

## NOTES AND REVIEWS

VENERA ACHIM et RALUCA TOMI, édés., FLORINA MANUELA CONSTANTIN, collab., *Documente de arhivă privind robia țiganilor : Epoca dezrobirii* (Bucarest : Editura Academiei Române, 2010), LXXVI + 268 pp. + 12 facs.

S'il nous fallait une preuve de plus que nous ne connaissons pas encore en détail des aspects importants de l'histoire roumaine moderne, le volume *Documents d'archive concernant l'esclavage des Tsiganes : L'époque de l'émancipation* nous l'offre, avec des arguments impossibles à contester.

Celui qui pourrait objecter, à bonne raison, que ce recueil de documents vise, selon le titre, la situation juridique, sociale et économique des Tsiganes dans les Principautés roumaines en 1831–1860, trouvera sa réponse dans ce qui suit.

Pour être complètement honnêtes, nous devrions reconnaître qu'à part la monographie fondamentale d'I. C. Filitti de 1915<sup>1</sup> et, plus récemment, le volume de documents élaboré par Ion Varta et Tatiana Varta<sup>2</sup>, il n'existe aucune étude cohérente, systématique, bien documentée et de haut niveau scientifique de la structure administrative, des composantes de l'appareil d'État ou de la composition humaine du personnel dans l'étape historique qui porte le nom d'« époque réglementaire » (1831–1848).

C'est pourquoi le volume ci-présent, même si dédié à l'évolution historique et juridique de la population minoritaire des Tsiganes, apporte, par les documents recueillis, des contributions précieuses et utiles à l'approfondissement scientifique des sujets mentionnés. En égale mesure, il invite à poursuivre la démarche historique dans cette direction de recherche, ignorée depuis longtemps, sans justification aucune, par notre historiographie.

Le volume réunit 235 documents provenant pour la plupart des fonds des Archives nationales historiques centrales, de leurs filiales des départements de Dolj, de Vâlcea, d'Argeș et de Iași, et, en moindre nombre, de la collection de manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Académie roumaine.

Le matériel documentaire pourrait se diviser, de manière sans doute subjective, en trois grands segments. Le premier, s'étendant jusqu'à la veille de la révolution de 1848, recouvre les premiers 120 documents du volume. Du point de

---

<sup>1</sup> *Domeniile române sub Regulamentul organic (1834–1848)* (Bucarest : Librăriile Socec & C. Sfetea, 1915).

<sup>2</sup> *Moldova și Țara Românească în timpul domniilor regulamentare : Documente inedite din arhivele din Federația Rusă, Ucraina și R. Moldova* (Chișinău : Cartdidact, 2002).

vue historique, cette période a été marquée par deux moments importants, notamment l'émancipation des Tsiganes appartenant à l'État et aux monastères, avec des conséquences sur la destinée de cette ethnie, mais ceci a une moindre résonance dans le matériel inclus. Les témoignages offrent plutôt une image de la complexité du problème à l'époque (évasions, actes antisociaux, litiges entre propriétaires), ainsi que de la lourdeur et de l'incapacité des autorités centrales et locales de l'État de gérer la situation correctement et de manière efficiente. La première section du volume nous donne aussi l'occasion de faire une constatation véridique et très plastique : la possession des groupes de Tsiganes ou des familles tsiganes est acceptée comme telle par la société et considérée une chose tout à fait naturelle. Rien de surprenant alors si l'on retrouve parmi les possesseurs d'esclaves tsiganes, dans les documents du volume, les familles d'un bon nombre de personnalités culturelles et politiques importantes de l'époque, comme par exemple Theodor Aman, Ion Câmpineanu et Vasile Alecsandri. Il existe sans doute, dans ce clivage social, des tendances humanistes et libérales-émancipatoires : certains officiels et boyards grands et moyens libèrent leurs esclaves et notifient les autorités de l'État, ou bien ils les vendent au fisc, sans constituer toutefois une majorité apte à influencer l'opinion publique.

Un second segment est celui allant de 1848 jusqu'à la veille de la guerre de Crimée (documents 121–189). Illustrant une période historique très mouvementée, les environ 70 documents inclus sont très suggestifs quant aux transformations survenues dans le mental collectif et dans la vie publique et politique. Cela en soulignant que pour le statut de la minorité tsigane, la révolution en Valachie a marqué un tournant important. Le quatrième décret-loi émis le 26 juin/7 juillet 1848 par le gouvernement révolutionnaire de Bucarest stipulait l'émancipation définitive des Tsiganes, notamment de la dernière catégorie d'esclaves, appartenant aux propriétaires individuels. À la défaite de la révolution de 1848, le décret avait déjà été appliqué, même si partiellement, faisant impossible le retour à la situation d'avant.

Le dernier segment recouvre les documents n<sup>os</sup> 190–235 et s'achève avec le mois de décembre 1859. Il s'agit ici d'une situation nouvelle. D'une part, les Principautés s'étaient trouvées pendant quelque temps sous la domination autrichienne, avec des implications sur le système administratif et sur la mentalité publique. D'autre part, il était évident que le « problème roumain » était devenu une question *européenne* et devait se retrouver sur l'ordre du jour du Congrès de paix de Paris de mars 1856. Comme les élites de Bucarest et de Iași le savaient très bien, les Roumains devaient se présenter à ce forum comme une nation moderne, civilisée, avec des aspirations libérales et émancipatoires. À l'exception du continent africain, seuls les États-Unis et les Principautés roumaines continuaient à avoir des esclaves : des esclaves noirs sur les plantations et, respectivement, des

esclaves tsiganes. Cela tenait de l'évidence que les choses devaient changer, donc le terrain était bien prêt pour les deux décrets d'émancipation définitive des derniers esclaves tsiganes, appartenant à des propriétaires privés (décembre 1855 en Moldavie et 11 février 1856 en Valachie). Un mécanisme compliqué de dédommagement des propriétaires a été appliqué dans les deux Principautés et nous pensons que les auteurs, dans une note en bas du texte ou dans l'introduction, auraient bien fait de nous éclaircir sur cette procédure si laborieuse des obligations (à intérêt) garanties par l'État, dont le paiement s'est prolongé pour de longues années.

L'ouvrage respecte toutes les usances scientifiques requises, l'introduction et la liste de documents sont accompagnées par une traduction en anglais, à qui s'ajoutent un glossaire des termes archaïques, un index des noms et des localités et 12 fac-similés.

Le volume nous offre aussi un panorama fascinant de la terminologie administrative de l'époque (*nazîrie, dejurstvă, ocolaş, bulubaşa*, etc.) et il reflète de quelle manière les fonctions de l'administration centrale et locale, introduites sans doute selon le modèle russe au temps du général-comte P. D. Kisselev, ont trouvé leur continuité dans la période suivante. La titulature a changé, mais le contenu des termes est resté. C'est pourquoi, le chef de bureau de l'époque de la révolution de 1848 est en effet le fonctionnaire qui continue à exercer les attributions du « *stolnacialnik* » de 1831–1832.

Nos observations au sujet de ce volume se lient surtout aux grands problèmes de translittération et aux difficultés de déchiffrer le matériel documentaire. Par exemple, même si les auteurs ont utilisé des cartes d'époque pour la délimitation administrative de la Valachie et de la Moldavie, nous considérons que la translittération correcte de la contrée de Vâlcea est Oşesari et non pas Otasău (doc. 185 et *passim*). Le monastère de Mărgineni ne se trouve pas dans le département de Dâmboviţa, comme les auteurs l'affirment (p. 259), mais dans le département de Prahova, au nord de Câmpina. Ostrovu Carboavii (documents 54 și 58) est en fait Ostrovu Corbului, village et commune dans le département de Mehedinţi, l'erreur étant sans doute le résultat d'une translittération erronée de la localité. En ce qui concerne le document 32 (p. 34), il serait difficile à supposer que l'administration du département d'Argeş avait l'intention, en *janvier* 1835, de prélever en avance les taxes pour le dernier trimestre de la même année, mais plutôt qu'elle comptait liquider les taxes restantes pour l'année précédente.

Comme les auteurs du volume le remarquent à juste titre, le matériel documentaire présenté dans ce recueil sera de grand intérêt pour les historiens, les linguistes, les ethnologues, les anthropologues, ainsi que pour d'autres catégories de chercheurs.

En soulignant une fois de plus les mérites incontestables de l'équipe qui a élaboré ce volume, nous nous devons de préciser aussi que ces efforts se sont déroulés dans le cadre du projet de recherche ID\_717, *Problema țiganilor în România în secolul al XIX-lea: Instituția robiei, mișcarea abolitionistă și emanciparea țiganilor*, financé par le Conseil national de la recherche scientifique de l'enseignement supérieur, dans le cadre de l'Institut d'histoire « Nicolae Iorga », sous la coordination autoritaire de Viorel Achim, à l'heure actuelle un des meilleurs spécialistes roumains du domaine. Il convient aussi de vouer une gratitude spéciale à l'Editura Academiei Române, la maison d'édition qui a assuré l'excellente présentation graphique de ce volume.

Nous espérons que le travail d'investigation de cette thématique ne prendra pas fin une fois la publication de ce volume, tenant compte des perspectives intéressantes qu'ouvre ce chemin.

*Marian Stroia*  
*Institut d'histoire « Nicolae Iorga », Bucarest, Roumanie*  
*Institutul.Iorga@email.ro*

ȘTEFAN DELUREANU, *L'Italia e la Romania verso l'unificazione nazionale: Un secolo di storia parallela (1820–1920)* (Bucarest: Paideia, 2010), 232 pp.

Ștefan Delureanu professava fin dal 1972 la sua fede mazziniana partecipando al Congresso sul Risorgimento dedicato al leader genovese, essendo dal quel momento un rappresentante permanente della Romania nelle più importanti manifestazioni sul Risorgimento organizzati nella penisola. Ștefan Delureanu, noto e instancabile italianista, ricercatore del periodo risorgimentale, del federalismo e dell'unificazione dell'Europa, pubblicava nei ultimi anni libri su questi argomenti: *Risorgimento italiano e Risorgimento romeno* nel 2005; *Mazzini și românii în Risorgimento* nel 2006; *Garibaldi între mit și istorie* nel 2007; *Uniunea Europeană a federaliștilor și promotorii români ai Europei unite* nel 2007 e nel 2010 una nuova raccolta di studi dal titolo *L'Italia e la Romania verso l'unificazione nazionale: Un secolo di storia parallela (1820–1920)*. Gli studi trattano argomenti riguardanti le relazioni politiche tra i due spazi, l'eco del Risorgimento nell'opinione pubblica dei principati romeni e della Transilvania, le personalità che hanno segnato, con la loro attività, la vicinanza spirituale tra le due nazioni.

I rapporti tra i principati romeni e gli stati italiani durante il periodo prerivoluzionario del 1848 sono presentati in termini di presenza della migrazione

politica dalla penisola sul territorio romeno. Sulla base di documenti inediti appartenenti agli archivi italiani ed austriaci, l'autore rivela destini inediti di italiani che, dopo i movimenti rivoluzionari del 1821–1822 e 1830–1831, hanno trovato rifugio nelle città romene. Congiuntamente, nei principati romeni si diffondono le idee mazziniane della democrazia. Dopo il fallimento delle rivoluzioni del 1848, i collegamenti tra gli ambienti mazziniani e quelli romeni si intensificarono sullo sfondo dell'organizzazione di un nuovo movimento sinfonico e sincronico. Trovati in esilio, i leader romeni si implicarono in attività progettate da Mazzini a Londra, incontrandosi diverse regioni europee con i rappresentanti dell'emigrazione polacca, italiana, ungherese, ecc. Un luogo preferito per la creazione del futuro movimento è stato Malta, dove i fratelli Golești, C. A. Rosetti e D. Brătianu sono entrati in contatto con il mazzinista Emilio Sceberras ed il generale Emilio Milbitz. L'episodio maltese è presente nella presente raccolta, evidenziando i tentativi di costituzione delle legioni di volontari formate da esuli del periodo della Guerra di Crimea. La possibilità di formare un'alleanza romeno-italiana antiaustriaca negli anni immediatamente dopo il suddetto conflitto e le prospettive per la realizzazione di movimenti rivoluzionari nei Balcani, alle quali partecipino le nazioni slave congiuntamente a quella greca, sono gli argomenti discussi nell'articolo "I problemi e le aspettative dell'Europa centro-orientale del giornale politico di Giorgio Asproni". Ștefan Delureanu è il primo ricercatore ad attirare l'attenzione sui lavori di Asproni relativi ai romeni. Il deputato sardo, famoso per le sue affinità mazziniane, era convinto che i romeni fossero "dei guardiani fermi del Danubio contro" le barbarie e ha sostenuto la fondazione di uno stato nazionale romeno. La *Gazzetta* del patriota italiano è la testimonianza dei piani immaginati insieme a Dora D'Istria per la dissoluzione dell'Austria attraverso una cooperazione militare italo-romena, un'idea presente sotto varie forme durante il regno di Al. I. Cuza. Legata a tali piani comuni è stata anche l'attività di Eugen Carada, una figura la cui attività rivoluzionaria è legata ai cerchi mazziniani, e che viene delineata in un articolo separato ed in una lettera inedita pervenuta dal genovese nell'agosto 1864 e redatta nell'allegato documentario del libro. Consapevole che "le due questioni, italiana ed orientale-europea, dovessero ingranarsi", Mazzini spinge i leader romeni a lottare contro le tendenze autoritarie di Cuza e di unire le loro forze con quelle delle altre nazioni della zona: i greci, gli slavi, gli ungheresi.

