

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE HISTORICAL WRITING IN THE FORMER HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY ROMANIA

ALEXANDRU ISTRATE

The beginning of the 19th century Romania witnessed the first rather timid increasingly frequent expressions of assumed positions regarding the manner in which the writers of the age understood to make their opinions clear on two points: firstly, the drafting of texts and secondly, and most importantly for the next stage, the way those texts could have the most visible and strong effect on the readers. This was a new practice meant to increase the responsibility of the creative act and invest it with a new valence, somewhat dependant on the commissoners' tastes and culture. The writing of books out of books, a perfectly normal reality in the old culture¹, no longer found its use in its relationship with the possible readers, increasingly prepared to cover numberless pages of a subject more than familiar, result of a sterile repetition of events of no fundamental representative significance to them, which did not meet the dilemmas of their past.

Two major problems were taking shape at the horizon and required an immediate solution: firstly, the type of editorial policy to be adopted, with all its implications and, secondly, the validation of another type of writing, periodically enriched in topics, which was conditioned among other things by the readers' requests, the latter increasingly taken into more serious consideration after 1800. Beside its purely formal side, the dialogue with the readers aimed at detecting the preferences of the regular subscribers, whose minimal expectations needed to be met in order to ensure the distribution of the subsequent issues.

A close reading of the Romanian press of the first half of the 19th century reveals that love of history did not boast the ardent sharing one might suspect after having read texts by Kogălniceanu, Bălcescu or Asachi.

A historical consciousness, something one would have like to meet as early as possible in our country, cannot be labeled as an immediate preoccupation of the time, as it is no natural thing for the average human being to experience an existential need. It implies the handling of some basic notions of culture with a hope that within a developing future the outlook on a problem and emulation could

¹ Mircea Vasilescu, "*Iubite cetitoriule...*" *Lectură, public și comunicare în cultura română veche*, Editura Paralela 45, Pitești, 2001, p. 24.

be maintained by institutional programs. Practically invested with this function, the newspapers and journals were to prepare the road and constantly fuel the readers' interest until the litterati were able to envisage a worthy historical synthesis.

Periodicals such as "Albina românească" (The Romanian Bee), "Curierul românesc" (The Romanian Courier), first published in 1829, and the later "Foaie pentru minte inimă și literatură" (A Leaflet for Mind, Heart, and Literature) reshaped the outline of the manifestation area claimed by the scholars of the time and invested considerable efforts to accommodate everything meaning the message of the text and the level of its conception, in order to make it as intelligible as possible, so that its assimilation can include an important segment of initial subscribers². There was quite a considerable lot at stake for both sides, as publications resulted in the emergence of public figures and the consecration of well-known cultural personalities, a position which brought glory and respect in their original social milieu. That was no new practice, it had been and was being successfully used in the Western world and there was nothing spectacular about it. Young people aspiring to cultural validation would send their papers to publishing houses in the hope of being included in the subsequent issues of the regularly distributed newspapers or journals. Two eloquent examples, Byron and Walter Scott, earned their celebrity mostly as a result of their constant presence in the newspapers. Only later did they become famous, gain stature and some financial stability. The first steps in a career as a contributor to a periodical was immensely important to anyone, despite the small amount of money earned³. Consequently, the number of people who lived off their writing was very small and those were people who had to hold another job to round up their income.

In a fatal manner, court literature was in its last phase of expression, ignored and without any power to change the course of destiny to its advantage, abandoned under different circumstances by the very people who had generated it. Some determinations intervened, including the material one, of an undesirable first importance, which inevitably led to a change in the positioning of literary productions, including the history book. The practice of reading was becoming most outstandingly a public act in its aim. It involved the spirits and unleashed different reactions involuntarily focussed on papers and periodicals which won their way through with difficulty in the landscape of the time. The reading carried out in the private space far from the madding crowd stayed ineffectual unless commented in the literary salons of București or Iași. The transfer to the "high life" sector of society, not exactly in the pejorative sense of the word, was to become one of the identifying marks of cultural facts of the former half of the 19th century.

² Ștefan Lemny, *Conștiința națională în primele periodice din Moldova*, "AIIAP", XVIII, 1981, p. 240.

³ Christophe Charle, *Intellectualii în Europa secolului al XIX-lea. Eseu de istorie comparată*, Institutul European, Iași, 2002 p. 95–96.

