

International Conference



September

23rd-25th

2021

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
University, Iași
Ferdinand
Conference Room
and online (zoom)

* This conference was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-1868, within PNCDI III

Organizers:



Romanian Academy
“Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
University, Iași
Faculty of History
Center for the History of
International Relations, Iași
The Romanian Society for
Historical Studies, Iași

An Epoch Threshold? The Year 1821 in the History of South-East Europe, at Bicentennial



The conference will be live on Facebook
<https://www.facebook.com/ciri.uaic>

Organizers:

Romanian Academy

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași

Faculty of History

Center for the History of International Relations, Iași

The Romanian Society for Historical Studies, Iași

Partners:

Iași City Hall

Ministry of Culture – County Direction for Culture, Iași

“Regina Maria” Municipal Museum, Iași

Media Partener: TVR IAȘI**Organizing Committee:**

Academician, Professor emeritus **Victor Spinei** – Vice President of the Romanian Academy

Corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, Professor **Ioan Bolovan** – Director of the “George Barițiu” Institute of History, Cluj-Napoca

Professor **Laurențiu Vlad** – Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest

Associate Professor **Cristian Ploscaru** – Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași

Lecturer **Gabriel Leanca** – Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași

Assistant Professor **Cosmin Mihuț** – Faculty of History, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași

Dr. **Nicolae Mihai** – Romanian Academy, “C. S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, Craiova

Dr. **Ștefan Petrescu** – Romanian Academy, Institute of South-East European Studies, Bucharest

CSIII **Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu** – Institute for Interdisciplinary Research, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Department, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași

Lecturer **Vlad Popovici** – Faculty of History and Philosophy, “Babeș-Bolyai” University Cluj-Napoca

Thursday, September, 23rd

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81055243978?pwd=dUIISGxTMDZQRUJVZTdlMHpyUXFwdz09>

13.30-14.00. Opening:

Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba, Dean of the Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași

Mihai Chirica, Mayor of Iași

Academician Ioan-Aurel Pop, President of the Romanian Academy

14.00-14.30. **Keynote speaker:**

Sorin Alexandrescu (The Centre of Excellence in Image Studies (CESI), University of Bucharest, Professor Emeritus/University of Amsterdam),
Tudor of Vladimir, a Threshold of Modernity (Romanian, in person)

followed by *the debate:*

1821 – an “Epoch Threshold”?

Conceptualizations of the Transition to Modernity

Will be participating:

Sorin Alexandrescu (University of Bucharest)

Eugen Munteanu (Faculty of Letters, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași)

Andrei Corbea-Hoișie (Faculty of Letters, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași)

Alexandru-Florin Platon (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași)

Moderator: Cristian Ploscaru

From the debate topics:

- *1821 as an “epoch threshold”: how could it be, how could it not be? Revolution and change in the Balkans and Romanian space;*

- *Between tradition and modernity: how the Enlightenment discourse influenced Romanians’ perception of themselves?*

- *A difficult reception? Romanian culture and the theories of modernity (from Max Weber to Michel Foucault, Reinhart Koselleck and Hans Blumenberg).*

16.30-17.00. Break

Thursday, September, 23rd

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88533397824?pwd=cFJHbkF1djFtSkdGdXpCNIQzK3QwZz09>

17.00-19.30. **First section:** *The Greek Revolution – a Turning Point in Balkan History.*

Moderator: Vlad Popovici

17.00-17.20. Ioannis Zelepos (Centre for Mediterranean Studies, Faculty of History, Ruhr-University Bochum), *The Greek Uprising of 1821 Between Constitutional Revolt and Religious War* (English, on Zoom)

17.20-17.40. Gelencsér Ildikó Éva (Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, University Fernando Pessoa, Porto), *Empires or Nation-States? The Role of the 1821 Greek War of Independence in the Changes of European Relations in the Balkans* (English, on Zoom)

17.40-18.00. Gabriel Leanca (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *The French Occupation of Morea and the Russian Occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia: A Comparative Perspective in the Context of the Greek War for Independence* (English, on Zoom)

18.00-18.20. Ela Cosma (“George Barițiu” Institute of History, Cluj-Napoca), *25 March 1821, the National Celebration Day of the Greeks in Romania* (Romanian, on Zoom)

18.20-18.40. Anastasia Tanampasi (University of Western Macedonia, Kozani), *Teaching and Celebrating the Greek Revolution in the Romanian Schools of Greece* (English, on Zoom)

18.40-19.30. Discussions

Friday, September, 24th

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82827565921?pwd=bTZXNk0xNEtERnA0dGM5UUFkMmppdz09>

9.00-9.10. Opening:

Ioan Bolovan – Corresponding member of the Romanian Academy

9.10-9.40. **Keynote speaker:**

Alexandru-Florin Platon (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), „*La Révolution de la Grèce n’est qu’accidentelle...*”: *an Unknown Version of Prince Gheorghe Cantacuzino’s Account of the Action of the Etairia in the Romanian Principalities in 1821* (Romanian, in person)

9.40-9.50. Discussions

9.50-11.40. **Second section:** *1821 in the Romanian Space – Contemporary Perceptions in Historical Sources*

Moderator: Bogdan Popa

9.50-10.10. Ioan Bolovan (Corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, Director of the “George Barițiu” Institute of History, Cluj-Napoca), *Transylvania in the First Half of 1821: Reactions and Behavioural Attitudes* (Romanian, in person)

10.10-10.30. Ligia Livadă-Cadeschi (Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest), “*De viscolia Patriei nu sânt în neștiință*”: *1821 Viewed by the Romanian Students Abroad* (Romanian, on Zoom)

10.30-10.50. Ion Varta (Director of the National Archives, Chișinău), *The Relations Between Tudor Vladimirescu and the Etairist Movement in the Light of Unpublished Documents from the Archives of the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and the Russian Federation* (Romanian, in person)

10.50-11.10. Filip-Lucian Iorga (Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest), *Tudor Vladimirescu’s Movement: Social and National Stereotypes. And a Few Words about a Forgotten Writer and an Unknown Genealogy* (English, on Zoom)

11.10-11.50. Discussions

11.50-12.10. Break

Friday, September, 24th

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84208342884?pwd=Yk50OVpXSmlVNSEZ2NGNMUIJkOGFqZz09>

12.10-14.10. **Third section:** *The Romanian and Greek Uprisings – International Entanglements and Domestic Tensions*

Moderator: Alexandru-Florin Platon

12.10-12.30. Gheorghe Cliveti (Director of the “A. D. Xenopol” Institute of History, Iași), *Russia, Etairia and Tudor Vladimirescu* (Romanian, in person)

12.30-12.50. Cosmin Mihaș (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *A Diplomacy of Conciliation? Lord Strangford and the Oriental Crisis of 1821-1822* (English, in person)

12.50-13.10. Cristian Ploscaru (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *“With Evil let us Doom the Wicked”. Networks of Influence and Clashes of Interests in 1821 in the Romanian Principalities* (Romanian, in person)

13.10-13.30. Nicolae Mihai (Romanian Academy, “C. S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, Craiova), *How can a 1821 Revolutionary Leader Lose his Charisma? Reading the Case of Tudor Vladimirescu through Max Weber’s Theory* (English, in person)

13.30-14.10. Discussions

Friday, September, 24th

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81841241432?pwd=c093WjZvL2xWRGFjYVhPbnZLSTk3QT09>

