

•

**ANALELE ȘTIINȚIFICE
ALE
UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA”
DIN IAȘI
(SERIE NOUĂ)**

ISTORIE

**TOM LXVIII
2022**

Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași

COLEGIUL DE REDACȚIE:

Nelu Zugravu (Iași), Neculai Bolohan (Iași), Alexandru-Florin Platon (Iași), Petronel Zahariuc (Iași), Ștefan S. Gorovei (Iași), Maria Magdalena Székely (Iași), Cristian Ploscaru (Iași), Claudiu Topor (Iași), Gabriel Leanca (Iași), Gheorghe Iacob (Iași), Ovidiu Buruiană (Iași), Victor Spinei, membru al Academiei Române (Iași), Ioan Aurel Pop, președintele Academiei Române (Cluj-Napoca), Ovidiu Cristea (București), Antal Lukács (București), Ion Eremia (Chișinău), Ion Varta (Chișinău), Dennis Deletant (Londra), Carol Iancu (Montpellier), Hans-Christian Maner (Mainz).

COMITETUL DE REDACȚIE:

Laurențiu Rădvan (redactor șef),
Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba, Ionuț Nistor, Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu,
Adrian Vițălaru (secretar de redacție),
Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu (secretar de redacție).

Responsabilitatea pentru opiniile exprimate în textele publicate revine în exclusivitate autorilor.

Manuscriștele, cărțile și revistele propuse pentru schimb,
ca și orice corespondență se vor trimite redacției:

Laurențiu Rădvan

Facultatea de Istorie
Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
B-dul Carol I 11,
700506, Iași, România
Tel.: 40-(0)232-20.12.74
e-mail: radvan@uaic.ro



CUPRINS

Romanian-Serbian relations in the 20th century

Zoran Janjetović, <i>Romanian national minority in the Yugoslav Banat 1918-1948</i>	11
Adrian Vițălaru, <i>In the capital of the allied state. Romanian diplomats in Belgrade (1919-1941)</i>	25
Alexandru D. Aioanei, <i>Yugoslavia and Britain's clandestine actions in Romania during the Second World War</i>	39
Olivera Dragišić, <i>Italian precedent for the armistice negotiations with Romania in 1944</i> ..	51
Vladimir Lj. Cvetković, <i>Yugoslavia and the crisis of Petru Groza government (August 1945 – January 1946)</i>	65
Ionuț Nistor, <i>A marriage of convenience. The Romanian Workers' Party and the Yugoslav emigration in the early 1950s</i>	79
Petar Dragišić, <i>Serbian press and Romanian Revolution in 1989</i>	89

Iulia Dumitracă, <i>Despre potentialul halieutic pontic la Ovidius</i>	101
Ionuț Acrudoae, <i>Cohortes I-VIII Breucorum în secolul I p.Chr. Locuri și oameni</i>	119
Nelu Zugravu, <i>Vasile Pârvan e Marco Aurelio</i>	145
Claudiu-Costel Luca, <i>Ciclurile monarhiei imperiale în Liber de Caesaribus – o abordare istoriografică</i>	159

Alexandru Ștefan, <i>Tentația falsului diplomatic. Cazul lui Ștefan de Sânger, notarul conventului benedictin de la Cluj-Mănăștur</i>	169
Ştefan S. Gorovei, <i>Falsuri și falsificatori pentru istoria românească</i>	185
Radu Cârciumaru, <i>Greci la Târgoviște în veacul al XVII-lea. Interferențe istorico-arheologice</i>	197
Celestin Ignat, <i>Logofeția Țării Moldovei în cea de-a treia domnie a lui Gheorghe Duca (1678-1683)</i>	211
Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu, <i>Documente inedite ale familiei Goia (I). Ramura lui Sandu Goia</i>	225
Gheorghe Lazăr, <i>Ajutoarele românești în favoarea așezămintelor athonite Karacalu și Marea Lavră. Noi mărturii documentare (sec. al XVIII-lea)</i>	261
Mihai Anatolii Ciobanu, <i>Două planuri rusești ale ansamblului Episcopiei Buzăului ..</i>	287
Laurențiu Răduvan, Mihai Anatolii Ciobanu, <i>Planul satului Lăzăreni (Iași) și surprizele sale: reședința lui Rumeanțev și schitul de la Stâncă Jijiei</i>	303
Georgiana Mădălina Mihai, <i>Ținutul Romanului în cadrul organizării administrative a Moldovei în secolul XVIII – prima jumătate a secolului XIX</i>	321