Agli anni tesi 1914–1918 vengono dedicati due articoli. Il primo presenta il dibattito circa la continuazione o lo scioglimento della monarchia dualista, dibattito che incoraggia la diplomazia europea ed americana negli ultimi anni della prima guerra mondiale. In questo contesto, l'organizzazione del Congresso delle nazioni sottoposte all'Austria-Ungheria, svolto a Roma tra l'8 ed il 10 aprile, ha spinto i piani di riorganizzazione del continente sulla base di nuovi principi: la scomparsa dei vecchi imperi e la creazione degli stati nazionali. La delegazione romena al

Congresso formata da G. G. Mironescu, D. Drăghicescu, Nicolae Lupu, Simion Mândrescu, Benedetto De Luca, si è pronunciata per lo scioglimento della monarchia bicefale, contribuendo così all'imposizione di tale idea davanti ai rappresentanti dell'Entente cordiale (l'Intesa amichevole). Le informazioni dagli archivi romeni permettono all'autore di presentare gli sforzi per l'istituzione di una legione rumena, composta da soldati e da ufficiali, prigionieri di guerra trovati nei campi di concentramento della penisola. I rapporti diplomatici del periodo neutrale e della guerra sono oggetto dell'articolo di Sidney Sonnino e l'intervento della Romania nella prima guerra mondiale. L'identità delle aspirazioni nazionali, la lotta comune contro la monarchia dualista, la posizione simile della prima fase del conflitto, l'attuazione della posizione neutrale, sono sottolineati dall'autore. La Gazzetta del Ministro Italiano degli Esteri testimonia la condotta "inappuntabile" di esso verso la Romania del 1918, quando spingeva l'Entente cordiale a rispettare gli obblighi politici e militari adottate nel 1916 con i trattati firmati dalla Romania e si è pronunciato favorevole per il riconoscimento della Romania come alleato e la sua partecipazione alle trattative di pace del dopoguerra.

L'opinione pubblica rumena vibrò alle idee del Risorgimento, che ha penetrato sia grazie agli studenti partiti a studiare presso le università italiane (i primi studiosi dello Stato erano a Pisa), grazie ai viaggi effettuati nella penisola da Dinicu Golescu, Nicolae Suțu, Vasile Alecsandri, Costache Negri, sia attraverso le attività culturali di alcune personalità affascinante come I. H. Rădulescu, nonché attraverso i contatti diretti tra i leader durante l'esilio. Quattro articoli vengono dedicati, dall'autore, agli echi degli eventi dalla penisola nei principati romeni e nella Transilvania. Uno di essi fa riferimento al Risorgimento e all'unità dell'Italia nel giornalismo rumeno. Prima del 1848, informazioni sul mondo italiano sono presenti nei giornali *Albina românească*, *Curierul românesc* e *Gazeta de Transilvania*. L'autore sottolinea che la prima menzione di un movimento mazziniano si trova, paradossalmente, nella gazzetta pubblicata a Iași da Gheorghe Asachi, che annuncia il fallito tentativo dei Savoia nel 1834, come "il primo movimento organizzato dalla Giovine Italia". Lo spazio italiano è presente nelle gazzette rivoluzionarie di Bucarest: *Poporul suveran*, *Pruncul român*, e le pubblicazioni dall'esilio testimoniano, con i loro articoli, l'affinità con il pensiero mazziniano dei leader romeni. Dall'anno della sua fondazione, il giornale *Românul* di C. A. Rosetti, ospiterà in modo costante rubriche dedicate alla politica dello stato, ai piedi degli Appennini, e lo stesso interesse è stato condiviso anche dalla *Gazeta de Transilvania*. Forse il più duraturo argomento dell'affinità romeno-italiana è la presenza nel folklore della Transilvania di canzoni dedicate alla lotta da Custozza e Solferino, evento che si riflette anche nella collezione firmata da Ștefan Delureanu. Dopo la costituzione degli Stati nazionali, per i romeni e per gli italiani sorgerà un'altra sfida: la formazione di una struttura statale moderna.

L'instaurazione della sinistra costituzionale al governo dell'Italia ha permesso ai politici romeni di esaminare la sua evoluzione in termini di riforme avviate. La stampa del Regno e dalla Transilvania accorda grandi spazi alla politica italiana e straniera, in particolare al ravvicinamento alle Potenze centrali.

Hermiona Quinet e Luigi Cazzavillan sono ritratti dall'autore in due articoli che sottolineano il loro contributo al potenziamento dei rapporti romeno-italiani. Cresciuta dal padre con l'ammirazione per la cultura italiana, traduttrice dei lavori di Silvio Pellico, *Sui doveri degli uomini*, Hermiona Asachi, sposando Edgar Quinet, diventa un'amica fedele dei circoli democratici italiani. A sua volta, Cazzavillan, dopo una giovinezza tumultuosa sui fronti dell'Italia, Francia, Serbia, si stabilì a Bucarest e divenne uno dei fondatori della stampa moderna con le due pubblicazioni *Fraternitatea româno-italiană*, in particolare *L'Universo*. È diventato così la figura più importante della colonia italiana nella capitale del Regno.

Attraverso le informazioni inedite e le analisi in cui si abbina armoniosamente il contesto europeo a quello interno, Ștefan Delureanu porta, con la nuova collezione di ricerche, ancora un prezioso contributo agli studi risorgimentali in Romania.

*Raluca Tomi*

*Istituto di Storia "Nicolae Iorga", Bucarest, Romania*  
*raluca\_tomi@yahoo.com*

FRANCESCO GUIDA, curatore, *Italia e Romania verso l'unità nazionale* (Bucarest: Humanitas, 2011), 214 pp.

Nel 1911, a l'occasione del cinquantenario dello stato italiano, Nicolae Iorga scriveva il libro *Breve storia dei rumeni con speciale considerazioni delle relazioni con l'Italia*.

A distanza di cento anni, la Romania festeggia i 150 anni della fondazione dello Stato Italiano con una serie di eventi scientifici e culturali che, con il generoso aiuto dell'Ambasciata italiana, si sono svolti nel 2011. Gli storici dei due stati hanno celebrato l'evento con articoli e studi, conferenze e convegni, tenuti a Bistrița, Cluj, Timișoara, Craiova, Bucarest durante i quali hanno condiviso i risultati di recenti ricerche relative all'impatto del Risorgimento Italiano sul movimento nazionale romeno.

In questo contesto effervescente, a Bucarest si è tenuto, il 16–17 giugno 2011, un convegno le cui opere sono raggruppate nella presente raccolta, a cura del professor Francesco Guida, uno dei ricercatori italiani che si è dedicato con rigore e

passione allo studio della storia dell'Europa del Centro-Est e del Sud-Est. La Sua predilezione per la cultura e la spiritualità romena è conosciuta negli ambienti scientifici romeni ed europei. Ha scritto molto sulla storia romena soprattutto sul ottocento e novecento romeno, dalla rivoluzione guidata da Tudor Vladimirescu fino ai regimi autoritari, per ricordare soltanto l'ultima raccolta di studi curata da Lui, apparsa nel 2010: *Intellettuali versus democrazia: I regimi autoritari nell'Europa sud orientale 1933–1953*. Grazie al suo impegno, in breve tempo, il contenuto del convegno è stato pubblicato presso la prestigiosa casa editrice Humanitas. Unitamente all'Ambasciata Italiana a Bucarest, da menzionare che Sua Eccellenza Mario Cospito ha firmato la prefazione della raccolta, all'Associazione Italiana degli Studi del Sud Est Europeo, fondata nel 1969, il cui Presidente è il professor Guida, all'eccellente organizzazione della manifestazione hanno collaborato il Centro Italo-Romeno degli Studi Storici presso la Facoltà di storia dell'Università di Bucarest, il cui Presidente è il professor Ion Bulei, e l'Istituto Italiano di Cultura di Bucarest, mediante il suo Direttore, Rodolfo Amadeo.

I lavori del convegno hanno intrecciato, in perfetta armonia, diverse generazioni di ricercatori dedicati ai rapporti italo-romeni, fatto che ci autorizza a sperare nella continuità di tali studi in futuro. Storici italiani erano rappresentati dal professore Francesco Guida, di Alberto Castaldini, direttore dell'Istituto Italiano di Cultura di Bucarest (2006–2010), storico, pubblicista, professore universitario, personalità riconosciuta al livello europeo per i suoi lavori dedicati alla storia degli ebrei; Giampaolo D'Andrea, assistente ordinario di Storia del mezzogiorno e professore associato di Storia del Risorgimento presso l'Università di Salerno e di Storia Contemporanea presso l'Università della Basilicata, Alberto Basciani ricercatore presso Università Roma Tre, autore dei volumi: *Un conflitto balcanico: La contesa tra Bulgaria e la Romania in Dobrugia di Sud 1918–1940*; *La difficile unione: La Bessarabia e la Grande Romania 1918–1940* e ha curato con Antonio D'Alessandri, *Balcani 1908: Alle origini di un secolo di conflitti*; Antonio D'Alessandri, chi svolge attività di ricerca e didattica nella Facoltà di scienze politiche dell'Università Roma Tre, autore di un bello volume dedicato alla fascinante personalità di Dora D'Istria e il curatore dei molti libri, l'ultimo apparso nel 2011, *Dopo la pioggia: Gli stati del ex-Jugoslavia e l'Albania 1991–2011*, con Eugenio Pitassio; Emanuela Costantini, ricercatrice presso la Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Perugia, autrice della monografia: *Nae Ionescu, Mircea Eliade, Emil Cioran: Nazionalismo antiliberal alla periferia d'Europa*. Storici romeni furono: Ștefan Delureanu, personalità riconosciuta per le sue preoccupazioni risorgimentali e chi può essere considerato il capo della scuola romena risorgimentale da oggi (*Risorgimento italiano e Risorgimento romeno; Mazzini și românii în Risorgimento; Garibaldi între mit și istorie*); Adrian Niculescu, professore universitario presso la Scuola Nazionale di Scienze Politiche

ed Amministrative di Bucarest, membro del Gruppo romeno del Istituto Storico per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano (il suo recente libro *Aux origines de la démocratie en Roumanie: Pruncul român, premier journal libre roumain*); Rudolf Dinu, professore associato di storia delle relazioni internazionali presso la Facoltà di storia dell'Università di Bucarest, presidente del gruppo romeno presso l'Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, oggi direttore della Casa Romena di Venezia; Ion Cârja, docente universitario presso la Cattedra di storia moderna della Facoltà di storia e filosofia dell'Università Babeş Bolyai, vicepresidente del gruppo romeno del Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, il curatore del libro *Unità nazionale e modernità nel Risorgimento italiano e romeno* e l'autore di un altro con l'accademico Ioan Aurel Pop: *Un italian la Bucureşti: Luigi Cazzavillan*.

Durante il convegno sono stati presentati 11 lavori, e nell'ultimo giorno è stata organizzata una tavola rotonda dove sono stati presentati i lavori più recenti firmati da Ştefan Delureanu, *Italia şi România spre unificarea naţională: Un secol de istorie paralelă (1820–1920)*, Antonio D'Alessandri, *Il pensiero e l'opera di Dora D'Istria fra oriente europeo e l'Italia* e la raccolta di studi a cura di Ion Cârja, *Unità nazionale e modernità nel Risorgimento italiano e romeno*. Nella discussione sono intervenuti l'accademico Dan Berindei, il professor Ion Bulei, Ştefan Delureanu, Alberto Basciani.