15.40-17.40. **Fourth section:** *Thinking and Representing the Historical Event: Political Narrative, Cultural Heritage and Celebration*

Moderator: Nicolae Mihai

15.40-16.00. Raluca Alexandrescu (Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest), *Ancient and Modern around 1821: The Turnouts of the Political Narrative Around The “Old and New Regime”* (English, on Zoom)

16.00-16.20. Lia Brad Chisacof (Institute of Southeast European Studies, Bucharest), *Emperor Trajan and Malpractice: 1821 Under Other Circumstances* (English, on Zoom)

16.20-16.40. Bogdan Popa (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *A Play, Two Royal Weddings, a Land Reform. The Academic, Political and Social Contexts of the Celebration of Tudor Vladimirescu in 1921* (Romanian, in person)

16.40-17.00. Alexandru Mamina (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *The Revolution of 1821 – an Obsolete Theme* (Romanian, in person)

17.00-17.40. Discussions

17.40-18.00. Break

Friday, September, 24th

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81668541926?pwd=TUQ2ZGc1OG81cVJlZm5KL3IwU05YZz09>

18.00-20.00. **Fifth section:** *Between Old and New Regime:*

Documentary Decoupage

Moderator: Alexandru Mamina

18.00-18.20. Oana Rizescu (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *The Boyar’s Class and the Small Officials in Oltenia from the Austrian Rule to Tudor Vladimirescu* (Romanian, in person)

18.20-18.40. Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu, Cristian Ploscaru (Institute for Interdisciplinary Research, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Department, Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *Surprising Biographies: Descendants of a Moldavian Boyar Under the Banner of Greek Revolution – the Brothers Cantacuzino-Deleanu* (Romanian, in person)

18.40-19.00. Constantin Ardeleanu (Faculty of History, “Dunărea de Jos” University, Galați; New Europe College, Bucharest), *The Moldavian Boyars and the Pasha of Braila in 1821* (Romanian, on Zoom)

19.00-19.20. Mihai Mîrza (National Archives, Iași Branch), *The Prelude to Secularization: the Fortunes of the Dedicated Convents from Moldavia in the Early Years After 1821* (Romanian, in person)

19.20-20.00. Discussions

Saturday, September, 25th

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84006105986?pwd=bUd3MjFXTTFYQVNRY2x4bGszK1Vvdz09>

9.00-9.10. Opening:

Gabriel Leanca – Center for the History of International Relations, Iași

9.10-9.40. **Keynote speakers:**

Vlasis Vlasidis, Costas Chalkis (Department for Balkan, Slavic and Oriental Studies, University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki), *Spreading Fake News During 1821 Revolution for the Contribution of the Balkan Nations* (English, on Zoom)

9.40-9.50. Discussions

9.50-11.30. **Sixth section: 1821 – Geopolitics and History in the Shaping of National Identities in the Balkans**

Moderator: Cosmin Mihut

9.50-10.10. Victor Taki (Department of History, Concordia University of Edmonton), *The Year 1821 and Russia's Policy with Respect of Moldavia and Wallachia* (English, on Zoom)

10.10-10.30. Domagoj Krpan (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka), *How Religious Difference Was Not an Obstacle for Albanian Unification* (English, on Zoom)

10.30-10.50. Mircea-Cristian Ghenghea (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *Tudor Vladimirescu and the Romanian Interwar Historiography: Documentary Contributions and Critical Reflections* (English, in person)

10.50-11.10. Maria Dimasi, Angeliki Mouzakiti (Department of Languages, Literature and Culture of the Black Sea Countries, Democritus University of Thrace), *The Uprising of 1821 in the Danubian Principalities. Findings in Greek School History Textbooks of Primary and Secondary Education (20th-21st Century)* (English, in person)

11.10-11.50. Discussions

11.50-12.10. Break

Saturday, September, 25th

Ferdinand Conference Room and online (Zoom)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86763944472?pwd=dmVtSDQvbWFCSTZqVGd6YnlNWmlMUT09>

12.10-14.10. **Seventh section:** *Romanian Historiographical Readings of the Year 1821*

Moderator: Gabriel Leanca

12.10-12.30. Sergiu Iosipescu (The National Heritage Institute, Bucharest), *1821: Between historians' Interpretations and Historical Realities* (Romanian, on Zoom)

12.30-12.50. Vlad Popovici (Faculty of History and Philosophy, "Babeş-Bolyai" University, Cluj-Napoca), *The Historical and Historiographical Memory of 1821 in Transylvania and Banat* (Romanian, on Zoom)

12.50-13.10. Ştefan Petrescu (Institute of Southeast European Studies, Bucharest), *A Visit to the Working Laboratory of C. D. Aricescu, the Author of the First Monograph on the 1821 Revolution in the Romanian Principalities* (Romanian, on Zoom)

13.10-13.30. Gabriel Moisa (Faculty of History, University of Oradea), *Between Politics and Historiography. Solomon Stirbu or the Proletcultism in the Sign of Tudor Vladimirescu's Revolution* (Romanian, on Zoom)

13.30-14.10. Discussions

14.10-14.40. General Conclusions

SUMMARIES

Thursday, September, 23rd

Keynote speaker:

Sorin Alexandrescu (The Centre of Excellence in Image Studies (CESI), University of Bucharest, Professor Emeritus/University of Amsterdam), *Tudor of Vladimir, a Threshold of Modernity* (Romanian, in person)

The honor of opening this important conference involves me trying to outline a space for discussion. I cannot do it for the whole Balkan world but I can only propose Tudor Vladimirescu's revolt as typical for the efforts of this world, 200 years ago, to become independent nations from the permanent bargain between the *local* powers, Turkey and Russia, differently supported, or maneuvered, by the *European* powers, England and Austria, after the collapse of Napoleonic France.

I will try to discuss not only the “story” of Tudor Vladimirescu, meaning the facts chronologically established by the documents, but also two ways of analyzing their meaning given that it refers not only to “what happened” but also to the historical context, the narrator’s perspective, the relation between discourse and narration, the role of the other social actors and their opinions within a semiotically articulated whole in which Tudor functions, for me, as a “floating” signifier in the sense proposed in Barthes’ late writings. He has this function, I think, in relation to the various historical groups of that time: the Romanian boyars, the Phanariots and Etairia, the townspeople or “the people” as Tudor calls them, the mercenaries, as well as the international audience North and South of the Danube. It is only this *ensemble* that seems to me to constitute the object of proper historical analysis, not the individual facts that constitute it, nor the direct information provided by the documents: all this should therefore be read not individually but as the opinions and interests of various *groups*, all legitimate for an impartial historian.

The first chapter of my study thus shows how Tudor's story is *told* in various documents presented by C. D. Aricescu, I. D. Liprandi, M. Cioranu etc. and, very recently, by Gheorghe Gorun, or by large public collections. The second chapter questions how this story can be *read* if we challenge as schematic both the traditional reading – the documents say what is written in them, and that is all – and a Marxist reading, still common for example in certain circles in England, but given here as a negative example by current critics who are also English. Going for a while in the same direction as the latter, I attempt in the same second chapter a “postmodern” historical reading of Tudor in their sense. Frank Ankersmit, Patrick Joyce and others thus analyze historical texts about nineteenth-century Britain by constructing their meaning exactly as a *literary*, aesthetic or moral, narrative meaning is constructed, not as an expression of a pre-existing objective historical truth. As this option, although stimulating, seems to me insufficient, I wonder, in a third chapter, what sense the

“Tudor story” makes for us, those of us who are in a completely different era than Tudor. I wonder, however, when and how *Tudor’s epoch* began as such, distinct from both the previous one and of our own.

