

PERSPECTIVES ON THE ROMANIAN ELECTORAL SYSTEM OF 1918-1919: A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF A RECURRENT PROBLEM

Adrian Alexandru HERTȚA*

Received: May 6th, 2026

Accepted for publication: July 20th, 2026

Abstract: This study examines the ways in which Romania's electoral system after the First World War was understood, described, and classified in academic literature over more than a century. Built upon disparate normative components, developed in different parts of the country and in a socio-political context that is difficult to reconstruct, the legal structure as a whole was complex both in its form and in the processes that gave rise to it. Consequently, despite the considerable volume of historical, legal, and political science literature devoted to the subject, it was frequently described only partially or classified incorrectly. By tracing the evolution of the literature from the interwar period through the communist decades and into the post-1989 era, the article explores how unusual political and legal circumstances, a particular pattern of asymmetrical center-periphery relations, contingent limits of understanding, accidental superficiality, ideology, the ways in which books and academic studies have sometimes mechanically built upon one another, and inertia contributed to the persistence of this problem. It also highlights the gradual reassessment of the legal framework in recent decades, which has made possible a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of its internal configuration.

Keywords: historiographical inquiry; Romanian electoral system of 1918-1919; geographically configured mixed electoral formula; interdisciplinarity

Rather than limiting itself to a linear historiographical survey, the present study examines how unusual political and legal circumstances, a particular pattern of asymmetrical center-periphery relations, contingent limits of understanding, accidental superficiality, ideology, the ways in which books and academic studies have sometimes mechanically built upon one another, and inertia produced and subsequently preserved a glaring error of theoretical classification. Despite an exceptionally rich and interdisciplinary body of scholarship on the subject, Romania's first electoral system after the First World War was repeatedly, and for a curiously long period of time, described incompletely or even altogether incorrectly. Recent authors have similarly noted both the substantial volume of academic output over more than a century and,

* "Ovidius" University of Constanța, Romania. adrian_hertza@yahoo.com

to some extent in contrast, the fragmentary and rather modest perspectives offered by many contributions¹. Against this background, the present contribution has set itself four fundamental, overlapping objectives: 1. to bring this quantity-quality paradox to light – not as a mere stocktaking exercise, but as a complex phenomenon within a broader analytical framework; 2. to highlight the most flagrant recurring errors and misguided approaches; 3. to attempt, where appropriate, to formulate possible explanations for shortcomings of both form and substance; 4. to reconstruct this tortuous and atypical evolution of the literature by examining all representative works – both those that form part of the prevailing tendency and those that substantially enrich our understanding or emerge as exceptions.

The Object of Analysis: A Heteroclite Electoral Arrangement

Both in its legal foundations and in the final form it assumed, the system designed in 1918–1919 to organize elections to the Parliament of Greater Romania embodied a genuinely composite construct. Its dual nature probably also constitutes the main difficulty in understanding it. In an altogether unusual political context, marked by post-conflict and post-unification provisionality, ad hoc institutions in different parts of the country enshrined the principle of universal male suffrage in different decree-laws, conceived from different perspectives and giving rise to substantially different electoral arrangements; the administrative and decision-making elites of the former Austro-Hungarian provinces, recently incorporated into the Romanian state, resisted the mechanical extension of the rules governing electoral competition from Bucharest, preferring instead to draw on their imperial legal heritage². As a result, and rather curiously, what took shape was a geographically

¹ Andreea Zamfira, “Élections et électeurs aux XIX^e et XX^e siècles: Une généalogie de l’étude électorale en Roumanie,” *Studia Politica: Romanian Political Science Review* VII, no. 2 (2007), 355-357, 360, 366, 370-371; Mihai Ghițulescu, “Alegerile din 1919 din Vechiul Regat. Comentarii juridico-aritmetice,” *Revista Bibliotecii Academiei Române* 4, no. 1 (January-July 2019), 57; Mihai Ghițulescu, “Despre Ardealul electoral (1919-1920). Note privind decretul pentru organizarea alegerilor în „Transilvania, Banat, Crișana și Maramureș,” *Archiva Moldaviae* XII, 2020, 163-164.

