

NOTES AND REVIEWS

* *Polacy i ziemie polskie w dobie wojny krymskiej*, ed. by JERZY W. BOREJSZA, GRZEGORZ P. BĄBIAK, Warszawa, 2008, 282 pp. + ill.

Under the editorship of Jerzy W. Borejsza and Grzegorz P. Bąbiak, The Polish Institute for International Relationship has published a comprehensive volume devoted to the 19th century never-ending ‘Oriental Question’. Entitled *Polacy i ziemie polskie w dobie wojny krymskiej* (Poles and the Polish Lands During the Crimean War), it comprises thirteen papers authored by well-known Polish historians bound to 19th century research.

Jerzy W. Borejsza, distinguished historian, Professor Emeritus at the Nicholas Copernic University in Torun and member of the Polish Academy of Science, opened the volume with his study ‘*The Principle of Nationality from the Spring of Nations to the Crimean War*’. This was one of his favorite topics for, in 2004, at the International Conference “Around the Crimean War: New Approaches and New Topics,” held in Istanbul at the Institut Français d’Études Anatoliennes Georges Dumézil, he had a similar paper, entitled *The Principle of Nations in the Age of the Crimean War and Its Unknown Aspects*. In his new article he stressed the French emperor’s instrumentality in this issue: “European monarchic or revolutionary public opinion associated Napoleon III from the 1830-post 1860 period with the ‘principle of nationality’, support for national liberation movements, the unification of Italy, and the defense of the Poles or the Romanians. (...) The emperor did not merely proclaim but also juggled the principle in question (...)” This dual nature of the part played by Napoleon III as a supporter of the ‘principle of nationality’ is discussed by the author from the viewpoint of its various aspects while dealing with the Polish question at the time of the Crimean War. In the end, the author even touches modern issues such as ‘the utopian national ideas from the early years of Soviet Russia and then the Soviet Union.’

In his extensive paper – the largest in the volume (35 pages) –, *The Russian Empire and National Issues – The Evolution of Russian National Thought (at the Time of the Crimean War)*, **Henryk Głębocki** tried to explain one of the most complex and thorny issues of that period. He distinguished two trends in the national idea: the ‘official patriotism’ based on traditional values of Orthodoxy, autocracy and *narodnost*, national in form and conservative in content, opposed to the Russian liberal intelligentsia’s ideas on this respect.

The Polish emigration’s issues are discussed by some of the contributors to this volume. **Krzysztof Marchlewicz**, in his paper entitled *Different Images of the Crimean War among the Great Emigration*, deals with the two opinions concerning the war: that of those opposed to it, as useless bloodshed which brought no good to anybody, anywhere, and that of the Hotel Lambert circles who hoped in great changes for the Polish nation at the conflict’s conclusion. **Paweł Wierzbicki** makes a vivid portrait of Michal Czajkowski, and the celebrated but controversial Sadyk Pasha in his paper *The Activity of Sadyk Pasza at the Time of the Crimean War against the Backdrop of his Relations with the Czartoryski Camp*. Even though they were both émigrés, there was a great animosity, even hatred, between Czajkowski, who initiated and commanded the 1st Regiment of the Cossacks of the Sultan, and Count Wladzslaw Zamoyski who became the head of the 2nd Regiment and, afterwards, of the Division of the Cossacks of the Sultan. Sadyk Pasha is mentioned again in another paper due to his involvement in the Polish colony of Adampol, established, in 1842, on the

outskirts of Istanbul. In *The Adampol Traces of the Crimean War*, **Jerzy Drożdż** follows Sadyk Pasha's steps on that colony which he meant as a base for all Poles who came to the Ottoman Empire. Drożdż, who is both historian and diplomat, developed in this study an older paper which he presented at the 2004 Istanbul conference above mentioned. In the meantime he identified more settlers of that tiny village, known also as Polonezköy. **Wiesław Caban** researched the career and destiny of some Polish officers in the Russian army. In the paper *Russian Officers of Polish Descent and the Crimean War* he traced up to 6280 such military men who, in spite of their national ideals, decided not to desert but continued to fight for the czar in order to be rapidly promoted and attend a higher social status.

As usual, the old archives are a gold mine for the passionate researchers who devoted their time to their research. At least three papers unveil such forgotten documents. **Janusz Pezda** authored two of them: *Sources for the History of the Crimean War in the Princes Czartoryski Library* and *Sources for the Crimean War in the Collections of the Polish Library and the Adam Mickiewicz Museum in Paris*. **Joanna Nowak** based her paper, *Sources for the History of the Crimean War in the Kórnik Library*, on some family files and unpublished diaries. Besides this, her endeavor to dig in The Archives of the Division of the Cossacks of the Sultan was rewarding.