The third chapter thus gets to the fundamental theoretical issue of the discussion. What actually is a historical epoch? The discussion originated with the philosopher Hans Blumenberg and was taken up in particular by the German Romanists who brought together fundamental texts in the volume *Epochenschwelle und Epochen-bewusstsein (The Threshold between Epochs and the Consciousness of Epochs)*, edited by Reinhart Herzog and Reinhart Kosseleck in 1987, a good few decades ago. I don't know what echo it had in our country when it appeared, I'm afraid none, or very little, but the issues it raises still seem to me extremely important for us. It has long been obvious to all of us that Tudor's movement fundamentally changed the political reality of the Romanian Principalities as well as the fact that through it we entered modernity. But what this means in terms of mentality, and not only in terms of international relations and internal reforms, has not, I believe, been clearly stated in the language of the philosophy of history. Kosseleck proposes some important general theoretical criteria for this, such as the actual synchronicity of historically non-synchronous things or values, pluralism, open future, etc. They seem to me to fully characterize the society and social actors of Tudor's time, including himself. What purely documentary history could not explain although it offered generous material, as well as what historical postmodernism highlighted, yet without an overall explanation, I think it can clarify at both levels the epoch threshold theory. The crossing of a threshold, inscrutable in the moment but effective afterwards, defines what is new and what disappears as old from the current horizon *without* polemic, but definitively. Other aspects, perhaps even after the 1989 revolution, could be similarly examined. The terms of the theory are profound and generous provided that they are not adopted superficially and therefore ineffectively.

Finally, we can ask ourselves other questions. Nicolae Bălcescu wrote in Paris in 1850, after the failure of the 1848 revolution, a dramatic and visionary text “The path of revolution in the history of the Romanians”. In it he attacks the Phanariot era in which “the people were degraded by slavery and poverty like the nobles by wealth and oppression” but argues that in 1821 it, “now standing and awake” ... “demands that the state become Romanian, demands the reign of democracy”. Vladimirescu was then killed by the Phanariots and the Russian-protected *ciocoi*. But the future revolution will create “a nation of brothers, of free citizens...” concluded Bălcescu. Such views were in Romania sometimes opposed by communism as “fascist”, sometimes tacitly approved by nationalism. About Tudor, Bălcescu says no more, we can wonder whether he was the first to conceive the revolution in this sense, or whether he, “floating” between opposing groups and interests, was, despite some mistakes, closer to a democratic vision than many others. Were there other epoch “thresholds” in Romania then, and which ones? The discussion continues.

First section: *The Greek Revolution – a Turning Point in Balkan History*

Ioannis Zelepos (Centre for Mediterranean Studies, Faculty of History, Ruhr-University Bochum), *The Greek Uprising of 1821 Between Constitutional Revolt and Religious War* (English, on Zoom)

The presentation deals with the political articulations of the Greek insurgents of 1821 with a focus on the revolutionary constitutions of the first period of the war, which are examined in trans-regional European perspective. They were characterized by a specific combination of democratic-constitutionalist as well as religious elements, which are analyzed here under the aspect of self-legitimation strategies in the context of post-Napoleonic political order.

Gelencsér Ildikó Éva (Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, University Fernando Pessoa, Porto), *Empires or Nation-States? The Role of the 1821 Greek War of Independence in the Changes of European Relations in the Balkans* (English, on Zoom)

Historiography calls the period between late 18th and mid-19th century the Age of Revolutions which witnessed a number of revolutions in Europe. These movements made changes in the socio-political structures: absolutist monarchies faded away handing over their power to representative governments with a written constitution, and left room for creating nation states. There are three great powers that directly influenced the Balkan Peninsula. The Ottoman-Turks had imposed a strong control over the region since they captured Byzantium in 1453. Suleiman the Magnificent laid a strong foundation for the empire in the 16th century, which continued to maintain a flexible and strong economy, society and military throughout the 17th and for much of the 18th century. However, the rising Russian Empire – due to the reforms of Peter the Great – started to challenge the Ottomans' power creating a long period of military conflicts between the two states. The third great power was the Habsburg Empire that gradually lost its influence in Western Europe and turned its attention to Central and Southeast Europe. This paper focuses on the process that ends up in the establishment of nation states with constitutional institutions. It is going to examine the interaction among the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the intention of the Habsburgs and the Romanovs to penetrate into the region and the formation of the nation states in the Balkan Peninsula. The efforts of the Serbs to gain their independence followed by the Greeks with the same objective were the first steps to oust the great powers from the Balkans and to make it possible for the peoples of the region to make an attempt to form their own nation state, which meets their economic, social and cultural needs. Additionally, the opportunity also opened up for the Balkans to rejoin the European system.

Gabriel Leanca (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *The French Occupation of Morea and the Russian Occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia: A Comparative Perspective in the Context of the Greek War for Independence* (English, on Zoom)

The ultimate rationale behind the comparison chosen here for analysis is to shed light on the concept of intervention in the era following the Congress of Vienna. These two military occupations have to be understood through the lens of the center-periphery relations within the international system, particularly in the

context of the Ottoman rollback from Europe. Thus, the notion of intermediary bodies is crucial in order to analyze and dissect the mission of both Russian and French militaries in the European provinces of the Ottoman Empire. To a large extent, both occupations are very similar. They can be regarded as humanitarian interventions to the benefit of the Greek cause. Moreover, the imperial ambitions of both French and Russian political elites, albeit not absent, did not compromise the initial purpose of these military expeditions. On a different layer of analysis, the Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia, as well as of the territories south of Danube during the hostilities, is very different from that of the French in the Morea. The French operated in the Peloponnesus under a collective mandate, whereas the Russian forces operated in a purely bilateral context in which the Ottomans had very little chance to uphold their authority. Even if Moldavia and Wallachia served as an example of political organization for the creation of a Greek entity, the two regions situated at the extremities of the European Turkey evolved very differently.

Ela Cosma (“George Barițiu” Institute of History, Cluj-Napoca), 25 March 1821, the National Celebration Day of the Greeks in Romania (Romanian, on Zoom)

For two centuries now, Greece has continued to celebrate the unforgotten 25 March 1821, considered the national day and the most significant of the two official Greek state days. The Greek Revolution turned into a nine-year war (1821-1829), which led to Greek independence (1832). The first of the four phases of the Greek revolution was triggered by the “Etairia” in the Romanian Principalities, where the first armed events and anti-Ottoman battles took place, lasting seven months (February-September 1821). The absolute beginning of the Hellenic Revolution was recorded in Iași, with the proclamations issued by Alexander Ypsilanti (23-24 February 1821) and the consecration of the revolutionary flag by the Metropolitan of Moldavia Veniamin Costache at the Monastery of the Three Hierarchs (27 February 1821). The first great (and tragic) battle of the Etairists was at Drăgășani (7/19 June 1821), and the last confrontation with the Turks saw the martyrdom of 28 monks, as well as the self-sacrifice of Giorgios Olympios and his comrades at Secu Monastery (9 September 1821). It is natural, therefore, that the Greeks of Romania commemorate, year after year, the Etairists who fell in Moldavia and Wallachia. This communication therefore presents the anniversaries of 25 March 1821 in the Greek communities in our country, as reflected in a little-known source, namely the articles published over the last three decades by the bilingual magazine ‘Ελπίς/Speranța’, the periodical of the Hellenic Union of Romania.