² Sorin Radu, *Electoratul din România în anii democrației parlamentare (1919-1937)* (Iași: Institutul European, 2004), 24-27; Andrei Florin Sora, “Cadrul legislativ,” in *România Mare votează: Alegerile parlamentare din 1919 „la firul ierbii”*, coords. Bogdan Murgescu and Andrei Florin Sora (Iași: Polirom, 2019), 38. For a detailed discussion of the Transylvanian case, see Mihai Ghițulescu, “Despre Ardealul electoral,” 166-173. This is also confirmed by the contemporary press: “Situația politică a Basarabiei și Bucovinei,” *Patria*, August 13, 1919, 1; Vasile Grecu, “Reforma electorală,” *Glasul Bucovinei*, August 14, 1919, 1; A. Burac, “Dreptul de opțiune în legătură cu reforma electorală,” *Glasul Bucovinei*, August 26, 1919, 1; for a critical perspective: T. Oțelea, “Reformele electorale,” *Socialismul*, August 24, 1919, 1; V. Gr., “Presa din Regat și reforma electorală,” *Glasul Bucovinei*, August 26, 1919, 1.

configured mixed electoral system: for the Senate, while in the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia a majoritarian system based on plurality voting in multi-member constituencies was introduced, in Transylvania and Bukovina an absolute-majority system in single-member constituencies was adopted (with an additional round of voting whenever necessary); for the Assembly of Deputies, while the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia opted for a proportional system (based on open lists), Transylvania and Bukovina adopted a predominantly majoritarian system (with the major cities – Cernăuți, Arad, Cluj, Oradea Mare, and Timișoara – turned into small proportional enclaves electing three or two representatives)³.

This highly unusual legal framework remained in force until 1926. Three parliamentary elections were held under its provisions: those of 1919, 1920, and 1922. From the outset, there was a fairly discernible tendency among specialists and political commentators of the time to treat this electoral system – composed of contrasting elements – not as a whole but in segments: greater attention was given to elections for the Assembly of Deputies and, likewise, to the electoral arrangements devised for the territory of pre-war Romania and Bessarabia⁴. Predictably and understandably, the higher or more visible political stakes at the center and, perhaps, the challenges posed by a complex and entirely new mathematical algorithm tilted the balance of attention and, to some extent, distorted the overall perception. Yet the distinction between the electoral arrangements in force in the southern and eastern provinces and those in force in the northern and western provinces was clearly recognized. I have found it reflected in academic discourse⁵, in the press⁶, and even in the memoirs of political figures⁷ – most often in critical terms and as a primary argument for

³ All three legislative texts – the one for the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia, the one for Bukovina, and the one for Transylvania – are available in *Cod electoral* (București: Ministerul de Interne, Imprimeria Statului, 1919).

⁴ Some examples: ing. Mihail Manoilescu, *Represintarea proporțională după noul Decret-lege. Observații critice, explicarea calculelor electorale și simplificarea lor* (București: Tip. N. Stroilă, 1919); Mihail Manoilescu, “Inconsecvențe în Decretul-Lege electoral,” *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* 1, no. 1 (April 1919), 208-210; Anibal Teodorescu, “Reprezintarea minorităților în România,” *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* 1, no. 2-3 (July-October 1919), 465-473.

⁵ Dimitrie Xenopol, “Reforma electorală,” *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* 2, no. 1-4 (1920-1921), 216-218.

⁶ Camil Petrescu, “Legea electorală în Ardeal, Banat și Bucovina,” *Revista Vremii politice, literare și economice*, January 29, 1922, 10. One of the most scathing criticisms of the Transylvanian-Bukovinian legal arrangement: “It is one of the most reactionary laws that have governed any Romanian territory in recent times.”

⁷ Constantin Argetoianu, *Memorii. Pentru cei de mâine. Amintiri din vremea celor de ieri, Volumul al VI-lea, Partea a VI-a (1919-1922)* (București: Editura Machiavelli, 1996), 83. Another illustrative quotation: “Maniu and all his people (...) had devised a local electoral

the need to unify the disparate voting methods. Once, in the mid-1920s, the National Liberal Party's parliamentary majority devised and introduced a unified percentage-threshold majority-bonus scheme, one might have expected that, since this strange and unprecedented geographically configured mixed electoral system was no longer in force and the political passions surrounding it had subsided, it would become, if not a genuinely intriguing theoretical curiosity, at least an episode of legal history that could be readily reconstructed. However, the first work on electoral law published in those years marked the beginning of an entirely different trend.