The Crimean War was a milestone between the old and the new way of waging war. One of the editors, **Grzegorz P. Bąbiak** made a new approach to an old writing of a Crimean War contemporary analyst in *The Crimean War as the First Modern European War in Jan Gotlib Bloch's 'Przyszła wojna' (Jean de Bloch's 'The Future of War')*.

The aftermath of the conflict on the Poles' fate, either on veterans or on lower classes who had no direct connection with it, is the topic for two papers: *The Participants of the Crimean War – the post-January Uprising Deportees* by **Wiktoria Śliwowska** and *The Consequences of the Crimean War. Peasant Unrest in the Spring of 1855 in the Estates of the Polish and Russian Landowners in the Gubernia of Kiev* by **Elżbieta Orman**.

Danuta Jackiewicz, curator of Iconography and Photography at the National Museum in Warsaw is the author of one of the most interesting papers dealing with the first war photographers. Entitling it after one of Andrzej Wajda's well-known movies, *Landscape after the Battle*, Jackiewicz chose a more explicitly subtitle, *On Photography from the Crimean War*. The twelve pictures taken by James Robertson after the fall of Sevastopol – whose copies are stored at the National Museum – are only the pretext for a much extensive dissertation on the beginning of photography stressing its importance as an accurate document. It is a salutary thing that, in a period when few researchers and historians of photography are still reluctant to accept that Bucharest-based Carol Szathmari was the first war photographer, taking his pictures on the borders of the Danube eleven months before Roger Fenton, Danuta Jackiewicz not only agrees with this evidence but also quotes thrice our paper *Szathmari. War Photographer* from the volume *Războiul Crimeii. 150 de ani de la încheiere* (Editura Istros, Brăila, 2008). The twelve Robertson landscapes illustrate Jackiewicz's paper.

At the end of the volume there are inserted the discussions around the papers of the conference *Wojna krymska – konfrontacja różnych cywilizacji* (The Crimean War – a clash of different civilizations), held in Warsaw, on 6 October 2006. The English papers' summaries and an index complete the book.

The volume *Polacy i ziemie polskie w dobie wojny krymskiej* is an important contribution to the history of the Crimean War. More often, on libraries' shelves, one finds only British or French histories of this war. Without being only a work of local interest, this

book brings new light on the topic. It is obvious that East European historians have something to say to their Western counterparts.

Adrian-Silvan Ionescu

ALBERTO BASCIANI, *La difficile unione. La Bessarabia e la Grande Romania 1918–1940*, 2^a edizione ampliata e rivista, Aracne Editrice, Roma, 2007, 414 pp.

In the revised second edition of his monograph *La difficile unione. La Bessarabia e la Grande Romania 1918–1940*, published in 2007, Alberto Basciani, a specialist in the history of Eastern Europe affiliated to “Roma Tre” University and the author of a number of studies on Balkan history and on Italian cultural policies in the related geographical area, retraces the tribulations of Bessarabia between 1878, the year of the Congress in Berlin, and 1940, the year of the dissolution of Greater Romania, illustrating the complex and largely debated topic of its integration and destiny in the new state entity.

Basciani’s research effort, which is based on extensive archive sources, unpublished diplomatic correspondence, various state documents, police and secret police reports, and new historiographic material devoted to the central topic or to collateral or integrated topics, addresses several specific issues including nationalism and imperialism, coexistence and rivalry among states, contested and clashing identities, autonomy and centralism, ethnocentrism and multiculturalism, xenophobia, racial policies, and extermination of the Jews.

The European approach given to the experiences of the province outlines the unrest and insecurity of the 1920s and 1930s. The author places Bessarabia on the backdrop of the European crisis and engagement in war, and reconstructs the preoccupations, tribulations and reactions of these new citizens of Romania, faced with assimilation and disorder fueled both from the East and from the West, and unable to achieve civic and political maturity or social and economic progress.

Basciani makes a case study of a peripheral and insufficiently developed province, struggling to protect its individuality in managing its own destinies. The reconstruction is structured on three levels, and addresses Bessarabia as a province of Tsarist Russia, as a province integrated into Greater Romania, and as a constant source of tension in the relations with Russia, and subsequently with the Soviet Union.

