the hearts of the officials, some teachers and lawyers, as well as in the Macedonian colony.’ There are numerous testimonies of the epoch proving the competition in the Dobrudjan localities between Aromanian and Greek entrepreneurs (or, more rarely, Jews and Armenians), and sometimes these disputes were ending with the intervention of the administrative authorities as a result of extra commercial motivations” (p. 20).

The second study is broader (pp. 71–140), and the enumeration of the thematic subchapters provides the reader with a clear perspective on its content: *Teritoriul dintre Dunăre și Marea Neagră—spațiu de etnogeneză al poporului român* [The Danube-Black Sea Territory—An Ethnogenesis Space of the Romanian

People]; *Urmările pentru aromâni și meglenoromâni ale Păcii de la București* [The Consequences of the Bucharest Peace for Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians]; *Noul Teritoriu sau Cadrilaterul* [The New Territory or the Cadrilater/Quadrilateral] (“as it is called, in the Romanian media, in 1913, the southern part of Dobrudja has fulfilled, from the beginning, a dual function in the national territorial ensemble (*apud* Virgil Mihailescu, 1944): An *outpost* for defending the southern border of the Romanian territory and, on the other hand, a shelter for the Romanians living abroad (in the historical provinces under foreign rule, i.e. Transylvania, Bukovina, and Bessarabia), and those from other counties of the [Romanian] Kingdom, who might have come from the hills and the more densely populated regions, and those Vlachs/Aromanians/Megleno-Romanians from the Balkan Peninsula who declared themselves Romanians” (p. 76); *Strigătul comunităților aromânilor și meglenoromânilor din Macedonia grecească către frații din Țară* [The Call of the Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian Communities of Greek Macedonia Addressed to Their Brothers from the Country]; *Fărșeroșii și verienii—pionierii împroprietărilor în Dobrogea de Sud* [The Farsherots and the Veriens—the Pioneers of Land Ownership in Southern Dobrudja]: “Among the political personalities who understood the importance of settling the Aromanians in the South-Dobrudjan counties was Ion I. C. Brătianu, as Gheorghe I. Brătianu revealed in a large report in 1929: ‘The introduction of the Aromanians in this region meant its repopulation with active and good elements, of great liveliness for the national cause’” (p. 109); *Grămostenii, deșelinători ai ogoarelor sud-dobrogene* [The Gramosteans, Ploughers of the South-Dobrudjan Fields]; *Primul mare roman românesc cu aromânii dobrogeni* [The First Great Romanian Novel with Dobrudjan Aromanians]; *Străjeri ai Statului Român la granița dobrogeană* [Guardians of the Romanian State at the Dobrudjan Border]: “In the mid-20s, when the Aromanians began to settle in the South-Dobrudjan counties, there were often attacks by armed gangs based south of the border, generating a state of uncertainty in individuals and questioning the authority of government law institutions. After 1925–1926, the firm retaliation of those in charge—Aromanians (and also *Regățeni*)—will lead to the diminution of the terrorist attacks, but these will not cease” (p. 119); *Efectele național-economice ale procesului de stabilire a aromânilor în Dobrogea de Sud* [The National-Economic Effects of the Settlement Process of Aromanians in Southern Dobrudja]: “They mean the general modernization of the area, the Romanian appearance of the urban settlements and the villages of the South-Dobrudjan counties, the representatives of Balkan Romanity contributing in a defining measure, together with their close relatives, the Northern Danubians, to the strengthening of Romanianism in the South-Eastern part of Romania. Remarkable, especially from a historical perspective, is the desire of the Aromanians—*recte*, of the Balkan Romanians—and the Daco-Romanians (*Regățeni*) established in the South-Dobrudjan counties to live together in common settlements” (p. 122).

At the end of his study, the author points out that “Unfortunately, the tragic year 1940 would painfully mark the destiny of Romanianism in Southern Dobrudja, a region ceded by the Romanian State, according to the Treaty of Craiova (7 September 1940) to the southern neighbors, the Bulgarians; the Romanian population in the Durostor and Caliacra counties was evacuated (106,621 inhabitants and 25,741 families), especially in the Constanța county (11,124 families) and Tulcea county (7,017 families), and they were placed in the localities where the Romanian citizens of Bulgarian origin lived as a result of population exchange” (p. 136).

