

New Europe College Yearbook 2010-2011



IONUȚ FLORIN BILIUȚĂ
DUNYA DENIZ ÇAKIR
ANA-MARIA GOILAV
MARIANA GOINA
SILVIU-RADIAN HARITON
SUSAN MBULA KILONZO
CRISTIAN NAE
THEODOR-CRISTIAN POPESCU
COSMIN GABRIEL RADU
KONRAD SIEKIERSKI
ANDREEA ȘTEFAN

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



SILVIU-RADIAN HARITON

Born 1979, in Brăila, Romania

Ph.D. Candidate, Central European University, Budapest
Thesis: *War commemorations in inter-war Romania*

Teaching fellow (Historiography) at the University of Bucharest,
Faculty of History (2006-2010)
Member of the International Society for Cultural History (since 2008)

CEU Doctoral Research Support Grant, Russian, East European and
Eurasian Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
(September-November 2010)

CEU Doctoral Research Grant, Paris (July 2009)

Participation in international conferences held in Sofia (Bulgaria), Paris
(France), Hamburg and Berlin (Germany), Budapest and Köszeg (Hungary),
Florence (Italy), Chişinău (Moldavia), Romania, Portorose (Slovenia), Stockholm
(Sweden), Fort Leavenworth and Bloomington, Indiana (USA) and Southampton
(UK)

Publications in academic journals and edited volumes published in Bulgaria,
Germany, Romania, USA and UK

NATIONALISM, HEROISM AND WAR MONUMENTS IN ROMANIA, 1900s-1930s¹

On May 16, 1923 a train carrying the coffin with the remains of the Unknown Soldier arrived in Bucharest. It was selected during a ceremony taken place at Mărășești out of nine other unidentified bodies of soldiers fallen on ten most important battlegrounds the Romanian army fought in the Great War. The Unknown Soldier was brought to Mihai Vodă monastery for public mourning and it was buried on the next day in his specially designed Tomb in the Carol Park, the site of the June 1848 popular gathering and of the 1906 General Exhibition. Singled out from a series of other politically and militarily significant places of Bucharest like the statue of Michael the Brave, the initial Petre Antonescu's Arch of Triumph and the Military Club (*Cercul Militar*), the final site was in front of the Military Museum about to be established and to become a place of regularly organized visits for pupils and students during the interwar period. The process of selecting the body, carrying it to Bucharest and especially burying it represented a massive state organized ceremony where the most important public authorities, the hierarchs of the Romanian Orthodox Church, of the Greek-Orthodox Church and of the Catholic Church, officer corps, local notabilities, teachers and university professors, soldiers, high school pupils and students were convoked according to a detailed plan and had to participate. The tombstone was engraved with the inscription: "Here the unknown soldier happily sleeps *întru Domnul*, fallen as a part of the sacrifice for the unity of the Romanian people; the soil of remade Romania rests on his bones, 1916-1919". Besides this religiously shaped message, the inscription followed the Brancovan decorative style to be found in the Orthodox churches of 17th and 18th century Danubian Principalities and re-employed in the decades around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century as a part of a so-called Neo-Romanian style.²



Image 1. The grave of the Unknown Soldier, Bucharest, 1930s.

Source: ANIC, fond Illustrate, I 3229.

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Bucharest's Carol Park represented the central piece of an archipelago of war monuments that flourished in interwar Romania following a tradition established in the previous decades. These war monuments were dedicated to the Romanian participation in the Russian-Turkish War of 1877-1878 (Romania's War of Independence), in the Second Balkan War of 1913 and especially in the Great War. The vast majority of the Romanian war monuments is to be found in the urban areas of the Old Kingdom, in the areas where battles were carried which is nearby the Danube, nearby the Carpathians and on the valleys of Jiu, Prahova and Siret rivers but also scattered in numerous localities of the countryside. Their construction started in the last decades of the nineteenth century with some tens of war monuments being constructed between 1906 and 1914. The years around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century were a time when the occasions for public celebration multiplied, the political participation in the public sphere intensified, when professional groups able to promote public art were created and a public able to read it and enjoy it took form and, not the least, when resources became more readily available for being invested

in a variety of public building and public monuments. Still, the greatest part of the war monuments under discussion was erected in the interwar period, mostly during the 1920s. During the 1940s resources for building new war monuments became limited due to the Second World War and the subsequent Soviet occupation. Later, war monuments fell into oblivion before being recuperated especially during the Nicolae Ceaușescu's regime and turned again into sites of public rituals and political participation.

This paper contextualizes and details the appearance and the heyday of this particular type of public monuments in modern Romania. While paying attention to both the previous and the subsequent periods, my research concentrated only on the first four decades of the twentieth century when a tradition building upon itself of constructing public monuments started being developed in association within the paradigm of (state) nationalism. The questions framing my research included why war monuments started to appear mostly around the turn of the centuries in Romania? What were the ideological, political, social, economic and institutional contexts? What were the factors that contributed to this delay in comparison with Western and Central Europe? Who initiated them, who supported them financially and logistically, who sanctioned and used them and for what purposes? Who were included and who were excluded in the iconography of these monuments? What were the artistic, cultural and political languages that framed the iconography of war monuments? In approaching the Romanian case, I benefited from the previous work on different aspects of the topic authored by Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu,³ Florian Tucă,⁴ Andi Mihalache⁵ and especially Maria Bucur⁶ while Ioana Beldiman's work on French sculpture in Romania was a model for placing artifacts in their historical contexts and dealing with them in terms of social command and reception.⁷ A first part of the text contextualizes the category of war monuments within the larger European context of the nineteenth century and links it to a series of factors including the transformation of the definition of heroism; a second part surveys the factors that made possible the appearance of war monuments in the early twentieth century Romania while the following three parts presents and discusses the characteristics of war monuments in the three periods when they flourished in Romania, the period of 1900s-1910s; the 1920s; and the 1930s.

From Hero to heroes: public sphere, monuments and nationalism in the long nineteenth century

War monuments defined in this paper as intentional monuments designed especially for commemorating wars and recognize the contribution of those fallen during these wars are one of the most visible indicators of the impact of nationalism in modern times. They were not only the result of the affirmation of political ideologies but also the result of a series of interlinked processes taking place during the long nineteenth century including those of urbanization, spread of literacy, expansion of the public sphere and political participation, spread of arts and middle and higher education. Some of the most renowned scholars of the cultural history of nationalism like Benedict Anderson and George Mosse paid attention to war monuments. "No more arresting emblems of the modern culture of nationalism exist than cenotaphs and tombs of Unknown Soldiers. The public ceremonial reverence accorded these monuments precisely *because* they are either deliberately empty or no one knows who lies inside them, has no true precedents in earlier times" observed Benedict Anderson thirty years ago in the beginning of the first chapter of his *Imagined communities* pointing to war memorials as embodiments of the symbolic nature of nationalism.⁸ Before Anderson, George Mosse was less reflective on the nature of war monuments but more applicative in integrating the series of German national monuments built during the nineteenth century in his cultural history of the artifacts and rituals that helped building a visual culture that contributed to the *Nationalization of the masses* and to the rise of the Nazi ideology in Germany.⁹

It was the body of scholarship devoted to the cultural impact of the First World War that paid a closer and a more systematic look at the spread, iconography and uses of the war memorials dedicated during the interwar period to common soldiers fallen in the above mentioned war. While previously Antoine Prost has documented this type of public monuments in France,¹⁰ Australian historian Ken Inglis opened the way for approaching them in a more analytical way by pointing to the facts that these monuments had the unique feature that "after 1914-1918, both official policy and popular taste leaned towards equality in death". While previously ignored because few of them were considered of artistic value the monuments dedicated to the First World War started being given attention once cultural history became more popular among the academia of English language.¹¹ The most important scholar of the cultural history of

the Great War, Jay Winter, approached war memorials as the most visible evidence of a quest throughout the villages and towns of Europe for a meaning of the Great War that was to be accommodated in their process of mourning by the generations who fought the war and survived it.¹² Their performative action in front of the younger generations was stipulated by Reinhart Koselleck who underlined that “memorials which commemorate violent death provide a means of identification” for both the dead and the surviving people, on the one hand the dead being identified as heroes of the nation while on the other hand the surviving people being more or less directly suggested to follow their model.¹³ While focusing on the war monuments of the Great War because they represent the heaviest part of the constructed and surviving war monuments in general and especially because of their egalitarian significance, the scholars of the Great War paid less attention to the role played by previous developments of public monuments and definitions of heroism that greatly shaped the articulation, iconography and uses of the war monuments dedicated to the First World War. Therefore, for the benefit of this paper, war monuments or the monuments to the fallen soldiers are considered to be a category of public monuments that became widespread in a period of time of about a century spanning from 1850s to 1940s. Either under the form of buildings of more or less public use, gravestones, statues, street names or memorial plaques, public monuments and their spread in the modern era are a telling indicator of the ongoing cultural, social, political and ideological processes.

Monuments are approached by different trends of cultural and art history as political statements in modern times. Public monuments built in the decades around 1900 tend to present a unified vision of the past, they can easily be compared to an open space museum of the nation with several layers of memory while their iconography can be described as heroic, self-aggrandizing and figurative celebrating national ideals and triumphs.¹⁴ While paying no attention to the aesthetical dimension of the war monuments under consideration, this paper focuses on five dimensions of the war monuments: 1) their iconography which is approached as a set of ideological statements, cultural codes and illustrations of cultural pantheons and political discourses; 2) the illustrative function for the ideas of historical event and especially of various types of heroism and subsequent pantheons and thus as an indicator of the process of democratization that the concept of heroism passed during the nineteenth century; 3) their construction and use as sites for performing political

rituals; monuments devoted to groups of men, their spread can be correlated with the dissemination of the idea of “people” with its growing use of national history in arts and in literature; 4) they should not be considered as the result of a monolithic program imposed from top to the bottom even if the cultural, political and artistic languages they employed were designed by artistic and literary groups writing especially for the upper and sometimes middle classes; instead their erection represented the result of vernacular initiative and resources, social groups of a local distribution for whom these war monuments represented an instrument of connecting their contexts to the center(s) of political decision; and 5) in addition to being illustrative of a rhetorical style and content, these war monuments contributed to a visual discourse that reinforced the discourse of nationalism with its embedded military heroism.

Respecting a dynastic principle, funerary monuments had a “prospective” character during the Middle Age being devoted to the fate of the deceased beyond the grave and only since the Renaissance they regained a “retrospective” character being devoted to commemorating life and deeds on earth.¹⁵ The multiplication of “retrospective” monuments was a historical process that took place in early modern Western Europe. Professor Andrei Pippidi defined statues as “itinerant graves”, empty graves taking over the manifestations of public devotion to the memory of a dead personality.¹⁶ The rise of the public monument during the early modern period may indeed be correlated with the changing attitudes towards death, death being gradually evacuated from the growing urban areas. Initially restricted to royal and princely figures, monuments started being dedicated also to important military and political men towards the end of the eighteenth century public while the series of events associated with and subsequent to the French Revolution led to the formation of pantheons of Great Men which indiscriminately included historical figures, military, religious and political men as well as men of letters and arts.¹⁷ Symptomatic for this expansion of the pantheons as well as for the definition of Great Men is Thomas Carlyle’s 1841 essay *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* where heroism is analyzed in different fields of human activity and illustrated with the biographies of Dante and Shakespeare as the literary heroes, the biography of Martin Luther as the religious hero, the biography of Jean-Jacques Rousseau as the intellectual hero, Odin as an example of the divine hero and the biographies of Oliver Cromwell and Napoleon Bonaparte as the military and political heroes.¹⁸

The ideological, political, social and economic transformations of the nineteenth century contributed to a gradual democratization of heroism, initially confined only to the Great Men and later extended to include different social categories and to the concepts of nation and people. During the first half of the nineteenth century, historical themes became a favorite topic represented in literature and arts, historical characters and scenes being used as references, symbols, models and countermodels for the contemporary political debates and struggles. In parallel with the spread of the historical novels and plays and the making of the public museums like Louvre, visual artifacts created in this period, and later, greatly contributed in setting up the imagery supporting the paradigm of national history in Western Europe.¹⁹ Since the 1830s, the idea of historical patrimony started to develop as a consequence of this process and unintentional monuments like historical ruins, previously treated more like exotic artifacts and source of personal inspiration, received a growing attention with consequences on the closer attention given to the role of intentional public monuments in educating the public.²⁰

While for most of the nineteenth century, "heroism" was confined only to describing the deeds of the Great Men, models to be followed mostly by the instructed individuals, the "people" became a growingly visible subject represented mostly in painting and literature and later it included public monuments. After the mid-nineteenth century the Great Men started being represented as surrounded by personifications and social types. Further, starting with the decades around the turn of the nineteenth century great men were rather integrated among the people they were considered representative for or they led or they worked with even if particular features that helped their identification were still preserved. Thus their deeds were no longer considered to be exclusively belonging to them but the result of a collective effort.

Several factors may be taken into account for understanding the transformation of "heroism" from a model for elites to a model for masses of people during the nineteenth century: a) the spread of mass literacy enlarged the reading market and demanded accessible heroes which is visible in the spread of popular novels and theater; b) the expansion of the public sphere and of political participation; and c) the generalization of military conscription in Europe after the victories of Prussia during the 1860s and 1870. Military conscription offered an experience to large masses of men and represented the basis for the development after the 1880s of a process of commemorating the war experiences of the nineteenth century.

This process of war commemoration celebrated the “heroic” deeds of the common soldiers, a process of memorialization aimed at culturally mobilizing the male population for the (possible) war(s) to come. The “hero” turned into “heroes” while “heroism” and “heroic” deeds tended to refer only to acts of courage, braveness, self-sacrifice, sometimes comradeship and brotherhood into arms, all chanted in patriotic literature, textbooks and public and school ceremonies. All these transformations made possible the appearance of war monuments grounded in the paradigm of national history, a military definition of heroism and the uses of public ceremonies for cultural and political mobilization.