Moreover, the pleasure of reading was gradually discovered also in the recently opened reading-rooms, in the two capitals and in provincial boroughs, where books from Paris, Brussels or Berlin⁴ could be found. The books had limited subjects: world history or biographies of great military leaders like Alexander the Great, Caesar, Peter the Great, Charles XII, Napoleon. The extremely generous offer in this respect gave those interested many titles of a general kind which outlined overall views impossible to survey only on the basis of local writings.

But beside the pleasure of an easy attractive reading about the heroes of the Antiquity or the Middle Ages the reader could have no certainty as to the amount of information concerning his ancestors' deeds.

From a historiographical point of view, in a somewhat unexpected dynamics if one considers the letargy which encompassed the 18th century literature⁵ the relationship between tradition and continuity comes into focus. This favours the projection of history from an ideal centre in which the elites were predominant, on the one hand, and the new trend connected to the influences of the time, which outlined the need to elaborate a new methodology the young generation energetically claimed. Alecu Russo⁶ did not find it difficult to understand why "patriotic fanaticism and ignorance attributed to Stephen the Great everything which seemed unfamiliar: any old structure, a ruined stone bridge, an earthen mound in the middle of a vast expanse of land, a ruined castle, churches, hermitages...". Russo ascribed this kind of interpretation to the century-long continually enriched traditions and was well aware of the fact that the folk imaginary, the only source for the overwhelming majority of people, had its limits and served a rather significant horizon of expectation, a cultural construct which could not withstand the type of analysis the young people with a propensity to history wished to have.

This was no total denial of the predecessors' contributions, no definitive break from the old writing. Mihail Kogălniceanu and Costache Negruzzi's initiative was an unquestionable proof in this respect: in 1840 the two announced the printing of the three volumes of the Moldavian and Wallachian chronicles, with an appeal to all "who own chronicles of Wallahia or Moldavia ... to lend them, and send them to the Office of *Dacia Literară*, and as a reward they will receive a gift of three copies of the collection with their names on the title". A praiseworthy project, this gesture which restored the heritage of Grigore Ureche, Ion Neculce or Miron Costin advanced by the two intellectuals, had no chances of success without the necessary material. Neither manuscripts, nor reliable sources to check the historic truth were available. But it would be erroneous to think that the study of history was not seen as possible judging only by the first attention-bringing signals

⁴ Alexandrina Ioniță, *Carte franceză în Moldova până la 1859* (doctoral thesis), Iași, 2000.

⁵ Ștefan Lemny, *Întâlniri cu istoria în secolul XVIII. Teme și figuri din spațiul românesc*, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 2003, p. 44.

⁶ Al. Russo, *Scrieri*, Editura Scrisul românesc, Craiova p. 16.

about the uncomfortable situation anyone who wanted to clarify misunderstandings or study thoroughly a temporal sequence encountered. Gheorghe Asachi had warned in 1829⁷ that a credible history “is only possible to warp when all the matters in estranged and destroyed documents are gathered from Transylvania, Poland, Russia and Constantinople and upon the study of the monuments related to our events”. The warning taken by the editor of “*Albina românească*” was not meant to mend things, and either compilations from easily accessible works on world history or translations indiscriminately taken over on a quantitative basis were still preferred, which was mostly rejected by Mihail Kogălniceanu. The obvious taste for trivial and common performance was prevailingly reflected in the repertoire at the beginning of theatre seasons and was equally felt in the newspapers.

But still attention to national history was gradually coagulating, despite of the difficulties encountered with finding the sources indispensable to the making of truthful texts. It resulted in books which fuelled polemics mostly kept up in periodicals which frequently hosted some opinions, which proved the emergence of a model of exchange of ideas based on the correlation of arguments brought into discussion and on the knowledge of ideas which animated the partner in the dialogue. It was then that the secrets of the right to reply, the advantages of carrying a polemic were learnt, utterly new things to those used to a more restrained behaviour and to challenges taken only from inside close circuits.