Particularly important is, also, the section *Documente arhivistice relativ la prezența în Dobrogea a românilor balcanici (1895–1950)* [Archival Documents Relating to the Presence in Dobrudja of Balkan Romanians (1895–1950)]; official documents issued by the institutions—especially the Macedonian-Romanian Culture Society—reveal facts referring mainly to the Romanian nationality of the Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians established during the interwar period especially in Dobrudja, “ascertaining my Romanian origin.”

The volume also contains two letters inserted in 2006 in publications in Constanța and Tulcea—*Carti deschisă către cei “circa o sută de aromâni” din jud. Tulcea, participanți “la reuniunea filialei teritoriale a Comunității Aromânilor din România,” care doresc a nu mai fi, în România, români, ci numai aromâni* [Open Letter to the “about a hundred Aromanians” in Tulcea County, participants “in the meeting of the Territorial Branch of the Aromanian Community of Romania,” who want to be no longer Romanians in Romania, but only Aromanians], respectively *Carti deschisă către acei aromâni constănțeni—mai toți, dé, grămosteni—, care, în Patria noastră România, nu mai vor să fie români, precum părinții și bunicii lor, ci numai armănj* [Open Letter to those Aromanians from Constanța—almost all of them Gramosteans—who, in our fatherland Romania, no longer want to be Romanians like their parents and grandparents, but only Aromanians]. In his own narrative exposition, impregnated with many dialect words and phrases, the author passes in these letters addressed to his countrymen from the sobriety of the scientific style—characteristic for the studies—to a slightly polemical tone.

With a very rich bibliography, subdivided according to the chapters, this volume is representative for our today’s historiography, from the point of view of its research approach and the scientific interpretation of the discussed subject matter.

Marian Zidaru

Marian Zidaru, PhD Assistant Professor, Andrei Șaguna University of Constanța (Faculty of Communication and Political Sciences). Among other works, author of the volume *Românii balcanici (aromânii și meglenoromânii) în Arhivele Naționale Britanice (1850–1950)* (Balkan Romanians [Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians] in the British National Archives (1850–1950)) (București: 2016), in collaboration with Stoica Lascu, ed., and George Lascu.

ALIN CIUPALĂ, BĂȚĂLIA LOR. FEMEILE DIN ROMÂNIA ÎN PRIMUL RĂZBOI MONDIAL [Leur bataille. Les femmes de Roumanie dans la Première Guerre mondiale], Iași : Polirom, 2017, 368 p.

Le centenaire de la Grande Guerre a rallumé l'intérêt des historiens du milieu académique international pour les différentes problématiques liées au déclenchement, à l'évolution et au dénouement de cet événement historique. La nouvelle vague historiographique générée par ce contexte a cessé, en partie, d'analyser le conflit d'un point de vue militaire, politique ou diplomatique, pour s'orienter vers des aspects inédits d'histoire sociale et culturelle. Actuellement, la guerre est étudiée aussi sous un autre éclairage, par les yeux des gens ordinaires, des femmes, des enfants et d'autres couches sociales qui avaient soutenu l'effort de guerre entre 1914-1918. De ce point de vue, l'ouvrage soumis à notre analyse se situe à un carrefour entre ce courant historiographique généré par le centenaire de la Première Guerre mondiale et l'intérêt de l'auteur pour l'histoire des femmes dans la société roumaine, comme en témoignent ses ouvrages antérieurs.