La raccolta di studi è aperta dalle riflessioni del professor Francesco Guida sulle interdipendenze del Risorgimento italiano con i movimenti di liberazione dello spazio del Sud-Est europeo. Lo studio con il titolo *L'unificazione italiana e il Risorgimento delle nazioni del sud-est* fa riferimento ai due piani: quello visibile, degli eventi storici, intensamente studiato dei ricercatori e quello impercettibile, ma probabilmente molto più profondo e più interessante da analizzare, sul modo in cui il Risorgimento italiano ha influito la realizzazione degli stati nazionali. Per quanto riguarda il primo aspetto, sono messi in evidenza gli eventi degli anni 1821, 1830, 1848, 1856–1861. Interessante è però la distinzione relativa ai movimenti del 1821. Se viene evidenziata la componente rivoluzionaria dei movimenti, organizzati dalle società segrete: la Carboneria in Italia, Eteria Filiki in Grecia, si notano le differenze legate all'aspetto religioso dei movimenti nei Balcani, quello della lotta tra cristiani e musulmani, che non è presente nello spazio italiano. L'inizio degli anni trenta è simile in termini di progressi verso la costituzione di stati nazionali: se nello spazio italiano si ripristinano i tentativi di recupero delle libertà costituzionali e si organizza il movimento mazziniano circa la Giovine Italia, nello spazio est europeo, il trattato di Adrianopole apre una nuova fase nei rapporti tra l'Impero ottomano, la Russia e lo spazio balcanico. Nei decenni successivi, l'interdipendenza tra la questione italiana e quella orientale è evidente, soprattutto durante la Guerra di Crimea e durante le trattative di pace. Il modello del Risorgimento italiano per la formazione degli stati dell'Europa sud-orientale è stato

una realtà sia prima, che dopo il 1861. L'Italia è diventata un simbolo delle lotte nazionali nei Balcani ed il mito garibaldino ha influenzato ed ispirato i loro leader.

Il parallelo tra il Risorgimento ed il movimento di costituzione dello Stato Nazionale Romeno è evidente nell'importante contributo di Adrian Niculescu, *Risorgimento italiano e rigenerazione nazionale romena: Similitudini, sincronie, parallelismi ed una vistosa differenza*. Partendo dalla similitudine dei termini del Risorgimento e quello della rinascita nazionale romena, esistente nei titoli di importanti opere documentarie e monografiche della storiografia romena, sono presentati "nello specchio" gli eventi rilevanti del movimento nazionale dei due paesi durante il periodo 1821–1918. È una microsintesi dei rapporti italo-romeni, che non omette le eventuali differenze spiegate dall'autore mediante il divario tra la civiltà e la cultura italiana e le realtà dalla parte contemporanea del nord del Danubio.

Tre studi sono dedicati al periodo effettivo della costituzione dello stato italiano e romeno e cioè quelli firmati da: Ștefan Delureanu, Alessandro D'Alessandri ed Emanuela Costantini. *La ricezione romena del processo di unificazione italiana*, lo studio firmato da Ștefan Delureanu cattura il modo in cui la società romena ha percepito gli eventi della penisola tra il 1853 e 1861, uno spazio temporale in cui il problema italiano e quello romeno sono diventati argomenti europei, elementi essenziali nel mantenimento dell'equilibrio continentale. Il sostegno accordato da Cavour alla causa romena, l'entusiastico ricevimento fatto dai romeni al rappresentante sardo nella Commissione Europea, il cavaliere Benzi, le affinità mazziniane di Rosetti, le feste che celebravano la proclamazione del Regno d'Italia a Bucarest, la stampa romena favorevole agli eventi della penisola, sono tutti presentati dall'instancabile ricercatore, che porta a sostegno delle sue affermazioni una fonte meno utilizzata e cioè i rapporti dei consoli austriaci nei Principati.

Le ultime ricerche negli archivi francesi e britannici hanno permesso ad Antonio D'Alessandri di rimettere in discussione l'esperienza dell'esilio rivoluzionario, rivalutato negli ultimi studi specialistici firmati da Isabella Maurizio ed Angela Jianu. Il suo contributo intitolato *La questione d'Oriente e l'Europa: Nazionalismo, rivoluzione ed esilio dopo il 1849*, mette in evidenza l'importanza di risolvere la "questione orientale" per mantenere l'equilibrio europeo. La seconda parte del suo studio la dedica al ruolo di laboratorio del pensiero politico, che Parigi ha avuto per i leader polacchi, ungheresi e romeni in esilio, che venivano così in contatto con il dibattito sulla democrazia e sul suo ruolo nello sviluppo degli stati nazionali. Sono presentate le caratteristiche di ciascuna emigrazione politica indicata ed è stato evidenziato il loro operato concretizzato in memoriali, petizioni, scritti politici. L'influenza degli scritti e dei discorsi di Jules Michelet è stata travolgente per gli esuli romeni, che chiariranno il futuro programma politico nella

capitale francese: D. Brătianu, N. Bălcescu, C. A. Rosetti, I. H. Rădulescu, Al. G. Golescu.

L'interessante titolo *Quale Stato? Proposte federaliste nei processi risorgimentali italiani e romeni* appartiene a Emanuela Costantini, che apre nuove prospettive per la ricerca attraverso il parallelo con le idee federaliste. Se nella penisola il dibattito sulla futura forma unitaria o federale dello stato era fertile di idee e scritti firmati da Vincenzo Gioberti, Cesare Balbo, Giuseppe Ferrari, Carlo Cattaneo, Giuseppe Mazzini, nello spazio romeno, si incontrano progetti che delimitano piuttosto confederazioni composte da vari stati, liberati dalla dominazione straniera. L'ultima idea è stata presentata in un progetto elaborato da Nicolae Bălcescu, *Gli Stati Uniti del Danubio*.

Due contributi esaminano i rapporti diplomatici italo-romeni subito dopo la costituzione dello Stato Unitario Romeno. Alberto Basciani firma lo studio *Le relazioni diplomatiche fra l'Italia e i Principati romeni dalla Mica Unire al Congresso di Berlino (1861–1878)*, lavoro che si basa su una seria analisi dei documenti contenuti nell'impressionante corpus *I documenti diplomatici italiani*. Una volta sottolineato lo sforzo che l'Italia fece per staccarsi dalla protezione della politica francese e per diventare un soggetto decisionale nella politica europea, l'autore interpreta le competenze della politica italiana nei confronti del giovane stato romeno. L'atteggiamento dell'Italia è stato sfumato: se ha sostenuto il governo romeno sulla questione dei monasteri dedicati, ha preso le distanze dal regime autoritario di Al. I. Cuza ed è stata prudente nella primavera e nell'estate del 1866, nelle condizioni in cui si preparava per l'alleanza con la Prussia e per la guerra con l'Austria. Al suo turno, Rudolf Dinu firma l'interessante studio: *"Il modello italiano" nella proclamazione del Regno di Romania (1881)*. È un'opera basata su tanti documenti inediti, che sostengono l'esistenza di un modello italiano nella proclamazione del regno romeno del marzo del 1881. Lo studio è una ricerca appassionante nei rapporti romeno-tedesco-austro-ungarici subito dopo la conquista dell'indipendenza della Romania e sottolinea l'importanza dell'evento per il mantenimento della stabilità nella zona.

*L'Episcopato greco-cattolico ed il tardo Risorgimento* è il contributo firmato da Ion Carja, che mette in discussione una nuova visione dei rapporti tra la chiesa greco-cattolica in Transilvania ed il papato. L'autore sottolinea il ruolo del cattolicesimo nella creazione dell'élite politica e culturale romena oltre i Carpazi, nella dinamizzazione del movimento nazionale. Lo studio dedica uno spazio rilevante alla posizione dei rappresentanti dei greco-cattolici presenti al Concilio Vaticano I, all'arcivescovo ed al metropolita Ioan Vancea ed Iosif Pap Szilaghi, che hanno avuto una posizione contraria alla dottrina dell'infalibilità papale.

Alberto Castaldini e Giampaolo D'Andrea sono presenti con studi che evidenziano gli aspetti meno noti del Risorgimento italiano. *Una patria per le*

*minoranze: Ebrei e valdesi di fronte all'Unità d'Italia* è il contributo firmato da Alberto Castaldini, una ricerca interessante sullo stato delle minoranze nazionali e religiose, sia presso gli stati italiani prima dell'unificazione e, soprattutto, durante lo stato nazionale. Vengono sottolineati aspetti della legislazione liberale relativa agli ebrei ed ai valdesi e la garanzia dei diritti civili, politici per tutti i cittadini italiani, indipendentemente dalla religione, è prevista nello Statuto Albertino del marzo 1848. Così si spiega anche la presenza di numerose personalità della vita ebraica nella vita sociale e politica del nuovo Stato: Ernesto Nathan, Luigi Luzzati, Isaac Artom, ecc. La posizione dello Stato italiano sulla questione delle minoranze è ammirevole, soprattutto quando gli altri stati hanno promosso una legislazione restrittiva in relazione alla minoranza degli ebrei. Nello studio intitolato *Il Mezzogiorno e l'unificazione italiana*, lo storico italiano Giampaolo D'Andrea riesce a delineare le principali tappe nell'evoluzione del Regno di Napoli, in seguito chiamato Regno delle Due Sicilie, il territorio italiano con la più lunga continuità territoriale, che rappresenta un quarto della superficie dello stato italiano ed un terzo della sua popolazione. Il contributo del Sud allo sviluppo della civiltà italiana è sottolineato, a partire dalle riforme illuministe del XVIII secolo, con le misure anti-feudali attuate durante Giuseppe Bonaparte e Gioacchino Murat, con i movimenti rivoluzionari del 1820–1821 e termina con la spedizione garibaldina e con molti problemi rimasti insoluti, per quanto riguarda l'integrazione del Mezzogiorno nello stato italiano moderno.

La raccolta di studi a cura del professor Guida, riesce a catturare una vasta gamma di preoccupazioni degli storici appartenenti ad entrambi gli spazi culturali sulla formazione degli stati nazionali, sottolineando l'influenza del modello italiano sul movimento nazionale romeno e l'affinità genetica del popolo romeno ed italiano, la cui identità è segnata dal "sigillo di Roma" così come in modo ispirato affermava Nicolae Iorga.

Raluca Tomi

Istituto di Storia "Nicolae Iorga", Bucarest, Romania  
raluca\_tomi@yahoo.com

YAVUZ KÖSE, *Westlicher Konsum am Bosphorus: Warenhäuser, Nestlé & Co. im späten Osmanischen Reich (1855–1923)*, Südosteuropäischen Arbeiten 138 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2010), 574 pp.

Often described as "the sick man of Europe" during the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire showed an extraordinary capacity to introduce reforms aimed to empower its traditional structure to resist the pressure of both the Western

powers and Russia. In the past decades, historical writing underwent thorough investigations aimed to bring to light the laboratories, the carrying out and the impact of the political, social and economic reforms. Thus, the impact of the Crimean War, of the Oriental Question and of World War One was well documented and studied.

But in the last decades as well, historical writing integrated the so-called “frivolous” topics, e. g. consumption and consumerism, into its mainstream preoccupations. Yavuz Köse starts his *Westlicher Konsum am Bosphorus: Warenhäuser, Nestlé & Co. im späten Osmanischen Reich (1855–1923)* – originally a doctoral thesis – from this assumption, but goes deeper into a work which may offer answers to present debates, for instance on globalization or on the rising Islamic managed economy (e. g. banking) as a consequence of the recent political and economic developments (see pp. 22–27).

Yavuz Köse aimed to investigate the changes brought into the late Ottoman Empire by the new (Western European) forms of business, commerce, marketing, and consumerism, which emerged after the Crimean War. Yet, while these aspects were studied for Western Europe or North America, they were considered as “peripheral” in the Ottoman studies (p. 21). However, there is no lack of studies concerning the Ottoman economy during the final phases of the Empire. These have yet to cope with the specificities of an area where the state was a major player both in terms of rule setting and actual investments (p. 32).