There is a striking analogy between the methods employed by the tsarist administration and the Romanian one. The imperial governments exerted their political power to the detriment of regional autonomy. The Russian language and culture were promoted among the majority of the population to such extremes as to compromise education and literature in Romanian. In its turn, between 1918 and 1940, the central Romanian administration employed all means to absorb the province into the new State. The governing power was monopolized and local realities were ignored. The limited, abusive and hostile newly emerged bureaucracy promoted its own interests in economy, whilst ignoring the overspread poverty of the population and the underdevelopment of the province. On the cultural level, the Romanian administration fostered the progress of the Romanian language, to which the creation of new schools as instruments of integration had a large contribution. On the other hand, it succeeded in alienating the sympathy of the ethnical minorities.

The local people were only able to have a voice in the affairs of the province during the national movement for autonomy and the creation of the council *Sfatul Țării*. Their

participation in the autonomous governing lasted less than a year, after which the council dissolved itself and the central administration was introduced.

The attitude of Soviet Russia should have been anything but surprising. Anyone with some knowledge of the Russian Empire, whose spectacular rise was giving nightmares to Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg's Germany and whose immense territory populated with ethnical groups of various languages and traditions had been held together only through iron-handed governing, could easily anticipate the physiognomy of the new superpower.

Its firm determination to recuperate Bessarabia and Bukovina, anticipated and illustrated in threats, provocation and intimidation, frequent raids into the territory, infiltration of subversive elements, peremptory declarations having as a main object the revolutionary action, ultimatum notes of evacuation of the two provinces, anti-Romanian violence and insurrection attempts, largely contributed to exacerbate the situation.

Basciani devotes a last chapter to the conjugated effects of the external threat, the internal confusion in economy, and the tension among the various local communities, all marking a decline ever more difficult to prevent in the final decade of Romanian sovereignty, having analyzed in a previous chapter the persistent internal difficulties, the precariousness of public order, the attempts at bringing things to normal, the economic crisis, the opposition between extremism and the warning notices in what he terms the "Cingureanu File," employing to this effect the name of a protagonist of the struggle for autonomy and union to Romania, who in a memoir addressed to King Carol in 1932 was anticipating the failure of the unionist experience of Bessarabia and Romania.

In 1935, another prominent former member of *Sfatul Țării*, Pan Halippa, was denouncing in "Viața Basarabiei" the bitter disappointment of people from all the local ethnical groups, who considered themselves prisoners, ruthlessly exploited and ignored by the system. Again, the authorities were little alarmed, and Halippa was isolated and invited to refrain from defaming the nation with his critical remarks.

Frequent official reports, press articles and unpublished diplomatic accounts were all presenting Bessarabia as a failure. The author includes the report of General Rășcanu, commissary, who in 1927 was addressing the sufferings and the difficulties experienced by farmers. His punctual proposals were favorably received by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labor, and resulted in a number of facilities in the repayment of debts and exemption from inheritance tax for agricultural land and other types of property up to certain value.

Bessarabia, a privileged target in the program of the Soviet Union – an anti-State, pseudo-federative and placing itself from the very beginning outside the framework of international law, the primary fundament of which, namely respect for other states, it systematically denied, while engaging in permanent aggression against them – and additionally an object of dispute between Moscow and Bucharest, also prompted Basciani to begin an analysis of the involved diplomatic relations.

He forms the hypothesis that during the stage in which Russia was weakened in terms of military force and diplomacy, having barely overcome civil war, Romania could have lost an opportunity to obtain recognition of the incorporation of Bessarabia into the new entity.

In reality, in the exchange of views between Cicerin and his Romanian interlocutors, no direct reference had been made to such a probability, the only issue addressed being the possible establishing of diplomatic relations and friendly neighborhood. The only assurance offered by Tache Ionescu – the advocate of a strict regime of *cordon sanitaire* – to the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs in Warsaw, in 1921, was that Romania would not

become a base for attacks against the Soviet Union by the Ukrainian bands or by members of the White Army who had fled in. The recognition of the Soviet Union and the establishment of bilateral relations was considered by Romanian diplomacy an option not to be taken into consideration at the time.

On 16 April 1922, the economic and political agreement between Soviet Russia and Germany was being signed at Rapallo. Its terms were enabling Soviet Russia to break out from the isolation forced upon her by the interventionist policy of the Entente. The treaty was changing in a substantial way her international position, putting an end to the quarantine and concurrently to Ionel Brătianu's hopes that a permanent solution would be given to the issue of Bessarabia in the framework of some general agreements he had expected to be signed at the conference of Geneva.

