

# “Un program de muncă”: Constantin Moisil and the Founding of “Revista Arhivelor”, 1923-1926

Paul E. Michelson

## Introduction

In 1924, part one of the first volume of a new publication devoted to Romanian archivalistics appeared under the title “*Revista Arhivelor: Arhivistică. Cronologie. Diplomatică. Eraldică<sup>1</sup>. Genealogie. Instituțiuni. Miniaturistică. Paleografie. Sigilografie*”. It was prefaced by an agenda-like “*Un program de muncă*”<sup>2</sup> signed by Constantin Moisil.

“*Nu sunt de părerea acelor arhivari / I do not share the view of those*”, Moisil wrote, “[...] *cari susțin că menirea unei arhive publice se mărginește la adunarea, păstrarea în bune condițiuni și catalogarea cât mai sistematică [...] a prețiosului material [...] ce se găsește în depozitele ei. Este în adevăr și frumos și util să poți avea arhivele publice bine organizate, cu localuri proprii, cu inventarii și cataloage sistematice, cu materialul orânduit în chipul cel mai practic. Este frumos și util, dar în acelaș timp este și cea dintâi și cea mai de căpetenie datorie a oricărui director de arhivă și a personalului însărcinat cu grija ei. Dar atâta nu ajunge. O arhivă [...] nu trebuie să rămână o instituție moartă. Personalul ei, [...] are obligațiunea morală de a contribui cu informațiile sale la cunoașterea, lămurirea și deslegarea problemelor istoriei naționale. / [...] who argue that the task of a public archive is limited to the gathering, the maintenance in good conditions, and the systematic cataloguing [...] of the precious material [...] found in its repositories. It is, in truth, both excellent and useful to have well-organized public archives, with their own facilities, with systematic inventories and catalogues, with the material arrayed in the most practical fashion. It is excellent and useful and at the same time it is the primary obligation of the director of any archive and of the personnel charged with its care. But this is not enough. An archive [...] cannot remain a dead institution. Its personnel [...] has the moral obligation to contribute with their knowledge to the awareness, the explanation, and the solution of the problems of national history.*”<sup>3</sup>

In order to do this, Moisil continued, “*o activitate exclusiv birocratică [...] nu este suficientă; ea trebuie însoțită neapărat și de o activitate științifică / an exclusively bureaucratic approach [...] is insufficient; it must be accompanied by a scientific approach*”<sup>4</sup>. This was a serious problem, according to Moisil, because

---

<sup>1</sup> This was subsequently amended in vol. 2 to “Heraldică”.

<sup>2</sup> Constantin Moisil, *Un program de muncă*, “Revista Arhivelor”. 1 (1924-1926), 1, p. 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*.

"până acum arhivistica a fost cu totul neglijată [în România], iar studiul documentelor, peceților, stemelor, ornamenticeii manuscriselor n'a luat încă desvoltarea cuvenită [...] / up to the present, archivistics as been completely neglected [in Romania], while the study of documents, seals, coats of arms, and illuminated documents have not had the appropriate development [...]"<sup>5</sup>

The solution? "*Arhivele Statului au nu numai puțința, dar și datoria* / The State Archives not only has the means but also the obligation" to carry out the scholarly effort required. It, of course, had the raw materials needed. In addition, the existence of regional archive affiliates made access to such materials easier than it had ever been before<sup>6</sup>. So what was lacking in the Romanian context? "*Arhivele Statului trebuie în primul rând, să-și formeze un corp de funcționari specialiști* / In the first place, the State Archives need to develop a specialized corps of archivists." Secondly, "*administrația centrală a acestor arhive trebuie să provoace în pătura noastră intelectuală un interes cât mai mare față de aceste importante rămășițe culturale* / the central administration of these archives needs to provoke among our intellectual class a greater interest in these important cultural remains."<sup>7</sup>

This, in turn, would necessitate two further measures: 1) the creation of an archivist school to prepare specialists in archivistics and paleography, and 2) the publication of a scholarly journal to encourage such study and to disseminate the results. In addition, Moisil proposed 3) the establishment of a workshop for the study of manuscript ornamentation and the commercialization of such ornamentation, and 4) the creation of a standing exhibition (or museum) of documents, seals, coats of arms, miniatures, and other archivist items to promote public awareness and interest in the material remains of the Romanian past. These activities would be, of course, in addition to the Archives' ongoing task of cataloguing materials and the editing of historical documents. The goal of such efforts would be to raise the level of awareness of scholars and the general public of the holdings of Romania's historical repositories "*pentru ca viața, faptele și cultura strămoșilor noștri să fie cât mai bine cunoscute* / so that the life, deeds, and culture of our ancestors can be much