The history of Ottoman consumerism is, to Yavuz Köse, an urban history (Istanbul, Damascus, and Izmir), thus a history of the relationship between majority, minorities (Greek, Armenian) and foreign investments. The main point of interest lies in the marketing of Western products in the Ottoman society, following a direction of research inaugurated in the second half of the twentieth century (p. 50), which includes and surpasses the history of advertising.

Department stores (*Warenhäuser*) as “cathedrals of consumerism” and their marketing strategies are the focal point of Yavuz Köse’s contribution. The author starts from the following hypothesis: private (Western European) companies brought the Ottoman society into the capitalist world. However, the analysis of their marketing strategies does not reflect a unilateral transfer, but reciprocal influences (pp. 94–95), which mirror the difficulty to accommodate Western understanding of concepts such as culture to the (late) Ottoman society (pp. 98–102). For Yavuz Köse, the history of marketing is part of the cultural and economic history (*Kultur- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*), as marketing is the place where Western companies meet and cope with the demands and expectations of Ottoman (Turkish, Greek, Armenian, Jewish, Levantine) consumers (p. 103). Products, pricing, distribution, advertising, sales, market regulations and, last but not least, the reaction of an atypical society are Yavuz Köse’s points of interest.

The second part of the book is dedicated to the research of the specificities of the Ottoman market and marketing, with contributions by Halil Inalcık, Mehmet Genç, and Traian Stoianovich, as well as Barbara Larson's analysis of eighteenth-century Egypt as theoretical basis (pp. 118–120). The latter was considered by Yavuz Köse as a model applicable to the entire Empire, with the state as the major player, followed by private merchants and a rather complicated system of markets, which included the bazaars (pp. 124–128). One major difference between the Ottoman city bazaar and the present shopping malls lies, for Yavuz Köse, in the role the latter has in the shaping of leisure (p. 133). The modernization of cities such as Constantinople and Damascus during the second half of the nineteenth century led to the emergence of new commercial and business districts (p. 135). Nevertheless, the role of the state, of trade guilds and of religious prescriptions was dominant in the organization of the Ottoman market and marketing, and a constant since the sixteenth century (pp. 138–141). Yavuz Köse made use of travel accounts in order to illustrate both the differences and similarities in “marketing” and “advertising” in the Oriental and Western worlds (pp. 141–142). One effect of the transformations brought by the policies of the nineteenth century was the reversal of the positions of customers and producers in favor of the first – a fact which triggered some industries (e. g. textiles) to adapt to and finally overcome the Western influence on the taste and demand of the Ottomans (pp. 143–144).

Another point of interest – which might well look as strictly a twenty-first century one – was the labeling and falsification of goods. As Yavuz Köse demonstrates, this phenomenon might be traced back to the eighteenth century and it was a sign of a changing consumer taste. Owning or wearing European watches or clothes labeled as such, even if those were actually produced in the Ottoman Empire, was one of the aspects revealed by a careful investigation of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Western European travel accounts and Austrian or French commercial reports (see pp. 146–151, 155). Yet, a comparison to Colbert's politics in France or Frederick II's in Prussia would have been perhaps more fruitful than the discrete hints about some present day circumstances. Precisely this quest for (Western European) labels and patterns was, for the author, an excellent starting point in the research on the history of marketing in the Ottoman Empire. Western sources spoke widely about quality, pricing and ways of selling clothes, French perfumes, and even alcoholic drinks (pp. 160–166) in the department stores built in various cities. Once again, the demand of the market was sometimes met via counterfeit products (e. g. French cognac made actually in Russia). The price was an issue well known to the diplomats in charge of defending their countries' economic interests within the Ottoman Empire (p. 162). Yet, much more important than the price seemed the label itself: French or English sold better than German during the late nineteenth century (p. 162). On the other hand, while

in the Western part of the world Oriental patterns on labels were accepted, they were rather prohibited in the Ottoman Empire, a fact which must be understood in connection with both censorship and Islamic regulations.

Yavuz Köse used the writings of Joseph Grunzel (a clerk in the Austro-Hungarian Ministry of Commerce) and Paul Fesch (a French priest and journalist) in order to present the goods imported and/or produced in the Ottoman Empire for the internal market. Coffee, chocolate, tea, beer or galoshes, amongst other, were luxury and show-off commodities as well. And the connection between the wide consumption of coffee and the increase in sales of imported French or German porcelain is an interesting point in the history of taste and marketing in the late Ottoman Empire (p. 179). These valuable insights into the evolutions of the Ottoman markets and consumer preferences reveal the careful documentation undertaken by the author. And precisely this wide range of sources proves that, for the Western European states and companies, the Ottoman and Oriental market was different, important and profitable. The marketing strategies had to be adapted to competition (represented also by any other European state), local conditions (see again Islam), and the psychology of the consumer as well (pp. 184–186). Another important local condition was the evolution of the press (pp. 187–189).

The third part of the book is dedicated to the foreign consumer goods companies, many selling their wares through department stores, an institution which the author set at the crossroads between economy and culture (p. 195). Resembling, but not imitating the bazaars, the department stores followed modern, capitalist rules and made their appearance in the Ottoman cities in the second half of the nineteenth century (pp. 193–197). Details are given for each traceable department store (one should note that companies like *Orosdi Back* and *Au Bon Marché* had branches in Bucharest or Galați) (pp. 201–202). Among the problems the department stores established in the second half of the nineteenth century had to cope with was the transfer of the Christian population following the Balkan wars and the Great War (p. 207). The Switzerland-based *Nestlé* Company built its worldwide success on the invention of a substitute for maternal milk by the German born Henri (Heinrich) Nestlé. This achievement was not singular in an era when infant mortality was high. After Henri Nestlé sold his original company to a financial concern, the marketing strategy was radically changed. The Ottoman market was only one among 23 others (pp. 219–221). Established in 1875, it had to be reshaped after the military and political events of 1877–1878. Thus, Galați and Brăila were assigned by the company to another subordinate structure (p. 222). The pre-existence of Swiss communities in major cities across the Ottoman Empire made the penetration easier. The first link between *Nestlé*'s products and the department stores was the very distribution network: most agents were non-Muslim, thus linked to this modern way of carrying on commerce (p. 224). *Nestlé*'s

products were also sold in pharmacies, owned mostly by non-Muslims. Not without problems, a network of agents and re-sellers was established. A decisive moment was the 1905 merger with the *Anglo-Swiss Condensed Milk Corporation*, as key decisions were now taken in the London headquarters. 1912/1913 was another key year, as *Nestlé* built its own headquarters in Constantinople (p. 229); yet, one may argue that, in terms of profit, the Ottoman market was not a key one for the company. Additionally, the *Nestlé* Company had to deal with internal political struggles, wars fought between 1911 and 1923 (see, also for the organizational changes, pp. 236–240). The nationalistic oriented economic policy of the new Turkish Republic deepened the problems *Nestlé* had to face. Without having access to a similar archive and secondary literature, Yavuz Köse tried to compare *Nestlé* with another well-known company, namely with the North-American *Singer* (pp. 243–259).

“The Marketing of the Foreign Companies of Consumer Goods” forms the fourth part of the book. Being owned by non-Ottomans, the department stores followed Western architectural and management patterns, which differentiated them from the bazaars. Yavuz Köse analyzed the architecture, internal structure and location of department stores in the Ottoman cities (pp. 262–277). As a main marketing strategy of the department stores, the author cites the advertising in the local newspapers. From the images used as sources, one may easily understand the interlacement between Western European patterns (the image of the product to be sold) and the Oriental calligraphy (pp. 286–288, for instance). Posters, postcards, clearance sales, special offers linked to all kind of celebrations and even balloon flights (p. 297) were also used as advertising strategies.

As to *Nestlé*, its own marketing strategies were not very different; however, one may note the recommendation letters from paediatricians as a particular feature (pp. 304–306). The construction of the Constantinople headquarters influenced the strength of the marketing campaigns; moreover, the company had now its own shop, meant also to serve an advertising purpose (p. 315). Once again, the Western company had to come to terms with local and Islamic regulations (see the differences between brochures for Europe and for the Ottoman Empire, p. 319). The use of cartoon strips was, in Yavuz Köse’s interpretations, a way to present the *Nestlé* products as part of the Ottoman daily life (p. 322), targeting mostly the women and children from the middle and upper classes.

Yavuz Köse was interested not only in the marketing strategies of department stores and companies, but also in the reaction of the local competition and consumers. As already demonstrated, the main difference between a bazaar and a department store was the management: the latter was run by a single owner, taking all the decisions. The emergence of the Ottoman department stores followed a Western pattern; nevertheless, the owners had to find locations outside the more

cosmopolitan parts of the capital city (pp. 350–360). *Nestlé* also had to face the competition of other Western companies, as well as that of some minor local ones. Here Yavuz Köse comes back to the issue of counterfeiting and investigates the strategies used by all companies involved in order to defend their products for toddlers and children (pp. 371–374).

The department stores and major companies were not only players on a new market, but also employers. Yavuz Köse's interest lay also with this interface between consumer and seller/producer. Table 22 (p. 385) reveals the dominance of non-Turkish employees and that of men over women (pp. 388–389). Professions, income and career were also important for the author. An interesting point is the lack of Muslims in top positions within companies like *Nestlé* and *Singer* (p. 399).

The seventh chapter of the book is dedicated to the collective portrait of the Ottoman consumer. The success of the Western department stores and companies was measured rather by means of the Ottoman criticism from nationalistic and religious points of view (pp. 411–425). Strikes, commercial conflicts and, once again, nationalistic and religiously motivated stances influenced the behavior of the Ottoman consumers in the final two decades of existence of the Empire.

Yavuz Köse's work may be described as an attempt to investigate the transformation underwent by the Ottoman urban society in the final stages of the Empire. The changes brought by Western ideas and agents were deep, and they influenced not only the traditional ways of doing commerce, but also the marketing system and consumer behavior. This proves that, when investigating modernization according to the Western European patterns, researchers must go beyond the surface and challenge the structural and essential transformations implied by these processes. The rise of nationalism and patriotism was, for the present day historian, an advantage, due to the criticism of foreign goods, companies and conducts.

A special mention should be given to the sources used by Yavuz Köse: the "usual" state archives and printed sources were enhanced by those found in the *Archive Historique Nestlé* of Vevey, Switzerland. Besides the numerous contemporary drawings and photographs meant to illustrate the thesis of the book, Yavuz Köse added an important number of maps and tables with lists of agents for companies and employees of the department stores, as well as Turkish news items including references to the commercial centers (pp. 459–511).

Would the Romanian historical writing benefit from Yavuz Köse's *Westlicher Konsum am Bosphorus: Warenhäuser, Nestlé & Co. im späten Osmanischen Reich (1855–1923)*? One answer lies in the excellent introductory part (state of the art in research, sources, and theses) of the book, namely in the discussion on the relation between the modernization of economy and "cultural dependency" (pp. 87–94), which should be considered as an interesting theoretical approach. The quest for Western clothes in the Ottoman urban society, even

tempered by questionable taste (p. 153), would find an interesting counterpart in the outer signs of modernity, as revealed for the Romanian case. Last, but not least, the archives of major companies active in Romania during the nineteenth century certainly hold interesting sources for the economic and social history of the country.

It is our firm belief that Yavuz Köse's *Westlicher Konsum am Bosphorus: Warenhäuser, Nestlé & Co. im späten Osmanischen Reich (1855–1923)* has taken the history of marketing out of the “frivolous” – or, better said, from the non-axial coordinates of mainstream historical writing – and has made an excellent contribution to the economic, social, cultural and mentalities history of the Ottoman Empire.

*Bogdan Popa*  
“Nicolae Iorga” History Institute, Bucharest, Romania  
*bogdanidpopa@gmail.com*

GHEORGHE LAZĂR, *Les marchands en Valachie, XVII<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Bucharest: Institutul Cultural Român, 2006), 438 pp. + ill. + apps. + maps

The present monograph, published by the Romanian Cultural Institute in its Augur collection, is the doctoral dissertation presented by Gheorghe Lazăr at the Laval University in the autumn of 2005. This detail on the adopted scientific approach is quite significant and instrumental in a better understanding of the context in which this work was written and eventually published in French.