The analysis of the Soviet-Romanian diplomatic meetings continues with Tiraspol (1922), Odessa (1923) and Vienna (27 March – 2 April 1924), where Brătianu believed that the resuming of normal relations called for a recognition of borderlines. The Soviet proposal to organize a plebiscite in Bessarabia was vigorously rejected, and negotiations eventually failed, with the head of the Soviet delegation maintaining that the province was a territory under Romanian military occupation. Followed the polemics of 1925 in London, between the two ambassadors, Titulescu and Rakovski, in whose point of view the issue of Bessarabia was to remain open until a positive solution could be found. The intransigent positions generated long delays and the difficulties in finding a way out of this situation became obvious.

With the renewed Soviet declarations that Russia would never give up on Bessarabia, the insufficiency of direct, thoroughly pursued and potentially efficient contacts between the accredited interlocutors was implicit. This was clearly pointed out by Gafencu, who noted that the field of negotiation between parties – the only one liable to produce a definite and complete solution to the issue of Bessarabia and the Romanian-Soviet relations – had remained unacceptably and only too long unused, the parties indulging into simple conversations accompanied by “erratic and senseless gestures, more or less inspired from directions given by the West, which were not taking into account the interests of friendly neighborhood, as if the achievement of a state of peaceful passivity” could ever be considered final: “Peace among neighbors,” he maintained, “is a living process, it constantly calls for equal surveillance and benevolent collaboration. Otherwise, written documents kept in a dead atmosphere are a peril rather than a guarantee.”

In 1939 the isolation of Moscow from Europe was brought to an end and an energetic, dynamic and unprejudiced external policy was inaugurated, with Molotov at the head of the related department. Europe would soon feel the burden of the profound turmoil generated by the Hitler-Stalin Pact which sanctioned the principle of the division of the world into areas of influence. Thus, an area of considerable extent, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, became Stalin's hunting grounds. The fate of Bessarabia was also decided in the agreements of Kremlin, which – euphemistically – were giving Germany “peace in the East,” and to Russia, “the application of Soviet measures along the western borders.”

Basciani concludes that Bessarabia, whose Romanian history is reconstructed thoroughly and convincingly, was lost in 1918–1940, before the revisionist front could annul the value of the Versailles system of treaties and the efficacy of traditional alliances. Indeed, in the inter-war period, shallowness, arrogance, corruption (moral corruption included) of an important part of the political class had made the Union of 1918, animated by such a visible spiritual impulse in the province, to become a precarious construction.

The haste to wipe out from memory all traces of *Sfatul Țării* and of the experience of autonomy, the rejection of the demand for a more radical land reform, and the institutionalization of culture, perceived as intolerance towards other ethnical groups in the region, deprived the union of Bessarabia to the Old Kingdom of any authentic significance.

However, Basciani believes that not even a competent, prudent and honest administration would have been able to prevent the tragedy of 1940, namely the brutal occupation of the province by the Soviets and the ensuing executions and deportations.

Without absolving western democracies of having capitulated under the attacks of totalitarian revisionism, Basciani considers that a union founded on the dominant concreteness and consistency of elements other than exacerbate nationalism and the adoption of a scholastic model with more than Romanianism at the core could have acquired the solidity and the moral and spiritual strength allowing new Central European states and the new Europe to counteract Nazi and communist barbarity.

A reconstruction of the final years in the history of the presence of the Romanian State in Bessarabia brings out a host of negative factors and features a prelude of the political, diplomatic, moral and spiritual defeat of June 1940, when the Romanian government would yield to force without claiming its rights or refuting the justifications of the Soviet ultimatum. The ultimatum was the final act of a foreseen tragedy.

Ștefan Delureanu

MARK BRYANT, *World War I in Cartoons*, Grub Street Publishing, London, 2006, 160 pp. + ill.

A well-known personality in the British press, secretary of the London Press Club and a passionate historian of caricature, Mark Bryant (born in 1954) has linked his name to this synthetic and comic way of depicting the realities of a time. He already authored or co-authored several books on this topic such as: *Dictionary of British Cartoonists and Caricaturists 1730–1980*, co-author S. Heneage (Scolar Press, London, 1994), *Dictionary of Twentieth-Century British Cartoonists and Caricaturists* (Ashgate Publishing, London, 2000), *World War II in Cartoons* (Grub Street Publishing, London, 1989, republished in 2005), and *God in Cartoons* (Highland Books Ltd., Godalming, 1997).