In correlation with the growth of the number of instructed people and the number of citizens active in the public sphere, the number of public monuments, especially of statues, increased exponentially in the decades prior to the First World War as a part of the cultural politics of state-/nation-/empire-building all over Europe, the cultural codes associated with the local centers of power helping in (re)inventing the local and national political traditions. Besides lay and religious statues of a symbolic nature, public monuments were dedicated to three types of figures or heroes: a) men associated with the major political decisions contemporary or still directly affecting the period like royal figures, statesmen and military leaders; b) men of culture and science especially of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; and c) historical figures, usually belonging to the period of the Middle Age, who were those acclaimed for most of the times as national heroes and mostly used to promote political and national unity.²¹

In France, building and removing monuments followed the violent political changes started in 1789 and reflected the competing political and ideological discourses.²² However, it was only the Third Republic that pursued a systematic program of disseminating its set of symbols through visual artifacts decorating public buildings and public squares. While the monument of Defense was built in the last days of the Second Empire (Amédée Doblemaire) and the statue of Jeanne D’Arc (Emmanuel Fremiet) was erected while awaiting Henri V to accept the tricolor, starting the late 1870s numerous busts of Marianne and statues of political figures of the French Revolution or cultural figures of the French Enlightenment started to adorn the urban areas and the public buildings.²³ Some of the most important statues were the static *Monument to the Republic* of Leopold and Charles Morice (Place de la République, Paris, 1879-1883) and the more dynamic *Triumph de la République* of Jules Dalou (Place de la Nation, Paris, 1889-1899). Overall, several hundred monuments

appeared in Paris and elsewhere in France in the decades prior to 1914. A part of them, directly associated with the French Revolution, were removed during the Nazi occupation and the Vichy regime and many of them were unfortunately destroyed partially or entirely.²⁴

In Germany, the tradition of *National-denkmäler* consisted in the construction of massive granite monuments placed at the heart of the countryside, symbolically differentiating from if not opposing the bronze and marble statues of France mostly built in urban tissues. Joseph-Ernst von Bandel's Arminius monument situated in the Teutoburg Forest (1839-1875) symbolically identified the German nation with the ancient German tribes and the victory of the latter (9 AD) was celebrated as the victory of their supposedly healthier and uncorrupted way of living over the Roman cosmopolitanism, so much prized in Paris and France where the Roman political traditions represented the model and the foundation of the First Republic and of the First Empire. Johannes Schilling's monument of Niederwald (inaugurated in 1883) representing a *Germania* very similar to the Statue of Liberty and Bruno Schmitz's monument to Kaiser Wilhelm I at the confluence of Moselle and Rhine (inaugurated 1897) symbolically guarded Germany's border with France. Bruno Schmitz authored other two major monuments situated in Porta Westfalica and on the Kyffhäuser Mountain (both inaugurated in 1896) and the biggest of all German national monuments, *The Monument to the Battle of Nations in Leipzig* (1913). All these National- *denkmäler* became sites of national pilgrimage and they can be considered war monuments as well. Furthermore, tens of statues dedicated to Wilhelm I and later hundreds of monuments dedicated to Bismarck spread all over Germany in the decades prior to the First World War, solidifying the visual culture of *volkish* militarism that influenced to a great extent the political affiliations of numerous Germans during the Weimer Republic.²⁵

In Austria, statues of Joseph II were erected by the German communities and they became sometimes contested sites as Nancy Wingfield has documented.²⁶ In Hungary, local authorities constructed numerous columns of the Millennium after 1896, all placed in mountainous regions or on high hills, some of them symbolically guarding Hungary's borders of 1867.²⁷ In the Balkans, major statues were erected to Prince Milos Obrenovici in Belgrade (1882) and to the Russian tsar Alexander II in front of the Bulgarian Parliament in Sofia (1907).²⁸

In this context, where the symbolic legacy of the First Republic and Napoleonic wars heavily influenced the political cultures in France and

Germany, the commemoration of the French-Prussian war of 1870 became the vehicle for employing collective heroes in parallel with a similar process of commemorating the Civil War in United States so well before the First World War.²⁹

The gradual democratization of heroism and the heyday of this military version of heroism are visible after the Great War in the process of war commemoration that swept (mostly the victorious states of) Europe.³⁰ For the case of the British Empire and later the Commonwealth, the memory of the Great War played an important role in underlining its political and cultural unity through the shared experience on the Western Front.

After the Second World War, public monuments spread especially in the countries where a process of constructing a historical consciousness supporting and legitimizing local forms of power was under going e.g. the Soviet Union and all the other Communist states or major transformations of the local paradigms were undertaken e.g. the Holocaust. The war monuments constructed within the paradigm of the nation-state during the nineteenth century and especially during the first half of the twentieth century were affected most of the times by indifference. When and where abrupt political changes emerged, the most visible such monuments were affected by various forms of iconoclasm e.g. the major Communist and Soviet monuments in Eastern Europe after 1989.³¹

The rise of the public monument in nineteenth century Romania:

As everywhere else in Europe, the appearance and the spread of public monuments in nineteenth century Romania was the result of a combination of local ideological, political, institutional, social and economic factors. Besides these, the acculturation of the French culture by the local elites played a major role in the articulation of public, artistic and cultural spheres.³² The first public monuments in Romania to last were those of Michael the Brave in Bucharest (1874) and of Stephen the Great in Jassy (1883) followed during the 1880s by the statues dedicated to illustrious figures of cultural revival like Gheorghe Lazăr and Ion Heliade Rădulescu in Bucharest and Miron Costin and Gheorghe Asaky in Jassy.

Probably close to a hundred public monuments were created in Romania before the First World War and they were dedicated mainly to three types of heroes: the historical figures usually categorized as national

heroes; the cultural personalities who shaped the canon of modern Romanian culture; and the political personalities who created the modern Romanian state during the nineteenth century. Their distribution is clearly regional before 1914, their presence in regions other than their regions of birth and activity dating mainly from the interwar period. When no birthplace, place of death or period of activity could be linked to the respective personality, the choice for a certain cultural or political figure indicates the regional identity of the group of members of initiative and support committee as well as of those who subscribed for the creation and building of the statue in their locality.

Identification, selection, clustering and ordering according to a theme and in chronological order of the public monuments in general and of the war monuments in special was possible due to two main sources of information. One of them is a dictionary compiled during the 1970s by the military documentarist Florian Tucă.³³ The other one is a survey of public monuments ordered in 1937 by the Commission of Public Monuments, established 1929, not to be confused with the Commission of Historical Monuments established in 1892.³⁴ Both of these surveys are not complete and systematic and a reserve on their accuracy should be preserved at all times. However they are useful in tracing the spread of public monuments in Romania dedicated to the three types of heroes mentioned above, statemen, cultural figures and national heroes, and especially in identifying the war monuments dedicated to the war of 1877-1878, to the campaign of 1913 and to the campaigns of 1916-1919. All of the following lists of monuments are based on these two main sources of information and the lists of the localities are indicated according to the administrative organization of Romania existing in the moment of their compilation, the 1930s and the 1970s.

According to the dictionary of Florin Tucă, a monument dedicated to Stephen the Great was erected in Bârsești, Vrancea County, in 1904, Mircea the Elder had a statue built in Tulcea in the early 1910s only to be removed by the Bulgarian military authorities during the First World War while Tudor Vladimirescu received attention mainly in Oltenia (Baia de Arama, Mehedinți County, 1898; Targu Jiu, 1898; Cerneti, Mehedinți County, 1914) and Bucharest (1934). Vasile Alecsandri benefited of the famous monument in Jassy in 1906 while Costache Negri of a monument in Galati in 1912. Political figures like Alexandru Ioan Cuza and Mihail Kogalniceanu received attention mainly in Moldavia. Cuza was depicted as a standing man and therefore as a stateman, riding a horse being a

posture reserved only for princely and royal figures. Cuza's statues were erected in Galați (bust in 1888 and, according to Tucă, a statue in 1917), Grivița, Vaslui County, 1903; Mărășești, 1908; Jassy, 1910/2; Răcăciuni, Bacău County, 1912; Alexandria, 1915 (Ion Iordănescu), Cetate, Dolj County, 1933, Craiova, 1939. The statues of Iasi, Galați and Craiova were authored by Raffaello Romanelli. Statues to Kogălniceanu were built at Galați, 1893; Piatra Neamț (Wladimir Hegel); Iasi, 1911; Dorohoi, 1913 and Bucharest, 1936.³⁵

Romanian monuments dedicated to the War of Independence (the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878):

The appearance and the spread of war monuments in the late nineteenth century Romania was possible in the context of commemorating the Romanian participation in the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 and it represented the embodiment of a militarized conception of heroism disseminated especially after the 1870s. The Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 was immediately interiorized in the political and historical culture of Romania as the Independence War (*Războiul de Independență*) and it quickly became the cornerstone of King Carol I's reign. While 1866 moments of his election as a prince and of establishing the Constitution were the creation of the Romanian political elites, only after 1871 his personal influence being firmly established, Carol I's role in the successful Romanian involvement in the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 was pivotal and therefore uncontestable. Especially since the 1890s his image became increasingly more visible in the public sphere in connection to the symbolic affirmation of the young Romanian kingdom through the development of the public infrastructure on the one hand and through the commemoration of the War of Independence on the other hand. While he showed no personal ambition for being immortalized because he saw himself as an element of equilibrium in the volatile Romanian politics and never as an absolute monarch, in spite of maintaining the army as his personal domain, the commemoration of the 1877-1878 war was partially based on and in the same time contributed to a growing cult of Carol I's effigy.³⁶ However, few busts were dedicated to him compared to those dedicated to the historical, political and cultural figures and no public subscription or parliamentary initiative for providing public funds for erecting a statue seems to have been successfully launched before the 1930s. Based on the 1937 survey of public

monuments, I could identify only three monuments dedicated to Carol I before 1914. A first one was authored by C. Bălăcescu and it was built in Turnu Severin. Placed in the courtyard of the local high school "Traian," it cost 7.000 lei.³⁷ Other two monuments appeared in Călugăreni (1913) and Gh. Lazăr, Ialomița County (1914).³⁸

The Romanian participation in the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 in the Romanian arts and literature before the First World War

An iconography of the Romanian participation in the war started early to develop, King Carol I being the first to order paintings describing moments from the war, including his presence. Thus he ordered five paintings to Johann Nepomuk Schönberg in order to adorn his residences, the Royal Palace in Bucharest and the Peleş residence in Sinaia, Prahova County.³⁹ However, during the war a series of artists were conscripted including Nicolae Grigorescu, Sava Henția and George Demetrescu Mirea. They had the opportunity to document and sketch drawings of soldiers in different moments of their daily life.⁴⁰ Among them, Grigorescu is probably the mostly known to create a large number of paintings, especially during the 1880s. *Atacul de la Smârdan* (The attack of Smârdan, 1885, 253x390cm) is probably the largest but some other pieces, impressive through their size, were *Vedeta* (85.5x122.5cm) and *Spionul* (1878-1880, 74x143.5cm). For the first one, Grigorescu received from the city of Bucharest a portion of land of 1823sqm close to the Victoria Square. For other two, *Dorobanțul* and *Recunoașterea*, Nicolae Blaremburg paid 12.000 lei. Besides a large number of sketches and paintings, in 1878-1879 he printed at Paris an "Album of the Independence War", only ten images out of the intended thirty being printed in the end. A set of such five images were supposed to be sold at twenty lei or six lei a piece but not many of them were actually sold and therefore in 1902 he donated the rest of the issue to the Ministry of Public Instruction. The ministry donated sets of ten copies to the normal schools for preparing teachers and a copy to every rural school having a building in good condition and only if the teacher agreed to pay for the frame.⁴¹ The difficulty of distributing these images is illustrative for the ways how the cultural politics of war memorialization were implemented and for the popular indifference their study should be placed against.

Presenting Nicolae Grigorescu's work including his paintings dedicated to the war experience of 1877-1878, Vlad Țoca observes they depict

rather idealized figures with no particular feature or expression on their faces⁴² denoting their conception as part of an impersonal visual program corollary to the national ideology. The same observation may be extended to the war monuments under discussion, constructed before and after the First World War. When representing human figures, the focus is on their bodies and their solemn, resigned or broken posture and hardly on the features of their faces that could have denoted personal feelings.

The commemoration of the Independence War took numerous forms and it is visible in numerous forms of media. It was not a systematic policy promoted by a monolithic state, as it is visible in the difficulty of disseminating the images created by Nicolae Grigorescu, but the result of a set of initiatives of local and national actors who were active in the public sphere, actors sharing the language of nationalism and many times being active either in the public bureaucracy or in the parliamentary activity. This was visible in the spread of war poetry, later to be included as a part of primary schools' curriculum, in the initiatives of streets' renaming, in the publication of self glorifying recollections and military textbooks etc.⁴³

While a military fashion started to spread among some members of the Romanian upper classes, especially among children and women (illustrated by Ion Luca Caragiale's *Domnul Goe* while Queen Maria's representation as an officer of *roșiori* troops is more of an exception),⁴⁴ in many cities including Bucharest and Brăila square names and street names were changed during the early 1880s in order to celebrate the outcome of the war and the names of the victories or bodies of the army: *Piața Independenței, Calea Victoriei, Calea Rahovei, Calea Plevnei, Calea Griviței, Calea Dorobanților, Calea Călărășilor, Roșiori Street* etc. Rahova, Plevna, Grivița represented names of battlefields where the Romanian army has fought while the others represented names given to different branches of the Romanian army. Before 1908 when all young men started being conscripted if they were in their early twenties, only about a quarter of them were actually trained in the barracks for several years, either in the regular infantry (*infanteria de linie*) or in the regular chivalry (*roșiori*). The rest of them, about three quarters of those conscriptable in their early twenties, were trained periodically, once a week and for several weeks in the autumn, as territorial infantry troops (*dorobanți*) or territorial chivalry troops (*călărăși*). Added to these names, streets carrying the names of Mihai Bravu and Stephen the Great were reminders of the glorious past and of the brave behavior attributed to the Romanian people by the historical and literary writings of the time.⁴⁵

Numerous recollections or histories of the war were written since the 1880s but especially around the turn of the centuries,⁴⁶ the events were always part of the military textbooks⁴⁷ while the celebration of twenty-five years since the war took place triggered an increase of attention given to commemorating the Romanian participation in the Russian-Turkish War of 1877-1878. A column of forty meters in height, engraved with scenes from the war to be authored by Karl Storck, was proposed; a play entitled "Peneş Curcanul" was written by actors of the National Theater and it was staged there on May 11 and 19, 1902. The theme was used in several examples of the school theater encouraged at that time.⁴⁸ The third volume of his Comanesteanu family saga, Duiliu Zamfirescu's *At war* (In război) was initially published in 1897-1898 in *Convorbiri literare* and significantly in separate volumes in 1902 and 1907.

Vasile Alecsandri quickly wrote during the war a series of poems like *Peneş Curcanul*, the *Sergeant*, *Ode to the Romanian soldiers* and *Hora de la Plevna* which were published in 1878 in the volume *Our soldiers* (*Ostaşii noştri*). Alecsandri created the character Peneş Curcanul based on the real life Constantin Ţurcanu (1854-1932), a sergeant of *dorobants*, the Romanian territorial infantry troops between 1872 and 1908. The hero necessary for providing a unitary narrative, Peneş Curcanul became the main character of many subsequent romanced histories of the war, including of the first Romanian movie, *Independenţa României* (1912). During the First World War Constantin Ţurcanu volunteered to fight in the Romanian army and apparently he also enrolled all his sons and grandsons.⁴⁹

A teenager in the years following 1877-1878, George Coşbuc dedicated a great part of his writing to the memorialization of the Independence War, his marriage with the daughter of school books editor C. Sfetea in 1895 and his activity as a director in the Ministry of Public Instruction after 1902 probably playing a role in focusing his attention to writing war poetry. While early poems like *Trei Doamne şi toţi trei* (1891) and *Recrutul* (1893) were included in his volume *Balade şi idile*, the volume *Songs of bravery* (*Cântece de vitejie*, 1904) collected the largest number of poems dedicated to glorifying the Romanian participation in 1877-1878, all of them written between 1898 and 1904. This volume included *Dorobanţul*, 1900; *Scut şi armă*, 1902; *Mortul de la Putna*, 1903; *Pe Dealul Plevnei*, 1900; *Cântecul redutei*, 1898; *Povestea căprarului*, 1898; *Coloană de atac*, 1900; *O scrisoare de la Muselin-Selo*, 1901; *Raport (Luarea Griviţei)*, 1898. Song [*Cântec*], the opening poem of this volume is illustrative for the cultural agenda it carried: "Raise your head, you worthy people/

All of you who speak the same language and carry one name/You all should have a single goal and a single wish/To proudly raise above all in this world/The tricolor!"⁵⁰ In addition, in 1899, Coșbuc published two narrative accounts dedicated to the participation of the Romanian army in 1877-1878: *Războiul nostru pentru neatârnare* (Our war for independence) and *Povestea unei coroane de oțel* (The story of a steeled crown). This period correlates with the period of intensification of public celebrations in Romania and the appearance and spread of war monuments.