It is an innovative and fundamental work that tackles boldly and with great intelligence a topic only superficially approached until now by Romanian historiography. More often than not, historical writing in Romania has regarded merchants as the forerunners of the Romanian bourgeoisie. Thus, research on this social category looked for the “the roots of Romanian bourgeoisie” and “its birth” at a time more or less close to the nineteenth century. Very fortunately, Lazăr does not intend to add a new branch to the genealogical tree of the bourgeoisie, but rather focuses on the Wallachian merchants such as they appear in contemporary documents. His methods, presented in the introductory chapter, are impressive and employed adroitly in a network of arguments, interrogations, and conclusions.

Equally addressing a public unfamiliar with the history of Wallachia, Lazăr's book offers a picture of the principality's political and economic history. The analysis begins with a chapter entitled “Effectives of Merchants,” which was difficult to construct and edit. The author constantly reminds the reader about the scarcity and even lack of sources for one aspect or another, which he would have

wanted to explore in greater detail. Precaution is seen in every paragraph, and this concern for preventing any possible misunderstanding and avoid criticism from readers unaccustomed to the typology of Romanian sources can be cumbersome, especially in a chapter consisting predominantly of statistical analysis.

The following chapter discusses the institutional framework for merchants in Wallachia: the guilds. Lazăr captures and explains convincingly the particularities of these organizations of late occurrence: they were mostly corporations of fiscal solidarity under the prince's control rather than professional and spiritual brotherhoods, as in the medieval West. The subsequent chapters are most innovative and insightful, where the author employs the varied sources at his disposal and paints courageously, and without the previously mentioned inhibitions, the social picture of the merchant class in Wallachia in premodern times. Chapter IV, "The Ethnic Structure of the Merchants," tackles the thorny issue of the foreign merchants in the economic, social and political life of Wallachia. The arguments are balanced and well organized, and the Greek, Turkish, Bulgarian, Jewish and Armenian merchants are presented with the essential characteristics of their trade, and of their social and political status. The merchants of Braşov – *lipscani* and *gelepi* – are grouped in chapter V, "At the Borders of the Great Trade," their transit trade with oriental goods providing them with considerable profit and a privileged economic status. An important conclusion is that the merchants were not specialized, but rather showed some preference for a certain type of merchandise or distribution area, enabling them to make profit. I should add that there are interesting similarities in the status of the "Greek" merchants of sixteenth-century Transylvania and those of seventeenth-century Wallachia, and that in the official documents of both principalities one may find the ambivalence of "Greek" as an ethnonym and at the same time a generic term for Balkan merchants trading in oriental goods.

Tensions between the Central-European and Ottoman spheres of attraction, constant cash flow problems and political pressures on trade hindered the activity of the Wallachian merchants. Chapter VI makes an analysis of these technical aspects linked to the organization of trade: merchant associations and commercial practices. Associations were more often than not temporary and made for one operation alone. Family associations were more enduring, blood ties being a guarantee for contract enforcement. Quite interesting are associations of the "commenda" type, which the author identified in historical documents starting with the second half of the seventeenth century. Moreover, the Greek trading houses of the eighteenth century, grown from family associations of the previous centuries, were an innovation in response to the expansion of Austria into the south-east of Europe. In the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries one may still trace commercial practices of the fifteenth century (associations among local and foreign merchants,

delayed payments), a thing that perhaps could have been mentioned in the book, in order to distinguish between continuity and novelty in the slow process of modernization of the Wallachian society during the Phanariote period.

The following chapter analyzes lucrative activities other than trade: usury, currency exchange, real estate investment, leasing, and manufactures. The author adopts the methodology of social history in the last three chapters of the book, in order to identify the moral and cultural values of merchants in Wallachia, despite the fact that they did not form a homogeneous social, ethnic or religious group. Integration into the high society, marriage strategies, purchase of real estate, and imitation of the aristocratic lifestyle are some of the coordinates traced out and analyzed by Lazăr with the same skills in employing varied documentary sources. The text is appealing and well written, and it includes an adequate number of case studies. An important conclusion is that merchants were fascinated with the boyars' lifestyle and they employed their wealth, once accumulated, to procure aristocratic titles and live a life of luxury, while their offspring rarely continued to be active in trading activities. Among the varied appendices I should mention the genealogical trees of several families of merchants compiled by the author, and the processing of information on testamentary donations.

In the opening sentence of the final chapter, the author tells us that the book was "a challenge, and also a beginning." My opinion is that the challenge was well met by the author, and that his monograph on the Wallachian merchants of the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries shall remain a crucial contribution to Romanian historiography for many years to come.

*Măria Pakucs-Willcocks*  
"Nicolae Iorga" History Institute, Bucharest, Romania  
*mpakucs@yahoo.com*

IOANA MACREA-TOMA, *Privilighenția : Instituții literare în comunismul românesc* (Cluj-Napoca : Casa Cărții de Știință, 2009), 364 pp.

Il existe des auteurs capables d'extraire de la lecture des documents d'archive et des diverses sources utilisées les plus menus détails. Par son livre « *Priviligentsia* » : *Institutions littéraires à l'époque du communisme roumain*, Ioana Macrea-Toma en est un exemple. L'ouvrage de ce chercheur de Cluj est en premier lieu une tentative ambitieuse de contredire le scepticisme des historiens (y compris les positivistes) vis-à-vis de l'application des théories de Bourdieu dans l'analyse des régimes communistes, dans notre cas, du fonctionnement de la plus importante union d'écrivains de l'époque d'après-guerre. Une provocation d'autant

plus grande qu'Ioana Macrea-Toma propose d'autres équations que celle classique : *dissidence versus opportunisme*.

L'idée argumentée est que les options politiques-littéraires des écrivains ne montrent pas un manque de verticalité morale ou une rétractilité profitable et commode, mais ils sont plutôt le résultat d'un certain état socio-institutionnel du champ littéraire (p. 7). Ioana Macrea-Toma pose des questions fondamentales (*quel est le statut réel de la production intellectuelle pendant le communisme*, par exemple) et essaie d'y répondre. L'ouvrage se propose de faire une radiographie institutionnelle de la position des écrivains, en suggérant qu'au sein de l'*Union des écrivains* cohabitaient deux logiques : l'une autonomiste et l'autre hétéronome. Il se fait remarquer surtout par la mise en discussion – peut-être bien de la manière la plus professionnelle jusqu'à l'heure actuelle – des interdépendances économiques, politiques et sociales dans le fonctionnement du secteur culturel, presque obligatoires pour quiconque s'intéresse à l'étude du financement de la culture à l'époque communiste.

De nos jours, l'utilisation de certains concepts se fait de manière dilettante et politisante. Un exemple serait celui de la *résistance par la culture*. Les anticommunistes féroces, qui pas plus tard qu'hier rejetaient l'emploi de ce syntagme, considéré comme un camouflage de la lâcheté, l'emploient aujourd'hui excessivement et pour des raisons tenant de l'évolution et de la réorganisation des alliances dans le monde politique-intellectuel. Si Ana Blandiana proposait il y a des années un changement de ton et de concepts – la *survie* (au lieu de la résistance) *par la culture* –, Ioana Macrea-Toma continue cette démarche au niveau académique et scientifique, en suggérant une détente dans le ton de la discussion et une modification des données du problème. L'auteur explique de manière tout à fait convaincante pourquoi les écrivains n'ont pas choisi la voie du samizdat et de la dissidence (p. 276).

Les paradigmes idéocratique et totalitaire sont contestés ou nuancés, sans que cette contestation se situe à un niveau rhétorique ou militant-idéologique. Ioana Macrea-Toma, en contraste avec une gauche intellectuelle plutôt amnésique et parfois inculte (lorsqu'il s'agit du passé récent), emploie des documents et des arguments, et surtout un discours académique. L'ouvrage s'éloigne de manière équilibrée du paradigme totalitaire, mais admet implicitement que dans la Roumanie d'après-guerre il a existé un régime totalitaire (pp. 31, 89, 123, 162, 215) ou une dimension totalitaire de la conception officielle de l'art (p. 133), du moins pendant quelque temps (dans les années du stalinisme culturel intégral). L'hypothèse des oppositions strictement délimitées entre le front littéraire et l'appareil de la censure (p. 256) est invalidée par des exemples concrets, illustrant des réseaux de négociation divers. Les analyses de plusieurs écrivains restent valables, même si les décisions du collège CNSAS (Conseil national pour l'étude

des archives de la Securitate) et les révélations des dernières années des dossiers de la Securitate pourraient nuancer et/ou compléter certains points de vue.

L'auteur exclue de l'équation des rapports entre le champ littéraire et celui politique « le cliché (invalidé par Katherine Verdery) de l'instrumentalisation par le Parti du nationalisme, pour attirer les intellectuels » (p. 296). Le volume de Katherine Verdery, qui traite de l'idéologie nationale pendant le communisme, n'est toujours pas à ignorer, mais la question que l'on pose est beaucoup plus compliquée. Par contre, un bon nombre de documents de parti, publiés ou gardés dans les archives des départements idéologiques du Comité central du PCR, pourraient indiquer le fait que le Parti assumait cette instrumentalisation. Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej et Nicolae Ceaușescu ont tiré bon parti du soutien des intellectuels et, dans un certain sens, ils ont patronné des mécanismes de censure qui opéraient avec des directives nationalistes, afin de gagner le support populaire. Dans son livre, publié initialement en anglais en 1991, Katherine Verdery part de la prémisse – assez discutable – que ces questions liées à l'identité nationale avaient déjà trouvé leur autonomie après 1965 et que « le Parti ne pouvait pas simplement s'en saisir et les agiter indifféremment ».

Même avant Ceaușescu, les formateurs idéologiques de Gheorghiu-Dej (Leonte Răutu *et al.*) et, par la suite, les censeurs ont imprimé méthodiquement et à bon escient des lignes nationalistes, du moins au niveau de l'historiographie (de nuances antihongroises, et même antisoviétiques). L'homogénéisation ethnique au niveau de la haute direction du Parti, qui commence à la fin de la sixième décennie et continue dans les années 1960, ne fait que préparer le chemin pour cette nouvelle orientation. En plus, le nationalisme devient un problème d'État. L'angoisse de Gheorghiu-Dej et, par la suite, de Ceaușescu, de se voir débarqués par leurs homologues soviétiques (Khrouchtchev et, respectivement, Brejnev) les met en quête d'une nouvelle source de légitimation ; or, dans cette zone du nationalisme, les intellectuels n'avaient pas une grande liberté de manœuvre. La censure de nuance nationaliste interdisait en 1965–1966 l'utilisation même du terme de « Moldave », avec référence aux réalités des Principautés roumaines du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le message transmis aux intellectuels à travers ce genre d'interdictions ne semblait pas suggérer que le Parti communiste autorisait le débat libre autour de l'idée nationale ou qu'il désirait instrumentaliser cette question. Il n'existe plus de nos jours des arguments solides pour soutenir que les exagérations national(ist)es du Parti n'étaient pas orientées vers l'instrumentalisation, mais avaient comme but une affirmation (désintéressée) de l'autorité sur l'idée nationale. L'antisoviétisme professé surtout après 1964 a amené un profit politique et idéologique incontestable, surtout pour Ceaușescu et pour la bureaucratie du Parti, tout en étant un piège dans lequel beaucoup d'écrivains sont tombés.

Ioana Macrea-Toma nous offre des explications convaincantes pour le fonctionnement de l'*Union des écrivains*, ainsi que pour la signification et la motivation des réorganisations diverses du ministère de la Culture ; les figures et les tableaux illustrant la pyramide du pouvoir, ainsi que les organes du gouvernement et du Parti impliqués dans le contrôle de la production culturelle, sont très utiles. Par l'analyse du champ littéraire, la valorisation des sources et les nombreuses informations fournies, ce volume est une contribution historiographique consistante. Il s'approche réellement du statut de démarche comparatiste, intégrant le cas roumain dans le contexte est-européen et soviétique. Il est à souhaiter qu'il ne reste pas uniquement en langue roumaine. Ioana Macrea-Toma introduit une note de rigueur, de détachement et de relativisme historiographique. Il existe quelques erreurs matérielles, qui n'influencent pourtant pas les points principaux de l'argumentation. *Privilighenția : Instituții literare în comunismul românesc* est une plaidoirie pour la professionnalisation de l'écriture historique sur les rapports entre le littéraire et le politique. Peut-être, une discussion autour du concept de *priviligentsia* aurait-elle été nécessaire.