*The History of the Beginnings of the Romanians in Dacia (Istoria pentru începuturile românilor în Dacia)*⁸ by Petru Maior represented a moment of reference and brought back to the fore, in a somewhat virulent argumentation, the relationship of the present to what *origin, anteriority, Romance nature (Romanity), continuity, Latinity*⁹ meant. This was no hazardous option for the Transylvanian scholar (also the author of the first synthesis of Romanian history elaborated according to criteria used in the Central European space at the turn of the 18th–19th centuries) and this effort culminated with the printing of the work by the Buda University in 1812. An attempt to calculate Maior’s merits should rather start with the end, namely with his efforts for the *History* to be included on the list accepted by the censors in Buda, but also with the inherent compromises¹⁰ he had to accept in order to accomplish a major project in our historiography. Despite the fact that Maior was assisted by truth and despite his erudition (a rare thing before him),

⁷ *Rediul moldovenesc în Austria*, “*Albina românească*”, Iași I (1829) p.140; see also Vasile Cristian, *Istoriografia pașoptistă*, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 1996, p. 40.

⁸ *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dacia* by Petru Maior, în Crăiasca Tipografie a Universității Ungurești din Pesta, 1812.

⁹ Laura Stanciu, *Biografia unei atitudini: Petru Maior (1760–1821)*, Editura Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, p.279.

¹⁰ Adrian Marino, *Cenzura în România. Schiță istorică introductivă*, Editura Aius, Craiova, 2000, p. 22–29.

things did not unroll normally till the end. A symbolic act was needed, submission to a hierarchy, dominated by the institutional authority of bishop Ioan Bob. Maior eventually accepted the sacrifice, only in order to prevent the abrupt senseless stoppage of his impressive work in which he had fervently believed. It is a well-known fact that at the time the difficulties encountered in the publication of a book mostly annihilated the difficulties and deprivation intellectuals consciously assumed. Once overcome, impediments brought the author the satisfactions he desired, in an act of moral reparation after the humiliation he had endured. Not anonymous in Transylvanian circles in 1812, by the publication of his book which fired the minds and hearts of many young people, Maior was ranked within the distinguished continuity inaugurated by Dimitrie Cantemir, Prince of Moldavia in the 1720s. In an imaginary letter to a friend, published in 1839 in "*A Leaflet for Mind, Heart, and Literature*", a young man unveiled his emotions on learning the news of a way to find the book: "in a few months we heard talk of Petru Maior's *History* of the beginnings of the Romanians in Dacia. Let us procure it, you said. Let us procure it somewhere, my friend. The reading of this book was like a strike of lightning through our whole being: a host of premonitions and ideas dormant within ourselves were suddenly risen, as though conjured up by some powerful charms, an exultation and fanaticism of being a Romanian and nothing less, and there was no balance, there were no boundaries to the feeling ... Well, my friend, where would P. Maior have taken all these books out from, and how could we find them?" So, the scholarly model was being separated from the image of journalism by which it received absolute validation. That was a constant model for Damaschin Bojincă, Florian Aaron, and I. Albinet.

The author of *A Brief Overview of the History of the Principality of Tara Romaneasca (Wallachia) (Idei repezi de istoria prințipatului Țării Românești)*¹¹ attributes a kind of specifically apostolic activity to Maior, as "... he teaches Romanians to honour one another more and has kindled in them a nationalistic spirit which caused innumerable fruit". The epigones of the man who breathed in a new approach to the present by deciphering the past realized that the scientific reply accompanied by correct honest demonstration need not pursue the destruction of the partner open to dialogue, in order to defend the convictions to which he subscribed. In most cases the inheritance taken over by the descendants proved much too heavy a burden and obviously marked the contributions in historical matters in the latter half of a century.

A contrast is here to see between the manifesto programs focused on a resuscitation of the historiography dedicated to the Principalities, forewords written with pathos, designed in a mostly idealistic manner, on the one hand, and the

¹¹ Florian Aaron, *Idee repede de istoria prințipatului Țării Românești*, I. Eliad's printing works, București, 1835, p. XVIII.

contents of the works as such, similar in most case, contained within an established pattern. Gheorghe Şincai was not as fortunate as Petru Maior to see his whole *œuvre* published during his lifetime, although he deserved it beyond any doubt. Some short incoherent fragments taken from the first volume were included in the Calendar (*Calendarul*) of Buda for the year 1808–1809, without too many comments or explanatory notes. It was only some thirty years later that the first volume was published in part, in 1843 in Iaşi, and the next year in Buda. Another ten years later *Hronica* was finally published in a complete edition in Iaşi in Cyrillic script, in 1853–1854.