---

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*. This is, in general terms, only somewhat true, as one cannot ignore the work of Ioan Bogdan, Dimitrie Onciul, Constantin Giurescu, N. Iorga, and others prior to World War I. See N. Iorga, *Despre adunarea și tipărirea izvoarelor relative la Istoria Românilor. Rolul și misiunea Academiei Române*, in *Prinos lui D. A. Sturdza*, Bucharest, 1903, p. 1-127; *Idem*, *Note critice asupra culegerilor de documente interne românești*, Bucharest, 1903; the observations on Romanian historiography made by Ioan Bogdan, *Istoriografia română și probleme ei actuale*, Bucharest, 1903 and Constantin C. Giurescu, *Considerații asupra istoriografiei românești în ultimii douăzeci de ani*, "Revista Istorică", 12 (1926), p. 137-185; my study *The Birth of Critical Historiography in Romania: The Contributions of Ioan Bogdan, Dimitrie Onciul, and Constantin Giurescu*, "Analele Universității București. Istorie", 32 (1983), p. 59-76; and Al. Zub's *De la istoria critică la criticism (Istoriografia română sub semnul modernității)* (revised edition), Bucharest, 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Moisil, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 2.

better understood"<sup>8</sup>. Moisil concluded with the explicit hope that these steps would follow as a matter of course as the newly unified Romanian national state developed in the period after the Great War. In short, the state archives were called upon to promote and foster the national consolidation of Romania in the post-World War era.

Who was Constantin Moisil? What was his role in interwar Romanian cultural development? And how successful was he in contributing to the achievement of the research agenda outlined in his "*program de muncă*"?

### Constantin Moisil (1876-1958)<sup>9</sup>

Constantin Moisil was born in Transylvania in 1876, the grandson of a front rank Romanian priest-educator-civic leader in Năsăud, Grigore Moisil (1816-1891). His father, Constantin Gr. Moisil (1842-1939), was a teacher in Năsăud and held a doctorate from the University of Vienna, while his uncle, Iuliu Moisil (1859-1947) was an educator, school director, and later a cultural functionary in the Romanian Kingdom<sup>10</sup>.

The younger Constantin Moisil followed a not-unusual trajectory taken by academically talented young Transylvanian Romanians with similar backgrounds coming of age in the latter years of the Austro-Hungarian domination of Transylvania<sup>11</sup>. After completing secondary school in Năsăud, a center of nationalist Romanian culture<sup>12</sup>, in 1894 he moved across the Carpathians to attend the University of Bucharest, from which he graduated in 1898<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>9</sup> What follows draws on Lucian Predescu, *Moisil, Constantin*, in Idem, *Enciclopedia Cugetarea*. Bucharest, 1940, p. 562; Ilie Țabrea, *Constantin Moisil: pionier al numismaticii românești*, Bucharest, 1970; Emilia Poștăriță, *Constantin Moisil, in Figuri de arhiviști* (ed. by Mihail Fănescu), Bucharest, 1971, p. 265-295; Constantin Preda, *Moisil, Constantin*, in *Enciclopedia istoriografiei românești* (ed. by Ștefan Ștefănescu), Bucharest, 1978, p. 224-225; *Moisil, Constantin*, in *Dicționar al științelor speciale ale istoriei. Arhivistică, cronologie, diplomatică, genealogie, heraldică, paleografie, sigilografie* (ed. by Ionel Gal), Bucharest, 1982, p. 168-170; Viorica Moisil, *O familie ca oricare alta. Corespondența lui Grigore C. Moisil cu familia* Bucharest, 1989 and *Moisil, Constantin*, in Dorina N. Rusu, *Membrii Academiei Române 1866-1999. Dicționar* (second edition), Bucharest, 1999, p. 345.

<sup>10</sup> Iuliu Moisil was also the author of a useful study of the contributions of Transylvanian Romanians in the Romanian Kingdom before World War I: *Românii ardeleni din vechiul Regat și activitatea lor până la războiul întregirii neamului*, in *Transilvania, Banatul, Crișana, Marmureșul 1918-1928*, Bucharest, 1929, p. 1347-1396. In retirement, he was a founder and the first director in 1931 of the *Muzeul Năsăudean*, which in 1937 became a sub-directorate of the State Archives for Năsăud. A biographical sketch is available by Ion Rusu, *Iuliu Moisil*, in *Figuri de arhiviști cit.*, p. 299-311.