All these cultural artifacts contributed to the articulation of a warrior culture that served as an instrument for further cultural mobilization for war where war monuments played a major role. Illustrative for this warrior culture is Ioan Nenițescu's *Lion cubs* (Pui de lei), a poem that entered school curriculum and pupils' folklore ever since:

There were heroes and there still are/
And there will be among the Romanian people/
Born out of hard rock/Romanians grow everywhere!//
It's our inheritance/Created by two men with strong arms/
Steeled will/Strong minds and great hearts.//
And one is Decebal the diligent/And the other one is Traian the rightful/
For their homeland/They bitterly fought so many enemies.//
And out of such parents/Always fighters will be born/
Who for their motherland/Will stand as the next [fighters]//
There were heroes and there will be/Who will defeat the evil enemies/
Out of Dacia's and Rome's ribbon/Forever little lions will be born.⁵¹

It comes at no surprise that the first Romanian movie was dedicated to the war of 1877-1878. The two hours movie was authored by Grigore Brezianu and it included a cast composed mostly by the actors of the National Theater of Bucharest. Brezianu obtained the necessary 400.000 lei from Leon Popescu, a rich senator of Ialomița. Popescu was also helpful in gaining the support of the War Department for the 80.000 troops used as extras as well as the military equipment used for fostering realism to the movie. The script was supposed to be as historically accurate as possible and the character of PeneșCurcanul became the common hero that viewers were able to connect with. With explicit emphasis on being realist and aiming at stirring emotions, the movie had a pedagogical aspect which is visible also in the fact that its premiere on September 1, 1912, was accompanied by a libretto listing the most important scenes with their

accurate historical chronology. Significantly, a competitive project with the same topic authored by Gaumont with a cast of a different Romanian theater was stopped by the Romanian authorities on the grounds of not being historically accurate.⁵² Historical objectivity became once again the instrument for eliminating alternative interpretations to the officially approved historical perspective.

The Romanian war monuments before the First World War

In this context, war monuments dedicated to a collective hero took either the form of celebrating historical figures who led the Romanian people in their fight against the never ending foreign invasions during the Middle Age or the form of celebrating the three major events of the nineteenth century that shaped the Danubian Principalities and Romania: the 1821 revolt led by Tudor Vladimirescu, the 1848 revolution in Wallachia and the war of 1877-1878. The monuments dedicated to Vladimirescu were already surveyed in a previous section. The celebration of fifty years since the Wallachian revolution of 1848 contributed to the appearance of the first highly visible war monument dedicated to a collective hero and in the same time one of the first public monuments in Bucharest. Initiated by Eugeniu Carada, the monument authored by Wladimir Hegel (1839-1918) was inaugurated in September 13, 1903, actually on the fifty-fifth anniversary of the struggle of Dealu Spirii of 1848 when Ottoman troops occupied Bucharest and removed the revolutionary government. Dislocated during the 1980s to make place to the present Palace of the Romanian Parliament, the monument to the firemen was restored on September 13, 1990. A Victory trumpets the victory of liberalism and nationalism and supports a wounded fireman.⁵³

It was only the Romanian participation in the 1877-1878 that best fitted the criteria for a national celebration: it involved a large number of people from all historical regions of the Old Kingdom of Romania, it was victorious and it greatly shaped the cultural and political realities contemporary to those organizing and assisting the commemorative practices. While a first Arch of Triumph was built in 1878 for the troops returning from Bulgaria,⁵⁴ the first monuments dedicated to 1877-1878 were erected nearby the most important battlefields in Bulgaria where the Romanian troops took their part, at Plevna, Rahova and Smârdan. Authored by Fritz Storck, together with a chapel constructed at Grivița,

they cost 180-190.000 lei that were paid by the Department of War. The monument at Smârdan is described in 1898 by a visitor as being “a bronze woman, looking to Bulgaria’s interior, holding a light in her right hand and a sword in her left hand; keeping her right foot on a cannon and her left foot on a broken chain” with the inscription “Giving your life in a manly way, you have given life to your country and liberty to Bulgaria. Grateful Romania will never forget you; what is gained through fiery battles must be piously preserved. Nations that reward those faithfully serving them assure their future.” The same traveler was observing that monuments “remind us forever the glorious deeds of a people on the one hand and they steel the future generations and strengthen the sentiment of patriotism on the other hand”,⁵⁵ an observation that confirms Reinhart Koselleck’s theoretical analysis of the role of war monuments.

According to the two surveys of public monuments that were used as primary sources for this study, over sixty war monuments were constructed before 1914, several of them in the first decades after the war but the greatest part of them being built after 1907, mostly in the county capital cities next to Danube (Calafat, Turnu-Măgurele, Tulcea etc.), in the cities around Bucharest (Potlogi, Pitești, Ploiești) and fewer in the rather mountainous regions of Moldova (Vrancea, Neamț etc). This geographical distribution is not necessarily an indicator of the origin of the sacrificed troops but it is rather an indicator of the urban communities able to mobilize the resources necessary for erecting these monuments.⁵⁶

Interestingly enough, based on these lists, monuments built in Moldavia seem to appear only after 1907. The greatest part of these monuments were not constructed in relation to the local cemeteries and no special war cemeteries or sections dedicated to war graves were created in the cemeteries existing or being created before the First World War. Why two thirds of the war monuments constructed before 1914 were inaugurated after 1907 may be related not only to a more coherent policy of stressing national unity after the Great Peasant Revolt and to a greater availability of resources but also to the activism of the teachers impregnated by the cultural policies of Spiru Haret.⁵⁷

The design of these monuments does not include any religious reference either in the form of dedications, the presence of crosses or the employment of floral elements associated with the old Orthodox monasteries, the old Romanian culture or the newly stylized Neo-Romanian. In most of the cases, they represent obelisks having sometimes an eagle on top of them,

soldiers of different army corps, female figures representing either Patria or Victory holding flags, laurels or swords. Below them, bas-reliefs depict scenes of battles particularly associated with the group of heroes to whom the monuments were dedicated and many times they list the names of the local fallen officers and soldiers. The same iconography is going to be employed for the war memorials dedicated to the First World War when initiated by committees composed mostly by active and retired officers. This is hardly surprising since the military usually represented an agency of secularization in societies living in rural conditions in their greatest part and motivated by religious worldviews as it was Romania at the time but also most the countries of South-Eastern Europe. For example, the monument of Calafat (1886) was represented by an obelisk with a captured Turkish shell on top of it and an eagle with stretched wings, both removed during the First World War, and guarded by two cannons. The same obelisk with an eagle on top of it was also represented at Azuga (1905) and Pitești (1907). A column was built at Târgoviște (1905) to which other two were added after 1918.

Representations of the *dorobanț*, the soldier of the territorial infantry troops, are illustrative for the gradual shift from representing officers, obelisks or single female figures, even if the names of the local fallen sergeants, corporals or privates were listed below, to the representation of the common soldier as embodying the idea of heroism as it was articulated and disseminated through the public system of education and through the military training. Not included in the above mentioned list is the Cernavodă Bridge (built 1890-1895) which has two massive statues of *dorobants*⁵⁸, symbolically “guarding” the entrance from the newly acquired territory of Dobruja and in the same time “taking into possession” the new province. While the war monument of Câmpulung (1897) represented the bust of mayor Dimitrie Giurescu, a war monument of Craiova (1900) represented a *dorobanț*, the one of Turnu-Măgurele (1907) authored by Romano Romanelli also presented a *dorobanț* while the war monument of Potlogi presented a mountain trooper (1910). Later, the monument of Focșani (1914) was composed of an attacking *dorobanț* and a female holding a flag and showing the direction of attack while the war monument built at Râmnicu-Vâlcea (1915) depicted as well a female representing Patria holding an open book engraved with the names of the local fallen towards the direction of the viewers’ eyes.



Image 2. The monument to the heroes of Putna County fallen in the War of 1877-1878, built 1916.

Source: ANIC, Fond Departamental Artelor, dos. 69/1937, ff. 101 and 108.

Most of these monuments were erected through public subscription. However, few data survived as it is the case of those concerning most of the other public monuments in Romania. The monument of Azuga was inaugurated on September 5, 1905, being erected by the local citizens with the help of the Predeal's mayoralty, of the local school and of Banca Sinaia;⁵⁹ the monument of Focșani authored by Oscar Spaethé inaugurated on June 29, 1916, had a committee presided by General Gheorghe Marcovici. The costs of these monuments varied between less than 1000 lei to 20.000 lei. The monuments of Chirnogi (1907) and Jilava (1908), both in the Ilfov County cost 7000 lei and 2000 lei respectively.⁶⁰ The monument of Șuțești, Brăila County (1912) cost 4500 lei.⁶¹ The most expensive monuments were built in Azuga (1904) costing 20.000 lei, in Turnu-Măgurele (1906), authored by Romano Romanelli and costing 15.000 lei,⁶² and in Potlogi, Dâmbovița County (1910), this last monument being authored by Aristide Iliescu and costing 12.400 lei.⁶³

Between the moments of initiating the construction of these monuments and their inauguration more than a decade has passed. For example, the construction of the monument of Tulcea was initiated already in 1879 but its final realization was due to the efforts of the local prefect, no other than the above mentioned poet Ioan D. Nenițescu. Nenițescu supported the work of the local League for Dobruja's Prosperity (*Liga pentru propășirea Dobrogei*) founded in 1896. Through public subscription, with support from the Tulcea's mayoralty and by organizing public festivities dedicated to collecting the necessary funds, the twenty-two meters granite obelisk flanked by an eagle and by a five meters *dorobanț* statue was finally inaugurated on May 2, 1904 in a position that dominated the city. Started by sculptor Giorgio Vasilescu (1864-1898) the monument was finalized by sculptor Constantin Bălăcescu (1865-1913) in 1899. During the First World War the monument was destroyed, the obelisk was restored in 1932 while the eagle and the *dorobanț* were restored in 1977.⁶⁴ An interesting case is represented by the statue *Avântul Țării* [The country's impetus/enthusiasm] dedicated to the Romanian soldiers of the Second Balkan War, a medal with the same name being conferred at the time. A subscription list was started immediately after 1913 but due to the beginning of the First World War the statue was inaugurated only in 1924. The jury to decide the winning project was formed out of Dr. Constantin Istrati, painter George Demetrescu Mirea, architect Nicolae Nenciulescu and Colonel Victor Radovici. Out of the thirty-four projects, sculptor Emil Wilhelm Becker's project grouped a soldier with a gun in his hands about to start to attack, an allegorical figure holding a flag and representing Patria bestowing and encouraging him while an eagle watches him from the direction of his feet. It cost 40.000 lei, 9.000 lei being provided by the mayoralty of Bucharest and 27.000 lei being collected through public subscription and organization of public gatherings. Initially placed on Calea Griviței, in front of then School of Artillery and Engineering (*Școala de artilerie și geniu*), it changed its place probably in 1940 to the present emplacement in the Mărăcineanu Square, where at that time the Ministry of National Defense had its headquarters.⁶⁵ Few other war monuments were constructed for commemorating the Romanian participation in the Second Balkan War. With the help of the 1937 survey of public monuments I could identify other four monuments besides the one from Bucharest: a monument dedicated to "Alipirea Cadrilaterului la Patria Mumă" in Cuiugiuc (?), Durostor (1913), another "Avântul Țării" in Râmnicu Sărat (1913) and two other war monuments in Drăgănești, Vlașca (1913) and Huși (1914). They

were so few not necessarily because the respective war played a minor role in the public sphere. When the committees of initiative were able to restore their activities after 1918 they merged the significance of their monuments dedicated to the War of Independence and to the Romanian participation in the Second Balkan War with the significance of the war monuments dedicated to those fallen in the First World War thus many of the monuments built during the interwar period being devoted to both or all three wars the Romanian army took part before the Second World War.

War monuments during the 1920s:

Romania did not experience a “Lost Generation” as Great Britain did, at least not at the level of the political, cultural and social elites, and this had an important impact on the whole process of commemorating the Great War and in constructing war monuments in Greater Romania. Those able to read, to write and to convey ideas were limited in their number. Most of them either benefited from a limited military training as baccalaureates and were conscripted as reserve officers or had the connections to get them conscripted in the war administration. Few were those fighting in the first line as Ștefan Zeletin, Camil Petrescu, Nicolae Tonitza and George Topârceanu did, the last three being taken prisoners, or could take a closer look at the home front as Nichifor Crainic did being a sanitary during the war. Most of the intellectuals who were not conscriptable worked as war journalists as it was the case of Nicolae Iorga, Mihail Sadoveanu, Octavian Goga, Gala Galaction and others.

This situation had several consequences. On the one hand, at the level of the political, cultural and social elites, the direct experience of war was rather silenced, a memory boom in the years immediately after the war concentrating on debating the erroneous decisions of 1916, participants in this debate most of the time seeking explanation and justification of their own acts especially if publicly perceived as coward or incompetent. On the other hand, especially during the 1920s, with notable exceptions, the construction of war monuments was rather the result of vernacular initiative, the initiators of the public committees aiming at gathering funds for constructing war monuments being direct participants in the war like military of all ranks, teachers who also were conscripted as officers and relatives of the fallen.

Silencing the experience of the war at the level of the elites had several reasons. Firstly, the most important was above explained and consisted in a lack of direct experience of the frontline, the experience that would have legitimized at that time in Romania a written opinion on the war experience. While privileged or at least given an equal foot by cultural history of the last decades, the experience of the home front was not legitimating enough for a public statement since the heavy part of the population experienced it to some extent and it was probably considered too well known for being explained; this is probably why few written recollections about the direct experience of the war were preserved, by these understanding reflections on the experience of the life in the trenches, combat and forms of escapism. Secondly, many of the cultural elites were educated in Germany, some of them campaigned for the alliance with the Central Powers, remained in the occupied territory and several of them were judged and convicted at the end of the war as it was the case of Constantin Stere and Tudor Arghezi. While part of an oral tradition, this experience was also silenced until recently not only at the level of the public memory but also in the Romanian historiography. Thirdly, numerous members of the social elites refuged at Jassy enjoyed a standard of living which many times contrasted with the misery of the troops and the rest of the population which sought refuge in Moldova.⁶⁶ Finally, if none of these personal reasons were the case, then bringing up the negative experiences of the war would have been interpreted as questioning the outcome of the string of events debated in 1916 and ended with the Treaty of Trianon.