A Striking Gap in the Puzzle

A doctoral thesis defended by Ioan Macovei in Paris in 1927 and published that same year claims to cover the evolution of Romanian representation arrangements, from the Organic Regulations to 1926. The publication of the monograph was briefly noted in specialized academic journals, in rather neutral terms⁸. In reality, although promising in its structure, Macovei's extensive study is considerably weaker and more problematic than contemporary impressions of it would suggest. The section devoted to the electoral system then in force draws heavily and uncritically on arguments from the explanatory memorandum presented by the bill's parliamentary sponsors⁹. More seriously, the part dealing with pre-war legislation appears to reproduce the ideas, the manner in which the subject was constructed, and even substantial passages from another thesis written by a Romanian, that of the future Liberal prime minister Gheorghe Tătărescu, defended at the Sorbonne in 1912¹⁰. Finally, as regards the electoral system in force from 1918/19 to 1926, the study examines in detail the decree-law concerning the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia, but entirely overlooks the fundamentally different character of the regulations governing Transylvania and Bukovina¹¹. The first book published on the subject thus leaves half the country outside its account.

law for themselves, thanks to which elections were no longer anything but a sham of elections.”

⁸ Const. Rarincescu, review of *Représentation nationale en Roumanie. Thèse pour le doctorat (Sciences Politiques et Economiques). Présentée le Mardi 31 Mai 1927, à 2 heures*, by Ioan Macovei, *Revista de drept public* III, No. 1 (1928), 188.

⁹ Ioan Macovei, *Représentation nationale en Roumanie. Thèse pour le doctorat (Sciences Politiques et Economiques). Présentée le Mardi 31 Mai 1927, à 2 heures* (Troyes: Imprimerie Les Presses Modernes, 1927), 80-83.

¹⁰ The following pages should be placed side by side: Gheorghe Tătărescu, *Regimul electoral și parlamentar în România* (București: Editura Fundației Pro, 2004), 31-38, with Ioan Macovei, *Représentation nationale*, 19-31. I have previously made this observation in another recent study. See Adrian-Alexandru Herța, “The Historical Stratigraphy of the Romanian Voting Formulas: Defining Attributes of the 1866 Electoral Legislation,” *Historical Yearbook* XXII, 2025, 169.

¹¹ Macovei, *Représentation nationale*, 33-79.

Somewhat in contrast, two contributions from the 1930s, that of Marcel Ivan¹² and, respectively, that of Ilie Gănescu, Const. Gr. Zotta, and Alex. Kostachi¹³, recover and reconstruct the legal framework within which voting was first established in Greater Romania. However, they do so only briefly, focusing instead on other aspects – the former on the interpretation of electoral results and statistical indicators, and the latter on the general theory of electoral law. Also dating from the fourth decade of the last century is one of the most extensive and solid analyses of post-First World War legislation on parliamentary elections. Conceived according to a methodological pattern well established in the Francophone world (France and Belgium)¹⁴ during the modern era, the work left to us by Crișan T. Axente¹⁵ stands out in at least three fundamental respects: the precision and clarity with which the key provisions of the legislative acts governing the elections of 1919, 1920, and 1922 are delineated and explained; the reconstruction of relevant episodes or snapshots from the consultations and debates surrounding the legal texts; and, not least, an elaborate comparative exercise. The investigation then proceeds to an assessment of the political effects. Overall, what was written on this subject – from different analytical perspectives – during the 1930s provided a fairly solid theoretical foundation.

Quite unfortunately, however, the contributions of some of the most prominent and influential jurists during the dictatorships of King Carol II and Ion Antonescu marked a clearly discernible and abrupt regression. In George Alexianu's chapter in the monumental *Encyclopedia of Romania*, published under the patronage of the Royal House in 1938, which purports to offer a retrospective overview of modern electoral systems, the voting arrangements in force in Transylvania and Bukovina until 1926 are once again completely ignored¹⁶. The same major flaw persists in a treatise on public law that Alexianu

¹² Marcel Ivan, *Evoluția partidelor noastre politice în cifre și grafice 1919-1932. Studiu comparativ al rezultatelor oficiale ale alegerilor pentru Camera Deputaților din anii 1919-1932* (Sibiu: Editura Kraft & Drotleff s.a.), 6-10.

¹³ Ilie Gănescu, Const. Gr. Zotta, Alex. Kostachi, *Dreptul electoral român* (București: Institutul de Arte Grafice „Vreamea”, 1937), 14-15, 23-26, 30-37.