<sup>11</sup> The infamous Memorandum trial took place in Cluj in 1894, less than a month before Moisil's graduation from high school.

<sup>12</sup> For example, George Coșbuc, Liviu Rebreanu, and Nicolae Drăgan were from the same area.

<sup>13</sup> Moisil developed and expanded his family's circle: his son was Grigore Moisil, one of Romania's most distinguished mathematicians and a member of the Academy. His daughter Florica married to another future Academician, Emil Condurache, and his granddaughter is the historian

Between 1898 to 1910, Constantin Moisil served as a high school teacher in two provincial towns of the Romanian Kingdom, Focșani (1898-1899) and Tulcea in the Dobrogea (1899-1910), before transferring to a similar position back in București. Beginning in 1905, he was an assiduous contributor on a wide variety of topics to the leading Romanian cultural publication of the times, "*Convorbiri Literare*", as well as to numerous other publications<sup>14</sup>.

Moisil's transfer back to the Romanian capital was due to his call to become the numismatic assistant in charge of the newly-founded *Cabinetul Numismatic* of the Academy Library (in 1910; in 1933, he was named chief of this office, a post which he held until his death). It was in the Dobrogea that Moisil's interest in numismatics and in archaeology had matured and flourished. Through this process, he formed a connection with the National Liberal Party leader and sometime Prime Minister, D. A. Sturdza. Sturdza was an numismatist and the long time secretary general of the Romanian Academy (1885-1914); he was now instrumental in bringing Moisil to București and the new *Cabinetul Numismatic*. (Sturdza was the nominal head of the Cabinetul until his death in 1914, followed by M. C. Sutzcu who died in 1933, when Moisil formally became the chief.)<sup>15</sup> This began the public phase of his numismatic activities<sup>16</sup>.

In 1913, Moisil became a member of the Romanian Numismatic Society (founded in 1903 and somewhat in disarray by the end of its first decade), and was charged with editing its "*Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române*"<sup>17</sup>. In 1920, he would add to this the editorship of another publication for the society, the "*Cronica Numismatică*" (after 1921 called the "*Cronica Numismatică și Arheologică*")<sup>18</sup>. And, in 1933 he became President of the Romanian Numismatic Society (succeeding M. C. Sutzcu), a position he also held until his death in 1958. As president, he initiated annual congresses throughout Romania (1933-1937) and served as a member of the International Committee of Historical Sciences' Numismatic Commission beginning in 1934<sup>19</sup>. Both activities were curtailed by the looming of World War II in the late 1930s.

Constantin Moisil was clearly the founder of professional numismatics in

---

Zoe Petre. The Moisils were related to other Romanian academic notables, including Constantin Daicoviciu, Virgil Vătășanu, Nicolae Drăgan, and Tudor Bugnariu.

<sup>14</sup> For a bibliography of Moisil's writings, see Ilie Țabrea, *Opera științifică a d-lui Const. Moisil*, "Revista Arhivelor", 3 (1939), Pt. 2, 8. p. 383-393; and Idem, *Moisil*, 1970, p. 118 ff. His principal publications were in numismatics.

<sup>15</sup> See Țabrea, *Moisil*, 1970, p. 34 ff. Ion Bianu, the director of the Academy Library from 1884 to 1935, was another transplanted Transylvanian.

<sup>16</sup> One result was a series of inventories or catalogues of numismatic collections published by Moisil in the Academy's *Creșterea Colecțiilor*, beginning with vol. 19 (1911), p. 362-385.

<sup>17</sup> He edited this journal from no. 19 (1913) through its final issue, no. 92-95 (1944-1947).

<sup>18</sup> Moisil edited the entire series from vol. 1 (1920) through its final appearance in 1945.

<sup>19</sup> In April 1936, in conjunction with a meeting in Bucharest of the International Committee on Historical Sciences, Moisil hosted several sessions led and attended by members of the Numismatic Commission.

Romania<sup>20</sup>, was the first to classify Geto-Dacian money and devoted a good deal of effort to the study of medieval Romanian coins<sup>21</sup>. He was also the founder of several other auxiliary disciplines of history in Romania, including paleography as well as the study of medals, seals, and heraldry<sup>22</sup>.