Toute recherche centrée sur le rôle et l'activité des femmes dans les années de la Première Guerre mondiale s'arrêtera inévitablement à la même question : comment la participation des femmes au conflit avait-elle réussi à en modifier le statut ? Pour ce qui est de l'espace roumain, le bilan effectué immédiatement après la cessation des hostilités n'a pas enregistré les sacrifices faits par les femmes à l'appui de la cause nationale, leur accès dans le monde social-politique se maintenant à un niveau réduit. Néanmoins, l'auteur n'omet pas de souligner les modifications survenues dans les rapports de genre pendant le conflit. Ces modifications sont à remarquer dès la période antérieure à l'entrée de la Roumanie en guerre, lorsque des voix féminines de plus en plus nombreuses ont commencé à assumer des vues politiques au sujet surtout de l'orientation du pays vers l'une des deux alliances. Les plus notables ont été les interventions dans la presse du temps de la Reine Marie et d'Eliza Brătianu. L'effort de guerre assumé par les femmes a connu un changement qualitatif : si auparavant cet effort s'était limité à la perte d'un époux ou d'un fils pour la cause de la guerre, pendant la Première Guerre mondiale le sacrifice féminin a signifié un effort personnel assumé dans le cadre d'une association caritative ou des hôpitaux de campagne. C'était une manière d'adaptation aux exigences d'une guerre de type moderne.

L'amour, la sexualité et l'érotisme pendant la Première Guerre mondiale sont analysés sous deux aspects. D'abord, le départ des hommes pour le front a conduit à l'apparition d'un amour déssexualisé et à la perpétuation de la solitude. Les femmes ont cherché à compenser l'absence de leurs maris par la lecture de romans d'amour et de scènes à caractère érotique. Ce n'est donc pas étonnant que bon nombre de femmes aient devenues la proie des aventures amoureuses. Par exemple Arabella Yarka, l'épouse de Carol Davilla, reconnaissait dans son journal qu'elle se sentait attirée par un officier médecin français. Ensuite, la présence des soldats étrangers à proximité de femmes censées vulnérables a généré une série d'accusations

à l'adresse de ces dernières. Cella Delavrancea, qui a dirigé l'hôpital de Coțofenești, a été accusée de relations illicites, tout comme les infirmières qui soignaient les soldats dans les hôpitaux de campagne. Si la relation avec un soldat allié était en quelque sorte acceptée, celle avec un soldat ennemi était un sujet de honte, étant considérée même comme une trahison. De pareils cas se rencontraient souvent dans le territoire occupé par les troupes allemandes.

Revenant à l'activité des femmes dans les hôpitaux de campagne, l'auteur analyse la question d'une nouvelle perspective : celle de la reconnaissance manifestée par les soldats envers les femmes qui les avaient soignés. Pour révéler ces sentiments de reconnaissance, il se sert d'une série de lettres adressées à Fatma Alice Sturdza. Les soldats qui avaient bénéficié de ses soins témoignent de leurs sentiments de gratitude, parlent de leur état actuel de santé, demandent des conseils ou des aides. Les données sur l'activité caritative des femmes roumaines à l'étranger révèlent aussi bien le dévouement sincère de ces femmes que les contacts diplomatiques qu'elles réussissaient à établir et la confiance dont elles jouissaient à l'extérieur du pays. Non en dernier lieu l'auteur détruit le mythe de la solidarité absolue entre les femmes roumaines en ce qui concerne le soutien porté à l'effort de guerre. Ces femmes provenaient d'une société qui était divisée entre ententophiles et germanophiles, de sorte que leur affiliation à l'un des deux camps a porté l'empreinte des idées ou des influences venues de leur milieu. Les germanophiles, par exemple, avaient subi des critiques acerbes durant la période de l'occupation allemande.

Un chapitre de cet ouvrage est consacré à la personnalité de la Reine Marie, qui est évoquée aussi bien à travers ses propres mémoires qu'à l'aide de témoignages des hommes politiques contemporains. Le portrait ainsi esquissé est celui d'une personnalité puissante qui, en dépassant souvent les limites de son genre, a osé faire entendre sa voix dans les sphères politiques et devenir un symbole de dévouement à la cause nationale.

Un symbole similaire, celui du sacrifice sur l'autel des intérêts nationaux, est incarné par Ecaterina Teodoroiu, à qui l'auteur consacre plusieurs pages à la fin de l'ouvrage.