Laurențiu Răduțan, <i>Noi contribuții privitoare la originea și activitatea arhitectului Johann Freywald</i>	337	
Alexandru-Florin Platon, „ <i>La Révolution de la Grèce n'est qu'accidentelle...</i> ”: o versiune inedită a relatării prințului Gheorghe Cantacuzino despre acțiunea Eteriei în Principatele Române la 1821	355	
Cristian Ploscaru, <i>O piesă de teatru și afacerea „idarelelor calpe”</i> . Secvențe din istoria domniilor pământene	413	
Maria Rados, <i>Întâia reformă a școlilor din Moldova?</i>	429	
Simion Câlția, <i>Decorațiile, instrument de guvernare în timpul domniei lui Carol I</i>	457	
Claudiu-Lucian Topor, <i>Romania's Royal Legation in Germany before 1914</i>	473	
Mihai Tudosă, <i>Orthodoxy and Orthopraxy Among Romanians During the Great War</i> ..	497	
Ovidiu Buruiană, <i>The German military occupation in Romania (1916-1918) and its representation</i>	515	
Liviu Brătescu, <i>Centenarul nașterii lui I. C. Brătianu (1921). Memorie socială și legitimare politică</i>	543	

<i>In memoriam: Ion Toderașcu</i>	559	
Recenzii și note bibliografice		
Sextus Aurelius Victor, <i>Liber de Caesaribus. Carte despre împărați, editio bilinguis</i> /ediție bilingvă, ediția a II-a revizuită și adăugită, traducere, considerații privind limba și stilul și notă asupra ediției de Mihaela Paraschiv, ediție îngrijită, abrevieri, studiu introductiv, ediții de izvoare folosite, notă asupra ediției, note și comentarii, apendice și indice de Nelu Zugravu, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, 2022, 734 p. (<i>Thesaurus Classicus III</i>) (<i>Cozmin-Valerian Broșteanu</i>); Lactanțiu, <i>Instituțiile divine. Epitoma</i> , traducere și note Petru Pistol, București, Editura Sophia, 2019, 286 p. (Nelu Zugravu); Giovanni Filoromo, <i>Crucea și puterea. Creștinii, de la martiri la persecutori</i> , traducere din italiană de Dionisie Constantin Pîrvuloiu, București, Editura Humanitas, 2022, 486 p. (Nelu Zugravu); <i>The Dacians in the Roman Empire. Provincial Constructions</i> , edited by Sorin Nemeti, Dan Dana, Irina Nemeti, Eugenia Beu-Dachin, Luciana Nedelea and Timea Varga, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Mega, 2019, 443 p. (<i>Casian Gămănuț</i>); <i>The Roman Provinces. Mechanisms of Integration</i> , edited by Sorin Nemeti, Eugenia Beu-Dachin, Irina Nemeti, Dan Dana, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Mega, 2019, 368 p. (<i>Casian Gămănuț</i>); Yann Le Bohec, <i>Războiul în lumea romană 58 a.Chr.–235 p.Chr.</i> , Cluj-Napoca, Editura Mega, 2021, 348 p. (<i>Alex-Marian Cornea</i>); Scris, scriituruă, text în Țările Române (secolele XV–XVIII), volum îngrijit de Monica Dejan cu un cuvânt înainte de Maria Magdalena Székely, Suceava, Editura Karl A. Romstorfer, 2020, 288 p. (<i>Alexandru Gora</i>); Mihail K. Qaramah, <i>O istorie a Molitfelnicului românesc. Evoluția formularelor Sfintelor Taine (sec. XVI–XVII)</i> , Alba Iulia, Editura Reînregirea, 2022, 307 p. (<i>Celestin Ignat</i>); <i>Doi călători elvețieni și lumea românească la începuturile modernității (1808–1811)</i> : Léonard Revilliod și Charles René Pictet de Rochemont. Mărturii inedite, editat		561

de Alexandru-Florin Platon, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2021, 398 p. (*Adrian-Ionuț Gilea*); Gheorghe-Florin Știrbăț, *Alexandru Enacovici. Din activitatea politică*, Iași, Editura PIM, 2019, 343 p. (*Andrei Bordeianu*); Radu Mârza, *Călători și pacienți români la Karlsbad. O istorie culturală a mersului la băi pe la 1900*, Iași, Editura Polirom, 2022, 504 p. (*Renata-Gabriela Buzău*); Sonya Orfalian, *Mărturii ale copiilor armeni 1915-1922*, Iași, Editura Polirom, 2022, 218 p. (*Bogdan Iutiș*).