By 1919, Moisil's accomplishments were of a sufficient magnitude that he was elected a corresponding member of the Romanian Academy. (In 1948, he became a full member.) Thus, in the fall of 1923, when he was named Director General of the Romanian State Archives, he was not exactly an unknown. On the other hand – though he had obviously done a lot of work in archives (from those in Năsăud to Focșani to Bucharest to Vienna, Budapest, and Paris), had been a student of Dimitrie Onciul (who directed the State Archives from 1900 to 1923), and had studied both Latin and Slavic paleography in connection with his interest in numismatics – prior to 1923 Moisil had published virtually nothing dealing with archivistics and his selection was something of a surprise<sup>23</sup>.

Onciul's initial successor in 1923, Alexandru Lapedatu, a well-known professor of history at Cluj, had resigned almost immediately to become Minister of Religion and the Arts<sup>24</sup>. This led to an urgent search for a replacement conducted by the Ministry of Public Instruction (to which the State Archives were then subordinated) which produced highly favorable responses from the four Romanian universities and from specialists to the idea of Moisil's selection. His nomination was speedily confirmed, and his term in office began November 1, 1923<sup>25</sup>. It was in this position that he became the founder and *spiritus rector* of the new journal, "*Revista Arhivelor*".

---

<sup>20</sup> This point is emphasized by Țabrea, *Moisil*, 1970, p. 38 ff.

<sup>21</sup> See for example his doctoral thesis at the University of Cluj in 1924, published in 1926 as *Monetăria Țării-Românești în timpul dinastiei Basarabilor. Studiu istoric și numismatic*, "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională" (Cluj), 3 (1924-1925), p. 107-159, which according to Țabrea was the first doctorate in Romania dealing with numismatics (Țabrea, *Moisil*, 1970, p. 30). Though he never managed to finish a projected synthesis, his comprehensive, well-illustrated article, *Monetele României*, in *Enciclopedia României* (ed. by Dimitrie Gusti), Bucharest, 1938, I: *Statul*, p. 98-124, is a worthy substitute.

<sup>22</sup> Poștăriță, *Moisil*, 1971, p. 265. Since the focus here is on 1923-1926, no attempt has been made to detail Moisil's activities after 1926, such as his role in the founding in 1930 of the *București l'echi* society devoted to the study of the history and archaeology of the Romanian capital or the 100th anniversary celebration of the State Archives in 1931. See Țabrea, *Moisil*, 1970, *passim* for details.

<sup>23</sup> In the interim following Onciul's death, he had published *Arhivele Statului*, "Cronica Numismatică și Arheologică", 4 (1923), 3-4, p. 21-23, which I have not been able to see. He also published a necrology for *Dimitrie Onciul*, "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională" (Cluj), 2 (1923), p. 507-511.

<sup>24</sup> Lapedatu served in this post (except for two months in 1926) until 1928, when the National Liberal Party was ousted from power. His support for archives initiatives in the 1920s was important.

<sup>25</sup> See Țabrea, *Moisil*, pp. 63-64; and Poștăriță, *Moisil*, p. 267. He would hold this post until he was pensioned in 1938.

## "Un program de muncă", 1923-1926

The choice of Moisil proved to be a good one. He was a quick study and seemed to hit the ground running. His passion for the Romanian archives made him an able and active successor to Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu (1876-1900) and Dimitrie Onciul (1900-1923). Onciul had taken a number of steps to organize the archival remains of the greatly expanded Romanian state following World War I, but much of this, including a projected new law concerning the Romanian archives, was little more than in preliminary stages when Onciul's deteriorating health finally gave out.

The epoch was, of course, one of considerable optimism about the future of Romania. The unification in 1918 of the Romanian Kingdom (the *Regat*) with Transylvania, Bucovina, and Basarabia had marked the culmination of Romanian nationalist aspirations. The adoption in 1923 of a new constitution seemed to place Romania on the road to normalcy. Romanian scholarship was exploding with renewed vitality, production, and expansion.

Almost immediately Moisil launched an initiative for a new journal. Doubtless he saw this as providing a voice for promoting archival reforms and a vehicle for change<sup>26</sup>. In an appeal which he sent out in December 1923, he apprised specialists of the desire of the new regime at the State Archives to publish an archive-specific review under the title "*Revista Arhivelor*"<sup>27</sup>. His inaugural article in the journal, *Un program de muncă*, discussed above, laid out clearly his plans both for the journal and the State Archives.