Les sources utilisées pour la rédaction de ce livre sont multiples, puisant à la fois dans des sources inédites, telles que les archives de la famille Brătianu et la correspondance de la Reine Marie – qui se trouvent en manuscrit à la Bibliothèque de l'Académie Roumaine –, et des documents conservés aux Archives nationales, aux Archives du Ministère des Affaires étrangères, aux Archives militaires roumaines et aux Archives nationales de film. S'y ajoutent des mémoires, des tomes de documents, des périodiques et une consistante littérature de spécialité. Il faut également mentionner une cinquantaine de photographies illustratives pour l'activité des femmes pendant la Première Guerre mondiale.

La publication de cet ouvrage vient combler une lacune dans l'historiographie roumaine, où de pareils sujets sont faiblement représentés, surtout en comparaison

avec les études sur ce thème parues à l'étranger. Il invite à de nouvelles démarches centrées sur l'activité des femmes, axées cette fois-ci sur d'autres régions à l'extérieur du Royaume de Roumanie, à savoir la Transylvanie, la Bucovine ou la Bessarabie, mais aussi les zones rurales où, en l'absence de données écrites, leur activité est beaucoup plus difficile à identifier.

Luminița Andreea Popescu

Luminița Andreea Popescu est étudiante en master à la Faculté d'Histoire et de Philosophie (Université Babeș-Bolyai de Cluj-Napoca, Master *Histoire de l'Europe du Sud-Est*). Dans le cadre du projet *Héroïnes de la Grande Roumanie. Destins en première ligne. Album* (Fondation universitaire Carol I), elle a écrit quatre biographies féminines (Maria Cosma, Alexandrina Matheiu, Ana Popp Lemény, Lucreția Mureșianu).

IONUȚ NISTOR, IDENTITATE ȘI GEOPOLITICĂ. ROMÂNII DIN NORDUL DUNĂRII ÎN TIMPUL CELUI DE-AL DOILEA RĂZBOI MONDIAL [Identity and Geopolitics. The Romanians North of the Danube during the Second World War], București: Editura Academiei Române, 2014, 332 pp.; with maps, tables, and graphics.

In the suite of works from recent years—not many—dedicated to the issue of Romanians south of the Danube, there is also this valuable volume, written by a young professor and researcher in Iași (part of a research project, conducted during 2010–2012), who refers to the impact of the Second World War on the Romanian communities, the conflict and the role assumed by Balkan Romanians in the context of the political and territorial reorganization of the area, the elaboration or import of some projects—as the author says—in the “new order” of projects and in the perspective of peace.

The structure of the work respects the usual academic norms: *Cuvânt înainte* [Foreword], five chapters, *Concluzii* [Conclusions] (pp. 221–223), *Rezumat* [Summary] (pp. 225–230), *Bibliografie* [Bibliography] (pp. 231–238), *Lista anexelor* [List of Annexes] (p. 239), *Anexe* [Annexes] (pp. 240–323), *Indice de nume* [Name Index]. The five chapters are: Chap. I. *De la un război mondial la altul (1940–1941)* [From One World War to Another (1940–1941)] (pp. 13–62); Chap. II. *Provocările “noii ordini”* [The Challenges of the “New Order”] (pp. 63–108); Chap. III. *Școli și biserici românești în Balcani* [Romanian Schools and Churches in the Balkans] (pp. 109–128); Chap. IV. *Propagandă și discurs istoric* [Propaganda and Historical Discourse] (pp. 129–185); Chap. V. *“Frontul intern”* [“The Internal Front”] (pp. 187–219).