Furthermore, a group of artists including Jean Al. Steriadi, Camil Ressu, Nicolae Dărăscu, Cornel Medrea, Ion Jalea, Oscar Han, Ion Teodorescu-Sion and Ștefan Dimitrescu were mobilized and attached to the general headquarters of the Romanian army (*Marele Cartier General*). They were encouraged to depict the experience of war, General Constantin Prezan intending to establish a national military museum at the end of the war. A first exhibition of this group was organized in Jassy in January 1918. After being demobilized they organized themselves in the society "Arta Română" later joined by Nicolae Tonitza and Dumitru Paciurea.⁶⁷ They organized exhibitions in Jassy and Bucharest including artifacts inspired by the war experience, mostly known being Dimitrie Paciurea's *The God of war*. Later, in 1919 and 1920, the theme of war has dominated the Saloon of the Romanian Sculptors, but this time painter Francisc Șirato, one of the most influential art critics during the interwar period, has condemned the

sentimental rhetoric of this type of sculpture, considering it non-artistic.⁶⁸ Probably as a consequence, the war experience was hardly thematized in painting and sculpture. However, war literature developed especially during the 1920s. Mihail Sadoveanu authored *Bloody pages: stories and impressions of the frontline* [File sângerate: povestiri și impresii de pe front] (1917) and later the novel *The Lăpușneanu Street* (1923), Hortensia Papadat-Bengescu shared her experience in *Balaurul* (1923) while Ion Minulescu has written *Red, Yellow and Blue* [Roșu, Galben și Albastru] (1924) which places a love story during the retreat to Iasi from late 1916. War poetry has been written by Octavian Goga, Nichifor Crainic, Camil Petrescu and several others. Still, the most important novels were Liviu Rebreanu's *The forest of the hanged* [Pădurea spânzuraților] (1922),⁶⁹ Cezar Petrescu's *Darkening* [Întunecare] (1927-1928) and *The eyes of the ghost* [Ochii strigoiului] (1942) and Camil Petrescu's *Last night of love, first night of war* [Ultima noapte de dragoste, întâia noapte de război] (1930). The chronology of writing and publishing these novels correlates with an intense interest among the reading public in the early 1920s, an interest in the war experience which later decayed and during the 1930s it became quite thin.

The official politics of war commemoration initiated during and especially immediately after the end of the war is responsible for legitimizing and supporting the spread of war monuments in interwar Romania. The care for the dead soldiers was stipulated in the Peace Treaties with Germany and Hungary. Through the articles 155-156 of the Treaty of Trianon (1920), the Hungarian as well as the allied and associated governments took their responsibility to respect and take care of the soldiers buried on the territories resulted from the respective treaties.⁷⁰ The construction of public war monuments was stipulated by the September 1920 law "for honoring the memory of the fallen heroes" as one of the types of commemorative actions to be carried out next to listing the local dead soldiers in the mayoralties and schools and maintaining the graveyards specially laid out for those fallen during the First World War. Transylvanians no matter of their nationality were not excluded from this process of commemoration and this is visible in the high number of war monuments constructed during the interwar period in the region. However, the 1920 law explicitly focused on the commemoration of the Romanians. According to the motivation introducing the law to the Chamber of Deputies, the construction of war monuments was supposed to express the energy of the nation (*cea mai justă expresie a energiei*

naționale) prepared by 2.000 years of “sufferings, unbending faith and fight for the affirmation of the Latin genius”:

Together with those who contributed to the rising of our Patria, together with those who survived this generation of sacrifice, the fallen have their own rights. They do not ask for our tiers – in exchange, they pretend the recognition of their sublime sacrifice and the transformation of this sacrifice into a symbol, example and stimulant for new heroic deeds which are needed for the complete consolidation and the future of our *neam*. [...] In front of these graves, in front of these temples, the youth of the future will come in every hard time for the country to receive the gospel and here it will learn, more than in any other place, the path to follow so that our people to deserve, as in the past, the moral leadership of the surrounding people, a role that represents the basic principle of our existence as a Latin people at the gates of Orient.⁷¹

This law was issued together with other three aimed to offer assistance to those affected by the Great War, establishing the National Office for Protecting the War Invalids, War Orphans and War Widows. A society for the Cult of the Heroes was established while different other societies were involved.⁷²

Monuments built during the 1920s included the cross of Caraiman and the statue dedicated to the chivalry troops in Jassy. The Cross of Caraiman in the Bucegi Mountains was built between 1926 and 1928 and it included an electric installation that was lighted during the night of August 14 to 15 until the beginning of the Second World War. Placed at 2291m above the sea level, the thirty meters cross is placed on a fifteen meters postamen.⁷³ The statue built in Jassy for those fallen among the chivalry troops (*Monumentul Diviziei a II-a Cavalerie*) had a committee presided by Mihail Sadoveanu and including Sextil Pușcariu. The committee was established in 1925, the projected statue and its surroundings being considered as part of a possible extension of the Copou Garden, the major green area inside the city. The cost of creating this monument and laying the area around was 1.500.000 lei and it was covered through public subscription and the organization of social gatherings. It presents a chivalry soldier on a horse charging an invisible enemy and having on his left a woman representing the goddess of Victory showing the way with one hand and about to place laurels on his head with the other hand.⁷⁴



Image 3. The monument cross of Caraiman, Bucegi mountains.
Source: ANIC, fond Illustrate, I 3030.

Most of the times the monuments were erected in the home towns and home villages of the soldiers, as it were the case of the monuments from the War of Independence, for the identified soldiers and on the former battlefields when they were not identified. This is why the inter-war monuments dedicated to the Great War are concentrated mostly on the counties nearby the Carpathians, on the villages from the valleys of Jiu, Olt and Prahova rivers and around the Carpathian passes from the region of Moldavia. Based on the dictionary of Florin Tucă I could identify more than 200 monuments dedicated to the memory of those fallen in the First World War. However travelling in the countryside one could observe a much higher number of monuments, almost every village having placed nearby its church, cemetery, school or townhall a monument of various shape. Besides them, *troitas* and memorial plaques in the halls of major public institutions.⁷⁵

The statistic ordered in 1937 by the Commission of Public Monuments, already mentioned as one of the two major sources of information for this paper, indicates about 1500 war monuments constructed in Romania especially in the rural areas. The statistic was ordered mainly due to the vernacular character of the process of constructing such war monuments during the interwar period, a process thus rather escaping the control of central authorities. Since most of the war monuments already built in the downtowns of the major Romania's cities was rather known, these statistics sent by the local administration to the above mentioned Commission dealt with the war monuments built in the rural areas as well as in the smaller urban localities.

An analysis of these unsorted statistics indicates a number of 697 monuments out of a total of 735 public monuments only in the rural regions of Oltenia, Muntenia and Dobruja, a number of 198 war monuments out of a total of 263 public monuments in the regions of Moldavia, Bukowina and Bessarabia and a number of 478 war monuments dedicated to the First World War out of 636 public monuments existing in the regions of Transylvania and Banat.

In case of the regions of Oltenia, Muntenia and Dobruja, out of the 735 public monuments listed in this survey and 54 others included in a previous 1936 survey listing monuments of Mehedinți county, totaling 789 monuments, 38 monuments were dedicated to the war of 1877-1878, three monuments were dedicated to the campaign of 1913, three monuments to Carol I and 48 were public monuments with a different dedication, most of them busts of different local personalities and several historical

monuments. Therefore, 697 were dedicated to those fallen in the First World War. Comparatively, for the same region, the dictionary compiled by Florin Tucă identified about one hundred similar monuments including those from all urban areas left out in their greatest part by this survey. Consequently, one may estimate safely that at least 1200 war monuments commemorating the First World War were erected during the interwar period all over (Greater) Romania. For an illustration of the density of war monuments in the countryside in most of the regions of Oltenia, Muntenia and Dobruja here is a list of their number by county: Mehedinți (50), Gorj (43), Romanați (44), Olt (41), Argeș (68), Muscel (55), Dâmbovița (66), Vlașca (50), Ilfov (67), Prahova (70), Buzău (48), Râmnicu-Sărat (10), Brăila (11), Ialomița (38), Constanța (26) and Durostor (10). This density suggests that in almost every locality a war monument was built.

With the mention that the war monuments were not exclusively dedicated to the Romanians, for the regions of Moldavia, Bukowina and Bessarabia, the number of war monuments were the following: Bacău (22), Vaslui (9), Jassy (22), Roman (45), Baia (19), Botoșani (12), Câmpulung (3), Rădăuți (8), Cernăuți (10), Hotin (2), Bălți (6), Soroca (7), Lăpușna (2), Tighina (3), Cahul (4), Cetatea Albă (17) and Ismail (7) while for the regions of Transylvania and Banat the counties the number of war monuments was the following: Someș (25), Sălaj (10), Satu Mare (1), Năsăud (15), Bihor (19), Arad (30), Cluj (25), Turda (11), Alba (25), Hunedoara (4), Ciuc (6), Odorhei (55), Trei Scaune (12), Târnava Mare (6), Târnava Mică (16), Sibiu (25), Făgăraș (11), Brașov (11), Timiș-Torontal (105), Caraș (41) and Severin (25).

Numerous war monuments were created by sculptors Spiridon Georgescu, Ioan Iordănescu, Theodor Burcă and Dumitru Mățăoanu. However, in their heaviest part the war monuments were constructed by local stone workers, probably tombs and graves builders, and only a few of them were created by professional sculptors. Most of them were built during the 1920s and they cost between 20.000 lei and 100.000 lei, only larger monuments created by sculptors in cities costing more. The creation of the Commission of Public Monuments in 1929 may thus be interpreted not only as establishing an instrument for controlling and excluding alternative political and cultural interpretations belonging to the ethnic and religious minorities but it may be interpreted also as creating an instrument of a professional group interested not only in the creation of artifacts respecting their standards of quality but also in keeping the market under control.

During the 1920s, public contests were organized for a series of planned public monuments aimed at decorating Bucharest including the statues of kings Carol I and Ferdinand, Spiru Haret as well as war monuments like those dedicated to the infantry, aviation, railroad heroes or the Arch of Triumph. However, in the case of most of these contests, their results were not taken into account by the deciding authorities who ordered them and sometimes provided the necessary funding for their organization.⁷⁶ Many of these sculptors were members of the deciding committees or they were in close relationship with their members. For example, poet Ion Minulescu, a member of the Commission for Public Monuments, was officially the head of the Direction of Arts of the Ministry of Arts until 1944. Effectively, the direction was lead after 1936 by Ion Theodorescu Sion, painters Eugen Ispir and Marius Bunescu and sculptor Ion Jalea.⁷⁷

The construction of war monuments during the 1920s may be characterized by a multiplication of vernacular initiative combined with a scarcity of available resources. The great majority of these monuments were built at the initiative of the local officers, teachers or priests. Most probably the later two categories combined their efforts even if the initiative was registered as coming from only one of them. The initiative committees included local notabilities as well. These committees pursued gathering funds for constructing their monuments through public subscriptions, lotteries, postcards selling while donations from public institutions represented the greatest part of the contributions. Only a few of these monuments were built entirely by the Society for the cult of the heroes which is indicative that commemoration was not a process imposed from above but it rather fulfilled expectations at the local level. This suggests that these politics of war commemorations during the interwar period rather followed than set the general trend. This suggestion is confirmed by the establishment of the Commission of Public Monuments during the late 1920s with the aim of amending the numerous proposals for war monuments and its activity during the 1930s.

The costs varied. A local teacher supported by a committee built in 1930 in Jina village of Sibiu County a monument of four meters in its diameter and eight meters in its height at the cost of 149.000 lei.⁷⁸ A monument built in 1933 in Aiud with funds raised on different occasions by the officers of the local garrison cost 30.000 lei and it had rather large dimensions (4x4m and 8m in height).⁷⁹ A *troița* offered by the society for the cult of the heroes was erected in 1932 in Silistra at the cost of 169.000

lei.⁸⁰ The monument of Caracal cost 185.000 lei, 90.000 lei being gathered by the Society for the cult of the heroes, 30.000 lei by the prefecture of the Romanați County and another 30.000 lei by the mayoralty of Caracal, 3.000 lei were given by the local branch of the National Bank (*Banca Națională a României*, BNR) while the rest of them, 32.000 lei, came from public subscription.⁸¹

Unlike the monuments built during the period prior to the First World War, many of these monuments included a cross as a part of their iconography if not directly as a symbol on top of the monuments and thus fully religious in their meaning (e.g. Cross of Caraiman) at least in the form of the military decoration associated with the participation in the war, "The commemorative cross of war" (*Crucea comemorativă a Războiului*), a decoration with a special design issued following a French model. In numerous cases of war monuments, as it was the case with the monuments built before 1916, these monuments took the form of obelisks, sometimes with eagles on top of them, they represented soldiers of different army corps but mostly infantrymen, many of them sculpted by Spiridon Georgescu, Ioan Iordănescu and Dumitru Mățăoanu who all specialized in creating variations of this theme, or female figures representing either Patria or Victory or both of them holding flags, laurels or swords and showing the way to and inspiring soldiers. Added to them oak leaves and olive trees suggested the perennial strength of those who fought and died and the aspirations of those who survived.

Below them, bas-reliefs depicting scenes of battles were not as frequent as before the war while most of the times lists of the names of the local fallen officers and soldiers accompanied dedications like "Tell to the future generations that we made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields of 1916-1918 for the reunification of all Romanians" (Bragadiru, Ilfov County, 1919) or "To you heroes of Romanați this temple of ancient virtues was erected, to you piously the thoughts of those of today and tomorrow are dedicated, you deserve the thankful tribute of the reunited people forever celebrating the unity of all Romanians" (Caracal, 1925) or "Nothing is more saintly/And more beautiful in this life/Than to die as a fighter/Wrapped up in Tricolor!" (Zalha village, Ileana, Sălaj County, 1937).⁸² The most frequent size of these statues is around two meters. Most of the statues were placed on postaments as twice as tall. When representing human figures, the focus is on their bodies and their solemn, resigned or broken posture and hardly on the features of their faces denoting personal feelings. Few monuments were constructed to officers and this is illustrative for both

the vernacular character of the process of constructing these monuments and the democratization of the concept of heroism.