Volume 1 (1924-1926), no. 1, of "*Revista Arhivelor*" appeared in 1924, consisting of 144 pages<sup>28</sup>. How well did this initial volume measure up to Moisil's research agenda? Contributions were generally of two kinds: pieces dealing with archival issues, such as an article by Paul Gore on *Arhivele*<sup>29</sup>. Gore, who was President of the Chişinău Archives Commission and who had been President of the Scientific Commission of the Bessarabian Archives before the World War, divided his contribution into two parts: 1) a synthesis on the history and practice of archivism (based on German, Austrian, French, and Russian sources); and 2) a discussion of the situation and future of the Bessarabian archives. The first section largely reflects many of the same general points made by Moisil's "*program*". The second provides an interesting commentary on Bessarabian archives, which never existed as a central resource as such, which in 1924 was scattered across different jurisdictions, and which had been damaged, lost, or destroyed by war, revolution, carelessness, and haphazard transfers. Gore included a description of twelve archival collections

<sup>26</sup> See Mihail Fănescu, *Revista Arhivelor (Seria veche) și Hrisovul*, "*Revista Arhivelor*", n. s., 12 (1969), 1, p. 327-328, on previous attempts at an archives journal in Romania.

<sup>27</sup> A copy of his letter of invitation, dated 15 December 1923, is published in Poştăriţă, *Moisil*, p. 269. See *Ibidem*, p. 290 ff. for additional details on "*Revista Arhivelor*".

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix One for a bibliographical description, and Fănescu, *op. cit.*, p331-343 for a cumulative table of contents.

<sup>29</sup> "*Revista Arhivelor*". 1 (1924-1926), 1, p. 8-20.

remaining wholly or in part in Chişinău. The most controversial part of Gore's presentation was his conclusion that all of these materials, in addition to others that might be collected in Bessarabia by donations or bequests should be added to the archives located in Bucovina and moved to Iaşi to form a "central Moldovan archive" coupled with a comprehensive "museum of Moldova". This was an idea that never gained much traction.

Other pieces on archival issues in this first number were shorter, such as the presentation of an 19<sup>th</sup> century overview of Transylvanian archives by Ioan Lupaş, *Un tablou statistic al arhivelor judeţene şi orăşeneşti din Transilvania*<sup>30</sup>; Paul Eder's *Über Archivfragen in den Friedensverträgen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*<sup>31</sup>, dealing with the freedom of archives<sup>31</sup>; a discussion of *Arhivele din Ardeal după războiu*<sup>32</sup>, by Ştefan Meteş, which contrasted post-war access to these archives with the lack of access in the pre-war era<sup>32</sup>; Gh. Nicolaiasa's *Cercetări de izvoare istorice în trecut*, presenting documents related to Paul Kisseleff's measures in the 1830s to modernize Romanian archives<sup>33</sup>; and V. Zaborovki's *Ceva despre Colecţia Hurmuzaki (Vol. LXI)*, a critique of errors and omissions<sup>34</sup>.

The second type of contribution to "*Revista Arhivelor*" were document-based, shorter (5-10 pages) works, usually a commentary followed by documents, such as the lead contribution to the first issue by one of the giants of Romanian historiography and a pioneer explorer of archives related to Romanian history at home and abroad, Nicolae Iorga: *Un mănunchiu de acte prahovene*<sup>35</sup>. Iorga briefly introduced ten documents from the 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries dealing with Scorţenii Prahovei, a *moşneni* village near Ploieşti, and then reproduced the documents. Though the documents dealt with relatively minor issues, Iorga noted that they were interesting for the various archaic usages and names as well as information about daily life in the pre-modern Romanian principalities.

Other pieces of this genre included: Zenobie Pâclişanu on *Cenzura cronicii lui Gh. Şincai*<sup>36</sup>, which discussed the circumstances under which Şincai's work on Romanian origins was suppressed and confiscated in 1814, including the text of the Habsburg censor's report (in Latin); N. A. Bogdan's *Pamflete politice împotriva lui Mihail Gr. Sturza-Vodă*<sup>37</sup>, which enumerated the first printed criticisms directed against a ruling Romanian prince in the 1848 era (they had previously been able to control the few presses in the Romanian Principalities); *Un dosar de porunci dela Ioan Sandu Sturza Voevod*<sup>38</sup>, by C. I. Karadja, found in the papers of Nicolae A.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 73-76.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 77-84.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 85-87.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 88-104.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 133-135.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 3-7.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 20-30.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 31-38.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 39-54.