Abrevieri 597

Ovidiu BURUIANĂ*

The German military occupation in Romania (1916-1918) and its representation**

Introduction. A disputed aspect. Methodological mentions

In November 1916, after the battles of Neajlov-Arges, the Romanian authorities decided for the refuge in Moldova for the State institutions and a part of the population. Lacking anti-air defense or an air force, as the French plenipotentiary minister remarked with surprise¹, and with the German Zeppelins as everyday „emissaries of death”², Bucharest was declared an open city. The enemy troops entered the capital on December 6th, 1916³. By the end of that year, the frontline stabilized on the Siret River, after the Central Powers’ conquest of the city of Focșani and the de facto division in two of the Putna county, as separation line dictated by firearms. The Old Kingdom’s Romania was experiencing a veritable drama, seeing its territory and population reduced, in only several months after joining the war, to a third of the country. As a result of the authorities’ precipitous retreat in October-November 1916, Wallachia and Dobrogea found themselves under the Central Powers’ control, especially Germany’s. In the

* Assoc. Prof., PhD, Faculty of History, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Iasi, Romania; ovidiu.buruiana@uaic.ro.

** This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS – UEFISCDI, Project Number PN-III-P-4-ID-PCCF-2016-0131.

¹ “The German pilots were not risking anything, considering that the air force and anti-air defense were non-existent in Romania. Due to the lack of sirens and observers, the police gave the alarm by way of shrill whistles and only when the bombardment had already begun at an altitude where missing its mark was impossible (...). Bucharest was the most tested capital by the enemy air force”. (Count de Saint-Aulaire, *Confesiunile unui bătrân diplomat*, translated by Ileana Sturdza, introduction and notes by Mihai D. Sturdza, București, Editura Humanitas, 2003, p. 71).

² Arhibald (G. Rădulescu), *Porcii. Impresii din timpul invaziei. Note de om necăjit*, vol. I, București, Editura „Poporul” S.A., 1921 (second edition, București, Tipografia „Steaua Tării”, 1926), p. 53. Bacalbașa mentions 800 deaths and wounded only on 12 September 1918 (Constantin Bacalbașa, *Capitala sub ocupația dușmanului. 1916-1918*, Brăila, Editura Alcalay & Calafeteanu, f.a., p. 4). See also Eugen Lovinescu’s metaphor „the birds of death, which the simple resident of Bucharest regarded with sympathy and curiosity and went out to greet” (E. Lovinescu, *În cumpăna vremei. Note de războiu*, București, Editura Librăriei Socec & Co., Soc. Anonimă, 1919, p. 20).

³ The dates in the text follow the Gregorian calendar.

following two years, the Germans administrated the counties of Mehedinți, Gorj, Dolj, Râmnicu-Vâlcea, Romanați, Argeș, Olt, Teleorman, Muscel, Dâmbovița, Vlașca, Prahova, Ilfov, Ialomița, Buzău, Râmnicu-Sărat, Putna, Brăila and the Dobrogea region.

The Romanians saw the military occupation as a unique reality in their modern history, half a century old. Forgotten were the Crimean War and the time when the Russian “ally” controlled the territory east of the Olt River for a short period in 1878, or at least, these memories did not remain in the active memory of the public space in the inter-war world. The occupation by the Central Powers generated a broad historical, as well as historiographical discussion, associated as it was to the favorable end of the world conflict and the subsequent formation of the Romanian political community, what we generally call *România Întregită* (“Unified Romania”). For the contemporaries, the debate was subsumed to the public legitimacy after the war. A literature of some Romanians’ suffering and resistance during the Germano-Austro-Hungarian domination intersects exculpatory texts regarding those accused of collaborationism. The sides after the war make the moment of the occupation overlap the rift pro-German/pro-Entente⁴; after 1918, those who has supported the alliance with the Central Powers during Romania’s neutrality period were mostly considered guilty and accused of “National treason” due to support of the German war administration in Romania or benevolent attitudes towards the occupants. But, unlike the decision to participate in the war, where the spokesmen were exclusively members of the political and cultural elites, the subject concerning the position during the conquest of *the others* generated a more “democratic” debate. It was not only the members of the upper classes who were involved in the discourse, on one side or the other. Officials⁵,

⁴ Significant historiographical contributions came from Lucian Boia, „*Germanofilia*”. *Elita intelectuală românească în anii Primului Război Mondial*, 4th ed., București, Editura Humanitas, 2017 (first edition in 2009) and Radu Tudorancea, *Frontul de acasă. Propagandă, atitudini și curente de opinie în România Primului Război Mondial*, second edition, revised and enlarged, București, Editura Eikon, 2016, especially the parts „Pro-Germania vs. Pro-Antantă”, p. 23-45 and 46-74.