Despite the obstacles, the legend around *The Chronicle* was more influential in the literary circles than many of the books in catalogues sent to editors of periodicals, which was an effective way to enhance the sales in bookshops. The lessons of Mihail Kogălniceanu's childhood made by Gherman Vida, the stray native of Maramureş who went east of the Carpathians gave history a prominent place. It was Şincai's book, brought over by the monk from across the mountains, that provided the support for learning and analysis.

So, a work of synthesis doomed to be ignored and condemned, circulated for a long time due to Mihail Kogălniceanu¹² and George Bariţ¹³ and their articles in the press which reminded their contemporaries how necessary it was to publish the work by the scholar in Blaj. In what may look like too categorical an exposé, the future prime minister of Prince Cuza stated his opinion that: "...Şincai gathered the largest collection of Romanian documents ever possible ... *Hronica* by Şincai is such a great thing, so precious, that words are not enough to show my amazement. Thousands of unknown documents have been gathered here and I will not hesitate to say that as long as *Hronica* has not been published, the Romanians will have no history." If we consider the fact that the statement was made by an intellectual bred in the rigour of the French and German higher education, where he had come into contact with Western historiography, which enabled him to show a vast culture only comparable at the moment¹⁴ with Dimitrie Cantemir's encyclopedic spirit, we will have a better understanding of the importance of Şincai's contributions and the vagaries of his fate. The position of a peasant's son is the more laudable if one considers that by the time since Sincai had edited the first volume of the *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques transdanubiens*, whose topic was not fundamentally different from the paper by the ex-censor of the printing house of the university of Buda and consequently entered a competition of ideas. He had

¹² Mihail Kogălniceanu, *Georgie Şincai*, in "Arhiva românească", vol. I, Cantora Foaiei Săteşti, Iaşi, 1841, p. 3–5.

¹³ George Bariţ, *Hronica romînilor...*, in "Foaie pentru minte inimă şi literatură", Braşov, 1841, p. 95.

¹⁴ Ilie Minea, *Câtă istorie românească ştia M. Kogălniceanu?* in "Curier ieşean", I, nos. 7–9, Iaşi, 1941, p.115.

the levers he needed to make his own book well-known, which was a natural thing, but did not hesitate to recommend Şincai unreservedly. That was a gesture of moral uprightness, in support of a valuable project, awaited for more than a century. In his turn, the editor of *Foae pentru minte inimă și literatură*, in his eulogy of his Moldavian colleague's merits in the rediscovery of Şincai's texts, confessed an oppressive feeling of guilt: "When I first read this biography, not in the Archive, but in *Dacia literară* in 1840, alone as I was in my rooms, my face heated with joy and shame. Şincai was from Transylvania, and we were from Transylvania, too ..."

The two opinions, not the only ones on the book in question, brought along more than what at first reading seems simply a grateful opinion of the significance of the book written by the representatives of *Școala Ardeleană*. They also illustrate the supreme satisfaction of a generation that finally the history of the predecessors was no longer exclusively available through the writings of foreigners¹⁵, with a hope that the model personified by Şincai would generate true emulation. A note of pessimism could be fatally heard, despite the success the Chronicle enjoyed, a pessimism generated by the shortcomings those entitled to coagulate a restitutional discourse encountered at any step; as "to offer a history of the homeland is a most courageous thing, and there are thousands of obstacles to be surpassed which can lead to despair even the most ardent and enterprising Romanian spirit". Asachi, given his position of a state archivist since 1831, would have had chances to succeed in an attempt "to compose a History of the homeland", as he wrote in the preface of the translation of *A History of Russian Empire (Istoria imperii rosiene)* by Ivan Kaidanov. It is not difficult to suspect which was the reason for Asachi to procrastinate in assuming the mission. It looks like a paradox today to believe that the very person in charge of the collection of old documents and manuscripts did not have any vital instruments available for his work to use and should complain about his delicate position.

That was, in fact, an expression of an acute need to change the production of historiography, with a more and more urgent emphasis on the information provided by the sources, by an encouragement of systematic research in the country and particularly in the capitals of the neighbouring countries, as well as an appeal to owners of manuscripts to put them back into circulation. But in order to attain the desired point preliminary stages of document search and collection had to be performed and chronicles ordered according to topics. History as a tale was backed off with legends, folk traditions, and was marginalized to make room for rational documentation, based on the use of direct indispensable sources for the elaboration of the history of the Romanians, mostly unknown till then.