Anastasia Tanampasi (University of Western Macedonia, Kozani), Teaching and Celebrating the Greek Revolution in the Romanian Schools of Greece (English, on Zoom)

What kind of History of 1821 were the students of Romanian schools of Greece taught? How did they memorize the past? How was their cultural memory related with certain heroes of the Greek revolution? Given that the History lesson is of crucial political importance in creating a national identity, historical consciousness and furthermore, in incorporating the official viewpoint of a nation, it is very interesting to study about the re-reading of the Greek revolution in the Romanian schools of Greece. This study focuses on how Romanian schools remembered the Greek revolution of 1821 and it is based on oral history, Romanian and Greek archives.

Friday, September, 24th

Keynote speaker:

Alexandru-Florin Platon (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), „La Révolution de la Grèce n’est qu’accidentelle...”: an Unknown Version of Prince Gheorghe Cantacuzino’s Account of the Action of the Etairia in the Romanian Principalities in 1821 (Romanian, in person)

Prince Gheorghe Cantacuzino's account of the beginning and development of the Etairia's action in the Romanian Principalities in 1821 has been, until now, known only in two versions. The first and, at the same time, the one most familiar to researchers, written in French and entitled *Însemnare autentică a colonelului, prințul Gh. Cantacuzino, despre începuturile și acțiunea Eteriei în Principatele Române* was published by Andrei Oțetea in the fourth volume of the collection *Documente privind istoria românilor. Răscoala din 1821* (București, Editura Academiei R. P. R., 1960).

The second version, in German, entitled, in short, *Denkschrift des Fürsten Georg Cantacuzeno*, was printed in 1824 in Halle, as a pamphlet, being finished – according to the inscription at the end – “at Chișinău, on 28 October 1821” (*Geschrieben zu Kishinev, am 28, Oktober, 1821*). After its publication, it was never republished, neither in Romania nor abroad, but Andrei Oțetea was familiar with it, since he quotes it several times in his 1945 synthesis, devoted to Tudor Vladimirescu's movement: *Tudor Vladimirescu și mișcarea eteristă în țările românești, 1821-1822*, București, 1945 (extract from “Balcania”, IV-V).

The version we discovered, the third, is therefore unpublished. Preserved in the Geneva State Archives (*Archives d'Etat de Genève*), among the papers of Léonard Revilliod (1786-1867), a Swiss citizen of this city who lived in St Petersburg and Odessa between 1805-1824/1825, it is in the form of a manuscript in French, with 31 double-sided pages. Compared to the first two versions, it is much more extensive, giving not only a detailed description of the action of the Etairia on Romanian territory, from the beginning of the movement to the disaster of Sculeni (29 June 1821), but – In subsidiary – also some details about Tudor's movement and the situation in the two Principalities.

Second section: *1821 in the Romanian Space – Contemporary Perceptions in Historical Sources*

Ioan Bolovan (Corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, Director of the “George Barițiu” Institute of History, Cluj-Napoca), *Transylvania in the First Half of 1821: Reactions and Behavioural Attitudes* (Romanian, in person)

Certainly, the year 1821 was more special in Transylvania compared to the previous and following years. There were many local tensions, protests and uncoordinated agitations. It is certainly not possible to speak of a revolution, not even a revolt, a rebellion. And yet, the echo of the events of 1821 across the Carpathians, among the Transylvanian Romanians, was quite remarkable. In the Grand Principality of Transylvania and Banat, the authorities recorded waves of discontent and unrest, especially among the Romanians, fueled by rumors that the “prince Todoruț” or Todorăș would free the Romanians in those territories. Local and Austrian authorities noted in their reports the state of mind of the Romanian peasantry. These upheavals

took place against the more general background of the systemic crisis of feudalism, because the *robotă*, *dijma*, *plocoanele* and other obligations were crushing burdens for the peasants of the Transylvanian region. Between 1790 and 1821, they were on the rise because of the favorable conditions for the price of grain and the progress of the alodization of the seigneurial estates with a view to production for the market. The condition of the peasants worsened during this period also due to the widespread practice of feudal lords to lease their estates. In addition to this there were public taxes for the functioning of the state apparatus, taxes paid only by peasants and townspeople. At the national-political level, the Romanians had a history that gave the authorities cause for concern: the uprising of 1784, the *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* of 1791, other memorials in 1804, the struggle for Romanian bishops in Sibiu and Arad, etc. The accumulation of social and national tensions generated by this reality found expression in the unrest among the peasantry, which, manifested in various forms, foreshadowed a replay of the times of Horea. The behavior of many of the peasants investigated by the authorities reveals mental clichés, behaviors specific to moments of major crisis, of rupture between two worlds, such as we find during Horea's rebellion or during the 1848 Revolution. Our paper will try to present precisely these behaviors, both of the authorities and of the Romanian peasants in Transylvania during the first half of 1821.

Ligia Livadă-Cadeschi (Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest),
“De viscolia Patriei nu sânt în neștiință”: 1821 Viewed by the Romanian Students Abroad (Romanian, on Zoom)

The paper we propose has as sources parts of the correspondence, speeches and a series of other works (translations, lectures, publicity) of the first Romanian scholars abroad in the years 1820-1830, Simeon Marcovici, Eufrosin Poteca, Petrache Poenaru, Constantin Popa Moroiu. The questions we propose to answer concern the way in which they felt the profound changes in the Romanian world of 1821-1822 and especially their consequences, from the perspective of the future teaching career that they were all preparing to embrace on their return home. Anticipating to some extent the conclusion towards which our study is heading, we must say that explicit contemporary references to the political situation in the country at the time are few. Just as their subsequent references are few. The main aspect that the students studying abroad remember and mention is the return to the native Princes, interpreted not in a strictly political perspective, but rather from the perspective of additional chances for the revival of Romanian language, culture and education. Obviously, our characters were not in the country (with the exception of Petrache Poenaru) at the time of the events of 1821-1822, which could explain their relative detachment. It seems surprising today, however, if we consider that we are referring to a moment that Romanian historiography has always recorded as crucial (regardless of the ideological grid under which it was interpreted). However, those who are aware of the events in the country do not seem to feel it as a moment of rupture. Rather, what dominates their writings is a sense of continuity and a firm intention to complete an intellectual journey that began before 1821 and which emphasized the Europeanisation of the Principalities, the importance of developing the Romanian language and culture and the organization of public education in the national language.

Ion Varta (Director of the National Archives, Chişinău), *The Relations Between Tudor Vladimirescu and the Etairist Movement in the Light of Unpublished Documents from the Archives of the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and the Russian Federation* (Romanian, in person)

The archives from the former Soviet space contain numerous documentary testimonies about the two movements, which started simultaneously – the Romanian national emancipation movement under the leadership of Tudor Vladimirescu and the Etairist movement. A good part of these archival documents has not yet been brought to light. On the basis of such documents we intend to elucidate the difficult and sinuous relations between the protagonists of the two movements – Tudor Vladimirescu and Alexandru Ypsilanti. Since these documents are mainly of Russian origin, their interpretation, as is natural, will be a critical one, in conjunction with the performance of Romanian and foreign historiography in the clarification of this extremely important theme, not only for researchers from Romania and Greece, but also for historians from other countries concerned with this subject.