During the 1930s, the memory of the war became more official as a part of Carol II's strategy of projecting himself as the savior of the nation and the cultural unifier of a morally divided country. Larger categories of people affected by the war received pensions and land. The style of the uniforms of the officer body resembling the French army suffered a dramatic change for the first time in decades and in the same time Carol II pursued a policy of gaining the support of the army. The projection of a unitary and prosperous Romania different from the Old Kingdom is visible in the multivolume project of Romania's Encyclopedia (*Enciclopedia României*) edited by Dimitrie Gusti, a perspective that shaped the interpretation of many researchers of the interwar period ever since. The memory of the First World War in the public discourse became more official, the sufferings of the war became rather silenced and illustrative for this transformation is George Topârceanu's story of captivity in Bulgaria (*Pirin Planina. Episoduri tragice și comice din captivitate*, 1936) where the author feels the need to justify himself why he can't keep the account funny in all moments; the Commission of Public Monuments already started to function and to amend the proposed projects of war monuments. This commission was already established in 1929 and consisted of five members, the director of the Department of Arts, two sculptors, a painter, an architect and a secretary. Members of this commission were Ion Minulescu as the director of the Department for most of the 1930s, Ion Pașa was its secretary for the same period, Frederick Stock, Ion Jalea and later Cornel Medrea, Mihai Onofrei, Jean Al. Steriade, Camil Ressu, Horia Teodoru and Horia Creangă were its members. Its archive represents the most important source for studying the dynamics of the war monuments during the 1930s.⁸³

The war monuments of Bucharest

Many of these war monuments constructed in Bucharest during the interwar period and dedicated to certain branches of the army were placed in areas that were peripheral at that time or in the process of being restructured. Thus, the Unknown Soldier was placed in the south, in the Carol Park, the monuments to the aviation heroes, to the teacher heroes and to the infantry as well as the Arch of Triumph were placed around and northern to the area of Victoria Square while the monuments dedicated to the sanitary and the medical corps, to the engineers troops

and a small monument dedicated to infantry troops too were placed around the Cotroceni area.⁸⁴

A monument to the French heroes was created in 1920 in one of the most visited places of Bucharest at that time, Cișmigiu Garden. It was authored by Ion Jalea who lost his left arm at Mărășești, participated in the *Arta română* group and went after the war to study at Paris with Antoine Bourdelle. He received the Legion of Honor and Marshall Ferdinand Foch was present at the inauguration of the monument which represents a feminine figure that could be a mother, a wife, a daughter or Patria kissing a dying soldier on his forehead. The monument to the railway heroes, authored by Ion Jalea and Cornel Medrea, was apparently built in 1923 but it carries 1930 as the date of its creation. Three groups of figures include in the middle a Victory about to place a crown of laurels on the head of an engineer, a couple of smiths and a soldier with a woman and a walking child.

In the area of Victoria square and north of it, three important war monuments were erected during the 1930s. The monument to the teachers-heroes (*Monumentul eroilor corpului didactic*) was authored by Ion Jalea and Arthur Verona. Representing three soldiers carrying the body of one comrade on a shield, it was inaugurated in 1930 in one of the most visible places of Victoria Square, chosen for the monument to the Soviet soldier from the late 1940s to the 1970s. The monument dedicated to teachers-heroes was taken down in 1940 at the suggestion of Ivan Meštrović to make room to the monument of King Ferdinand. While the latter was in the end given another location on Kisseleff Avenue, the former was never restored and its track was lost.⁸⁵ Ion Jalea's monument to the infantry troops was erected in 1936 in the first circus of Kisseleff Avenue from where it was taken down when King Ferdinand's monument was finally placed there. It represented a group of soldiers in attack position, a group placed on a large stone pedestal.⁸⁶ The monument to the aviation heroes was inaugurated on July 20, 1935, after two public contests were organized in 1925 and 1927. Authored by Lidia Kotzebue with the help of the sculptor Iosif Fekete (Negrulea), it is an obelisk having on top Icarus stretching his wings about to fly and three figures at the base of the obelisk, probably representing three moments in Icarus's downfall. Seen from afar it may look like a cross.⁸⁷



Image 4. The monument to the aviation heroes, Bucharest.
Source: Bogdan Furtună. *Monografia monumentului "Eroilor Aerului"*
(Bucharest: s.l., 1939), p.17.

Spiridon Georgescu's the Lion (June 22, 1929) and the Infantryman (1930) are both placed in the Cotroceni area, close to the Botanical Garden. The first is a monument dedicated to the engineering troops who fought not only in 1916-1919 but also in the Second Balkan War. It represents a lion keeping one of its paws on several war trophies. At each of the four corners, soldiers representing a pioneer, a pontoneer, a railway worker and a phone operator have between them bas-reliefs depicting moments of their activity. The inscription says "Tell to the future generation that we made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields for the reunification of our people." It was erected at the initiative of the general Constantin Ștefănescu-Amza, the first director of the military museum mentioned above.⁸⁸ The second represented a soldier pretty similar to many other war monuments to be found in the country. Also, not far away, on the new boulevard opened towards the Cotroceni Palace, not far away from the Faculty of Medicine and the Babeș and Cantacuzino Institutes, a monument to the medical and sanitary personnel who died during the war was authored by Raffaello Romanelli and it was inaugurated in 1932. The monument includes a group of three figures, a wounded soldier, a medicine officer and a Victory holding a sword in one hand and a crown of laurels about to be placed on the officer's head who instead points to the fallen soldier. Below them a bas-relief depicts scenes from the war involving the medical and sanitary corps having in the center a female figure usually identified with Queen Mary.

Other war monuments built in Bucharest included a monument dedicated to "eroilor din războiul de reîntregire" authored by Vasile Ionescu-Varo which was placed on current Silvestru street and inaugurated on June 22, 1924; a monument "to the last defender" (*Ultimul străjer al capitalei*) placed in Băneasa, north of Bucharest, proved to be a real grave for sergeant Nicolae Păianu when in 2007 the monument was moved to a different location; finally another monument was built in the Militari area in 1936 at the initiative of the prefect Gheorghe Marinescu.⁸⁹

The Arch of Triumph inaugurated in 1922 gradually decayed and its remaking from durable materials was postponed due to the lack of financial resources. Only after 1930 the government approved the necessary funds for architect Petre Antonescu and the monument was inaugurated on December 1, 1936, eighteen years after King Ferdinand's and Queen Maria's reentering Bucharest. Thirty meters in height and with the arcade having seventeen meters in height and ten meters in width, the Arch was made out of marble, granite and chalk.⁹⁰ The monument's inscriptions

focus on King Ferdinand and Queen Maria, both receiving two meters effigies, as creators of Greater Romania, with the support of the entire nation, the monument's iconography indirectly suggesting the rally of the entire nation around Carol II. Two large inscriptions were written by Nicolae Iorga, one facing the city outskirts being dedicated to King Ferdinand's entering Bucharest on October 16, 1922, while the second facing the downtown was saying:

After centuries of religiously endured sufferings and heavy battles given for preserving the national being, after a defense of the human civilization full of sacrifices, justice was finally accomplished for the Romanian people through the sword of King Ferdinand with the help of the entire nation and the moral support of Queen Maria.⁹¹

Laterally, two other inscriptions were glorifying those who "through the light of their mind and the power of the soul have prepared the national unity" and to those who "through their braveness and sacrifice realized the national unity."⁹² Above them, two inscriptions were placing Carol II's reign in immediate sequence to Ferdinand's reign and thus erasing the first reign of King Michael (1927-1930): "MCMXXXVI Regnante Carolo Secundo" and "Anno nono regni ejus" (the ninth year of our reign). Below, King Ferdinand's proclamations to the country at the moment of declaring war to Austria-Hungary in August 1916 and at the coronation of October 15, 1922 were engraved. These two dates were inscribed on the façade facing the city while other four dates were engraved on the façade facing the outskirts: August 15, 1916 (the first entering in Transylvania); November 10, 1918 (the second entering in Transylvania); January 8, 1918 (the entering in Bessarabia); and October 24, 1918 (the entering in Bukowina). At the inauguration, Carol II gave a long speech praising the spirit of sacrifice of those fallen in the First World War and underlining the pragmatic character of the monument:

The one passing by this Arch of Triumph should think that if it represents the commemoration of the Romanian glory it is built on the bones who believed and sacrificed themselves; and if these stones would have a voice, they would shout: 'You passerby, think about the sacrifice of the fallen! What do you do for strengthening and consolidating your Fatherland?' [...] O! Precious stones, memorials of moments of bravery, memorials of the nation's belief and hope, watch for ever and tell everyone that only through faith and sacrifice for the common good things can be built on this earth.⁹³

This quote illustrates best the performative aspect added to the process of war commemorations and the central role given to war monuments as conceptualized by Reinhart Koselleck. The Arch was built not only to commemorate those fallen in the First World War, those who contributed to the cultural mobilization for war in the previous periods, the figures of King Ferdinand and Queen Mary as symbols of Greater Romania but it also postulates their behavior of self sacrifice and faith in their leaders as a model for the contemporary and subsequent generations. The First World War presented as the last major chapter of a multiseular national history of continuous struggle for political unity to be followed by renewed efforts for the cultural unification of the country. This vision is also visible in the Romanian Atheneum's impressive historical painting authored by Costin Petrescu between 1933 and 1938 (75x3m), the same painter who decorated the Orthodox Cathedral of Alba Iulia (*Catedrala Reîntregirii Neamului*).



Image 5. Carol II at the inauguration of the Arch of Triumph, Bucharest.
Source: ANIC, fond Fototeca, II 322.

The mausoleums and ossuaries

Besides this variety of war monuments, a series of mausoleums, ossuaries and collective war cemeteries were initiated in places where a large number of soldiers were known to have died but it was impossible to individualize their bodies. Monuments were built in such cases in Șcheii Brașovului, Tulcea, Devesel (Mehedinți County), Toplița (Harghita County, 1925), Târgu Ocna (Bacău County, 1925-1928), Soveja (Vrancea County, 1929), and at Valea Mare-Pravăț, this last one being known as the mausoleum of Mateiaș (1928-1935).⁹⁴ Probably the most important such monuments were those of Mărăști and Mărășești. They were initiated almost immediately after the end of the First World War and their process of construction stretched over the whole interwar period.

The mausoleum of Mărășești was initiated by the National Orthodox Women's Society (*Societatea Ortodoxă Națională a Femeilor Române*, SONFR) at its congress in Bucharest (June 8, 1919) at the proposal of Pimen Georgescu, the Metropolitan of Moldavia and the head of the Romanian Orthodox Church that supported the Romanian government refuged in Jassy during the war.⁹⁵ The implication of Alexandrina Cantacuzino in the construction of this monument, initially supported by the Romanian government at a time when it was headed by General Alexandru Averescu, was met with reluctance by the following Liberal government.⁹⁶ In the end, the construction of the mausoleum took almost fifteen years being officially inaugurated on September 18, 1938. Designed by architects George Cristinel and Constantin Pomponiu, the mausoleum is thirty meters in height and forty meters in diameter being built out of concrete and being covered with andesite. An exterior frieze designed by Ion Jalea and Cornel Medrea depicts the battle of 1917 while an interior mural painting was authored by Eduard Săulescu. The sarcophagus of General Eremia Grigorescu was placed inside in the center of the mausoleum while crypts contain the remains of about 6000 soldiers and officers.⁹⁷

The mausoleum of Mărăști was a complex set of various buildings erected during the interwar period on the place of the battle of Mărăști (July 9-17, 1917). A "Mărăști" Society was established in January 1918 by the officers of the Second Romanian Army with the aim of commemorating the battle and its fallen soldiers through various types of actions and with the aim of reconstructing the village bearing the same name that was destroyed during the fighting. The honorary president of the society was general Alexandru Averescu followed after his death in 1938 by General Arthur Văitoianu. It

took ten years to collect the necessary financial means through donations, public subscription, social gatherings and support from the authorities and to reconstruct the destroyed village including a school and a church. The construction of the proper mausoleum designed by architect Pandeale Șerbănescu was started in June 1928 and it was finished only in 1941. Due to the events of the Second World War and later its subsequent political transformations that swept the country, the mausoleum was never officially inaugurated. The building has three levels, two of them being placed underground. The first level was organized as a museum of the battle while the second level hosts twelve ossuaries of 5.342 soldiers belonging not only to the Romanian army but also to the German and Russian armies. These ossuaries were covered by glasses with a model showing an angel designed by Queen Maria in a style close to Art Nouveau. At the ground level, four sarcophaguses of generals Alexandru Averescu, Alexandru Mărgineanu, Nicolae Arghirescu and Arthur Văitoianu are placed next to crypts of officers. The external decorations were realized by sculptor Aurel Bordenache. One of them represented a higher officer on a horse, a young woman and a child, the second one grouped a large eagle, a soldier on the horse and a pair of parents with two children. Fifteen marble stones list the names of the known fallen soldiers. Two eagles were sculpted by Spiridon Georgescu while a bust of General Alexandru Averescu that was sculpted by Oscar Spaethe was placed in front of the mausoleum.⁹⁸

Probably best known worldwide are the group of monuments of Târgu-Jiu authored by Constantin Brâncuși in 1937-1938. Brâncuși already proposed in the early 1920s a war monument in the form of a fountain for his native village Hobița (Gorj County) but his proposal was not accepted due to the disagreements between the two commissions that initiated the project. In 1934 or 1935, Aretia Tătărescu, wife of prime minister Gheorghe Tătărescu and president of the League of Gorj's Women (*Liga Femeilor Gorjene*), proposed Militza Petrașcu to create a monument commemorating the heavy battles of Jiu Valley of October 1916, a monument to be placed in Târgu-Jiu. Petrașcu already authored a statue of famous Ecaterina Teodoroiu. However, she proposed Constantin Brâncuși for completing the new project.

A newly built road called the Avenue of Heroes's Souls and later Heroes' Avenue (*Calea Sufletelor Eroilor; Calea Eroilor*) united a table and a gate surrounded by chairs, placed at one of its ends, nearby the Jiu River, and a column, placed at the other end. A Heroes' Church was already under construction in the middle at an equal distance from the two ends.

Nowadays known as the Table of Silence, Gate of the Kiss and the Column of the Infinite, they initially had a variety of names: the Round Table, the Heroes Portal and the Monument of Gratitude also randomly named in the local archives as the Peace Monument or the Heroes Monument or the Heroes Tower.⁹⁹ When a local official proposed placing an eagle on top of the Column, Brâncuși angrily rejected the idea.

The abstract nature of these monuments allowed them being read, approached and interpreted in the most diverse way by viewers with diverse cultural backgrounds who projected their own mindsets. The local and military authorities read them during the 1940s as being war monuments, the local priests invested them with religious meaning while a variety of art critics and art historians offered them during the Communist regime a variety of interpretations varying in their esthetical, philosophical or ethnographic emphasis.

War monuments during the Communist regime:

While numerous monuments dedicated to political leaders were dismantled if not destroyed in 1948 or immediately after (e.g. Mestrovic's monuments of Carol I, Ferdinand I and Ionel Brătianu etc.), during the 1950s war monuments enjoyed a curious tolerance if not support from a regime preaching peace. Since they were dedicated to common people not only thematically but also as a target audience these war monuments fit in the paradigm of socialist realism. Sculptors who designed war monuments during the interwar period like Cornel Medrea and Ion Jalea continued their activity during this period, the latter one being the author of numerous statues dedicated to historical figures during the 1970s. While bronze was the favorite material during the prewar years and stone during the interwar period, concrete became a very much used material during the 1960s to 1980s. The growing emphasis on nationalism during the 1960s led to a revalorization of the cultural heritage of the past. This was visible in the reestablishment of the Commission for Historical Monuments in the mid 1960s, existing monuments especially those dating from the Middle Age started to receive a growing attention while numerous other monuments were erected during the 1970s, especially around 1977 when a century was celebrated since Romania's proclamation of independence.