Soutzo, made more valuable because most similar papers were destroyed in a fire in 1827; a document-centered study by Iuliu Tuducescu, *Comoara. Un act de superstiție petrecut în București, anchetat și judecat în anul 1796*<sup>39</sup>, dealing with the investigation of what we would now call an "urban legend": the sensation raised by tales of buried treasure in the Pantelimon district of Bucharest, including the official report; Sever Zotta's piece *Despre neamul Cantemireștilor*<sup>40</sup>, an example of much needed genealogical study; Alex. Băleanu's *O scrisoare din anul 1853 a profesorului Nifon Bălășescu către Grigore Ghica, Domnul Moldovei*<sup>41</sup>, dealt with school reform<sup>41</sup>; D. Mototolescu's coverage of *Herie* promoting comparative linguistic approaches to law<sup>42</sup>; and, finally, a series of entries that were basically documents: Victor Motogna, "*O publicație de amnestie militară în limba românească din anul 1797*"<sup>43</sup>; Gh. Ghibănescu, *Din documentele moșiei Urdești*<sup>44</sup>; M. Costăchescu, *Trei urice vechi moldovenești*<sup>45</sup>; Stoica Nicolaescu, *Ajutoare bănești și danii ale domnilor români către Mănăstirea Sf. Filoteiu din Muntele Athos*<sup>46</sup>; Mihail Stăncescu, *O delimitare de moșie la hotarul Țării-Românești în 1764*<sup>47</sup>; and a concluding section of "*Miscellanea*", including a necrology for Paul Eder and a bibliography of books received<sup>48</sup>.

The subsequent numbers of vol. 1 (no. 2, published in 1925, p. 145-300 and no. 3, published in 1926, p. 301-433) were equally impressive, including Virgil Zaborovschi's *Importanța arhivelor vieneze pentru istoria românilor*<sup>49</sup>, a scholarly piece utilizing an impressive bibliography<sup>49</sup>; Gr. Avakian's informative "*Arhivele rusești din Cetatea-Albă și importanța lor pentru istoria românilor*"<sup>50</sup>; Ioan C. Filitti's *Schitul Aninoasa-Cislău (Buzău) și neamul Doamnei Neaga*<sup>51</sup>, another heavily footnoted, meticulous study<sup>51</sup>; Nicolae M. Vlădescu's *Din trecutul boierimei românești. Vel-comisul Șerban Pârvu Vlădescu*<sup>52</sup>; Constantin Moisi's erudite "*Bule de aur sigiliare dela domnii Țării-Românești și ai Moldovei*"<sup>53</sup>; a survey of the "*Arhivele Bucovinei*", by Teodor Bălan<sup>54</sup>; and a descriptive catalog of *Orânduielei*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 55-60.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 61-72; "Revista Arhivelor", 1 (1924-1926), 3, p. 316-327.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, 1 (1924-1926), 1, p. 105-108.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 109-115.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 115-116.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 117-120.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 121-124.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 125-130.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 131-132.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 136-144.

<sup>49</sup> "Revista Arhivelor", 1 (1924-1926), 2, p. 145-176.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 189-200.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 210-226.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 227-248.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 249-265.

<sup>54</sup> "Revista Arhivelor", 1 (1924-1926), 3, p. 301-311.



*românești vechi tipărite în Ardeal (1744-1848)*", by Andrei Veress<sup>55</sup>.

It is fair to say that the first volume of "*Revista Arhivelor*" was a promising fulfillment of one of the most important desiderata of Constantin Moisil's "*program de muncă*". The articles were clearly focused on archival work and materials. Many of these useful pieces would not be suitable for publication in another journal<sup>56</sup>. The range and degree of collaboration with the new journal by leading Romanian historical and archival specialists was also impressive: N. Iorga, Ioan Lupaș, Ilie Minea, P. P. Panaitescu, Ioan Filitti, Dan Simonescu, Andrei Veress, Emil Vârtosu, Paul Gore, Ștefan Meteș, Sever Zotta, Mihai Costăchescu, to mention just a few, were and would be names to reckon with in Romanian scholarship.

Moisil's next major concern was with the establishment of a new legal statute for the State Archives commensurate with the form of the new post-World War I Romanian national state. Romanian archives had gone through some very trying times because of the Great War<sup>57</sup>. The disruptions of warfare were particularly telling in this part of the world because of the catastrophic effects of the campaigns of 1916, 1917, and 1918 on Romanian soil<sup>58</sup>. Repeated advances, retreats, and evacuations led to the dispersal and destruction of Romanian archival materials. Typical examples were the losses incurred when Romanian monetary and historical treasures were shipped to Russia for safekeeping ... just prior to the Bolshevik takeover, which meant their confiscation by the new regime<sup>59</sup>, and the selling of Bessarabian archives as scrap paper in Chișinău in 1918<sup>60</sup>.