Filip-Lucian Iorga (Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest), *Tudor Vladimirescu's Movement: Social and National Stereotypes. And a Few Words about a Forgotten Writer and an Unknown Genealogy* (English, on Zoom)

Beyond the unfolding of the historical event itself, beyond the short and medium-term effects of Tudor Vladimirescu's movement, the event from 1821 received numerous historical interpretations. Like any moment in the past, Tudor Vladimirescu's uprising has its own mythology, imaginary and stereotypes. We will discuss about the social and national stereotypes associated with Tudor Vladimirescu's movement: the myth of the "peasant army" and the myth of "Romanian purity" against foreign rule and especially against the Greeks. In fact, Tudor himself was a *moşnean* (he belonged to the Wallachian gentry) and many of his supporters belonged to the petty nobility. Tudor Vladimirescu's army also included representatives of many ethnic groups, coming especially from the south of the Danube. The mythology surrounding Tudor Vladimirescu's movement is also reflected in fiction, especially the conflict between Romanians and Greeks. One of the literary creations, forgotten today, is a historical novel called *1821* and written by an almost forgotten writer. We commemorate this year 140 years since Alexandru Pelimon's death, and in 2022 we will celebrate 200 years since his birth. Starting from an unpublished genealogical tree of the Pelimon family, we will see how a writer who was neither a "peasant" nor a "pure blood Romanian" (he was probably of Greek origin) adopted and reflected in his writings the national discourse of Tudor Vladimirescu, his political ideals and some of the stereotypes associated with Tudor Vladimirescu's uprising.

Third section: *The Romanian and Greek Uprisings – International Entanglements and Domestic Tensions*

Gheorghe Cliveti (Director of the “A. D. Xenopol” Institute of History, Iași), *Russia, Etairia and Tudor Vladimirescu* (Romanian, in person)

One of the most disputed themes in Romanian historiography of the last century, Tudor Vladimirescu's relationship with Etairia and, related to it, the extent of Russia's involvement in the initiation and orientation of the two political movements, has been analyzed mainly on the basis of the corroboration and interpretation of internal sources, consular reports and contemporary narrative testimonies. Diplomatic reports and notes, from St. Petersburg, Vienna, London and Constantinople have not received the same attention. The information provided by these sources, placing the events in the Romanian Principalities in an international and regional context, linked to the Eastern Question as a whole, highlights, among other things, the distinction between the movement led by Tudor Vladimirescu and the Etairia movement, at the level of perception and implications, but also the duplicity of Russian policy, interested both in achieving its interests of domination in the Lower Danube, but also in disclaiming any responsibility for undermining the Ottoman Empire and peace in the Balkans.

Cosmin Mihuț (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *A Diplomacy of Conciliation? Lord Strangford and the Oriental Crisis of 1821-1822* (English, in person)

The newly appointed British ambassador, Lord Strangford (Percy Clinton Sydney Smythe), arrived in Constantinople in February 1821 with the mission to maintain Britain's friendship and commerce with the Ottoman Empire, to protect the rights of the Ionian Islands, cultivate the best possible understanding with his European colleagues and promote harmony and understanding between their governments. Within two weeks of his arrival, the events that reopened the Eastern crisis came to unfold and he would become a key figure in the effort to avert war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire. His dispatches, mostly unknown in the Romanian historiography, show the tensions between Russia and the Ottoman Empire, complete the complicated realities that constituted the core of the Eastern Question during and after 1821 and bring to light different dimensions of the situation in this region. Even if he didn't always receive specific instructions from the Foreign Office, he used his resources and energy to maintain a path for Russo-Turkish dialogue, and sought to simplify his tasks by dissociating two problems that required different approaches, trying to distinguish between the specific problems arising out of the Wallachian uprising and the more delicate issue of the pacification of Greece. This active policy of the chief representative of British policy in the Near East succeeded in averting a war by using not only the official diplomatic channels, but also a series of secret means. This meant the distribution of bribes on certain occasions (for which he billed his government), maintaining at his personal cost a number of trusted retainers placed in influential positions in the Sultan's entourage or in the Turkish Council and relying on a circle of sources, gleaning intelligence from consuls, travelers, merchants, protégés, dragomans, local and regional Ottoman authorities and from other European envoys.

Cristian Ploscaru (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *“With Evil let us Doom the Wicked”*. *Networks of Influence and Clashes of Interests in 1821 in the Romanian Principalities* (Romanian, in person)

In researching the events of 1821, deciphering the motivations and general objectives of the Romanian and Etairist movements has prevailed in the eyes of historians over studying the behaviors, reactions and gestures of the protagonists. The latter are an essential barometer for understanding both people’s relationship to political power as the legitimate source of authority in society and the features of political action in traditional society. Moreover, in 1821, the power element was the pivot around which the events took on a meaning, an unfolding, at least up to a point, that is, when, having lost the power, the former combatants began to excuse and justify themselves, to claim a certain political order from the authorities that were superior to them (Russia, Austria, the Ottoman Empire).

Around 1821, the discourse of contestation, both cultural and political, acquired a certain coherence and persuasiveness, attested by the multitude of proclamations. More than the politician in ordinary times, the revolutionary translates reality into the discourse of identity and imagery. In 1821, the mark of the revolutionary imaginary is visible, political action assuming a founding role – “the second birth of our rights” – the central hero is the people, as the permanent reference of the legitimacy of the political approach, with the aim of “defeating its enemies within and without, on its way to conquering a new Citadel”. Subsequent to this discursive horizon with numerous elements of novelty for Romanian society, the delimitation of the interest groups involved, taking into account first of all the relationship to internal and external power factors (the Princely throne, the Church, the great offices, the Russian consulate, the Danube Pashas, but also Russia and the Ottoman Empire), can contribute to a better understanding of the features of the revolutionary movement led by Tudor Vladimirescu.

Nicolae Mihai (Romanian Academy, “C. S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, Craiova), *How can a 1821 Revolutionary Leader Lose his Charisma? Reading the Case of Tudor Vladimirescu through Max Weber’s Theory* (English, in person)

The revolutionary movements of the early 19th century highlight a number of charismatic leaders, from the Balkans to the Cordillera. An analysis of how they gained, preserved, and lost this ‘gift’ can help us better understand the exceptionality of this historical temporality. The present paper is dedicated to the study of such a case, considered exemplary. It highlights also the dilemmas of a concept mostly attributed to Max Weber in which the reading of charisma is important: exceptional quality of an individual, but also the product of collective mobilizations or discursively constructed illusion, without neglecting the importance of the ‘charismatic community’ or of that of ‘charismatic configurations’ (applicable only to the group of those close to them, the “pandours”, or to a larger population?). And maybe this is where one of the explanations for the fall of Tudor Vladimirescu resides.

Lacking the means of a traditional authority (the support of the country’s Divan, whose members gradually disappear across the border) or legal (its recognition

by the Turkish and the Russian Empire), Tudor Vladimirescu sees his charismatic authority eroded when he is forced to hang some of its captains who refused to take written responsibility for the reprehensible actions of the pandours under their command. We are thus witnessing the manifestation of what Max Weber called the 'instability of charismatic authority'. At the moment of his loss, the leader's mission seems to cease, but the collective hope is not embodied in another successor, none of his captains rising to his level, much less Alexandru Ypsilanti. His followers will abandon him because the only legitimacy of pure charisma is given by that which emanates from personal power, permanently proven. Reading carefully the testimonies of the time, it seems that his contemporaries therefore correctly intuited the mechanism of the fall of the one already called with a popular term for the prince of Wallachia, 'Domnul Tudor'.