Beginning with the Foreword, the author points out to the reader that “The analysis follows the chronological thread and targets the main groups of

Romanians in the region: From those in the area of the historical Macedonia to those in the Western Banat and Timok. I have included in the study the Romanians from Cadrilater/Quadrilateral, who were displaced to Northern Dobruja in 1940, in an attempt to follow the evolution of some communities affected by the rigors of population exchange, to rebuild the process of relocation, started in September 1940 and concluded in mid-1941, to analyze the way of integration into Romanian society and the policies of the Antonescu government adopted in this respect. The chapter dedicated to the Aromanians in Romania is necessary for understanding the relations between the Bucharest authorities and the Macedonian groups under the circumstances of the existence of a pole of power and influence constituted around the Legionary Aromanians. They represented, during the period September 1940 – January 1941, a decision-making filter at the highest level, partly due to their presence in the state structures (ministries, diplomatic apparatus) and to Romania's foreign policy strategy and reactions to the Balkan issues. It is important to pay attention to the evolution of the relations between the Antonescu government and the Aromanian groups south of the Danube also after the 'rebellion' of January 1941, under the circumstances of the tensions between Bucharest authorities and the leaders of the Aromanian guardians who were exiled or remained in the country. The stake is therefore the issue of the continuity or discontinuity of the policies applied by the state to the Balkan groups, starting with Ion Antonescu's sinuous relationship with the Legionary Aromanians" (p. 10).

Some of the remarks and conclusions of the author of this particularly valuable book are relevant: "The targeted and diverse perspectives of the propaganda emitter are an essential part of the analysis of the system's effectiveness, but not enough. The missing feedback from the receptors, the difficulty in evaluating the impact of the messages make our approach incomplete. Even the effects over time cannot be quantified as the propaganda strategy was projected by relying on the victory of Germany and Romania. Peace has changed its roles and has built a Europe centered on the ideological conflict between the blocks, being still less attentive, at least in the East, at the national, ethnic minority provocations" (p. 185). "Incorporating in the Legionary Movement as early as the 1930s, the Aromanians took advantage of political opportunities, personal ties, and the 'advantages' of belonging to a closed group in order to quickly advance in the social and economic hierarchy between September 1940 and January 1941. They became, with the support of Constantin Papanace, a force group within the Guard, they had influence on ministries, enterprises, banks, and they determined, at one point, Romania's political and diplomatic strategy regarding the relations with Greece and, in general, with the Balkan countries. They have consistently expressed, even with varying nuances, the support for an independent Macedonian project under the tutelage of Italy, which would have given them the guarantee of their own home. Then they had a sinuous relationship with the Romanian state and with the Antonescu government. The desire of some of them to go to Macedonia

was intertwined with the projects of others (in fact, the great masses of Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians, the heads of the respective families established in the Durostor and Caliacra counties—where they also received farm land—did not have the problem of leaving the adoptive country Romania [*Patria-Mamă*, Motherland], the way the public and the media were informed—our note) to stay in the country, continuing the struggle for taking over the power, and after ‘the rebellion,’ the collaboration with Ion Antonescu turned into a harassment game. It was not a homogeneous, political, ideological, or economic group, but regarding the major issues, which concerned common interests, they acted as a coherent, articulate community” (pp. 218–219).

The present volume, based on deep archival research, with a pleasant narrative exposition and pertinent conclusions, is an essential contribution to the issue of the Balkan Romanians, and it is representative for the scientific solidity of our today’s historiography.

Stoica Lascu

SORIN LIVIU DAMEAN, **CAROL I AL ROMÂNIEI, UN MONARH DEVOTAT** [Carol I of Romania, a Devoted Monarch], Târgoviște: Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2016, 392 pp.; with portraits.

The author of this important monograph is a well-known researcher of the modern history of Romania, consecrated as such during the last two decades. This book explores his earlier studies, brings new information and, in particular, provides the reader with an integrated perspective on the life and activity of the one who was the sovereign of Romania, “a devoted monarch.” He is one of the emblematic personalities of modern Romania, on whose activity Romanian researchers have written extensively after 1989.

As Professor Ion Bulei says in the Preface, “the German on the throne of Romania took over the country’s project of the Romanian elite with ideas that were neither conservative *à outrance* nor revolutionary, supported by the radical Romanians of that time. They were moderate ideas and moderate people, as was the personage Carol I: Never excessively to the right or to the left, always keeping a fair measure, both in politics, economy, and society. He has not always succeeded (see the moment 1907), and often only partially, because he lacked the means for building schools, hospitals, in the faster urbanization...” (p. 10).