It took some time to overcome such deficits, but by 1925, a comprehensive new statute for the organization of the Romanian national archives had been passed by the Romanian parliament, which permitted the orderly development of the system. The process began in June of 1924, when Moisil convened a conference of archival specialists and employees to discuss the relevant issues that needed to be addressed by a new archives law.

Moisil then devoted a good deal of time to developing the new statute, which was eventually adopted by the Romanian Parliament in May of 1925. It created a centralized archival system in Bucharest, with four regional directorates (in Iași, Cluj, Cernăuți, and Chișinău; other sub-directorates were added later). It also ratified key items on Moisil's "*program de muncă*": mandating the publication of an

---

<sup>55</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 338-365.

<sup>56</sup> The cynically inclined might argue that some of this material was minutiae, but what of it? One never knows when research might become important or useful.

<sup>57</sup> For a comprehensive survey, see C. Moisil, *Problema arhivelor românești*, "*Revista Arhivelor*", 3 (1936-1937), 6-8, p. 1-46, including a somewhat bitter commentary on the failure of the Romanian authorities to resolve many of the issues and problems raised by the war.

<sup>58</sup> See Glenn E. Torrey, *Romania and World War I*, Iași, 1998.

<sup>59</sup> The so-called "Treasure of Moscow," some of which was returned to Romania in 1935. See Moisil, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>60</sup> Gr. Avakian, *Arhivele rusești din Cetatea-Albă și importanța lor pentru istoria românilor*, "*Revista Arhivelor*", 1 (1924-1926), 2, p. 189 ff.

official archives journal, the founding of a school to train archivists, and the establishment of a permanent archivist exposition (i.e. a museum)<sup>61</sup>. Most of these had already become operational in 1923-1925; the statute was in many respects simply ratifying them after the fact.

For example, in February of 1924, Moisil submitted to the Ministry of Public Instruction a proposal for the establishment of a school for the training of archivists and specialists. This project was approved in September, and on November 1, 1924, the *Școala Practică de Arhivari-Paleografi* (which in 1931 became the *Școala Superioară de Arhivistică și Paleografie* and in 1932 the *Școala Specială de Arhivistică și Paleografie* at the university level) opened under Moisil's direction<sup>62</sup>.

At the same time as he was working on all of this, in May of 1924, Moisil wrote to the Minister of Public Instruction to inform him that an exposition space had been opened in the State Archives with the aim of assisting "patriotic education", both for students and the general public<sup>63</sup>. This became a permanent exposition or museum of Romanian archival treasures in 1926<sup>64</sup>.

Thus it was that by the end of 1926, most of the major desiderata of Constantin Moisil's "program de muncă" had been achieved.

## Conclusion

In 1938, Constantin Moisil published a survey article on "Arhivele României", in the *Enciclopedia Română* which might be taken in part as a kind of summary of his tenure as Director General of the Romanian State Archives between 1923 and 1938<sup>65</sup>. He noted that the Archives had been given a completely new organization to correspond with the new post-World War status of Romania. He pointed out that the Archives now had a successfully functioning *Școala Superioară de Arhivistică și Paleografie*. Finally, he observed that the Archives was conducting "an intense program of cultural activities", including a museum, conferences, and the publication of a journal and scholarly works. That much of this activity originated

---

<sup>61</sup> Poștăriță, *Moisil*, p. 268 ff.

<sup>62</sup> See C. Moisil, *Din istoria Școlii de arhivistică*, "Hrisovul", 1 (1941), p. 11-45. The program for 1924-1926 is published on p. 36-45. *Hrisovul*, 1 (1941), p. 502-541 provides a wealth of information and documentation on the *Școala*, including professors, courses, and students. See also Țabrea, *Moisil*, p. 69 ff. and Poștăriță, *Moisil*, p. 280 ff.

<sup>63</sup> A facsimile of the letter is published in Poștăriță, *Moisil*, p. 269. For the museum, see *Ibidem*, p. 284 ff. Moisil had founded in 1912 a historical museum attached to the *Casa Școalelor* in Bucharest.

<sup>64</sup> "Muzeul Arhivelor Statului", 2 (1927), 4, p. 261-262; and *Dicționar al științelor speciale ale istoriei* cit., p. 170.