The regime's need for sites dedicated to political and ideological ceremonies is visible in the construction of monuments dedicated to the Romanian participation in the Second World War against Germany. These

monuments were used for commemorating the events of August 23, 1944, events that were considered as the founding moment of the Communist regime in Romania even if their significance changed from celebrating Romania's liberation by the Soviet Union to celebrating a local insurrection and later to invoking it as a revolution. In the following lines, based on the dictionary authored by Florin Tucă, I listed most of these monuments in order to better illustrate their topical, regional and chronological clustering and the regime's change from an exclusive antifascist discourse to an encompassing nationalist discourse.

Ploiești's monument to Independence was destroyed during the Second World War but it was restored in 1954 in order to celebrate ten years since August 23, 1944.¹⁰⁰ Monuments to the Soviet soldiers were erected in Bucharest, Jassy and Neamț during the 1950s while monuments to the Romanian soldiers fighting in the Second World War against Fascism started to appear during the late 1950s: Stănișești, Bacău County, 1948, Rucăr, Argeș County (1957), Moreni, Dâmbovița County, 1958, Păulești, Prahova County, 1959, Bacău, 1959, Bucu, Ialomița County, 1960, Urziceni, Constanța, 1968 and Giurgiu, 1976.

Since few monuments in general and especially fewer war monuments were previously built in Transylvania, this area became a destination for placing new public monuments: Baia Mare, 1959, Moisei, MM, 1959, Cehu Silvaniei, 1959, Arad, 1960; Ludus, Mures, 1960, Timisoara, 1962, Satu Mare, 1963, Carei, 1964, Târgu Mures, 1964, Covasna, 1973, Sf. Gheorghe, 1973, Miercurea-Ciuc, 1974, Sighetul Marmatiei, 1974, Dej, Cluj, 1981, Oradea, 1982.¹⁰¹ Besides the symbolical taking into possession of the area in the name of the Romanian people and being used as outlets for disseminating a unitary vision of Romanian history, these monuments were also used as local sites for local political, ideological and cultural ceremonies, most famously for granting the status of pioneers for pupils in primary schools.

Statues of the major figures of the nationalist pantheon of Ceausescu's regime were erected in every major city during the 1970s and 1980s. They are also war monuments since they were created in order to illustrate the official discourse focused on the unity of all people around their leaders and on the history of the continuous struggle against foreign invasions, a theme very much valued after Nicolae Ceaușescu's standing out against the Soviet Union's invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968.¹⁰² Especially Transylvania benefited of this attention for historical figures. Michael the Brave was embodied by some of the largest monuments like the equestrian

statues in Alba-Iulia, 1968 (Oscar Han); Cluj, 1976 (Marius Butunoiu) and Sf. Gheorghe, Covasna County, 1982; while smaller monuments commemorated his victory of Gurăslău, Sălaj County, 1976 and his death nearby Turda, Cluj County, 1977 (Marius Butunoiu). Decebal and Avram Iancu were the other two most important historical figures celebrated in Transylvania. The first one received an equestrian statue in Deva, 1976 (Ion Jalea) and a bust in Timișoara, 1977, Burebista receiving only a monument in the Măgura artistic camp, Buzău County, in 1979. Avram Iancu benefited from a monument in his birthplace in Alba County, 1972, and an equestrian statue in Târgu-Mureș, 1978.

In Muntenia, Mircea the Elder was one of the first instrumentalized and honored historical figures with monuments in Râmnicu-Vâlcea, 1966 (Ion Irimescu), Turnu Măgurele, 1970 (Oscar Han), Tulcea, 1972 (Ion Jalea), Constanta, 1972 (M. Butunoiu). Vlad the Impaler received only one monument, in Giurgiu in 1977. In Moldavia, Stephen the Great represented the local great hero with statues in Vaslui in 1972 and Piatra Neamt in 1974 (Oscar Han) and monuments in Băcăoani, Vaslui County, 1975; Suceava, 1977; and Jassy in 1979 (Marius Butunoiu). In many cases, the inauguration of these monuments during the 1970s benefited from the presence of Nicolae Ceaușescu. Besides emphasizing the newly built civic centers, creating a site for the local official ceremonies, the monuments illustrated the narrative of national unity at the local level. Adherence to the narrative of national history, many times used as a wooden language by the cultural and political activists reflecting their lack of sophistication and many times cynicism, was their way to connect to the political center and solidify their legitimacy in controlling the local context.

Conclusion:

Dedicated to great men like monarchs or generals and later to common soldiers, war monuments represents a category of public monuments that spread during a period of around a century, from about 1840s to about 1940s, with a period of exceptional flourishing during the interwar years, especially in Europe and North America. With few exceptions, war monuments were ignored by art history until recent decades when cultural history brought them to attentions as indicators of larger social, political and cultural trends of the society.

The spread of public monuments dedicated to the military/medieval heroes, to some of the most important the cultural figures or leading

politicians during the last decades of the nineteenth century was the result of a series of interlinked processes including those of urbanization, top to bottom spread of literacy, expansion of the public sphere and political participation, spread of arts and middle and higher education. As a part of this process of using artistic artifacts for grounding cultural and political discourses, war monuments best embodied the paradigm of national history, a military definition of heroism that shifted during the same period from celebrating the deeds of great men to emphasizing common people and thus they contributed to the reinforcement of a visual discourse of state nationalism through their use during public ceremonies.

In Romania, war monuments appeared in the context of the growing cult of national heroes in the last decades of the nineteenth century and multiplied as a part of the process of commemorating the Romanian participation in the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 (*Războiul de independență*). They started to spread around 1900 when a stable and coherent national historical memory was formed, the state started to put a greater emphasis on public ceremonies and celebrations, participation in the public sphere intensified, professional groups and a reading public were formed and resources became more readily available. About sixty such monuments were erected especially in Muntenia and especially after 1907, a regional and chronological clustering which is not necessarily only an indicator of the impact of the commemorative practices but also of the prosperity of the urban communities able to afford the construction of a local public monument at that time.

During the interwar Romania, the number of war monuments increased dramatically to over a thousand all over the country but mostly in Muntenia and Moldavia. While before WW I war monuments served mostly celebrations of a victorious participation in the war after 1918 the significance given to commemorating those fallen in the war became prevalent. These significances coexisted from the very beginning since plaques listing those fallen were placed at the base of all war monuments. However, the importance invested in these artifacts shifted during the inter-war period, the commemoration of those fallen becoming prevalent. While a legislative framework definitely encouraged the construction of war monuments and their use for anchoring the discourse of nationalism, most of those constructed in the inter-war period were the result of a vernacular initiative. Combined with the scarcity of resources, this contributed to their construction taking place over a long period of time, sometimes of the entire interwar period as it was the case of the mausoleums of Mărăști and Mărășești.

NOTES

- ¹ The author of this paper was a NEC-*Adevărul* Fellow for the academic year 2010-11. An early version of this paper was presented on September 28, 2010 while being a visiting fellow at the Russian, East European and Eurasian Center of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (September-November 2010) and expanded for being presented on June 8, 2011 while being a fellow of New Europe College in Bucharest (March-July 2011) and for the conference *Cult of Heroes in Central Europe from the 1880s to the Second World War – Transnational and trans-disciplinary aspects* (Paris, November 25-26, 2011). The following abbreviation ANR-DANIC was used for Arhivele Naționale ale României, Direcția Arhive Naționale Istorice Centrale when indicating the source of the images included in this text.
- ² “Aici doarme fericit întru Domnul ostașul necunoscut, săvârșit din viață, în jertfa pentru unitatea neamului românesc; pe oasele lui odihnește pământul României întregite, 1916-1919”; for detailed accounts of the procession see Traian Popa-Lisseanu. *Soldatul necunoscut, istoric și cult*, Publicațiile societății „Frontul Mărășești” nr. 1 [The unknown hero, history and cult]. The publications of the society „Frontul Mărășești” nr. 1] (Bucharest: Tipografia Ovidiu, 1936) and Valeria Bălescu. *Eroul Necunoscut. Istorie trecută și recentă* [The Unknown Hero in Bucharest. Past and present history] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 2005); for the French and British models established in 1919, see Ken Inglis, “Entombing unknown soldiers: from London and Paris to Baghdad”, *History & Memory*, vol. 5, nr. 2, 1993, pp. 7-31.
- ³ Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu, „Monumentul public, carte de vizită a identității unui popor” [The public monument, a visit card for a people’s identity]. In *Globalizare și identitate națională, Simpozion 18 mai 2006* [Globalization and national identity, symposium May 18, 2006] (Bucharest, Editura Ministerului Administrației și Internelor, București, 2006), pp. 102-111.
- ⁴ Florian Tucă. *In memoriam: itinerar eroic* [Remembering: a heroic itinerary] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1971); Florian Tucă and Cristache Georgehe. *Altarele eroilor neamului* [Altars to the heroes of the nation] (București: Europa Nova, 1994).
- ⁵ Andi Mihalache. *Mănuși albe, mănuși negre. Cultul eroilor în vremea Dinastiei Hohenzollern* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Limes, 2007);
- ⁶ Maria Bucur. *Heroes and victims. Remembering war in twentieth-century Romania* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009); Maria Bucur, “Edifices of the past: war memorials and heroes in twentieth-century Romania,” in Maria Todorova (editor). *Balkan Identities. Nation and Memory* (New York University Press, 2004) pp. 158-179.
- ⁷ Ioana Beldiman. *Sculptura franceză în România (1848-1931). Gust artistic, modă, fapt de societate* [French sculpture in Romania (1848-1931). Artistic

preferences, fashion, society] (Bucharest: Editura Simetria, 2005). Needless to say, this project was inspired and shaped by the magnificent Pierre Nora's series of *Lieux de mémoire: La République* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984), *La Nation*, 3 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1986), *Les Francs*, 3 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1992). Selections of these contributions were published in English as: *Realms of memory*. Edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman, translated by Arthur Goldhammer, 3vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996-1998) and *Rethinking France: les Lieux de mémoire*, translated by Mary Trouille (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2001).

- ⁸ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Second edition. (London, New York, Verso, 1991, c1983), p. 9.
- ⁹ George Mosse. *Nationalization of the masses. Political symbolism and mass movements in Germany from the Napoleonic wars through the Third Reich* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991, c1975); when dealing with the national monuments, Mosse draws on the work of Thomas Nipperdey, "Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert", *Historische Zeitschrift*, nr. 206/3, June 1968; George Mosse, "National cemeteries and national revival: the cult of fallen soldiers in Germany", *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 14, 1975.
- ¹⁰ Antoine Prost, "Monuments to the dead" in *Realms of memory*. Edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman, translated by Arthur Goldhammer vol. II: The construction of the French past: Traditions (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), pp. 307-330; and Antoine Prost, "Verdun", *Realms of memory*, vol. III: Symbols, pp. 377-401.
- ¹¹ Ken Inglis, "War memorials: ten questions for historians," *Guerres mondiales et conflits contemporaines*, nr. 167, July 1992, pp. 5-21.
- ¹² Jay Winter, "War memorials and the mourning process" in Jay Winter. *Sites of memory, sites of mourning. The Great War in European cultural history*. Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare nr. 1 (Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 78-116.
- ¹³ Reinhard Kosellek, "War memorials: identity formations of the survivors" in *The practice of conceptual history. Timing history, spacing concepts*. Translated by T.S. Presner (Stanford University Press, 2002), pp. 285-326.
- ¹⁴ James E. Young, "Memory/Monument" in *Critical terms for art history*. Edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), consulted through http://www.credoreference.com/entry/uchicagoah/memory_monument; November 18, 2010; the author thematizes on the opposition between the nineteenth century monuments and those built after the Second World War emphasizing the deconstructive intention of the latter, their physical accessibility and lack of intentional monumentality; however the centrality of these memorials in making visible a (counter-) discourse and promoting a (counter-) memory as well as the support from

- central and local authorities are elements that place them in correlation with the democratic transformations of the last century and rather in continuity with the first group thus making all them part of a historical series.
- 15 Erwin Panofsky. *Tomb sculpture. Four lectures in on its changing aspects from ancient Egypt to Bernini*. Foreword by Martin Warnke. Edited by H.W. Janson (London: Phaidon, 1992).
- 16 Andrei Pippidi. *About graves as landmarks of national identity* (Budapest: Collegium Budapest, 1995).
- 17 Maurice Agulhon, "La 'statuomanie' et l'histoire" *Ethnologie française*, 8, 1978, pp. 145-172; H.W. Janson, *The rise and fall of the public monument* (New Orleans: The Graduate School of Tulane University, 1976); Eveline G. Bouwers. *Public Pantheons in Revolutionary Europe. Comparing cultures of remembrance, c. 1790-1840* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- 18 Thomas Carlyle's *On heroes, hero-worship and the heroïc in history* [1841]. Notes and introduction by Michael K. Goldberg, text established by Michael K. Goldberg, Joel J. Brattin and Mark Engel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
- 19 Francis Haskell, "The manufacture of the past in nineteenth-century painting", *Past&Present*, nr. 53, November 1971, pp. 109-120.
- 20 Alois Riegl, "The modern cult of monuments: its character and its origin," *Oppositions*, nr 25, 1982, pp. 21-51; Françoise Choay. *L'Allégorie du patrimoine* (Paris: Seuil, 1992). In English: *The invention of historical monument*. Translated by Lauren M. O'Connell (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- 21 Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Mass-producing traditions: Europe, 1870-1914" in *The Invention of Tradition*. Edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 263-306; Sergiusz Michalski. *Public monuments. Art in political bondage 1870-1997* (London: Reaktion books, 1998); Helke Rausch, "Staging realms of the past in 19th-century Western Europe: comparing monumental strategies of middle-class nationalists," *East Central Europe*, vol. 36, nr. 1, 2009, pp. 37-62.
- 22 For the use of Marianne: Maurice Agulhon, *Marianne au combat. L'imagerie et la symbolique républicaines de 1789 à 1879* (Paris: Flammarion, 1979)
- 23 Maurice Agulhon, *Marianne au pouvoir. L'imagerie et la symbolique républicaines de 1880 à 1914* (Paris: Flammarion, 1989)
- 24 Michalski. *Public monuments*, pp. 13-55;
- 25 Michalski. *Public monuments*, pp. 56-76; Rudy Koshar, *From monuments to traces. Artifacts of German memory, 1870-1990* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 15-79; Mosse, *Nationalisation of the masses*, pp. 47-72.
- 26 Nancy Wingfield, "Statues of Joseph II as sites of German identity" in Maria Bucur and Nancy Wingfield (eds.) *Staging the past: the politics of*