The volume appearing in one of the most famous publishing houses in Romania—especially by publishing valuable historical books, most of them about untested topics up to that date—is structured according to the academic custom: *Prefață* [Preface] (pp. 9–12), *Argument* [Argument] (pp. 13–17), seven chapters (pp. 19–368), *Anexă* [Annex], *Bibliografie selectivă* [Selective Bibliography] (pp. 374–385), and *Indice de nume* [Name Index] (pp. 386–391).

The chapters are the following: Chap. I: *Prințul Carol de Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen devine principele României* [Prince Carol of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen Becomes the Prince of Romania] (pp. 19–65): “He also held an emotional speech, from which we quote: ‘Setting foot on this sacred land, I became Romanian as well. I bring you a sick heart, straight thoughts, a will to do well, a loyal commitment to my new homeland, and that unwavering respect for the law, which I gathered in my example. Today a citizen, tomorrow, if needed, a soldier, I will share with you the good fate as well as the evil one. From this moment on, everything is common to us, believe me, as I believe in you!’” (p. 51); Chap. II: *Casa princiară de Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen și întemeierea unei noi familii în România* [The Princely House of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen and the Foundation of a New Family in Romania] (pp. 66–130): “The King’s relations with the heir Prince [Ferdinand] will remain on the same line of Ferdinand’s total subordination to his uncle. Ferdinand’s lack of initiative and excessive shyness has led the sovereign to be less willing to show initiative in the affairs of the state” (p. 129); Chap. III: *Monarhul—factor al puterii executive și arbitru al vieții politice* [The Monarch—Executive Power Factor and an Arbiter of Political Life] (pp. 131–188); Chap. IV: *Comandant Suprem al armatei române* [Supreme Commander of the Romanian Army] (pp. 189–229); Chap. V: *Strategul politicii externe a României* [The Strategist of Romanian Foreign Policy] (pp. 230–305); Chap. VI: *Susținător al modernizării societății românești* [Supporter of the Modernization of Romanian Society] (pp. 306–345); Chap. VII: *Sfârșitul unei domnii—sfârșitul unei epoci* [The End of a Reign—the End of an Age] (pp. 346–368): “Carol I demonstrated a true devotion to the adoptive motherland and real qualities of a state man, giving him all the energy of the good work of the country and the well-being of a people with whom he identified and whom he loved. We conclude our excursus on King Carol I of Romania with the following words included in his *Testament*: ‘. . . I ask that future generations remember from time to time the one who worshiped his beloved people with his entire soul, a people in the middle of whom he felt so happy’” (p. 368).

In the synthesis entitled *Argument*, leaving it “to the latitude of the reader to analyze and judge,” the author points out that, as far as he is concerned, “we have endeavored not to engage emotionally, to be able to present the facts as they were” (p. 17): “The character or hero of this book is Carol I. During the 40 years of his reign, the monarch did not confine himself to a passive, decorative role but, on the contrary, actively engaged in different spheres of activity in Romanian society. First, after a difficult period of governmental and parliamentary instability, he succeeded in restoring internal stability and the bipartisan system in terms of the governing act, by reducing the power of liberals and conservatives, assuming his constitutional role as arbiter of political life. Given his military career, he took care of the organization, training, and endowment of the Romanian army according to European standards, which later enabled him to conquer the state independence on

the battlefields south of the Danube and to cover himself with glory in the memorable battles Romanian soldiers fought at Vidin, Grivița, Rahova, Opanez, Plevna, Smârdan, and Belogradcik. He was not satisfied with the conquest of independence, but sought to increase the prestige of the Romanian state, which, although it had lost Southern Bessarabia in 1878, it had won the territory of Dobruđja with the Danube Delta and the Serpent Island as a consequence of the Berlin Peace Treaty, ensuring the prerequisites for raising the country to the rank of kingdom and regulating the problem of dynastic continuity by definitively establishing the succession to the Throne” (pp. 14–15).