The present book, *World War I in Cartoons*, is a natural pendant to the previous volume dedicated to World War II, such as noted by the author in his *Foreword*: “Like its companion volume, *World War II in Cartoons*, this book is intended primly as a pictorial history of the Great War as seen through the eyes of the cartoonists and caricaturists who lived through it and chronicled the events as they occurred.” (p. 6)

In the *Foreword*, Bryant makes a definition of the terms employed and explains their origin. Specific to the Anglo-Saxon in designating comic strips, the term *cartoon* comes from Italian, *cartone*, which refers to the pasteboard used in upholstery, fresco or mosaic, namely the preparatory designs for the aforementioned techniques. The term *caricature* also comes from Italian, *caricare*, which means “to exaggerate.” Henceforth some notable differences between the Latin world and the Insular one: what the Romanians call *caricatură* – a term taken over from French – the Britons and the Americans call *cartoon*, while giving it a far broader meaning, so as to include the entire comical graphics, irrespective of size or of the material employed, be it the portrait of a political or military

personality with exaggerated or distorted traits, the billboard or the propaganda material with comic effect.

A list of comic journals published in Europe in the nineteenth century is further given: “La Caricature” (1830) and the most widely known journal “Le Charivari” (1832) in France, “Punch” (1841) and “Vanity Fair” (1868) in England, “Kladderadatsch” (1848) and “Simplicissimus” (1896) in Germany, “Puck” (1876) and “Judge” (1881) in the United States. Quite understandably, Bryant was little familiar with the no less amusing magazines published in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, such as “Furnica” and “Veselia,” to only quote two Romanian titles. On the outbreak of the Great War, comic publications were well developed and quite active in the belligerent and neutral countries alike. The author notices that from the national symbols widely publicized in the pre-war period – such as Marianne, John Bull, Uncle Sam, the British Lion, the Gallic Rooster, and the Russian Bear – a switch is made to the caricatured portraits of characters directly involved in the conflict: the Kaiser, Field Marshal Hindenburg, Admiral Tirpitz, Clemenceau, Poincaré, Franz Joseph, Tsar Ferdinand, Sultan Mehmet, Tsar Nicholas II, etc. (p. 8). Specific types, easily recognizable by any reader, are further on created, such as the mustached veteran Tommy ‘Old Bill’, the effigy of the simple soldier taken from his daily chores to the battle front, who has little understanding of what is going on around, asks silly questions, gives naïve answers, and reacts like any other untrained civilian to the great issues of the world, which he can only relate to his own little problems and limited universe; or, Schmidt the Spy, the German settled in England, the virtual enemy; or again, Great Willie and Little Willie, by which a satire was made of flamboyant William II and the filiform and ridiculous dandy, the Kronprinz, his son. Further on, the author briefly mentions a number of British cartoonists – with the biographies of whom he is quite familiar – who fought in the war and were promoted to higher ranks or decorated for bravery.

The illustration is ordered chronologically, and the chapters bear the years of the war as a title – 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918. They are preceded by a chapter *Pre-War*, in which the causes of the outbreak are explained.

World War I in Cartoons is not only a book about the history and art of war cartoons, but also a history book, as Mark Bryant is also a full-fledged historian – with a doctor’s degree in history – quite able to make a correct analysis of the political, diplomatic and military situation of the time. Quite at ease in this field, he makes a short presentation of the causes favoring the outbreak of the war and its subsequent developments. In addition to his analysis of British and French cartoons, he also makes a thorough study of publications in other foreign countries, belonging to the two opposed camps, so as to give an objective presentation of humor in time of war. He does not elude the highly inspired German caricature, of great artistic value, or the naïve Russian drawings – more easily ascribable to traditional woodcuts than to elevated art –, or even the Japanese sketches, traceable to Japanese woodcuts.

Each comment carries a host of information, and very often, between brackets, an explanation of various German, Russian, French and Italian terms is provided. Such didacticism is salutary and it gives a good measure of the author’s vast knowledge not only in his field of predilection, the cartoon, but also in politics, military issues, philology, economy, etc. The book is designed as an illustrated history of the war: on the left page, a brief presentation of the specific event is made, whereas on the right page the related cartoons are displayed. The author, the source and the impact on the general public are provided for each image. Many of these used to circulate in both camps, and some were

favorably regarded upon by the caricatured subjects themselves, like for instance William II, who showed his appreciation for some authors. In 1916, cartoons related to Romania's entering the war appeared, such as Frank Holland's drawing *David and Goliath*, published in "Reynolds News," in which a hedgehog, featuring Romania, is thrusting its spines into the snout of a wild boar wearing a Prussian helmet as the symbol of German aggression.