¹⁴ Among the reference works I have in mind are E. Willequet, *Réforme électorale. Représentation de la minorité. Système des deux-tiers* (Bruxelles: Librairie C. Muquardt, 1881); Léon Dupriez, *L'Organisation du suffrage universel en Belgique. Vote plural. Vote obligatoire. Représentation proportionnelle* (Paris: Librairie de la Société du Recueil Général des Lois & des Arrêts, 1901); Joseph Barthélemy, *L'Organisation du suffrage et l'expérience belge* (Paris: Librairies-Éditeurs M. Giard & É. Brière, 1912).

¹⁵ Crișan T. Axente, *Essai sur le Régime Représentatif en Roumanie* (Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1937), 437-483.

¹⁶ George Alexianu, “Regimul electoral din România,” in *Enciclopedia României. Volumul I. Statul* (București: Imprimeriile Naționale, 1938), 236-237. It is worth mentioning that Alexianu was also a highly controversial political figure. He began his career in government structures during the dictatorship of King Carol II. However, the peak of his professional

subsequently co-authored with Paul Negulescu¹⁷. What, in the case of Macovei's work, had appeared to be just a lamentably incomplete survey became, in fact, a recurring error. From this point onward, an entire constellation of papers followed the same distorted line, overemphasizing the electoral experience of the Old Kingdom while completely erasing the legal heritage of the provinces that became part of the Romanian state in 1918. The perspectives grew increasingly reductionist.

The Pernicious Impact of the Communist Experience

Before marking the beginning of a period of profound decline in the academic literature on parliamentary elections in the years between the two world wars, the 1940s produced one of the most important works on the mechanisms and dynamics of electoral competition. Published in 1946, Mattei Dogan's book revived the theoretical direction pioneered by Marcel Ivan more than a decade earlier, but it can be said to have taken the analysis to a higher level. The geographically differentiated legal methods for electing deputies and senators, adopted in 1918 and 1919, respectively, are accurately described¹⁸. The focus of the study then shifts from the normative framework to broader socio-political tendencies and implications. Drawing on the percentages obtained over time by the various political groups competing in elections, Dogan constructs variables and develops mathematical and graphical representations. In essence, the study employs a diverse range of statistical indicators to highlight and assess the extent of governmental pressure on the electorate, the dynamics of the party system, and even what Dogan regarded as the defining attributes of the political regime in Bucharest up to the end of the 1930s. Although his conclusions occasionally appear somewhat schematic and to some extent detached from their historical context, they are innovative and have significantly influenced the way in which the subject has been – and continues to be – studied.

By comparison, Mihail Florescu's booklet, also published in 1946, opens up a diametrically different perspective on how the first elections of the interwar period unfolded – one overwhelmingly distorted by the ideological

trajectory was his appointment as governor of Transnistria. In this capacity – which he held from August 1941 to January 1944 – he oversaw and ordered measures that led to the extermination of Jewish and Roma populations. He was, in essence, one of the most sinister criminal figures of the Antonescu regime. For details see Vladimir Solonari, *Imperiul-satelit: guvernarea românească în Transnistria, 1941-1944* (București: Editura Humanitas, 2021). I have also noted this biographical detail in a previous study. See Herța, "The Historical Stratigraphy," 169-170.

¹⁷ Paul Negulescu, George Alexianu, *Tratat de drept public, Tomul I* (București: Casa Școalelor, București, 1942), 453-454.

¹⁸ Matei Dogan, *Analiza statistică a „democrației parlamentare” din România* (București: Editura Partidului Social-Democrat, 1946), 14-21.

imperatives of communism. Florescu writes, for instance, that, as early as 1919, the electoral process in Romania was, in fact, “a sham”; that the manner in which the authorities (to be read: “the reactionary landowning and financial castes”) consistently approached the legal provisions (to which he himself pays no attention) resulted in “the violation of the most elementary democratic freedoms” and marked “the beginning of the campaign of terror unleashed against the popular masses.”¹⁹ From this juncture onward, the manifest disregard of the complex and heteroclit body of legislation governing the organization of the first parliamentary elections in Greater Romania became deeply entrenched in both historiographical discourse and legal treatises. Throughout the Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and Nicolae Ceaușescu eras, the emphasis shifted toward aspects carrying particular propagandistic value: the incorporation of the principle of universal male suffrage into Romanian legislation was accorded grossly disproportionate importance, while the role played by the radical left in the adoption of this unprecedented expansion of the direct electorate was also considerably overstated.²⁰