Malheureusement, cette démarche comporte des inexactitudes de style et des confusions dans l'appareil critique de l'ouvrage – *ibidem* est confondu systématiquement avec *idem* ; dans les notes en bas de page, *op. cit.* apparaît souvent de manière inutile. En plus, l'étude ambitieuse d'Ioana Macrea-Toma aurait mérité des conditions typographiques meilleures (certaines figures sont presque illisibles – voir par exemple, Fig. IV.12, p. 114). L'auteur emploie constamment *datorită* (grâce à) lorsque le contexte demande l'emploi de *din cauza* (à cause de). Il existe aussi des erreurs factuelles. Ainsi, Chișinevschi aurait rejeté la demande de Zaharia Stancu de redevenir membre du Parti en 1960 (p. 65). L'auteur se trompe ici d'une dizaine d'années ; Chișinevschi tombe en disgrâce après 1957 et en 1960 il n'était que l'ombre du superviseur idéologique de 1950. *Secția de Știință și Propagandă* (Département de science et de propagande) (p. 63, n. 176) n'a jamais existé ; par contre, il y a eu deux instances idéologiques portant des noms similaires, mais avec des compétences différentes : *Secția de Propagandă și Agitație* et *Secția de Știință și Cultură*. *Miliția* est confondue avec *poliția* (p. 225). Radu Cosașu n'aurait reçu la permission de publier qu'en 1968 (p. 178) ; il s'agit probablement de la permission de publier *sous forme d'ouvrage*, car Radu Cosașu publiait déjà depuis plusieurs années dans la presse (dans la revue *Cinema*, par exemple). *Comitetul de Stat pentru Cultură și Artă* n'existait pas en 1960 (p. 51) ; il sera fondé en 1962.

La translittération des noms propres nous fait penser que l'ouvrage s'adresse au public anglo-saxon et non pas au public roumain : *Trotsky*, au lieu de *Troțki* (p. 37) ; *Nikolay Haytov*, au lieu de *Nikolai Haitov* (p. 231) ; *Yordan Radichkov*, au lieu de *Iordan Radicikov* (p. 231). Certains termes pris de la littérature de spécialité

anglo-saxonne apparaissent comme tels, bien qu'il existe des équivalents roumains en usage : *Kossacks* devient *cosaci*, au lieu de *cazaci* (p. 245) ; *khozraschet* (p. 182) est employé à la place de *hozrașciot*, mot qui existe dans la langue roumaine des années 1950, fortement influencée par le russe. L'influence de l'anglais – *lines, devoted, assumption, pervasive, assertive* – se fait voir à des endroits divers : *printre linii*, au lieu de *printre rânduri* (p. 192) ; *devoți*, au lieu de *partizani* (p. 310) ; *asumpție*, employé systématiquement à la place de *supoziție* ou *ipoteză* ; *pervaziv*, pour *ubicuu, omniprezent*. Le syntagme inadéquat *discurs asertiv* apparaît à la page 200.

La translittération de plusieurs noms est erronée : Ovidiu *Drâmba* (p. 41), pour Ovidiu *Drimba* ; Paul *Nicolescu-Mizil*, pour Paul *Niculescu-Mizil* (p. 42) ; Létay *Lajos*, pour Létay *Lajos* (p. 45, n. 121). *Eugen Barbu* est confondu avec *Ion Barbu* (p. 176), et *Eugen Ionescu* (l'écrivain en exil) avec *Nae Ionescu* (p. 294). Le nom de l'écrivain Al. I. *Ghilia* devient *Chilia* (p. 23). Les noms de certains auteurs sont confondus et inversés – v. Florin Abraham (p. 360) et Mihaela Cristea (p. 357). Il existe aussi des désaccords. En plus, le *local* (restaurant) de l'*Union des écrivains* est confondu avec la *location* (p. 62). L'écrivain Paul Anghel este cité par deux fois dans la même énumération (p. 82). Nous constatons aussi des omissions : le quatrième volume de l'ouvrage d'Eugen Simion – *Scriitori români de azi* a été publié en 1989 (p. 81, n. 215). Par addition, les taux des écrivains « antiproletcultistes » vont outre 100 % (54 % urbain ; 48 % rural) (p. 84). À la page 87 il s'agit des *réalistes-socialistes*. Sans doute, un ouvrage de telle envergure aurait mérité un effort de rédaction plus important ; malheureusement, le volume a été publié en hâte. La cassette technique indique 2009 comme année de la publication, mais l'ouvrage a été disponible dans les librairies en mars 2010.

Cristian Vasile

“Nicolae Iorga” History Institute, Bucharest, Romania  
 cristivasile2002@yahoo.com

STELIAN MÂNDRUȚ et RUDOLF GRÄF, édés., *Între știință și politică : Fritz Valjavec și corespondenții săi români (1935–1944) / Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik : Fritz Valjavec's Briefwechsel mit rumänischen Gelehrten (1935–1944)* (Cluj-Napoca : Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2010), 574 pp. + ill.

Le volume *Entre science et politique : Fritz Valjavec et ses correspondants roumains (1935–1944)*, édité par les historiens Stelian Mândruț et Rudolf Gräf de Cluj, est centré sur le binôme *science-politique* rapporté à la personnalité si

intéressante de Fritz Valjavec (1909–1960), un des représentants les plus importants de la science et de la politique du sud-est de l'Europe au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle. L'ouvrage offre une perspective historiographique surprenante, pensons-nous, pour la recherche scientifique actuelle, que donne le monde divers des intellectuels roumains – historiens, archéologues, philologues, ethnographes, ethnologues, géographes, mathématiciens, naturalistes, médecins, philosophes, etc. – correspondant avec Fritz Valjavec dans les 4<sup>e</sup> et 5<sup>e</sup> décennies du siècle passé. Il serait possible, en partant de ces intéressants échanges épistolaires, de récrire, même si non pas de manière fondamentale, plusieurs étapes et moments de la vie, l'activité et l'œuvre d'un nombre d'historiens roumains, à partir de Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Silviu Dragomir et Nicolae Iorga, jusqu'à Ioan Lupaș, Ilie Minea et Ioan Nistor, sans omettre Petru P. Panaitescu ou Coriolan Petranu. L'ouvrage ci-présent, sans l'ombre d'un doute, plaide pour un « atelier de l'histoire », s'il convient d'employer, sans forcer un certain horizon épistémologique, un syntagme du vocabulaire de François Furet.

L'invitation de connaître la vie, l'activité et l'œuvre de Fritz Valjavec, en relation directe avec les aspirations et les préoccupations des correspondants d'un pays européen tel que la Roumanie, marquée par les événements précédant la Seconde Guerre mondiale et son déroulement, est facilitée, dans cette édition bilingue, en roumain et en allemand, élégante, complexe et dense, par une généreuse introduction par Camil Mureșanu, intitulée « La valeur des plans secondaires de l'historiographie » (pp. 7–10), à laquelle s'ajoute une postface (pp. 499–502) du politologue Anneli Ute Gabanyi.

Mais la clé de la personnalité de l'historien et homme de science Fritz Valjavec, en dialogue avec le monde des érudits roumains des 4<sup>e</sup> et 5<sup>e</sup> décennies du siècle passé, est donnée par la séquence théorique de Rudolf Gräf et de Stelian Mândruț, intitulée de manière paradigmatique « La recherche historique au service d'une idée » (pp. 11–152). Une telle plaidoirie historiographique, bienvenue, profonde et rationnelle, est la preuve d'une valorisation supérieure d'une plage d'historiographie européenne peu accessible pour la plupart d'entre nous, avec un envoi direct à l'activité publique et scientifique de Fritz Valjavec et à sa correspondance avec un grand nombre d'érudits roumains, démontrant les valences documentaires des lettres en tant que sources narratives intérieures et extérieures, gardées dans le fonds personnel « Fritz Valjavec » de Südosteuropa Gesellschaft de Munich. La lecture des deux micro-études de Rudolf Gräf, « Fritz Valjavec et le Südost-Institut, Munich » (pp. 13–45), et de Stelian Mândruț, « Fritz Valjavec et les Roumains » (pp. 47–134), conçues et rédigées avec application et rigueur, est absolument nécessaire si un historien roumain voudrait valoriser la problématique des idées si généreusement offertes par l'échange épistolaire entre Fritz Valjavec et les spécialistes roumains. Nous citerons en ce qui suit quelques-uns des problèmes abordés par Rudolf Gräf et Stelian Mândruț dans ces deux études. Rudolf Gräf

analyse les conséquences de la Première Guerre mondiale pour les vainqueurs et les vaincus, la situation des minorités dans la lumière des traités de paix, l'apparition et la manifestation du nationalisme radical et du fascisme, les ouvrages historiques allemands publiés pendant l'entre-deux-guerres et « la rupture » d'après 1945, l'histoire en tant que science et « instrumentum regni », etc. Stelian Mândruț s'occupe du rapport entre la géopolitique et le Sud-Est européen, des relations étroites entre le Südost-Institut et Fritz Valjavec, de l'échange épistolaire et de ses valences documentaires, du climat formatif d'Allemagne, des sujets d'intérêt commun pour Fritz Valjavec et ses correspondants roumains, de la collaboration avec des érudits saxons, des dialogues et des polémiques intérieures et extérieures, des contributions culturelles et scientifiques diverses, dans la perspective des activités personnelles ou collectives de recherche (bibliothèques, instituts, revues), des conférences, des congrès, des expositions, des bourses de recherche, des lectorats, des échanges d'étudiants et de la reconnaissance méritocratique, surtout en Allemagne, des visites et des documentations de Fritz Valjavec en Roumanie, de l'*Enciclopedia Europei de Sud-Est* avec de possibles collaborations roumaines, des opinions politiques, des opinions au sujet du périodique de l'Institut, *Südost-Forschungen*, des comptes rendus, de la bibliothèque.

L'ouvrage comporte aussi les sections très utiles : « Note sur l'édition » (pp. 135–142), « Liste d'abréviations » (pp. 143–144) et « Fritz Valjavec – une biographie » (pp. 145–152).

Les valences documentaires et historiographiques du volume sont conférées pleinement dans la section « Correspondance (1935–1944) » (pp. 152–497), où nous retrouvons toute la pléiade des spécialistes roumains qui ont eu un échange épistolaire avec Fritz Valjavec, la correspondance étant éditée par ordre chronologique, annotée et traduite en allemand. Parmi les correspondants, nous retrouvons : Ilie Bărbulescu, Valeriu Lucian Bologa, Alexandru Borza, Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Emanoil Bucuța, Nicolae Cartojan, Emil Diaconescu, Constantin Diculescu, Alexandru Dima, Silviu Dragomir, Nicolae Drăganu, Gheorghe Duzinchevici, Aurel Filimon, Constantin C. Giurescu, Victor Gomoiu, Vasile Grecu, Caius Jiga, Iorgu Iordan, Nicolae Iorga, Constantin Lacea, Ioan Lupaș, Ilie Minea, Ioan Moga, Ioan I. Nistor, Sabin Opreanu, Petre P. Panaitescu, Giorge Pascu, Coriolan Petranu, Emil Pop, Sextil Pușcariu, Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, Alexandru Rosetti, Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu, Dan Simonescu, Laurian Someșan, etc.

L'ouvrage bénéficie, grâce aux efforts de l'auteur, de véritables « instruments de travail », comme par exemple : « Études et communications » (pp. 505–506) ; « Comptes rendus et notes bibliographiques » (pp. 507–520) ; « Tableau synoptique, par ordres alphabétique et chronologique » (pp. 521–536) ; « Tableau synoptique, par ordres chronologique et alphabétique » (pp. 537–550) ; « Statistique » : « I. Correspondants, par ordres alphabétique et chronologique »

(pp. 551–552) « II. Correspondants, par ordres chronologique et alphabétique » (pp. 552–554); « III. Dates de naissance, par ordres chronologique et alphabétique » (pp. 554–555); « IV. Domaines d'activité scientifique, par ordres alphabétique et chronologique » (p. 555); « V. Institutions et périodiques, par ordre alphabétique et par localité » (pp. 555–556). Nous ne pouvons omettre, dans ce contexte de la lecture, la section très utile « Index » (pp. 557–574), assurant un parcours aisé de l'ouvrage.