Fourth section: *Thinking and Representing the Historical Event: Political Narrative, Cultural Heritage and Celebration*

Raluca Alexandrescu (Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest), *Ancient and Modern around 1821: The Turnouts of the Political Narrative Around The "Old and New Regime"* (English, on Zoom)

The New Regime of the Romanian Principalities, marked by the 1821 switch in the reign of Phanariots replaced by Romanian aristocrats gave the sign in rephrasing an entire debate built upon the liberal reforms and changed the course of the political language and thinking. It is by all means not a specific Romanian phenomenon: though the most frequent reference links the internalization of the concept with the western influence, the recent works in that field show a slow, yet visible change in the political language in the Ottoman Empire (and not entirely as a result of an internalized westernization). The question we are raising is therefore the intellectual correlation between the actual change of the political regime and the internalization of the Ancient-Modern dichotomy already thriving in the western political philosophy since the 17th century. Is there a beginning of a Nouveau Regime (Moderns) in the consciousness of the contemporaries, or is there a historiographical reconstitution of this reflection upon what is Ancient and what is New? The influence of the Greek revolution in 1821 Wallachia and its proximity to western political thought could provide a possible way of reading the Ancient-Modern gap (cf. Rosen 1992, Fumaroli 2021).

In other terms, following the general direction of analysis and methodological approach described by the Turkish historian Edhem Eldem (2021: *A la croisée des histoires*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres), is there a clear Romanian narrative that anticipates and accompanies the 1821 switch from the Old to the New Regime or it is mostly a narrative reconstruction that follows, after the actual events are taking place? Are the *Moderns* already in place in the ideological positioning of the political and philosophical voices of the 1821 momentum or are they the product of a reconstructed reflection?

Lia Brad Chisacof (Institute of Southeast European Studies, Bucharest), *Emperor Trajan and Malpractice: 1821 Under Other Circumstances* (English, on Zoom)

Were the 200 years anniversary of the 1821 events in South-Eastern Europe not now we had for sure to call for it. It is more than timely and always suitable to reconsider epochs and events at intervals that match the span of generations or suit new orientations in history or simply because reality prompts new understandings. 1821 was either a beginning or an end of an epoch. The perspective chosen by the organizers of the present conference is one among at least three. Most of those who look at the Greek Revolution of 1821 for instance agree to its suiting Hobsbawm's pattern of the Age of revolution (spreading from the double cradle it was a European expansion of the nation-state formula). 1821 may also fit into the other spoilt child of historic thought, the long centuries. In both the Greek case and the Romanian one 1821 would be the end of a long and oriental 18th cent.

Our own contribution, drawing on mainly less known materials is an attempt to add such nuances as the literary consequences of 1821. Taking into account both the Romanian expression and the Greek one, we actually witness a glide from the multi-ethnic Ottoman melting pot to a clear separation of nations and literary expressions as well as a definite statement of the bourgeois ideal of stability, comfort and justice.

Bogdan Popa (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *A Play, Two Royal Weddings, a Land Reform. The Academic, Political and Social Contexts of the Celebration of Tudor Vladimirescu in 1921* (Romanian, in person)

On 29th May 1920, the Romanian Academy decided to mark the centenary of Tudor Vladimirescu's revolution with a series of plenary events and special historiographical works. The idea of celebrating the revolution in which the peasantry of Wallachia played an essential role, but which ended in bloody conflicts with the Greek Etairia, had been announced to some extent by Nicolae Iorga in 1914. Great popular celebrations, a festive meeting, editions of the sources and, above all, a play with great didactic value (the drama “Tudor Vladimirescu”, by Nicolae Iorga) were the special events organized in March and June 1921. But 1921 has remained in the collective memory as the year of the agrarian reform promised to the Romanian soldiers, most of them simple peasants, when they entered the First World War. No less important were the two Romanian-European royal weddings.

In this paper I intend to analyze, based on Nicolae Iorga's historical, literary and memorial works, the context of the centenary of the 1921 revolution. I am interested both in the decision of the Romanian Academy to celebrate the revolution of 1821 and in the ways in which the royal family tried to maintain the balance between the politically significant decision of the marriage and political alliance with Greece and the memory of the tragic death of Tudor Vladimirescu, whose heroic figure was already indisputable.

Alexandru Mamina (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *The Revolution of 1821 – an Obsolete Theme* (Romanian, in person)

The paper discusses the evolution of Romanian historiography's interest in the 1821 Revolution over the last three decades. One can observe, based on the number of volumes and articles published, a fall into obsolescence of the theme, which tends to become a concern mainly local in the Oltenia area. The explanations

put forward concern the political culture prevailing in the public space after 1989, which engages the revolutionary idea in general and the evaluation of the nation-state in particular among younger generations of historians.

Fifth section: *Between Old and New Regime: Documentary Decoupage*

Oana Rizescu (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *The Boyar’s Class and the Small Officials in Oltenia from the Austrian Rule to Tudor Vladimirescu* (Romanian, in person)

Who are the Romanian vornic and ispravnic appointed by the Austrian central administration to represent its interests in Oltenia? How stable were their functions and what adjustments did they undergo during the reigns of Constantine Mavrocordat? How effectively was the authority of the Prince exercised in the territory after the reforms of the same Prince and in what parameters did the local power structures evolve in the second half of the 18th century? What was the impact of the administrative reorganization of Oltenia undertaken by Alexander Ypsilanti? In the spirit of a prosopographical approach undertaken in the field of regional institutional history, the paper traces the evolution of the small offices in Oltenia from the period of Austrian rule, using data from research into the tax censuses produced by the Austrian administration, the public catagraphs of the Romanian Country, and 19th century archondologies, with the aim of understanding both the characteristics of the social environment that produced Tudor Vladimirescu and the limitations he imposed on the events of 1821. The charisma of the “lord of the crowds”, capable of mobilizing multiple and otherwise conflicting interests in society on the path of revolutionary action, is related to the long-lasting evolutionary dynamics of social structures.

Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu, Cristian Ploscaru (Institute for Interdisciplinary Research, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Department, Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *Surprising Biographies: Descendants of a Moldavian Boyar Under the Banner of Greek Revolution – the Brothers Cantacuzino-Deleanu* (Romanian, in person)

Associated with the philhellenic trend that had emerged and spread among the cosmopolitan Russian elite since the time of Catherine II, as well with the conspiratorial associations that played a role in launching the Etairist movement, brothers Alexander and George Cantacuzino Deleanu, sons of an influential Moldavian boyar, Matthew, who had fled to Russia in 1792, are celebrated as leading representatives of the Greek liberation movement. Exponents of the codes of bravery and honor of the Russian officer corps of the time, they distinguished themselves in battle in 1821 in the Romanian Principalities and afterwards on Greek soil. Our interest focuses on a few biographical references associated with their links with Moldavia, with the local boyars, but also with circles of interests and loyalties in Petersburg, around Ioannis Capodistrias and the “war party” in the Empire of the East.

Constantin Ardeleanu (Faculty of History, “Dunărea de Jos” University, Galați; New Europe College, Bucharest), *The Moldavian Boyars and the Pasha of Braila in 1821* (Romanian, on Zoom)

By its geographical position, the citadel of Braila played an important role in the events of 1821. Pasha Iusuf, the commander of the Ottoman garrison in the city, was a significant but little-known player in the political and military developments of that year.