Delayed Progress in Recent Decades

After 1989, the “wooden language” and some of the ideological ballast of national communism proved unexpectedly resilient in a number of academic works. Vasile Budrigă’s monograph on the Romanian electoral system of the interwar period provides a particularly telling example. He ignores, misconstrues, and inadequately discusses the most important of the legal provisions. One of his most flagrant misjudgments is the entirely erroneous

¹⁹ Mihail Florescu, *Alegerile parlamentare în lumina cifrelor și a faptelor (1918-1937)* (Editura Partidului Comunist Român, 1946), 5-8. It is worth noting that the author was a combatant in the Spanish Civil War, having voluntarily enlisted on the Republican side. For details, see Mihai Burcea, “„Tovarășii din Spania”: Voluntari comuniști români în Brigăzile Internaționale din Războiul Civil Spaniol,” in *A fost odată ca niciodată: Partidul Comunist Român: pentru o istorie dezinhăbată a „viitorului luminos”*, ed. Adrian Cioroianu (Iași: Editura Polirom, 2021), 391; Dennis Deletant, *România sub comunism: paradox și degenerare* (București: Editura Humanitas, 2025), 44.

²⁰ A few examples of academic accounts marked by omissions or distortions: N. Prisca, *Sistemul electoral în R.P.R.* (București: Editura Științifică, 1965), 37; Ion Saizu, Leon Eșanu, “Momente din istoria regimului electoral în România (1922-1928),” *Anale de Istorie* XVI, No. 3 (1970), 84-85; Gh. Florescu, I. Saizu, “Alegerile parlamentare din România între anii 1919-1922,” *Cercetări Istorice* IV, 1973, 309-313; Mircea Mușat, Ion Ardeleanu, *Viața politică în România 1918-1921* (București: Editura Politică, 1976), 33-34; S. Cutișteanu, Gh. I. Ioniță, *Electoratul din România în anii interbelici (Mișcarea muncitorească și democratică în viața electorală din România interbelică)* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1981), 13-15; V. Pușcaș, M. Știrban, “Perfecționare și atitudini critice în sistemul politic al României interbelice,” in *Dezvoltare și modernizare în România interbelică 1919-1939. Culegere de studii*, coords. Vasile Pușcaș, Vasile Vesa (București: Editura Politică, 1988), 15, 27. Also see Ion Agrigoroaiei, “Problema reformelor agrare și electorală din România între anii 1916 și 1918,” *Cercetări Istorice* VI, 1975, 179-194.

characterization of the electoral regime in force between 1918/19 and 1926 as having a “unitary character”²¹. As in earlier periods, this volume of questionable quality may be regarded less as an accident and more as part of a deep-rooted tendency. Uninspired approximations, the mechanical use of sources, and the persistence of patterns of thought and rudimentary analytical frameworks inherited from the historiographical discourse of the 1970s and 1980s continued to produce effects, in some cases with unexpected durability. Thus, one can identify a considerable number of works published over the past three and a half decades that, while by no means as poorly written as Budrigă’s, continue to overstate the significance of the introduction of universal male suffrage into Romanian legislation and, at the same time, give short shrift to the question of legal arrangements by entirely overlooking the distinct voting formulas in force outside the territory of the Old Kingdom²². A symptomatic case, illustrating just how widespread a poor or incomplete understanding of the issue remains, is provided by a recent study by Sorin Arhire. The author correctly refers to a distinct electoral system – based on an “absolute majority” – for Transylvania, Banat, Crișana, Maramureș, and Bukovina. This, however, comes after he had stated on the preceding page that the decree-law of November 1918 (which introduced, among other things, voting “on the basis of proportional representation”), “applicable only to the territory of the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia,” was subsequently “extended to the other provinces as well”²³.

Against this relatively ossified theoretical background, a noteworthy shift in perspective came only in the early 2000s, and from the field of political science. “One country, two systems” is the memorable phrase coined by Cristian Preda in his analysis of the Romanian mixed electoral model established at the end of the First World War. The study by the Bucharest-based academic stands out not only for its accurate typological categorization of

²¹ Vasile Budrigă, *Sistemul electoral din România în anii 1918-1940* (București: Editura Planeta, 1997), 4-28.