The black and white as well as color illustration is of high quality. It samples a considerable number of comic images from old publications hardly accessible to the general public. Mark Bryant has completed the work of an archaeologist in libraries and collections in order to bring back into light a thesaurus of comic illustration related to the Great War, for the benefit of the contemporary public. As noted by the author in his foreword, even if these drawings may not have much relevance for a generation highly familiarized with the internet, they carry documentary value for posterity: "For those brought up on computer-generated animation, graphic novels, *manga*, children's comics, Batman, Superman and the multifarious works of Disney et al., historical wartime cartoons may come as a bit of a surprise. Not only was there a wealth of material produced during World War II by artists on both sides of the conflict but a considerable amount also appeared during the Great War of 1914 to 1918." An extremely useful index of names is provided at the end of the volume.

Mark Bryant's *World War I in Cartoons* is a valuable contribution to the iconography of the Great War.

Adrian-Silvan Ionescu

MICHEL PINAULT, *La Science au Parlement. Les débuts d'une politique des recherches scientifiques en France*, CNRS, Paris, 2006, 158 pp.

Based on the parliamentary discourses of the Third Republic, Michel Pinault's work is an example of the way one can apply the statistical method to the study of the language or of the social environment. Another book, *Vocabulaire des proclamations électorales de 1881, 1885 et 1889*, written by Antoine Prost and published in 1974 in Paris, had the same subject.

The book we now comment discusses the way the problem of scientific research was presented in parliamentary discourses, since 1896 and until the end of the First World War. The beginning of this period is marked by the creation of the modern universities and the first parliamentary debates concerning the funding of scientific research. Its end is marked by the mobilization of the scientists for national defense.

This is the moment when the idea that the State is responsible for the scientific research is born, when the role played by the circles of influence, in favor of the scientific research public funding, is emphasized and the first manifestations of a policy which led to the foundation, in 1939, of the National Center for Scientific Research appear.

The first chapter of the book is about the June 11th, 1896 Chamber debates regarding the research of infectious diseases funding, its central figure being Jean-Honoré Audiffred (1840–1917), House representative, then Senator, republican reformer. Actually, this debate was determinant for the way the problem of the scientific research was taken care of in the following twenty years: the State should fund the research, which is an essential progress and economic success factor.

The second chapter shows the efforts Audiffred made in order to create, in 1901, a „bank” for the scientific research, the so called CRS (La Caisse des Recherches Scientifiques). Being under the authority of the Ministry of Public Education, its funding possibilities were limited, especially because only the funding of private individuals was allowed, and not of the institutions; also, buying materials or permanent funding was forbidden. Biology was the only scientific field to benefit from this kind of funding substantially and with significant results.

Due to statistical methods of text and sociology of networks analysis, the third chapter is the most interesting. Any speech (or vocabulary) of a book, of a professional group, or of an epoch makes sense due to the relationships existing among them. Around a subject, the words and groups of words gravitate like in a galaxy, the themes being the stars, and the words and groups of words being the planets. The author takes into consideration thirteen of Audiffred’s speeches given in Parliament between 1896 and 1917 and thematically grouped by their relation to the scientific research, the biological and medical research, the struggle against infectious diseases, the scientific discoveries, the links among them being represented through diagrams.

The last part of the third chapter concerns the human networks, which can be compared to the word networks and which actually make up the groups of influence. Some groups are characterized through internal links, and also links with other groups, which give them a greater power in making decisions. Leaning on this theory, Pinault finds out if, during that period of time, a lobby of science existed and who belonged to it.

Michel Pinault’s work emphasizes, in the first place, the role of mathematical statistics in analyzing texts or group sociology, as a precious research tool, although sometimes it is hard to apply and the results are difficult to interpret.

In the second place, the book presents the main causes of the scientific research decline in France: the government’s lack of interest in scientific research, the loneliness of the researcher against the networks of influence, the wrong perception of the scientific work, the deep belief that only the academic environment is the ideal place for scientific research, and the lack of funding.

Most of these problems, existing in France before 1914, are still unresolved all over the world.

Irina Gavrilă

ERNST CHRISTOPH SUTTNER, *Staaten und Kirchen in der Völkerwelt des östlichen Europa. Entwicklungen der Neuzeit*, Academic Press, Fribourg, 2007, 482 pp.