Sans aucun doute, le volume ci-présent, qui a toutes les qualités d'un « Handbuch », montre, par le contenu de l'échange épistolaire entre Fritz Valjavec et toute une série de spécialistes roumains, en général, les efforts culturels de la Roumanie de l'entre-deux-guerres et, tout spécialement, de l'historiographie roumaine de l'entre-deux-guerres, de s'intégrer en Europe à une époque où l'histoire exerçait les attributs d'un « instrumentum regni ». Les historiens Rudolf Gräf et Stelian Mândruț nous offrent une édition exemplaire, centrée sur l'horizon culturel d'une personnalité de la taille de Fritz Valjavec, qui a joué un rôle dans l'historiographie « militante » national-socialiste, et aussi sur les aspirations culturelles d'un nombre de spécialistes roumains qui désiraient s'affirmer en Europe. D'où la signification à part de cette édition, pour laquelle les éditeurs de Cluj méritent des félicitations, leur démarche académique marquant un moment spécial dans l'archéologie et l'évolution des rapports entre l'Allemagne et un État du sud-est de l'Europe – la Roumanie.

*Iacob Mârza*  
*Université « 1<sup>er</sup> décembre 1918 », Alba Iulia, Roumanie*  
*imarza@uab.ro*

ANTONY PENROSE, *The Boy Who Bit Picasso* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2010), 48 pp. + ill.

In addition to art publications, the world-famous Thames & Hudson, like any prestigious publishing house, can afford to play games occasionally. This is the case with the recent book signed by Antony Penrose, son of the famous photographer Lee Miller and of the no less famous surrealist painter, poet and art historian Roland Penrose. Antony Penrose was not unknown to the public, as he had already published several books of success, re-edited: *The Lives of Lee Miller* (1985) and *Lee Miller's War* (2005). Not excluding the informative documentary element so characteristic of his writings, Antony Penrose now offers an object-book, a toy-book, in which he reveals a fragment of his childhood memories. To enhance the flavor, he employs the colloquial style of a little boy, who speaks of

his game playing experiences with a famous artist, just as playful as he was: Pablo Picasso. To emphasize this playful note of the age of questions, the font changes from one paragraph to another, or even in the middle of words, to highlight names, information or events, witnessed or created by him. By the alternation of italics and capitals, which often occurs in the hesitant writing of primary school children, the author means to indicate that both the composition and calligraphy belong to a child. The book is rich in illustrations of all kinds: children drawings, pictures of Farley Farm, the family's farm in East Sussex, domestic animals raised there, little Tony's toys – some made by Picasso himself –, reproductions of works of Picasso given to the Penroses, the artist's studio crammed with his works and himself in the process of creation, or in the company of friends, and many photographs of the protagonists – the author, tiny and smiling, Picasso looking into the camera with his piercing dark eyes, Lee Miller with the camera in her hand, but wearing the fake nose of a clown, the child and his adult friend wearing the same large nose topped by a pair of large framed eyeglasses. Many of these pictures, although originally black and white, were colored in some areas – the rubber boots and doggie in the foreground, or the shoes and the cap of the child who, leaning forward, shows his head between his legs, with a funny look, in order to emphasize the playful nature of the illustration.

Like any well-bred child, the author introduces himself from the first page, with the simplest sentence in the world: "My name is Tony." Then, he plunges directly into the subject: "When I was a little boy, living in a farm in Sussex, England, I had the most extraordinary friend. He had deep dark eyes, a wide smile and absolutely amazing hands. His hands were absolutely amazing because he could make paintings and sketches and sculptures and collages and pots and plates and many more." Repetition, often resorted to by the "diarist," is also a feature of childhood language.

Picasso visited the Penroses at their farm, in 1950. Little Tony explains here that the artist was from Spain but living in France, and the author inserts a map of the two countries, brightly colored, on which he draws the route and the means of transportation employed (plane, car, ship). Once arrived at the farm, Picasso asked to see the animals, the cows, and especially the bull – as he was a great lover of bullfighting. But William the bull was gentle, not aggressive like Spanish bulls. During the same evening, inspired by what he had seen, the artist drew several bulls with wings, which he gave to the hosts as a present. The framed work is still hanging at Farley Farm.

Picasso spoke no English, and little Tony no French. However, the two got along perfectly. They both played with the cheerfulness of young age, although several decades separated one from the other and the artist could very well have been the boy's grandfather: tweed jacket, neck tie, and beret on the head, he would

get down on all fours, next to the child, and mimic bullfighting. They would frolic all morning, inside and outside the house. During one such frolic, Tony bit the painter in the heat of the game, and Picasso bit him back, hard enough to make him burst into tears. Over the years, he no longer remembered the story, but his mother told it, very humorously, adding that she had heard Picasso mutter in French: “Good Lord! This is the first Englishman that I have ever bitten!” The friendship between the two did not suffer from this incident. Knowing the artist had a family, when his father left for Paris to meet with the painter, Tony sent Claude Picasso – who was the same age with him – a red double-decker toy bus. When Roland Penrose returned from the trip, he delivered a present from Claude: a woman drawn by Picasso on a piece of wood. This became one of the central pieces of Tony’s favorite toys: Noah’s Ark with animals carved in wood.

When they all visited Picasso in France, Tony was delighted to play with the artist’s children and with his sculptures too, as his mind could easily distinguish playfulness there: the monkey, whose head was made of a broken toy car of Claude’s, the little girl with the jump rope, made of two wicker baskets, and the baby in its pram, made from several pieces of broken pottery. The painter was very clement with children, and he used to let them play among and even with his works. But he would get very upset if a grown-up ever touched them.

Little Tony was shocked at the disarray in the artist’s house and studio, and asked his mother whether he had moved there recently and did not have the time to put things away. He was even more amazed upon learning that he liked to keep them like that. As a great lover of animals and birds, the painter had a pet goat, Esmeralda, who slept in a crate in front of his room, and he kept the windows open for the pigeons to fly in and about the room, which fascinated the child, as back home at the farm he was not allowed to bring animals into the house. Another fascinating thing about Picasso was that he loved disguise. He used to keep a lot of masks on a table, and he would invite his guests to use them, which would make a carnival on the spot. Tony changed his appearance often, trying to surprise his host with his funny disguises.

Several years later, when Roland Penrose went back to France to meet the artist with the intention of writing a monograph – the first that appeared in the UK –, Picasso inquired about his young friend. He learned that the boy had been sent to a boarding school and was rather unhappy there. To soothe his homesickness, Picasso sent him a drawing featuring a bull, a centaur, and a flute player. The drawing was highly appreciated by Tony, and it managed to cheer him up. It has never left him since, and it appears in the book as one of the most valuable works ever sent to him with a dedication.

After offering specific information on the work of the artist, who in his long career produced about 2,000 paintings, 7,000 sketches, and 1,000 sculptures, the

author ends his tale in the same playful tone in which his dialogue with his readers had begun: “Today [Picasso] is one of the most famous artists in the world ... but to me, he will always be the most amazing friend, and I hope that now he is yours too.”

*The Boy Who Bit Picasso* is an atypical and sparkling monograph *in nuce*, a history of everyday life in the artistic milieu in the eyes of a child, a playful excuse to present another image of Picasso, through the apparently simple, but so refreshing and relevant observations of a child. Along with his father, Tony Penrose keeps precedence in the family: he makes the great French artist known not through the analytical rigor of the parent – author of the monograph *Picasso: His Life and Work* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1958) – but through the emotional perception of the child. In addition to the anecdotal information provided, the value of the book resides in the way it was written: by an adult who has preserved the innocence of the child, and who is able to express himself exactly like a child, without emphasis. Antony Penrose’s book is a delightful reading for children and parents alike.

Adrian-Silvan Ionescu

“G. Oprescu” Art History Institute, Bucharest, Romania

adriansilvan@hotmail.com

NICOLAE-ȘERBAN TANAȘOCA, *Balkanologie și politică în România secolului XX : Victor Papacostea în documente din arhiva Securității și din arhiva personală* (Bucarest : Editura Biblioteca Bucureștilor, 2010), 328 pp.

La restitution de Victor Papacostea, presque à une moitié de siècle après sa disparition (1962), devrait représenter un effort intellectuel solide et conjugué des chercheurs de l’histoire et de l’espace balkaniques, pour des motifs tenant à l’évolution institutionnelle, scientifique, éditoriale, théorique et humaine de l’étude de l’Europe du Sud-Est en Roumanie au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle et au début du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Et peut-être que la direction de l’Institut d’études sud-est européennes et l’Académie roumaine voudraient prendre en considération la possibilité de donner à l’institution en cause le nom de celui invoqué, en récompense tardive, mais très méritée, de ses efforts, en tant que fondateur de la balkanologie roumaine.

Le volume de Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, *Balkanologie et politique dans la Roumanie du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle : Victor Papacostea dans des documents des archives de la Securitate et de l’archive personnelle*, est en effet une collection d’études dédiées à l’activité professionnelle de Victor Papacostea. Il réunit, ce qui le définit

comme un événement éditorial, plusieurs documents, pour la plupart inédits, en provenance surtout des archives de la Securitate, qui suivent méticuleusement le quotidien à ne pas envier de celui qui retourne des prisons communistes au « repaire de réactionnaires » du 19 rue Caragea Vodă, immeuble nationalisé, ayant appartenu auparavant à la famille.

N.-Ș. Tanașoca invoque les deux moments institutionnels de début de l'étude de l'évolution du sud-est européen en Roumanie : 1913 – la création de l'Institut d'études sud-est européennes, sous la direction de N. Iorga, et 1937 – la création de l'Institut de recherches balkaniques (depuis 1943 financé par le budget de l'État), sous la direction de Victor Papacostea. L'avènement du régime totalitaire communiste a mené en 1948 à la dissolution de l'Académie roumaine, des instituts de recherche et des anciennes structures d'éducation dans les lycées et les universités. L'auteur insiste sur les motifs *idéologiques* et *politiques* (y compris de politique étrangère) conduisant à la liquidation de l'institut fondé par Victor Papacostea : le stalinisme s'opposait à la balkanologie, ne voulant point soutenir la diversification du camp communiste, occupé par l'Armée rouge dans sa plus grande partie. En plus, les faibles intentions de collaboration bilatérale bulgare-yougoslave (par l'intermédiaire de deux communistes fervents, Georgi Dimitrov et Josip Broz Tito), sans l'information immédiate et détaillée du Kremlin, auraient provoqué l'irritation de Staline et l'impulsion de liquider toute initiative régionale (pp. 9–10). Il est intéressant de noter, comme il résulte de l'étude présente et des documents annexés, que l'autre régime totalitaire de l'Allemagne fasciste avait condamné dans les mêmes termes l'initiative de considérer le Sud-Est comme une région unie par sa diversité, dans le numéro de janvier 1944 de l'un de ses journaux officiels, *Das Reich* (pp. 158–159).

Les efforts de détente du régime staliniste roumain, surtout après la retraite des troupes soviétiques (1958), ont conduit aussi aux soi-disant actions de réévaluation et de libéralisation des recherches scientifiques humanistes : rien d'autre que l'effort de récupérer, par le chantage ou par la collaboration consentie librement, quelques noms et quelques œuvres d'avant la guerre, pour crayonner une façade nationaliste du régime, en essayant de légitimer le pouvoir totalitaire en face des évolutions de Moscou. Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca nous rappelle dans ce contexte le moment 8–14 juillet 1962, quelques jours après la disparition prématurée de Victor Papacostea, du colloque international sur le thème des civilisations balkaniques, organisé à Sinaia, sous les auspices de l'UNESCO. À cette occasion – nous dit l'auteur – les anciens concepts balkaniques ont été relancés : les civilisations régionales, l'unité dans la diversité, les facteurs d'unité et de diversité balkanique, l'union linguistique balkanique (pp. 10–11). L'auteur trouve des explications tenant des évolutions du système des relations internationales dans les efforts des dirigeants du régime totalitaire roumain, visant à récupérer la tradition de l'institut créé en 1937 : la réévaluation par l'URSS des

rapports de la « guerre froide », la réconciliation entre Moscou et Belgrade, la reconnaissance par le Kremlin du droit de chaque pays de développer le socialisme de sa manière propre, la tentative de N. S. Khrouchtchev de consacrer une zone dénucléarisée (de manière propagandiste) dans les Balkans (p. 11). Ces ouvertures ont conduit en 1963 à la création de l'Institut d'études sud-est européennes de l'Académie de la République populaire roumaine et de la *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, sous la direction de Mihai Berza (jusqu'en 1978).