²² Dan Florin Velicu, *Sistemul electoral – o controversă redefiniă* (Editura Semne), 154-161; Marian Curculescu, “Mentalitatea colectivă în alegerile parlamentare interbelice (1919-1937),” *Studii și articole de istorie* LXXVI, 2010, 300-308. A few other works offering incomplete accounts: Ioan Scurtu, “Opțiunile electoratului românesc în primul deceniu interbelic (1918-1928),” *Revista de Cercetări Sociale*, No. 1, 1997, 98-99 (this is only one of the author’s numerous contributions on the subject); Florin Costiniu, Paul Dorin Șerban, *Aspecte ale evoluției sistemului electoral în România* (București: Regia Autonomă Monitorul Oficial, 2000), 34-38; Filon Morar, *Democrația privilegiilor. Alegerile aleșilor în România* (București: Editura Paideia, 2001), 27-28; Luminița Banu, Florian Banu, “Alegeri, alegători și aleși în România monarhică (1866-1946),” in *Alegător în România secolului XX: între speranțe, promisiuni și interesele guvernanților*, coord. Constantin Hlihor (București: Editura Meteor Press, 2025), 115-116.

²³ Sorin Arhire, “Legea electorală din martie 1926 și efectele sale asupra vieții politice românești, 1926-1937,” *Terra Sebv. Acta Mvsei Sabesiensis* 16, 2024, 312-313.

the dual legal superstructure, but also for the innovative character of its approach²⁴. The author's clarifications and observations follow an interpretive framework adapted from Western political science of the second half of the twentieth century²⁵. Also emerging as a major scholarly voice on this subject at the beginning of the new millennium was the historian Sorin Radu. He places under close scrutiny the entire body of electoral laws and decree-laws drawn up in 1918 and 1919 in the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia, and in Bukovina and Transylvania, respectively. The normative scheme is dissected and explained in meticulous detail, almost article by article²⁶. Worth highlighting as well is the work's effort to reconstruct the socio-political and intellectual climate of the period. Complementing the earlier contributions, Mihai Ghițulescu's two studies on how the first electoral system of Greater Romania was configured²⁷ bring to light previously unknown or lesser-known historical information. It could be argued, however, that his fundamental achievement lies in the clarifications, bold hypotheses, and conceptual reframings he puts forward (sometimes arising from a close critical reading of the legal norms, and at other times from the very discrepancies uncovered between the way in which the various provisions were formulated and the way in which they were applied).

Viewed as a whole, the outcome of approximately a century of diverse and unevenly valuable scholarship is, however, predominantly positive at present. It has been possible to develop an accurate, detailed, and illuminating overall picture of the issue. Studies published over the past decade and a half confirm this²⁸.

Conclusion

Finalizing the map of the legal framework brings into sharper focus the challenge of reconstructing the complex procedural pathways that gave rise to it. What was once a barrier to understanding a multi-segment system is

²⁴ Cristian Preda, *România postcomunistă și România interbelică* (București: Editura Meridiane, 2002), 61-81, 91-102. See also, from a somewhat different angle, Cristian Preda, *Rumâniile fericiți: vot și putere de la 1831 până în prezent* (Iași: Editura Polirom, 2021), 124–144.

²⁵ I am referring here primarily to Arend Lijphart, *Modele ale democrației. Forme de guvernare și funcționare în treizeci și șase de țări* (București: Editura Polirom, 2006).

²⁶ Sorin Radu, *Electoratul*, 15-39.

²⁷ Mihai Ghițulescu, "Alegerile din 1919 din Vechiul Regat. Comentarii juridico-aritmetice," *Revista Bibliotecii Academiei Române* 4, No. 1 (January-July 2019), 57-71; Mihai Ghițulescu, "Despre Ardealul electoral," 163-191.

²⁸ Several examples: Corneliu Ciucanu, "Regimul electoral în România (1917-1938)," *Istorie și societate, Vol. II*, coords. Gh. Buzatu, Marusia Cîrstrea, Horia Dumitrescu, (București: Editura Mica Valahie, 2011), 167, 173-177; Alexandru Radu, "Un sistem electoral de factură particulară," in *1919 – Primile alegeri parlamentare din România Mare*, coords. Alexandru Radu and Camelia Runceanu (București: Monitorul Oficial R. A., 2019), 11-62; Andrei Florin Sora, "Cadrul legislativ," 36-58.

increasingly becoming an institutional labyrinth waiting to be solved. Beyond these considerations, the fairly widespread lack of concern with form remains somewhat perplexing. The overlapping voting algorithms established in Romania in 1918–1919 make up, after all, something of a legal-electoral chimera. It is an oddity in its own right. Last but not least, as the work of specialists moves away from a descriptive approach in favor of a more analytical one, new research questions will emerge across a wide range of theoretical fields.