An imposing and challenging volume by Ernst Christoph Suttner was published in 2007 in the reputed collection *Studia Oecumenica Friburgensia* 49. Formerly a member of the Department of Catholic Theology at Vienna University and a historian with a lifetime experience in the fascinating field of the History of the Church, Ernst Chr. Suttner addresses topics related to States and Churches in Eastern Europe. Nothing new in reasserting that for many years Ernst Suttner has been a discrete but accomplished presence in the Romanian writings of History of the Church. One should note here his frequent participation in conferences, scientific sessions of communications and symposiums, his

contributions to specialized journals such as “*Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai*,” Series Theologica, “*Annales Universitatis Apulensis*,” Series Historica, etc., his initiative and efforts devoted – together with the regretted historian Pompiliu Teodor – to the research project *The Religious Union of Part of the Transylvanian Romanians with the Church in Rome* (2001–2007), developed alternatively in Vienna and in Alba Iulia, with the assistance of the Foundation “Pro Oriente” and of “Alma Mater Apulensis,” and, no less importantly, his translation *Schisme: ceea ce separă și ceea ce nu separă de Biserică*, PUC, Cluj-Napoca, 2006.

Ernst Chr. Suttner’s dedication to historical analysis and his ability to synthesize, definitional in all his speeches and writings, are once again seen in the impressive volume recently arrived from Austria. The challenging pencil-in-hand reading of this book is a genuine cultural and historiographical adventure, starting with the concise foreword (*Vorwort*, pp. 9-10), and continuing with the inciting part one, in fact an all-encompassing *Introduction (Zur Hinführung)*, pp. 11-54), part two, addressing cultural exchange among Churches at the beginning of the new era (*Die Kirchen beim Kulturwandel zu Beginn der Neuzeit*, pp. 55-175), and part three, Churches in the Ottoman Empire (*Kirchen im Osmanreich*, pp. 176-280). The same coordinates of scientific research placed under the sign of oecumenism are seen in part four, an outline of the situation of Churches in Poland-Lithuania (*Die Kirchen in Polen-Litauen*, pp. 281-340), part five, the situation of Churches in Venice (*Die Kirchen in Venetien*, pp. 341-349), part six, and also one of the most consistent, devoted to Churches in the Habsburg Empire (*Die Kirchen im Habsburgerreich*, pp. 349-444), and the final part of this book, with conclusive attributes (*Ausklag. Auf dem Weg ins 20. Jahrhundert*, pp. 445-452).

The European vocation Ernst Chr. Suttner has demonstrated all his life appears ever more clearly in this conclusive part. An index of persons, settlements and relevant words (*Register. Personen – Orte – Stichworte*, pp. 453-476) is provided here, whereas in the *Appendix* are listed names of settlements, rivers, regions, and countries (*Orte – Flüsse – Stichworte, Landkarte zu den im Text erwähnten Namen*, pp. 477-482), that are as many landmarks for this captivating book.

Romanian historians will find this work extremely interesting, as almost every section provides information on the Romanians (*valahica natio*), from the perspective of the *State – Church* binomial, one of the author’s favorite topics of research.

The sixth part, devoted to Churches in the Habsburg Empire, is most illustrative in this respect. Its subchapters address the condition of the non-Catholic believers before the siege of Vienna of 1683 (*Nichtkatholiken vor der Türkenbelagerung von 1683*, pp. 349-364), the condition of the Eastern Christians after the peace treaties of Sremski Karlovci (26 January 1699) and Pojarevac (21 July 1718) (*Orientalische Christen nach den Friedensschlüssen von Karlowitz und Passarewitz*, pp. 365-413), the relations between Empress Maria Theresa and the Uniats of the Danubian monarchy (*Maria Theresia und die Uniarten der Donaumonarchie*, pp. 413-424), the papal doctrine of “*praestantia ritus latini*” (*Exkurs V: Zur päpstlichen Doktrin von einer „praestantia ritus latini*,” pp. 425-429), the situation of Churches in Bukovina (*Kirchen in der Bukovina*, pp. 430-436), the Edict of Tolerance of Emperor Joseph II (*Die Toleranzgesetzgebung Josephs II.*, pp. 437-440), and the general situation of Churches on the eve of the nineteenth century (*An der Wende zum 19. Jahrhundert*, pp. 440-444).