Personnellement, en essayant de trouver une réponse à l'action de ré-institution, par le régime communiste, de la science balkanologique roumaine, je ne peux pas prendre en considération une attitude idéologique et politique de Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej et des dirigeants du Parti ouvrier roumain face aux projets soviétiques de reconstruction institutionnelle du camp socialiste. Plus exactement, le « plan Valev », qui visait une réforme économique au sein du bloc soviétique, ne pouvait être agréé à Bucarest, pour la simple raison qu'il aurait annulé un grand nombre de privilèges du pouvoir des dirigeants locaux. Dans ce sens, l'État et le Parti ont encouragé les poussées de nationalisme dans l'idéologie officielle, y compris par l'appel aux valeurs authentiques du passé. La théorie fondamentale de Victor Papacostea au sujet de l'espace balkanique, notamment l'unité dans la diversité, pouvait être utilisée exemplairement par l'État communiste face aux tentatives du Kremlin d'annuler l'indépendance limitée des États communistes.

Les documents – pour la plupart inédits – viennent de différentes sources et archives, et il aurait été salutaire de voir quelques-uns d'entre eux encadrés dans leurs époques et leurs contextes respectifs. C'est le cas, par exemple, de l'exceptionnel *Referat pentru Ministerul Afacerilor Externe, în vederea Conferinței de Pace, cu privire la restabilirea frontierei româno-bulgare din Dobrogea (1945–1946)* (Rapport à l'intention du ministère des Affaires étrangères, en vue de la Conférence de Paix, au sujet du rétablissement de la frontière roumano-bulgare en Dobroudja, 1945–1946) (pp. 201–212), publié pour la première fois intégralement et qui mériterait une analyse appliquée dans l'histoire diplomatique roumaine, étant le seul mémoire qui soutient avec des arguments historiques et géopolitiques la rectification des frontières du Traité de Craiova de 1940. Sur des bases présentées de manière judicieuse, nous pourrions ajouter : le déplacement de la population roumaine de la zone de Vidin de l'autre côté du Danube, en Roumanie, en échange d'une zone de 2 000 km carrés, que la Bulgarie aurait cédée (la ligne Turtucaia-Silistra-Caraomer-Kavarna-Baltchik) (p. 211). Il existe d'autres textes aussi, d'une valeur similaire, produits dans des étapes historiques diverses, par exemple *Schiță istorică privind relațiile româno-grecești* (Esquisse historique au sujet des relations roumano-grecques), élaborée en 1958 pour l'Institut roumain de relations internationales, de toute évidence à l'intention des dirigeants du Parti et de l'État (pp. 212–241), ou *Referatul pentru Ministerul Afacerilor Externe privind situația*

*aromânilor sau macedoromânilor (1941)* (Rapport à l'intention du ministère des Affaires étrangères au sujet de la situation des Aroumains ou Macédo-Roumains, 1941) (pp. 184–189).

Tout aussi importants, bien que d'une autre facture, sont les documents recueillis des archives de la Securitate. Victor Papacostea l'homme, avec une carrière brisée par son arrestation et emprisonnement dans le camp de Sighet (1950), avec un destin mis sous le signe de la pénurie matérielle, surveillé de près par les agents et les informateurs de la Securitate, nous apparaît dans une lumière très diverse. Selon la règle générale du temps, les amis les plus proches de « l'objectif » relaient périodiquement à la police politique toute rencontre ou discussion – intime, professionnelle ou politique – pour obtenir la qualification de bon citoyen. Une note qui me semble dévoiler de manière généreuse la structure de Victor Papacostea a été rédigée par « Barbu Rîmniceanu », un fin intellectuel informateur, le 26 janvier 1962 : « La source (l'informateur de la Securitate, n. n.) tient à préciser que dans les 70 pages lues et rédigées en 1961 (non pas en 1938), il n'a rencontré aucune forme précise et élémentaire (entrée dans le vocabulaire usuel de chaque citoyen) telle que : la Roumanie des bourgeois et des grands propriétaires, capitalisme, socialisme, bourgeoisie, marxisme-léninisme. De telles formules sont évitées avec soin, c'est pourquoi les matériels semblent écrits en dehors du temps, en dehors de tout système socio-économique, comme par un historien 50 ou 80 années auparavant, qui n'aurait jamais entendu parler de marxisme-léninisme. Ce n'est pas un problème de vocabulaire, mais de conception. Il se reflète dans toutes les thèses que l'auteur développe, en présentant l'histoire balkanique tout au long des siècles » (pp. 81–82).

Très savoureux en tant que relation quotidienne et très précieux comme document de délation typique est un texte – exceptionnel dans tout registre de lecture – du 1<sup>er</sup> février 1956, rédigé par une colocataire (Silvia Iliescu) voulant incriminer toute la famille Papacostea (qui s'était « insinuée dans l'immeuble du 19 rue Caragea Vodă ») comme « une dangereuse nichée de réactionnaires hostiles à la classe ouvrière et au régime socialiste » (pp. 57–61). Qu'est-ce l'on pouvait reprocher aux membres de cette famille, la plupart d'entre eux harcelés de manière politique et pénale, avec de maigres moyens de subsistance et des perspectives minces de jamais pouvoir reprendre leurs carrières ? « Ils répandent des bruits et lancent des injures à l'adresse du régime populaire démocratique et promettent de hautes positions aux gens de leur entourage, pour lorsqu'ils retourneront au pouvoir. Ils incitent le personnel de service qui habite au sous-sol de l'immeuble en le mettant en état d'ébriété et en le forçant d'adresser des insultes aux gens honnêtes qui luttent pour la mise en pratique de la ligne du Parti. Ils provoquent, chicanent et menacent ouvertement tous les locataires qui ne font pas partie de leur groupe de réactionnaires, en se conduisant comme des propriétaires voulant se débarrasser à tout prix des locataires qui ne sont pas à leur goût, afin de pouvoir

satisfaire toutes leurs fantaisies. (...) Qu'ils soient punis de façon exemplaire les instigateurs, les provocateurs de ce repaire de réactionnaires qui calomnient et défient notre régime démocratique populaire et qui, sous le masque de gens paisibles, ne pense en réalité qu'à se venger et à prendre leur revanche » (pp. 60–61).

Le volume dédié à la personnalité et à l'œuvre de Victor Papacostea recouvre aussi, de manière fragmentaire, son activité politique sous les gouvernements Constantin Sănătescu et Nicolae Rădescu (novembre 1944 – mars 1945), pour laquelle les portes de la prison se sont ouvertes pour lui deux fois, sans que jamais il souffre de condamnation judiciaire.

La grande relevance des documents mis en circulation par Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca réside en ce qu'ils peuvent compléter – et doivent le faire, peut-être dans des conditions éditoriales plus généreuses – une histoire intellectuelle et institutionnelle très importante du temps du régime totalitaire communiste roumain.

*Florin Anghel*  
*Université « Ovidius », Constanța, Roumanie*  
*fl\_anghel@yahoo.com*

CRISTIAN VASILE, *Politicile culturale comuniste în timpul regimului Gheorghiu-Dej* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2011), 342 pp.

A historical analysis of the cultural policies during the period of the first Romanian communist leader, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, offers not only valuable insights into the cultural milieu but also a privileged outlook on the whole society. So far, historians have focused generally on the political side of the Romanian communist history and have neglected the evolution and dynamic of the cultural space, which remains a hinterland, usually explored by literary, art and music historians whose examination focus is for the most part on aesthetic criteria.

In the present book, which continues to a large degree a previous one, about literature and arts in communist Romania within the context of the Sovietization process [Cristian Vasile, *Literatura și artele în România comunistă, 1948–1953* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2010)], Cristian Vasile does primarily an institutional history by focusing on the way cultural policies were developed in Romania in the 1950s (after Stalin's death) and early 1960s, and on how various cultural sectors and the cultural bureaucracy functioned at that time. The author reconstructs a whole institutional labyrinth which is dynamic, but not in the sense of departing from the Stalinist way of conceiving culture. In the 1950s and the 1960s, it is well known that in communist Romania, destalinization was not the course of action as in other communist countries. Cristian Vasile aptly explores the situation of the

cultural space, where the new ideological and propagandistic directives related to the promotion of national values were first felt.

The historical sources used for this research consist mostly of archival materials from the Propaganda and Agitation Department, as well as documents from other collections preserved at the Romanian National Archives, complemented with memoirs and oral history interviews. It should be pointed out that this book could not have been written earlier, simply because this archival material pertaining to the communist period was not available to researchers. The setting up of the *Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship in Romania*, to which the author was the scientific secretary, fostered the opening of the archives and this book is a result of this favorable context. Therefore, archival materials constitute the main source of this book and the way the author handles the documents is exemplary. The analytical and balanced style makes the text an excellent piece of scholarship. Moreover, this contribution is also a valuable comparative effort because the situation in Romania is not isolated from the evolution and transformation of the cultural spaces from the Soviet Union and the rest of the communist bloc. In order to do this, Cristian Vasile draws on an ample secondary literature.

In the first part of the book, the author concentrates on the institutional setting by exploring the transformation/reconfiguration of the bodies responsible for the cultural life into a Ministry of Culture, which was directed in the period 1953–1957 by Constanța Crăciun, and analyzes the Romanian cultural legislative framework after Stalin's death. The institutionalization of censorship through the DGPT (General Direction for Press and Printing), the Romanian equivalent of the Soviet *Glavlit*, is also studied. Then, Cristian Vasile continues with a historical economical account. A proper investigation of the cultural policies during Gheorghiu-Dej's regime could not have been made without a thorough examination of the financial organization of Romanian culture. The level of resources allocated to culture and the legislation that regulated the way benefits were granted to intellectuals and cultural bureaucrats is an important part of this institutional history. It should be mentioned that contrary to what was generally thought regarding the contribution of the communist regime to the cultural sector, the author's analysis reveals that these resources were rather scarce and even inferior to those allocated to the cultural sector before communism.

Yet, ideologically the new cultural products were supposed to have a crucial role in the transformation of the old society into a new communist one. The third chapter, which explores the range of printed books for the masses and their distribution within the context of the reorganization of the state publishing system and the surveillance of the Agitprop Sector, also reveals the ideological transformations of Romanian communism during this decade. It is a short period, but Cristian Vasile succeeds in capturing, as he puts it, "the instrumentalization of

the national values and sentiments” which appeared together with a liberalization tendency in the cultural space. The author proceeds by analyzing different cultural domains – literature, theatre, cinema, painting and sculpture –, to which he dedicates particular chapters, focusing mainly on the role of institutions, cultural bureaucrats (the most prominent figure being Leonte Răutu), cultural actors and their relationship with the political power.

For instance, in the period under scrutiny, theatre was considered an ideological weapon whose aim was “to develop the artistic and cultural level of a larger public and direct it towards the spirit of the socialist democracy.” However, the official political-ideological requirements were not always followed. Interestingly enough, the author discovers, this time through oral history sources, that besides the official programs, there were the so-called “unofficial performances” organized by actors and having a different repertoire, which were more appealing to the public. Cinema was another important area in which the communist regime invested most. Cristian Vasile convincingly captures the increasing direct influence of the political power in this domain, from the promotion of Lica Gheorghiu, the daughter of Gheorghiu-Dej, as an actress, to the growing influence of Nicolae Ceaușescu starting from the 1960s, and the beginning of the national cinematographic epopee.

The moments of liberalization of the cultural sector are documented as well, for instance, the 1956 Paris tour of the Bucharest National Theatre or the Brâncuși exhibitions organized in Bucharest and Craiova. Despite all these, as Cristian Vasile concludes, the Romanian communist cultural sector and especially its actors were not able to generate a reformist intellectual movement, of course within the framework of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, as it was the case in Hungary (1956) or Czechoslovakia (1968). It is an important observation and this inability was generated as it is implied in the book by the way the cultural space was organized and the cultural policies shaped. In Gheorghiu-Dej’s period, instead of a destalinization of Romanian communism, the shift that could be noticed is from the impersonal and internationalist Stalinist model to the promotion of the Romanian national values. The author clearly points out that the intellectual origins of *protochronism* that would flourish during Nicolae Ceaușescu’s regime could be identified in the cultural policies implemented in the period of his predecessor. Cristian Vasile’s book is a valuable contribution to the study of Romanian communism and a continuation of this investigation to cover Nicolae Ceaușescu’s period is much needed.

*Eugen Stancu*  
*University of Bucharest, Romania*  
*eugen.stancu@gmail.com*