<sup>65</sup> *Enciclopedia României* (ed. by Dimitrie Gusti), I: *Statul*, Bucharest, 1938, p. 320-324. See also Moisil's pieces in "Revista Arhivelor": *Progresele arhivisticiei*, "Revista Arhivelor", 2 (1927), 4, p. 1-8; and *Problema Arhivelor românești*. "Revista Arhivelor", 3 (1936-1937), 6-8, p. 1-46.

between 1923 and 1926 is noteworthy. That this "*program de muncă*" continued to bear fruit for decades thereafter, even in the worst of times, is a remarkable accomplishment.

The Archives statute of 1925 laid the basis for the substantial, if turbulent, development of the Romanian archives system and was a landmark in the history of these archives. The establishment of an archives and paleography school provided for the preparation of several generations of specialists who served the Romanian archives and libraries as well as the historical profession under increasingly difficult circumstances as Romania passed through a royal dictatorship, a fascist regime, and military dictatorship, before finally being taken over by one of Eastern Europe's most unpleasant Communist regimes. And the creation of an archives museum not only provided for the display of some of Romania's archival treasures but also filled a significant pedagogical function in Romanian culture.

It is evident that the publication of *Revista Arhivelor* played a necessary and key role in Moisil's ambitious "*program de muncă*". The appearance of a journal specifically devoted to archival issues and the auxiliary sciences of history was an important and timely initiative for both Romanian archivalistics and Romanian scholarship, especially historical scholarship. It provided an outlet for the specialists being trained by the archives school as well as encouraged others who were interested in documents, archives, and the auxiliary sciences by providing the means by which to disseminate their work.

Moisil had written in 1923 that "*O arhivă [...] nu trebuie să rămână o instituție moartă. Personalul ei [...] are obligațiunea morală de a contribui cu informațiile sale la cunoașterea, lămurirea și deslegarea problemelor istoriei naționale.* / An archive [...] cannot remain a dead institution. Its personnel [...] has the moral obligation to contribute with their knowledge to the awareness, the explanation, and the solution of the problems of national history."<sup>66</sup> The "*Revista Arhivelor*" was critical in this task. He also wrote that the archives had a duty "*să provoace în pătura noastră intelectuală un interes cât mai mare față de aceste importante rămășițe culturale.* / to provoke among our intellectual class a greater interest in these important cultural remains."<sup>67</sup> "*Revista Arhivelor*" did this as well.

"*Revista Arhivelor*" would go on to total seven volumes (in fifteen numbers) before it ceased publication in 1947. It was a major scholarly contributor to the maturation of Romanian historical studies. Though the times would worsen after 1929 with the onset of the World Crisis and the Age of Tyrannies in the 1930s, Moisil and his collaborators continued to pursue their vital activities. But that is another story.

---

<sup>66</sup> Moisil, *Un program*, p. 1.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 2.

## Appendix One

*"Revista Arhivelor: Arhivistică. Cronologie. Diplomatică. Heraldică. Genealogie. Instituțiuni. Miniaturistică. Paleografie. Sigilografie"*, 1924-1947

1 (1924-1926), no. 1-3, 433 p. + VIII plates

Editor: Constantin Moisil

No. 1 = 1924, p. 1-144

No. 2 = 1925, p. 145-300

No. 3 = 1926, p. 301-433

2 (1927-1929), no. 4-5, 456 p.

Editor: Constantin Moisil

No. 4 = 1927, p. 1-264

No. 5 = 1929, p. 265-456

3 (1936-1939), no. 6-8, 461 p. + III plates

Editor: Constantin Moisil

Pt. 1, no. 6-7 = 1936-1937, p. 1-180

Editor: Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu

Pt. 2, no. 8 = 1939, p. 181-461

4 (1940-1941), 490 p. + VIII plates

Editor: Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu

Pt. 1 = 1940, p. 1-204

Pt. 2 = 1941, p. 205-490

5 (1942-1943), 520 p. + VIII plates

Editor: Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu

Pt. 1 = 1942, p. 1-296

Pt. 2 = 1943, p. 297-520

6 (1944-1945), 376 p. + IV plates

Editor: Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu

Pt. 1 = 1944, p. 1-144

Pt. 2 = 1944-1945, p. 145-376

7 (1946-1947), 420 p. + I plate

Editor: Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu

Pt. 1 = 1946, p. 1-216

Pt. 2 = 1947, p. 217-420