The present research will insist on the various functions played by Iusuf, as a channel of communication between Iasi and the authorities in Istanbul, as a negotiator with the political forces in Moldavia and later as a military leader involved in the “pacification” of the country. The presentation also shows how the Moldavian boyars tried to communicate with and through Iusuf, thus trying to detach themselves from the Etairist movement and from any suspicion that they had anti-Ottoman intentions and to reposition themselves as representatives of Moldavian national interests. A wide variety of contemporary edited sources will be used, bringing to light a less known actor of 1821.

Mihai Mîrza (National Archives, Iași Branch), *The Prelude to Secularization: the Fortunes of the Dedicated Convents from Moldavia in the Early Years After 1821* (Romanian, in person)

The turbulent events of 1821-1822 are deeply engraved in the memories of those who experienced them. Taking advantage of the mistrust of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, the boyars of Moldavia and Wallachia demanded on several occasions during 1821 and the first months of 1822, among other things, a return to the system of native Princes, the removal of foreign monks from the monasteries and a more judicious administration of the properties of these places of worship. The Sultan's response was, with some exceptions, favorable. If the appointment of the native Princes proved a lasting success, the removal of the Greek monks and their replacement by local monks was a temporary victory. As soon as Russia regained its influence in Constantinople, the question of the monasteries and their fortunes was settled in favor of the Holy Places. As a result of the Sultan's dispositions, in both Romanian countries, from the autumn of 1821 until 1827, the properties of the monasteries were administered by the state through a committee of Moldavian and Wallachian boyars and clerics. The income resulting from the administration of these assets was divided between the Holy Places, the monasteries and the Moldavian or Wallachian Principalities. Our paper will discuss, starting from new sources, the activity of the Committee of the Dedicated Monasteries, more precisely the way in which it understood to administer the wealth of the monasteries dedicated to the Holy Places on Mount Athos and in the East. I will also talk about the beginnings of the debate on the secularization, which would intensify over time and lead to Alexandru Ioan Cuza's law of 17/29 December 1863.

Saturday, September, 25th

Keynote speakers:

Vlasis Vlasidis, Costas Chalkis (Department for Balkan, Slavic and Oriental Studies, University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki), *Spreading Fake News During 1821 Revolution for the Contribution of the Balkan Nations* (English, on Zoom)

Every nation that rebelled against the Ottoman Empire during the 18th and the 19th century, either spontaneously or after thorough preparation, tried to motivate, not only other nations to rebel as well forming a united front, but also the Great Powers of that era in order to help their goal. Most of the time, the rebels exaggerated the facts and presented their impossible goals as real events or, even, exaggerated their victories on the battlefields. On that day and age, actions like those were considered spontaneous and enthusiastic actions and were completely understood. However, can nowadays those actions be considered fake news? The purpose of this essay is to focus on the texts written before and during the beginning of the Greek Revolution and to locate the declarations and promises given to the Balkan nations and chieftains, the events that never really happened, that were planned but not set in action and the exaggerations of the victories. In addition, this essay is set to examine if all the above were simply spontaneous actions or, in fact, were part of a bigger plan to fool the rest of the Balkan nations and the foreign forces. As sources were used the correspondences and declarations of the members of Philiki Etaireia sent to other rebels and chiefs of various local, national and ethnic groups, the correspondences of rebels sent to the representatives of the Great Powers and the newspapers that were published in 1821 in specific regions of Greece. These sources can be found at the Greek State Archives, the National Library of Greece and the Library of the Hellenic Parliament.

Sixth section: *1821 – Geopolitics and History in the Shaping of National Identities in the Balkans*

Victor Taki (Department of History, Concordia University of Edmonton), *The Year 1821 and Russia's Policy with Respect of Moldavia and Wallachia* (English, on Zoom)

The paper will examine both short- and long-term effects of the events of 1821 on Russia's policy with respect to Moldavia and Wallachia. It will begin with a brief overview of this policy in the decade preceding the Greek uprising. Both at the height of the confrontation with Napoleon and in the wake of his defeat Russia's policy in the principalities, just as its Eastern policy more broadly, was determined by its relations with the European Great powers. The high point of this tendency was the refusal Alexander I to declare war to the Ottoman Empire in support of the Etairia uprising. Both the contemporaries and later historians saw it as sacrifice of Russia's interests in the East for the sake of preservation of counter-revolutionary monarchical solidarity in Europe in the form of the Holy Alliance. However, this approach opened up the prospect of a loss of Russian influence in Moldavia and Wallachia, which is why the second half of the 1820s witnessed the development of the alternative policy of reform. Culminating in the elaboration adoption of the Organic Statutes this policy was made possible by numerous memoranda and projects that Moldavian and Wallachian boyars submitted to the Russian officials in the wake of 1821. The paper will argue that this policy of reform

represented a temporary revival of political dialogue between rulers and elites that existed in eighteenth-century Russia and other countries before being eclipsed by the ideological conflict generated by the French revolution. The end of the policy of reform in Moldavia and Wallachia came as a result of the resumption of the Austro-Russian cooperation in the spirit of the Holy Alliance after 1833, which was itself a response to the new revolutionary wave of the early 1830s.

Domagoj Krpan (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka), *How Religious Difference Was Not an Obstacle for Albanian Unification* (English, on Zoom)

In Southeastern Europa, 1821 was a year when the Greek War of Independence and the uprising in Danubian Principalities was a match that started the struggle for emancipation and independence of many nations living in this area. Two hundred years later, we can see that most of the states in this region created homogeneous nations under one church jurisdiction, e. g. Greece and Bulgaria. In other states where there are no clear majority or where the minority ethnic and religious groups represent a big part of the population, there are inter-ethnics tensions that lead to war, e. g. North Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The only nation which avoided creating one nation one religion state was Albania. Even today, most Albanians declared themselves Muslims, but there are many Christians in Albanians. One of the reasons is that there is the possibility that Albanians share the same view on the past, e. g. nation hero Skenderbeg was Christian noble fighting Ottoman Muslims. Furthermore, one of the League of Prizren's focuses was working towards Albanian identity that would cut across religious and tribal lines. These two examples demonstrate how Albanian nationalism was not obsessed with unifying religious aspects. They recognized that depending on one unifying aspect will be contra-productive for their national awakening.

This paper will examine how Albania, contrary to popular belief, created a multireligious state in the region where somebody would say that only one nation, one religion, and one state is possible.

Mircea-Cristian Ghenghea (Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași), *Tudor Vladimirescu and the Romanian Interwar Historiography: Documentary Contributions and Critical Reflections* (English, in person)

One of the key-figures of the Romanian historical patrimony, Tudor Vladimirescu benefited from a gradually increasing attention of the national historiography as the events in 1821 had been placed, even from the second part of the 19th century, in the center of a revival movement of the entire Romanian nation. Between the two World Wars there were numerous and intense discussions regarding the character of the movement (whether it was a revolution or not), the connections of Tudor Vladimirescu with the Greek movement Filiki Eteria, as well as his character as a man and a leader. Through our paper we deal with the main interwar documentary contributions regarding Vladimirescu and his actions and the way in which his figure was presented to the general public. This review of the sources and of the Romanian interwar historiography proved to be more than useful when trying to understand the reasons why the figure of the pandur militia leader was invested with such a historical significance and became an icon of the Romanian popular tradition and historiography.