- commemoration in *Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the present* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2001), pp. 178-205.
- 27 Bálint Varga, "Arpad meets the city: the reception of the 1896 Millenium monuments in the Hungarian peripheries", paper presented at the international conference *Le Culte des héros en Europe centrale (1880-1945) – Aspects transnationaux et interdisciplinaires* (Paris, 25-26 November 2011).
- 28 Ioana Beldiman, p. 36.
- 29 Annette Becker, "Monuments aux morts après la guerre de Sécession et la guerre de 1870-1871: un legs de la guerre mondiale?", *Guerres mondiales et conflicts contemporaines*, nr. 167, July 1992, pp. 23-40; David G. Troyansky. "Monumental politics: national history and local memory in French Monuments aux Morts in the department of the Aisne since 1870," *French Historical Studies*, 15, 1, Spring 1987, pp. 121-141; Karine Varley, "Contesting concepts of the nation in arms: French memories of 1870-1 in Dijon," *European History Quarterly*, vol. 36, nr. 4, 2006, pp. 548-573;
- 30 Michalski, chapter 3, "Memorials to the Great War", pp. 77-92; Annette Becker. *Les monuments aux morts: patrimoine et mémoire de la Grande Guerre* (Paris: Errance, 1989); Antoine Prost, "War memorials of the Great War: monuments to the fallen" in *Republican identities in war and peace. Representations of France in nineteenth and twentieth centuries*. Translated by Jay Winter with Helen McPhail (Oxford, New York: Berg, 2002), pp. 11-43; Daniel J. Sherman. *The construction of memory in interwar France* (Chicago UP, 1999); George L. Mosse. *Fallen Soldiers. Reshaping the Memory of the Two Worlds* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- 31 Alina Șerban, "The destiny of public monuments: celebration, abandonment and political iconoclasm, *Bucharest: matter & history*, pp. 251-269.
- 32 A survey on several recent works on the cultural history of French-Romanian transfers was offered in Silviu Hariton, "Francophonie and its Romanian entanglement: a review article", *Balkanistica*, vol. 24, 2011, pp. 265-284.
- 33 Florian Tucă and M. Cociu, *Monumente ale anilor de luptă și jertfe* [Monuments to the years of fighting and sacrifice] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1983) is an alphabetic dictionary of all public monuments still existing in 1970s and early 1980s Romania; it was realized through compiling brief data the author found in tourist guides; it includes indexes of names with numerous mistakes of the indicated pages, an index of the represented characters and another one grouping the information by county.
- 34 ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 68-70/1937. In the case of the region of Muntenia, data refer only to the counties of Mehedinți, Gorj, Romanați, Olt, Argeș, Muscel, Dâmbovița, Vlașca, Ilfov, Prahova, Buzău, Râmnicu-Sărat, Brăila, Ialomița, Constanța and Durostor, missing counties being those of Tulcea, Caliacra, Teleorman, Vâlcea and Dolj. In the case of the regions of Moldavia, Bukowina and Bessarabia, data were collected for

the counties of Bacău, Vaslui, Jassy, Roman, Baia, Botoșani, Câmpulung, Rădăuți, Cernăuți, Hotin, Bălți, Soroca, Lăpușna, Tighina, Cahul, Cetatea Albă and Ismail, missing counties being those of Putna, Tecuci, Covurlui, Tutova, Fălciu, Neamț, Dorohoi, Suceava, Storojneț and Orhei. In the case of the regions of Transylvania and Banat the counties, data were collected for the counties of Someș, Năsăud, Bihor, Arad, Cluj, Turda, Alba, Hunedoara, Ciuc, Odorhei, Trei Scaune, Târnava Mare, Târnava Mică, Sibiu, Făraș, Brașov, Timiș-Torontal, Caraș and Severin, missing counties being those of Satu Mare, Maramureș, Sălaj and Mureș. Out of the seventy-one counties Romania had in the interwar period data is missing for nineteen of them which represents about a quarter of them. In the same time information on the public and war monuments of some of the important cities including Bucharest are missing which confirms one of the conclusions of this texts that interwar war monuments were in their heaviest part the result of vernacular initiative possible in a framework created by the state legislation. Information on Mehedinți County was taken from ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 61/1936.

- ³⁵ Tucă and Cociu, *Monumente ale anilor de luptă și jertfe* [Monuments to the years of fighting and sacrifice] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1983). Few of these monuments were discussed in detail and this includes war monuments as well. Introductions in the history of sculpture in Romania are offered by George Oprescu, *Sculptura statuară românească* [The history of the Romanian statues] (Bucharest: ESPLA, 1954); Vasile Florea, *Arta românească. Modernă și contemporană* [The Romanian art. Modern and contemporary] (Bucharest : Meridiane, 1982), pp. 224-259 for the period of nineteenth century; Mircea Deac, *50 de ani de sculptură. Dicționarul sculptorilor din România, 1890-1940* [Fifty years of sculpture. The dictionary of the Romanian sculptors, 1890-1940] (Bucharest: OIDICM, 2000) details on the work of some of the sculptors involved in creating public and war monuments.
- ³⁶ Carmen Tănăsioiu, *Iconografia lui Carol: de la realitate la mit* [The iconography of Carol I: from reality to myth] (Timișoara: Editura Amarcord, 1999); Andi Mihalache, "Jubileul. Reprezentări ale regalității în portrete și medalii jubiliare: modele europene, replici românești" [The jubilee. Representations of the royalty in portraits and commemorating medals: European models, Romanian adaptations] in his *Mănuși albe, mănuși negre...*, pp. 124-149.
- ³⁷ ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 70/1937, f. 88.
- ³⁸ ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 70/1937, ff. 48 and 64.
- ³⁹ Adrian-Silvan Ionescu, *Penel și sabie. Artiști documentariști și corespondenți de front în Războiul de Independență (1877-1878)* [Brush and sword. Documentary artists and front correspondens in the independence war, 1877-1878] (Bucharest : Editura Biblioteca Bucureștilor, 2002), p. 159-162.

- ⁴⁰ Marin Mihalache, "Epopoea independenței și arta de evocare istorică" [The epopee of independence and the history evoking art] in *Epopoea independenței în arta plastică românească* [The epopee of independence in the Romanian arts]. Introduction and selection of illustrations by Marin Mihalache (Bucharest: Editura Meridiane, 1977), pp. 5-15; Ion Frunzetti. "Plastica independenței" [The Independence War in the contemporary Romanian arts], *Studii și cercetări de istoria artei*, vol. 24, 1977, pp. 3-52 and Ion Frunzetti, "Contribuția pictorilor la plastica Independenței" [The painters' contribution to the representation of the Independence War], *Arta și literatură în slujba independenței naționale* [Art and literature serving the national independence] (Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1977), pp. 157-200.
- ⁴¹ Petre Oprea, "Un act patriotic a lui Nicolae Grigorescu: Albumul Războiului Independenței" [A patriotic deed of Nicolas Grigorescu: the Album of the Independence War] and "Rolul colecționarilor în impunerea unor mari valori artistice" [The role of art collectors in promoting some great artists] in *Repere în arta românească (secolul al XIX-lea și al XX-lea)* [Landmarks in Romanian art. Nineteenth and twentieth centuries] (Bucharest: Maiko, 1999), pp. 28-30 and 34-41. The first was originally published in *Revista muzeelor and monumentelor*, nr. 1, 1989 while the second appeared in *Contemporanul*, December 7, 1984.
- ⁴² Vlad Țoca, "Visual mythology: the case of Nicolae Grigorescu as the National Painter" in *Re-searching the nation: the Romanian file. Studies and selected bibliography in Romanian nationalism*. Edited by Sorin Mitu (Cluj-Napoca: International Book Access, 2008), pp. 104-114.
- ⁴³ Sorin Alexandrescu, "Război și semnificație. România în 1877 [War and significance. Romania in 1877]" in A.P. Goudoever (ed.), *Romanian history 1848-1918. Essays from the First Dutch-Romanian Colloquim of Historians 1977* (Historische Studies, xxxvi), Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1979, pp. 61-84, republished in Sorin Alexandrescu, *Privind înapoi, modernitatea* [Looking back, modernity] (Bucharest: Editura Univers, 1999), pp. 19-46.
- ⁴⁴ Adrian-Silvan Ionescu, *Modă și societate urbană în România epocii moderne* [Fashion and urban society in nineteenth century Romania] (Bucharest: Paideia, 2006).
- ⁴⁵ Irina Stănculescu, "Apariția și evoluția denumirilor de străzi din București" [The appearance and the evolution of the street names in Bucharest], *București. Materiale de istorie și muzeografie*, vol. XIV, 2000, pp. 137-185.
- ⁴⁶ Mihail Dimitrescu. *Amintiri și episoade din Resbelul pentru independență*. Cu o privire retrospectivă asupra dezvoltării armatei române de la 1859 [Recollections and moments of the independence war. With a retrospective incursion in the development of the Romanian army since 1859] by veteran captain... Foreword by I. Nenițescu (Bucharest: Tip. Gutenberg, Joseph Gobl, 1893); further examples are mentioned in George Muntean, "Proza" and Rodica Florea, "Memorialistică, scrieri istorice, corespondență" [Memories,

historical writings, correspondence], *Arta și literatură în slujba independenței naționale* [Art and literature serving the national independence], pp. 49-65 and 87-102.

47 Elefterie Dumitrescu (1855-1938). *Educațiunea și datoriile morale ale soldatului. Precepțiuni și exemple* [The education and moral duties of the soldier. Rules and examples] by Major... of Argeș 4th Regiment (Bucharest: Inst. De Arte Grafice Carol Gobl, 1901).

48 Mihai Florea, "Teatrul românesc în slujba independenței naționale" [The Romanian theater serving the national independence], *Arta și literatură în slujba independenței naționale* [Art and literature serving the national independence], pp. 67-85, p. 84.

49 Archibald [Gheorghe Rădulescu], *Impresii de călătorie. Paris-Reims-Verdu n-Mărăști-Mărășești. Note de om năcăjit* [Travel recollections. Paris-Reims-Verdun-Mărăști-Mărășești. Notes of an upset man] (Bucharest: Institutul de Arte Grafice Cartea Medicală, 1924), p. 126.

50 "Sus ridică fruntea, vrednice popor!/Câți vorbim o limbă și purtăm un nume/
Toți s-avem o țintă și un singur dor - /Mândru să se nalțe peste toate-n lume/
Steagul tricolor!"

51 "Eroi au fost, eroi sunt încă//Și-or fi în neamul românesc!
Căci ruți sunt ca din tare stâncă/Românii orișiunde cresc//
E vița noastră făurită/De doi bărbați cu brațe tari//Și cu voința oțelită/
Cu minți deștepte, inimi mari.//Și unu-i Decebal cel harnic/
Iar celălalt Traian cel drept/Ei pentru vatra loc amarnic/
Au dat cu-atația dușmani piept.//Și din așa părinți de seamă/
În vechi s-or naște luptători/Ce pentru patria lor mamă/
Vor sta ca vrednici următori.//Au fost eroi și-or să mai fie/
Ce-or frânge dușmanii cei răi/Din coasta Daciei și-a Romei/
În veci s-or naște pui de lei."

Ioan S. Nenițescu (1854-1901). *Pui de lei. Poesii eroice și naționale* [Lion cubs. Heroic and national poetry] (Bucharest: Ig. Haimann, Tip. "Gutenberg" Joseph Gobl, 1891)

52 Manuela Gheorghiu, "Cinematograful, un aliat al istoriei" [The cinema, history's ally] in Ion Frunzetti and George Muntean (eds.) *Arta și literatură în slujba independenței naționale* [Art and literature serving the national independence], pp. 225-238. Grigore Brezianu's movie was the theme for another movie, *The rest is silence* (2007), directed by Nae Caranfil; conceived during the 1980s, it plays on the relationships between arts, funding providers and politics in general; see <http://www.restuletacere.com/>
53 Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu, "Monumentul eroilor pompieri" [The monument to the firemen heroes], *Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice*, nr. 4, 1991.

- ⁵⁴ Constantin Bacalbaşa, *Bucureştii de altădată* [Bucharest of the past], vol. I, 1871-1884 (Bucharest: Editura Universul, 1935), pp. 256-258; a picture of the moment was published in *Enciclopedia României*, vol. I (Bucharest: Imprimeria naţională, 1939), p. 874; Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu, "Arcul de Triumf din Bucureşti. Contribuţii documentare" [The Arch of Triumph of Bucharest. Documentary contributions], *Studii şi cercetări de istoria artei*, vol. 16, nr. 2, 1969, p. 338.
- ⁵⁵ P. Rădulescu, "Monumentul român de la Smârdan" [The Romanian monuments of Smârdan], *Albina*, Bucureşti, vol. I, nr. 28-29, April 11-12, 1898, pp. 897-900.
- ⁵⁶ Here is a list of the monuments still surviving in the early 1980s Romania, based on the dictionary compiled by Florin Tucă: Vişina, Dâmboviţa County, 1878; Calafat, Dolj County, 1886; Câmpulung, Argeş County, 1897 (author Dumitru Demetrescu-Mirea); Ploieşti, Prahova County, 1897; Craiova, Dolj County, 1900 (Oscar Spaethe); Tulcea, Tulcea County, 1904; Azuga, Prahova County, 1905; Târgovişte, Dâmboviţa County, 1905; Calafat again, 1907; Turnu-Măgurele, Teleorman County, 1907; Piteşti, Argeş County, 1907; Jilava, Ilfov County, 1908; Moineşti, Bacău County, 1908; Mărăşeşti, Păuneşti, Suraia and Vîrteşcoiu, all situated in the Vrancea County and all four inaugurated in 1909; Şuţeşti, Brăila County, 1909; Potlogi, Dâmboviţa County, 1910; Sascut, Bacău County, 1910; Cislău, Buzău County, 1911 (Storck); Ciuperceeni Noi, Dolj County, 1912; Rucăr, Argeş County, 1912; Dumbrăveni, Suceava County, 1913; Baratca, Neamţ County, 1913; Mălini, Suceava County, 1914; Focşani, Vrancea County (author Oscar Spaethe), 1914; Râmnicu-Vâlcea, Vâlcea County, 1915 (author Ion Iordănescu); Râmnicu-Sărat, Buzău County, 1915 (author Alexandru Severin); Ungureni, com. Măneciu, Prahova County, 1915-1916; Bucharest, 1916 (author Oscar Han). Besides these monuments listed by Tucă, I could identify other thirty-one monuments with the help of the 1937 survey of public monuments of Oltenia, Muntenia and Dobruja. Twenty-three of them were built in the Vlaşca County and the dynamics of their construction suggests that the area around Bucharest was prioritized by an ambitious or just a dedicated prefect who played a major role in initiating and supporting their process of construction. Eight of them were built before 1901, ten of them were inaugurated in 1904 and only five of them then after: Călugăreni, 1878; Frăţeşti, 1881; Grădiştea, 1893; Stoenşti, 1894; Găujani, 1890; Bălănoaia, 1898; Purani, 1899; Gastiu, 1900; Dărăşti; Gogoşari; Malu, Căscioarele, Corbii-Ciungi, Crevenia Mică, Fărcăşanca, Roata, Tudor Vladimirescu şi Scurtu, all ten in 1904; Babele, 1906; Căsnşti, 1908; Comana, 1913; Strâmba, 1913; Stăneşti, 1914. Other monuments dedicated to the war of 1877-1878 were built in Rucăr, Muscel County, 1902; Vişina, Dâmboviţa County, 1904; Tonea, Ialomiţa County, 1904; Corbul, Constanţa County,

1906; Boldu (1909), Dumitrești (1909), Măicănești (1912) and Vârteșcoi (1914), all four in the Râmnicu Sărat County.