As shown above, the supposedly best recipe for a history offered by Şincai and Maior, and taken over without any reserve by Asachi, Damaschin Bojincă, Albineț or

¹⁵ Florian Aaron, *op. cit.*, p. XXI notes: "Mulțumită istoriei Ungariei care în vreo câteva veacuri este o povățuire sigură și o lumină pentru istoria țării rumânești", thus corroborating, if necessary, the inconsistency of the autochthonous historiographic approaches.

Florian Aaron, successively idealized in articles in periodicals or in book prefaces was unfortunately to be materialized in remarkable papers and stayed as a simple act of popularization of events and prominent characters; it did not account though for a larger more complex vision, nor did it provide the necessary answers. So there was little innovation and solutions to basic questions were postponed for later. Moreover, the authors seemed to be the same and would rather not sign their papers, which gave the impression that the respective publications enjoyed a lot of contributors, as the offer was by far exceeding the demand, the latter sensibly lower than the former and rather limited in its choice of topics. The subscribers' wishes were obviously impossible to be met entirely because of the scarcity of funds on which they depended when they needed to elaborate historical texts but also because of the reaction of another significant segment of readers who preferred general information to everybody's understanding. They wrote: "Our book-shops are overcrowded with all kinds of history books on which many literary people strived to embellish.... Whoever would wish a history book, will you please Sir (Editor – a.n.) kindly send them to book-shops and tell them that they can find many useful things there, for the entire community."¹⁶ One can see that the history of the Romanians was not even mentioned, only the Romans were, as if there had been no new contributions after 1841, no matter their quality, on our past. This is the only explanation one could have for the formula and terms mentioned. Statistics tend to contradict the image outlined above: it shows that between 1821 and 1848 printing houses in București and Iași published approximately 59 volumes¹⁷, mainly meant for teaching in academies patronized by gentlemen, and so entered a closed circuit which rarely gave signals. An interpretation based on the number of copies published every year could only be favourable and leads one to presume that historiography was giving out the first signs for scores of years. Expectations were often futile and led to non-anticipated disillusionment, generated frustrations impossible to control or dissimulated in ambiguous statements. Amazed at what he could find out in libraries in Western Europe, Dinicu Golescu¹⁸ was drawing one's attention to the fact that "we have to gain this knowledge out of the reading of some book written by Europeans. A lot of histories of Wallachia are to be found in Europe, written in its languages and in Romanian as well, but by foreigners; there is no mention of any written by a native of this land". That was a realistic diagnosis of the lack our culture experienced in the former half of the 19th century, especially of printed material accessible to a majority meant to keep up a consciousness which was unfortunately to be found only with the few intellectuals in some groups of influence, who actually fought at the time for the assimilation of that material by the less receptive media.¹⁹

¹⁶ "Foaie pentru minte inimă și literatură", Brașov, 1841, p. 186.

¹⁷ Apud Gabriel Bădărău, *Academia Mihăileană (1835–1848). Menirea patriotică a unei instituții de învățămînt*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 1987, p. 134.

¹⁸ Dinicu Golescu, *Însemnare a călătoriei mele Constantin Radovici din Golești făcută în anul 1824, 1825, 1826*, Editura Eminescu, București, 1971, p. 15–16.

¹⁹ Ștefan Lemny, *Conștiința națională în primele periodice din Moldova* (reprint), in "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A.D. Xenopol”", XVIII, 1981, p. 1; Vlad Georgescu and his

In 1826 there was hope that appeals like Dinicu Golescu's would have beneficial effects. This was not the case; nor did it happen with the editing of documents, which stirred even more vehement reactions and made Mihail Kogălniceanu ask himself whether we had any right at all to revendicate a destiny of any kind: "But where is our history, who knows it, who reads it, who would, in such a material and selfish time, care to think about history, nation, and future?" – all this conveys the disillusionment of a fervent defender of the predecessors' heritage, apparently undeserved by contemporaries, much too preoccupied with other matters.