Maria Dimasi, Angeliki Mouzakiti (Department of Languages, Literature and Culture of the Black Sea Countries, Democritus University of Thrace), *The Uprising of 1821 in the Danubian Principalities. Findings in Greek School History Textbooks of Primary and Secondary Education (20th-21st Century)* (English, in person)

In the present paper we will attempt to analyze, interpret and assess narrations and perceptions of the 1821 Uprising in the Danubian Principalities in Greek school history textbooks from a diachronic comparative perspective. More specifically, we collect and critically evaluate data which are mainly related to: i) the aims and the character of the revolt, ii) the general historical context, iii) the role of the agents, such as Alexander Ypsilantis and Tudor Vladimirescu, their collaboration efforts and conflicting goals and iv) the extent to which the revolt determined both the future political organization of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia and the outbreak of the Revolution in Peloponnese and Central Greece. Through the study and analysis of the Greek history textbooks we aim at: i) studying and analyzing the reception of aspects of the revolt which concern mainly its Balkan dimension, ii) highlighting the nexus between the past and the present through the research of the mechanisms of production, diffusion and reception of historical knowledge, iii) tracing the continuities, discontinuities and ruptures in the school narrative throughout the years and iv) developing a critical approach to the Greek national narrative and the collective identities which are constructed on the conceptual framework *Us and Others*.

Our research focuses on the history textbooks used in the primary and secondary education in Greece and covers roughly the period from the Centenary to the Bicentenary. We take into consideration both the major ideological and political shifts that took place in the Greek society during the past 100 years and the historiographical trends and controversies in the academic and public field which formulated historical writing and history education in Greece. Through the method of content analysis, we collect and evaluate the explicitly stated and implied references on the research topic and attempt to shed light upon the aims and intentions of the creators of the history teaching material.

Seventh section: *Romanian Historiographical Readings of the Year 1821*

Sergiu Iosipescu (The National Heritage Institute, Bucharest), *1821: Between historians' Interpretations and Historical Realities* (Romanian, on Zoom)

In Romania after the exceptional effort of Nicolae Iorga to complete the knowledge of historical sources about the Year 1821, followed by Emil Vârtosu and specially by an equip animated by Andrei Oțetea, the interpretation of the period focused for a long time to the relations between Tudor Vladimirescu's movement and the Greek Philike Hetairia. Partial explanation of this option can be found in the avatars of the South-East European historiography after WW II confronted with the imposed Marxist historical materialism, national communism and finally nationalism and actual cancel culture.

The impressing collections of sources concerning the Restauration in Europe (1814-1830) and the Saint Alliance, the marvelous capabilities of electronic libraries offer new directions to understanding the Year 1821 and establish if it represents *an*

Epoch Threshold for the South-East European evolution but even for the general European history.

Our study presents the politics of the great powers toward the Ottoman Empire from 1812 to 1814, at the Vienna Congress, and the Russian action in Balkans between 1815 and 1821. A complete interpretation of Tudor Vladimirescu's uprising must be connected with the general reaction, military, as a Napoleonic tradition, especially in the South Europe (kingdoms of Spain, Two Sicilies, and Piedmont) against the excesses of Restoration, and also with the consequences of the Ottoman state territorial decomposition following the war of 1768-1774 and Kuçuk Kaynardji peace (1774). Napoleon's Expedition in Egypt, the French Empire expansion in the Illyrian Provinces and Ionian Islands were favorable to the Serbian national war, which impressed Tudor Vladimirescu's and of course the Morea and Archipelago movements.

And finally like in other countries of South Europe, the Romanian Revolutionary movement didn't resume to the year 1821, it continued in 1822 and obtained its first national achievement, separated from the Greek war.

Vlad Popovici (Faculty of History and Philosophy, "Babeş-Bolyai" University, Cluj-Napoca), *The Historical and Historiographical Memory of 1821 in Transylvania and Banat* (Romanian, on Zoom)

Tudor Vladimirescu's movement and the events of the year 1821 in the Romanian Principalities inevitably sparked the interest of the authorities and the population of the neighboring regions that were, at the time, part of the Austrian Monarchy. Soon after the end of the military clashes, the image of Vladimirescu and the programmatic ideas of his movement began to be capitalized by the Transylvanian publishers of the time, either in the form of historical narratives, publication of primary sources or commemorative moments (e.g. the semi-centenary of 1871, the centenary of 1921). With the development and professionalization of the Romanian historiography of the topic, the question of the connections between Tudor Vladimirescu's movement and the Romanians from the Austrian Monarchy emerged as a distinct research question, intensely exploited ideologically from nationalist or socialist stand points. Our research focuses first and foremost on how Romanian publishers (mainly journalists but not only) in Transylvania and the Banat approached the subject before the First World War and on their strategies of constructing the image of Tudor Vladimirescu, while also keeping an eye on the corollary represented by this process' echoes and interpretation in the historical writing of the twentieth century.

Ştefan Petrescu (Institute of Southeast European Studies, Bucharest), *A Visit to the Working Laboratory of C. D. Aricescu, the Author of the First Monograph on the 1821 Revolution in the Romanian Principalities* (Romanian, on Zoom)

The first synthesis on the 1821 Revolution in the Principalities appeared in the context of the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the death of the hero, Tudor Vladimirescu. Its author was C. D. Aricescu, director of the National Archives. One of Aricescu's most important sources was the History of Ioannis Filimon, the first Greek writer to deal with Etairia and its action in the Principalities.

The Romanian writer sought in his approach to combat Filimon's position, which presented Tudor as a traitor and spy. Another work that aroused Aricescu's interest was the monograph of a Greek from Wallachia, Ilie Fotino (1846), whose moderate opinions became known to Romanians through the translation of P. M. Georgescu (1874), translator at the State Archives. Aricescu also published the first collection of historical documents, popularized Vladimirescu's portrait and was involved in the purchase of the revolutionary flag by the National Museum. Aricescu's narrative was also based on the oral testimonies of survivors. C. D. Aricescu's archive at the National Library of Romania contains a file of the author's notes, correspondence and many other documents.

Gabriel Moisa (Faculty of History, University of Oradea), *Between Politics and Historiography. Solomon Știrbu or the Proletcultism in the Sign of Tudor Vladimirescu's Revolution* (Romanian, on Zoom)

Solomon Știrbu was an interesting figure of Romanian proletcult historiography, being at the same time a useful comrade of the communists as a member of the National Popular Party. Less known today, he played an important role for several years in the destiny of Romanian historiography, being involved in strongly ideologized historiographical areas. One of these was related to the organization of the new museum in Oradea in 1947-1948. Thus, Solomon Știrbu was actively involved in the design and organization of the new museum institution in Oradea in the image and likeness of the popular regime in Bucharest. Shortly after his arrival in Oradea, in October 1947, he hastily organized a temporary exhibition dedicated to the "30th anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution", wishing to demonstrate his ideological effectiveness. The following year also marked his consecration as a "museographer", being the one under whose supervision the permanent exhibition of the Regional Museum "Petofi-Bălcescu" in Oradea was completed.

His historiographical skills were best displayed in the context of the dispute over the character of the 1821 revolution led by Tudor Vladimirescu, in which he was, of course, in the interpretative line of Mihail Roller.

The present work captures the main landmarks of his professional and historiographical destiny, implicitly those related to his involvement in the historiographical dispute related to Tudor Vladimirescu's revolution, which took place in the mid-1950s. Solomon Știrbu placed himself in Mihail Roller's interpretative camp, one that was opposed to that of the historian Andrei Oțetea.

Partners:



Iași City Hall



Ministry of Culture - County Direction for Culture, Iași



“Regina Maria” Municipal Museum, Iași

Media partner:

TV IAȘI