A representative work of our today’s historiography, Professor Damean’s volume constitutes a fundamental contribution to the knowledge regarding the life and activity of King Carol I and his place in the modern history of Romania.

Stoica Lascu

DESTIN ROMÂNESC (serie nouă), Revistă de istorie și cultură [Romanian Destiny (New Series), Historical and Cultural Magazine], XII (XXIII) [Chișinău], no. 1–2 (99–100), 2017, 260 pp., with illustrations and facsimiles.

One of the most prestigious publications of history and culture, which has been appearing in Chișinău since 1994, has reached no. 100 this year (2017). Edited under the auspices of the Romanian Cultural Institute, the publication (with Gheorghe Negru—editor-in-chief, Alexandru Moșanu and Alex Cosmescu—editors) gradually became a tribune for the scientific and cultural writings of historians from the Republic of Moldova; the most representative of them are also members of the Board of Editors—Vladimir Beșleagă, Grigore Botezatu, Mihai Cimpoi, Vitalie Ciobanu, Gheorghe Cojocaru, Maria Danilov, Demir Dragnev, Nicolae Enciu, Ion Eremia, Andrei Eșanu, Valeriu Matei, Gheorghe Mârzenicu, Alexandru Moșanu, Ion Negrei, Ion Niculiță, Pavel Parasca, Anatol Petrencu, Gheorghe Postică, Ion Șișcanu, Mihai Tașcă, Constantin Ungureanu, along with highly representative names of today’s Romanian historiography like Ioan Caproșu, Ion Constantin, Ioan-Aurel Pop, Flavius Solomon, Alexandru Zub.

The titles in the (double) number of 2017 are clearly revealing the broad thematic coverage: Raia Rogac în dialog cu Petru Hadârcă: *Chișinăul era și este sincronizat la viața culturală europeană* [Raia Rogac in Dialogue with Petru Hadârcă: Chișinău Was and Is Synchronized to European Cultural Life], pp. 12–18; Ion Constantin, *Basarabia la interfezența marilor interese* [Bessarabia at the Crossroads of Great Interests], pp. 19–42; Alexei Agachi, *Serviciul de strajă al călărașilor din Basarabia în anii 1816–1828* [The Guard Service of Bessarabian Horsemen in 1816–1828], pp. 43–50; Valentina Chirtoagă, *Criza orientală și România (1875–1878): premise, intenții și consecințe* [The Oriental Crisis and Romania (1875–1878): Premises, Intents, and Consequences], pp. 51–66; Gheorghe