Damaschin Bojincă became an emblematic case and perfectly fitted into the profile of the Romanian scholar, duly criticised in the "Romanian Archive" (*Arhiva românească*), of whom there were huge expectations which resulted in comparable deceptions. With a few exceptions his *œuvre* was the product of compilations and translations or adaptations after the literature available. Qualitatively, the portraits of Radu Șerban, Mihai Viteazul, Iancu de Hunedoara published in the "Romanian library" (*Biblioteca românească*) in Buda by the editor Zaharia Carcalechi, deserve to be mentioned for the educative value of the message, focused on already well-known directions. The volumes as such intensely cultivate the genre of *antiquities*²⁰, a fashionable concept, in a boring schematization replete with well-known legends with Romulus and Remus as heroes and is far from any attempt at a successful explanation of Romanians' past.

The history book as a means of instruction did not reach its goal to the full extent of its project and did not outgrow the limits drawn as early as the 18th century. The old time, that is the Roman conquests under Trajan and the figure of Mihai Viteazul were most commonly invoked and represented as moments of reference, as symbols kept with piety in one's memory. "It occurred to me to see, S. Marcovici notes, while reading about the reign of the most happy and eternally remembered Mihai Viteazul, tears in my eyes and my breast all sighing... Tears have never been a forced tribute, but the most true and precious reward of a heart full of the excitement of a writing can bring to the author as gratitude. I myself have read, to audiences of ladies and gentlemen, from the life of that hero, and I was most pleased to see floods of tears flowing out from the listeners' eyes."²¹ The theatrical aspect of the act of reading, increasingly and frequently dramatic and directed to an audience which did not reject this kind of behaviour served only to a rather rudimentary level of assimilation. There were rare exceptions and non-acceptance of such a comment.

Following up the destiny of the history book in the former half of the 19th century the author of this paper is rather tempted to almost completely deny its

Istorie a ideilor politice românești (1369–1878) (History of Romanian Political Ideas), to which there are frequent references.

²⁰ We refer to *The Roman Antiquities (Anticile romanilor)*, Tipariul Universității din Pesta, 1831–1832.

²¹ C. Marcovici, *Istoria patriei*, in "Curier de ambe sexe", periodul I, București, p. 2.

presence in the areas of manifestation specific to cultural work. It would be quite easy to trust the outburst of George Bariț, exasperated by the slowness which had practically anesthetised the exchange of ideas in historiography. He would sarcastically remark, with unhidden concern²², as to the ignorance of some some lines without an echo: “I found out from a reliable source that count Iosif Kemeni, the famous historian from Transylvania has gathered three thousand four hundred twenty-six historical documents, charts, letters, diplomatic acts a.s.o. the most of which, though highly interesting are still unknown and shed a special light on the history of our homeland since about the year 1550 till today. The praiseworthy count commenced his collection at the age of 16, and he is now over 50. Who will make use of these most precious documents? Whoever of our patriotic gentry would be able to show such a priceless collection? Count Kemeni allows that beside those historic documents there is a host of others which need to be taken out to the light of day, in order for us to have a complete pragmatic history. His highness the count also owns some original letters of the Romanian princes, written in Romanian or Latin and signed by the princes themselves. **What are you doing, gentlemen historians, what are you doing?**”

This is in fact the last radiography of the period we are interested to explore. We cannot validate the radical position of Bariț, but the question at the end of his intervention indicates a reality different from the projects previously announced, dominated by optimism and confidence as they had been. This is where we think the key to the antagonisms which generated the polemics of the time is to be found. No matter how far the spirit of structural change had gone, and that was very far, if there were no indispensable documents for the historian’s work to be found, the historian’s work and local writing would take over without discerning anything they thought fit from the world history. The great merit of the generation which left an imprint on the post-1821 Romanian society was the initiation of some truly cultural programs which offered better perspectives to their successors. There was no way for the history book to go out of these patterns in the way of a literature still inert to the challenges of the time. One single individual or small group of intellectuals, despite the efforts made, could supply no school of historiography, no model of writing the past, no matter how much they would have wished to. Patience, institutional support for the archive and library research, and pertinent editing and writing were needed. All this was to become a reality only as late as the latter half of the 19th century. And it was only with great difficulty that it found a well-deserved place among the disciplines in the *nomenklatura* of the time.

²² George Bariț, *Pentru istoricii patriei*, in “Foaie pentru minte inimă și literatură”, Brașov, 1844, p. 55.