- 57 There is no war monument built before 1907 in the region of Moldavia according to ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 69/1937.
- 58 Maria Bucur, *Heroes and victims...*, p. 29.
- 59 ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 70/1937, f. 65.
- 60 ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 70/1937, f. 40-41.
- 61 ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 70/1937, f. 84.
- 62 ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 68/1936, f. 25.
- 63 ANR-ANIC, Fondul Ministerul Artelor, dos. 70/1937, ff. 65 and 45.
- 64 Florica Cruceru, "Monumentele Dobrogei" [The monuments of Dobruja], *Revista muzeelor și monumentelor. Monumente istorice și de artă*, vol. 50, nr. 1, 1981, pp. 11-19;
- 65 Ion Neacșu, "Un monument rătăcit în istorie [Avântul Țării]" [A monument wandering in history], *Buletinul Muzeului Militar Național*, nr. 3, 2005, pp. 272-279.
- 66 A four pages letter of Ștefan [Motăș] Zeletin to Vasile Bogrea from January 7, 1917, makes this compain, AMR-DANIC, Fond Colecția de personalități etc., dos. Vasile Bogrea, ff. 2-4.
- 67 Barbu Brezianu, "Gruparea 'Arta Română' (1918-1926)" [The 'Arta Română' group, 1918-1926], *Studii și cercetări de istoria artei. Seria artă plastică*, vol. 11, nr. 1, 1964, pp. 144-151.
- 68 Ioana Vlasiu, "Emile Antoine Bourdelle și sculptura interbelică din România" [Emile Antoine Bourdelle and the Romanian sculpture during the interwar period] in *Influențe franceze în arhitectura și arta din România secolelor XIX și XX* [French Influence on Romanian art and architecture of nineteenth and twentieth centuries] Edited by Augustin Ioan (Bucharest: Editura ICR, 2006), pp. 125-127.
- 69 Liviu Rebreanu. *Forrest of the hanged*. Translated from Romanian by A.V.Wise (London: Peter Owen, 1967).
- 70 *Tractat de pace între puterile aliate și asociate și Ungaria. Protocol și declarațiuni, din 4 iunie 1920 (Trianon)*. Bucharest: Imprimeria Statului, 1920. ANIC, fond Parlament, dos. 1898..
- 71 Ministerul de Război, Oficiul Național I.O.V., *Recunoștința națiunii către cei cari au făurit „România mare”* [The national gratitude to those who made Greater Romania] (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1920), pp. 10-11: "La fel cu toți cei care au contribuit la ridicarea Patriei, la fel cu cei ce supraviețuiesc generației de jertfă, morții își au drepturile lor. Ei nu cer lacrimile noastre; pretind însă în schimb, în mod imperios, recunoașterea sacrificiului lor sublim și ridicarea la înălțimea unui simbol, care să constituie exemplul și stimulenta a noui eroisme de care va avea nevoie completa consolidare și viitorul neamului nostru [...] În fața acestor morminte, în fața acestor temple, veni-va tinerimea viitorului, în orice moment greu pentru țară, spre a primi

cuvântul de ordine și aci va învăța, mai mult ca oriunde, drumul de urmat, pentru ca neamul nostru să merite, ca și în trecut, conducerea morală a popoarelor ce ne înconjoară, rol care constituie totuși principiul existenței noastre de popor latin la porțile Orientului.”

- 72 Niculae Niculae, “Unde ne sînt monumentele?” [Where are our monuments?], *Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice*, vol. 42, nr. 2, 1973, pp. 73-76; Niculae Niculae, “Societăți și așezăminte pentru ridicarea operelor comemorative” [Societies and organizations dedicated for constructing commemorative artifacts], *Revista muzeelor și monumentelor. Monumente istorice și de artă*, vol. 46, nr. 2, 1977, pp. 79-82;
- 73 Tucă, 1983, p. 122. Inauguration on September 14, Ziua Sfintei Cruci.
- 74 Radu Filipescu, “Monumentul Diviziei a II-a Cavalerie din Copou” [The monument to the Second Chavalry Division of Copou Park in Iasi] in *Patrimoniul național și modernizare în societatea românească: instituții, actori, strategii* [National patrimony and the modernization of the Romanian society] Edited by Dumitru Ivănescu and Cătălina Mihalache (Iași: Editura Junimea, 2009), pp. 239-248.
- 75 Speranța Diaconescu, “Unitatea națională oglindită în plăci memoriale din București” [The national unity as represented in memorial plaques in Bucharest], *București. Materiale de istorie și muzeografie*, vol. 12, 1997, pp. 250-255.
- 76 Petre Oprea, *Critici de artă în presa bucureșteană a anilor 1931-1937* [Art critics in Bucharest journals, 1931-1937] (Editura Tehnică Agricolă, 1997), pp. 14-15.
- 77 Petre Oprea, *Critici și cronicari în presa bucureșteană a anilor 1938-1944* [Critics and art chroniclers in Bucharest journals, 1938-1944] (Bucharest: Editura Maiko, 1999), p. 12.
- 78 ANR-ANIC, fond Ministerul Artelor, dos. 61/1936, f. 46.
- 79 ANR-ANIC, fond Ministerul Artelor, dos. 61/1936, f. 5.
- 80 ANR-ANIC, fond Ministerul Artelor, dos. 61/1936, f. 22.
- 81 *Romania Eroica*, March 1929, p. 14. However, in 1936 the cost of the same monument was evaluated at 1.500.000 lei, see ANR-ANIC, Fond Ministerul Artelor, Dos. 61/1936, f. 41.
- 82 Bragadiru: “Spuneți generațiilor viitoare că noi am făcut jertfa supremă pe câmpurile de bătălie din 1916-1918, pentru întregirea neamului”; Caracal: “Vouă, eroilor din Romani, vi s-a ridicat acest templu al virtuților strămoșești, către voi se îndreaptă cu pioșenie gîndirea celor de azi și de mâine, vouă vi se cuvine în parte prinosul de recunoștință a unui neam întregit eternizînd unirea tuturor românilor”; Poroinica/com. Mătăsaru, Dâmbovița (1935, Vasile Blendea): “Liniștit vă fie somnul/Astăzi bravilor eroi/Glorie, vă strigă țara/Veți fi pildă pentru noi//Neclintiți vom face stîncă/Să pătrăm ce ne-ați lăsat/Tot pămîntul țării noastre/Ce-i cu sânge amestecat// [...] Glorie vă strigă țara/Pentru sângele vărsat/Glorie, vă strigă satul/Nimenea

nu v-a uitat/Voi trăiți în mintea noastră și în inimă de mamă/Voi trăiți în copilășii care încă vă mai cheamă//"; Zalha, com. Ileanda, jud. Sălaj: "Nimică în lume nu-i mai sfânt/Și mai frumos pe acest pământ/Decât să mori ca luptător/Înfășurat în tricolor". The last quote is from a song apparently sung by Transylvanians volunteers in Romanian army.

- ⁸³ Decret pentru atribuțiunile comisiei monumentelor publice, *Monitorul Oficial* nr. 52, March 5, 1930, p. 1758; Hamangiu, XVIII, 168; Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu, "Informații referitoare la activitatea desfășurată de către Comisia Superioară a Monumentelor Publice" [Information concerning the activity of the Commission for Public Monuments], *Revista Arhivelor*, vol. 12, nr. 1, 1969, pp. 129-134 surveys some of the files from the commission's archive concerning a variety of monuments; Ioan Opreș, "Comisia Monumentelor Publice și activitatea ei" [The Commission for Public Monuments and its activity], *Revista Arhivelor*, vol. 50, nr. 3, 1988, pp. 267-276 affirms that the commission was established as early as 1922 by a Ministry of Cults and Arts's decision and its director during the 1920s was Z. Pelișanu; however, the source of this information is a 1933 file which suggest that probably due to a low level of activity it was officialy (re)established in 1929 under the directorship of Ion Minulescu.
- ⁸⁴ Dan Berindei et al, *Istoria orașului București* [The history of the city of Bucharest] (Bucharest: Muzeul de Istorie al Orașului București, 1965); Victoria Dragu Dimitriu, *Povești cu statui și fântâni din București* [Stories with statues and fountains] (Bucharest: Editura Vremea, 2010).
- ⁸⁵ Anca Benera, *Bucharest: Matter & history*, pp. 84-91.
- ⁸⁶ *Istoricul înfăptuirii monumentului infanteriei, 1921-1936* [The history of making the infantry monument, 1921-1936] (Bucharest: Monitorul oficial – imprimaria națională, 1936); Anca Benera, pp. 104-113.
- ⁸⁷ Bogdan Furtună, *Monografia monumentului „Eroilor Aerului”* [The monography of the monument "To the Heroes of the Sky"] (Bucharest: s.l., 1939).
- ⁸⁸ "Spuneți generațiilor viitoare că noi am făcut suprema jertfă pe câmpurile de bătaie pentru reîntregirea neamului"; *Revista Geniului*, July 1929 and January-February 1937.
- ⁸⁹ Victoria Dragu Dimitriu, *Povești cu statui și fântâni din București* [Stories with statues and fountains in Bucharest] (Bucharest: Editura Vremea, 2010), p. 85.
- ⁹⁰ Constantin Kirițescu, *Arcul de Triumf și epopeea română. 1916-1918-1922-1936* [The Arc of Triumph and the Romanian epos, 1916-1918-1922-1936] (Bucharest: Editura Casei Școalelor, 1936); Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu, "Arcul de Triumf – contribuții documentare" [The Arch of Triumph – a documented contribution], *Studii și cercetări de istoria artei. Seria artă plastică*, vol. 16, nr. 1, 1969, pp. 338-340; Virgiliu Z. Teodorescu. *Arcul de Triumf* [The Arch of Triumph] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1995).

- ⁹¹ Kirițescu, *Arcul de Triumf...*, p. 24: “După secole de suferințe creștinești îndurate și lupte grele pentru păstrarea ființei naționale, după apărarea plină de sacrificii a civilizației umane, se îndeplini dreptatea și pentru poporul român prin sabia Regelui Ferdinand cu ajutorul întregii națiuni și gândul Reginei Maria.”
- ⁹² “Glorie celor ce prin lumina minții și puterea sufletului au pregătit unirea națională”; “Glorie celor ce prin vitejia și prin jertfa lor de sânge au înfăptuit unitatea națională.”
- ⁹³ Kirițescu, *Arcul de Triumf...*, p. 32: “Acela ce va trece pe lângă acest Arc de Triumf să se gândească că, dacă reprezintă comemorarea gloriei românești, el are la temelie oasele acelora care au crezut și s-au jertfit și că, dacă aceste pietre ar avea glas, ar striga: ‘Trecătorule, gândește-te la jertfa celor căzuți! Ce faci tu pentru întărirea și consolidarea Patriei tale?’ [...] O! Pietre scumpe, amintitoare de ceasuri de vitejie, amintire a crezului și a speranței neamului, stați vecinic de veghe și spuneți tuturor că numai cu credință și jertfe, pentru interesul obștesc, se poate înfăptui ceva pe acest pământ.”
- ⁹⁴ Cristache Gheorghe and Ionel Batali, *Ansamblul monumental de la Valea Mare – Mateiaș* [The monument of Valea Mare – Mateiaș] (Bucharest, 1985). Drept : 69.613
- ⁹⁵ Pimen Georgescu, *Mărășești, Locul biruinții cu biserica neamului* [Mărășești, the place of victory with the help of the nation’s church] (Tipografia Monastirei Neamțu, 1924).
- ⁹⁶ *Istoricul înființării bisericii neamului de la Mărășești* [The history of making the nation’s church of Mărășești] (Bucharest: Tipografia Cărților Bisericești, 1925).
- ⁹⁷ No historical account that was written about the long process of building this Mausoleum as it is the case with the history of the other mausoleums paid attention to the political agenda of the initiators and of the contesters. Zefira Voiculescu, *Întru slava eroilor neamului. Istoricul mausoleului de la Mărășești* [For the glory of our heroes. The history of the mausoleum of Mărășești] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1971) is rather a touristic guiding brochure which presents some general information without much references; Valeria Bălescu. *Mausoleul de la Mărășești* [The mausoleum of Mărășești] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1993) used the archive of the Society for the Cult of the Heroes and focuses on the technical details without much attention to the cultural and political backgrounds of the involved historical actors; only Maria Bucur pursued in *Heroes and victims*, pp. 125-132 an analysis of the significance of Mărășești Mausoleum.
- ⁹⁸ Florian Tucă, *Câmpul istoric de la Mărăști. Istoricul mausoleului de la Mărăști* [The historical field of Mărăști. The history of the mausoleum of Mărăști] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1973) is also more of a touristic guiding brochure; Florian Tucă, “Societatea Mărăști și principalele ei înfăptuiri” [The Mărăști Society and its main realisations] in *Armata și societatea românească*

[Army and the Romanian society] Edited by Al. Gh. Savu (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1980), pp. 345-352; Valeria Bălescu, “Mărăști – o promisiune onorată” [Mărăști – a honored promise] in *Eroi și morminte* [Heroes and graves], vol. 2, 2008, pp. 18-63.

- 99 Ion Mocioi, *Brâncuși, Ansamblul sculptural de la Târgu-Jiu (documentar)* [Brâncuși. The sculptures of Târgu-Jiu] (Târgu-Jiu: Comitetul pentru cultură și artă al județului Gorj, 1971) uses local county archives to reconstruct in great detail the moments of constructing each element of the sculptural ensemble; Marielle Tabart, *Brâncuși. Inventatorul sculpturii moderne* [Brâncuși. The inventor of modern sculpture] (Bucharest: Univers, 2009, c1995), pp. 88-91 includes pictures from the inauguration of October 27, 1938.
- 100 Tucă, 1983, p. 304-5.
- 101 Mircea Deac, “9 mai 1945 – 9 mai 1985. Monumentele victoriei” [May 9, 1945 – May 9, 1985. The monuments to victory], *Revista muzeelor și monumentelor. Monumente istorice și de artă*, vol. 16, nr. 1, 1985, pp. 3-7.
- 102 Decree 117 of October 23, 1975 concerning the war graves and the commemorative works stated: “Cinstirea memoriei celor care și-au jertfit viața în lupta pentru libertatea și independența patriei, precum și pentru apărarea cuceririlor revoluționare ale oamenilor muncii, constituie una din tradițiile scumpe ale poporului român și, totodată, un mijloc important pentru educarea patriotică a maselor”; *Buletinul oficial al Republicii Socialiste România*, anul XI, nr. 111, partea I, October 30 1975, p. 1.