It is in congruence with this historiographical formula, and along Tacitus’ principle “*Sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo*,” that the present book should be read. Based

on the biaxial *narratio et argumentatio* line, Ernst Chr. Suttner debates in a European (including Romanian) historiographical context, subject to cultural reassessment, several stages in the evolution of the Church institution in East Europe, within the changing political and legal framework of the Habsburg Empire: the situation of Protestants in the Habsburg part of Hungary; the population of “Greeks” under the Habsburgs before 1683 (Vienna siege); the East European merchants in Vienna; the Uniats after the Union of Użgorod; the particularities of some social structures in the Ottoman Empire and in Austria; the determining causes and consequences, immediate and remote, of the Serbs joining Austria; Churches in Transylvania; the Union of Transylvanian Romanians to the Church in Rome; the various political, religious and cultural aspects of the Union; the importance of the concept of “ancestors’ law”; the offensive against the Union in the regions lying outside of the Carpathian arc; the Romanian resistance against the Union; the Union in the points of view of Bishops Inochentie Micu-Klein (1700–1768) and Petru Pavel Aron (1752–1764); “sensitive” controversial theological issues around 1750; the particularities and difficulties in organization experienced by the Union to begin with 1750; the complex denominational situation of the Armenians; particularities of Churches in the Banat province; the stage of Church development in Belgrade and in “Valahia minor” (west of Wallachia); Empress Maria Theresa and the legal statute of the Uniats; the bishoprics for the Uniats in the territories of Hungary; the Vienna Synod of 1773 and its contribution to consolidating the Union; the Uniats after the Austrian division of Poland; the Greek-Catholic St. Barbara Seminar of Vienna; the particular situation of the Church in Galicia (the absence of non-United Eastern Churches or of Protestant Churches); considerations on the spiritual significance of the papal doctrine “*praestantia ritus latini*” (context and subtext); the situation of the Church in Bukovina (the Greek-Eastern Church; the Armenian Church; the Lipovans; the Latin and Eastern Catholics); general and particular aspects of the context, text and subtext of the Edict of Tolerance signed by Emperor Joseph II, and the consequences deriving from its application; major aspects of Church policy on the eve of the nineteenth century; the statute of the Mechitarists; the evolution of the relations of Venice and Ragusa with Austria; the exacerbation of some Pascal states in Catholic Religious life, etc.

Ernst Chr. Suttner’s *Staaten und Kirchen in der Völkerwelt des östlichen Europa. Entwicklungen der Neuzeit* prompts a reconsideration of opinions already formed and tributary to a certain historiographical material, more often than not exclusively Romanian. The discourse of the reputed Viennese professor, with its many cultural and political challenges prone to foster research in the field of the history of East-European Churches and peoples, brings to mind a convincing example.

We refer to the cultural, theological, political and even diplomatic endeavors of the Metropolitan of Belgrade Simeon Ştefan († 1656), who edited in Belgrade, in 1648 and in 1651, two fundamental books for the culture of the seventeenth-century Transylvanian Romanians, namely the *New Testament* and the *Psalms*. The complex activity of the Metropolitan is interpreted by Ernst Suttner on the background of the concerted efforts of the Latin and Greek Churches, sadly meant to fail, at a time when the Church institution was contributing effectively to the undergoing profound cultural change at the beginning of a new age. Quite noteworthy in this respect are the relations with the Catholic Bishop of Mukačevo. The assistance given to the Union of Użgorod by the Metropolitan of Belgrade Simeon Ştefan, through the effective consecration of Petr Parfenij as a bishop, on the background of the religious, cultural and political efforts undertaken at Użgorod, a courageous and odd act, with short- and long-term consequences on the restructuring of the

Latin Church, also approved by the Primate of Hungary Georgius Lippay, who informed the Vatican on the situation, at a time when the Prince of Transylvania was trying to enthrone, with assistance from the minorities, the Calvinists' candidate, and the relations of collaboration with Georgius Lippay, etc., make Simeon Ștefan, in the opinion of Ernst Chr. Suttner, a champion of religious Union in this East European region.

Written with a clear insight into the issues and without religious or political passion, unlike many present-day Romanian historical writings on the State-Church relation in the past centuries, Ernst Chr. Suttner's *Staaten und Kirchen in der Völkerwelt des östlichen Europa. Entwicklungen der Neuzeit* is a challenging reading to specialists in the history of Eastern Europe, including to Romanian historians. Read and re-read "pencil in hand," to employ a syntagm from Matei Călinescu's cultural arsenal for *a poetics of (re)reading*, Ernst Suttner's book can and should be – at least for the Romanian case of the State-Church binomial – a new, uncomfortable and unavoidable starting point, placed under the sign of oecumenism, for a new stage in historiography. It is exactly what the reader feels upon closing this book that highly meets the European scientific standards.

Iacob Mârza