Mârzencu, *Westernul copilăriei noastre* [Our Childhood's Western], pp. 67–81; Elena Negru, *Eforturile URSS în propaganda istoriei și realizărilor "națiunii moldovenești" (1968–1985)* [The Efforts of USSR in Promoting the History and Accomplishments of the "Moldovan Nation" (1968–1985)], pp. 82–92; Ion Ciocanu, *Boris Movilă: "Dârz și neînfricat, ca în tinerețe..."* [Boris Movilă: "Steady and Fearless Like in His Youth..."], pp. 93–99; Gheorghe Cojocaru, *Istoriografia conferinței sovieto-române de la Viena (27 martie–2 aprilie 1924)* [The Historiography of the Soviet-Romanian Conference (27 March–2 April 1924)], pp. 100–119; Gheorghe Negru, Dinu Poștarencu, *O pledoarie publică a unor preoți basarabeni pentru reintroducerea predării limbii române în școlile teologice (1883)* [A Public Plea of Bessarabian Priests for Reintroducing the Teaching of Romanian in Theological Schools (1883)], pp. 120–149; Andrei Eșanu, Valentina Eșanu, *Tipărituri din estul Moldovei în spațiul românesc din dreapta Prutului (1792–1870)* [Printings from Eastern Moldova in the Romanian Space on the Right of the Prut (1792–1870)], pp. 150–166; Maria Danilov, *Manuscrisul basarabean al predicilor antimiene (1824)* [The Bessarabian Manuscript of the Antimian Sermons (1824)], pp. 167–175; Vlad Ghimpu, *Nume românești în scrieri novgorodene pe scoarțe de mesteacăn* [Romanian Names in Novgorod Birch Bark Manuscripts], pp. 176–183; Aliona Grati, *Vladimir Beșleagă. Destinul sub "cumplite vremi" sau drama celor doi părinți iluștri* [Vladimir Beșleagă. The Destiny in "Horrible Times" or the Drama of the Two Illustrious Fathers], pp. 184–193; Andrei Burac, *Era o noapte cu lună plină* [It Was a Night with a Full Moon], pp. 193–201; Nicolae Rusu, *Despre filmele contemporane ca o metodă de manipulare* [On Contemporary Films as a Method of Manipulation], pp. 202–206; Fareed Zakaraia, *Ascensiunea democrației liberale* (traducere și prezentare de Alexandru Cosmescu) [The Rise of Liberal Democracy (translation and presentation by Alexandru Cosmescu)], pp. 207–223; Maria Danilov, *Anul 1917 în Basarabia și ardeleanul Romulus Cioflec* [The Year 1917 in Bessarabia and the Transylvanian Romulus Cioflec], pp. 238–243; Raia Rogac, *Mitropolitul Gurie—operă zidită în destinul Basarabiei* [Metropolitan Gurie—A Work Integrated in the Destiny of Bessarabia], pp. 244–249; Ion Ciocanu, *Spiridon Vangheli—ambasador al copiilor noștri în Lume* [Spiridon Vangheli—Our Children's Ambassador to the World], pp. 255–259; Reviews by Nicolae Enciu, Sergiu Tabuncic, and Valentin Tomuleț, pp. 224–237, 250–254.

The attachment to rigor and scientific honesty in observing and revealing the historical truth becomes obvious also from the Declaration of the Association of Historians of the Republic of Moldova regarding the intention of the President of the Republic of Moldova to exclude from secondary education the teaching of the course *History of Romanians* and to include into the school curriculum the subject *History of Moldova*, approved by the AIRM Steering Committee in Chișinău on 20 April 2017. It is not superfluous to read some fragments from this important and relevant declaration of Clio's servants from the Republic of Moldova: "On 16

March, Igor Dodon, President of the Republic of Moldova, asked Prime Minister Pavel Filip to cancel Order no. 124 issued by the Ministry of Education on 7 March 2012, according to which the subject called *History* was renamed *History of Romanians and of the World*, and to introduce the subject *History of Moldova* into the school curriculum starting with the academic year 2017–2018.

The President invoked as a pretext the so-called Romanian danger, which would undermine ‘the future of the Moldovan State.’ This is not a new strategy. As historians, we observe that the Russian Empire’s authorities and those of the USSR had similar approaches, regarding their policy of Russification and denationalization as a response to the persecution of imaginary nationalists. ‘The Stalinity’ cannot be undermined by the truth, by our own history. The real danger is represented by the forgeries, the mystifications of our national identity, inoculated by manipulation and propaganda, in order to build and maintain an Iron Curtain on the Prut” (p. 7).

In conclusion: “Through this Declaration, the Association of Historians of the Republic of Moldova reiterates that the study and teaching of the *History of Romanians* in the educational institutions of the Republic of Moldova is an imperious necessity and is a factor of stability, an indicator of the democratic processes, in which the Moldovan society is involved, a premise and a guarantee for fostering the rule of law and democracy. The entry of the Republic of Moldova into normality and its transformation into a modern and European state can be ensured only on the basis of Romanian national and European cultural values, shaped over the centuries and which represent our identity blazon” (p. 11).

Written with scientific accuracy and based on documentary sources, exploiting the research so far, the studies in this number—and, as a whole, the historical and cultural magazine *Destin românesc* [Romanian Destiny] issued in Chișinău—provide a conclusive picture of the quality of historiography in the Republic of Moldova.

Stoica Lascu