⁵ These categories interfere with each other in the social and professional dynamic from the inter-war period. M. Socianu, an official at the Police Prefecture in Bucharest in 1916 and later a journalist, wrote multiple works dedicated to the subject: *În ghiarele nemților*, București, Atelierele tipografice „Poporul”, 1918; *Sub văl. Ocupația Capitalei de către nemți, memorii inedite*, București, 1932. See also the work of former director of the Police Prefecture in Bucharest, Anibal Stoenescu, *Din vremea ocupăției. Cu 20 de ilustrații*, București, Atelierele Grafice Socec & Comp. S.A., 1927. Also, Eugen C. Decușăra, economist and publicist, with a PhD in Law and Economic Science in Paris, former magistrate and administrative head of the Craiova Town Hall, later director of the Legal Statistics at the Ministry of Justice (E. C. Decușăra, *România sub ocupăție dușmană*, Fascicola I, *Organizarea și activitatea poliției militare*, București, Tipografia Curtii Regale Göbl & Fiii, 1920). Similarly, Vasile Th. Cancicov, lawyer and journalist, with *Jurnal din vremea ocupăției. Impresiuni și păreri personale din timpul războiului României. Jurnal zilnic*, vol. I, București, Atelierele Societății „Universul”, 1922 (see also the recent edition by Daniel Cain, printed by Editura Humanitas in two volumes, București, 2015). Secretary of the Commission for Historical Monuments in Bucharest (later, correspondent member of the Romanian Academy), Virgiliu N. Drăghiceanu wrote *707 zile sub cultura pumnului german*, f.l., f.a. [1920, most likely; see also the edition with a preface by

soldiers⁶, legal experts⁷, writers/marginalized men of letters⁸, journalists⁹ etc. became authorized voices in the inter-war context, drawing from the experience they had in the „German” territory of Romania. Their endeavors are not equal in terms of intentions, development and language or circulation. The memorialistic works, as auto-referential literature, co-exist with incriminating brochures and newspapers articles, with the parliamentary polemic and those outside the legal forum, which are subsumed to the dynamics of the political game. They are violent in their language or references as they express the euphoria of success and present the treason trials¹⁰. However, in all these conjectural materials, the authors try to pass verdicts or, on the contrary, to clear them of blame and to justify an act. Due to their diversity, the moral endeavors and the attempts to explain a position are, thus, dissolved in the social texture. The commemorative effect of the suffering had symbolic personal or group goals for the identifiable figures who wished to become a sort of guardians of the narrative regarding Romania’s participation in the “war of unification” and its essential actors. Seeing themselves as historically validated by the triumph at the end of 1918, many took on the role of “judge” of the acts

I. Oprișan, București, Editura Saeculum Vizual, 2018]; his diary was initially published in Iorga’s „Neamul Românesc”, during 1919; immediately after the war, D. (Demetru) N. Burileanu, professor of Greek at the University of Bucharest, published *Note din închisoare sub ocuparea germană*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Carol Göbl”, 1919. After 1918, Constantin Kirițescu, general inspector or director in the Ministry of Public Instruction, planned to offer a professional, diplomatic and military approach to Romania’s participation to the conflict, although he was neither a historian, nor a participant on the front operations he described, his narrative regarding „the unification war” became the „official” one for the Romanians and was met with success in multiple editions: *Istoria războiului pentru întregirea României (1916-1919)*, 2 vol. (București, 1922-1923); second edition, revised and enlarged, 3 vol. (București, f.a. [1925-1927]).

⁶ N. Russu Ardeleanu, *Prizonier în țara ta. 8 luni în teritoriul ocupat. Povestirile locotenentului Florin M. Rădulescu*, Botoșani, f.e., 1918, p. 19. Russu Ardeleanu was a well-known journalist and in the 1930s the director of the publication „Parlamentul românesc. Revista lumii politice”.

⁷ George D. Nedelcu, *Justiția română sub ocupație. 1916-1918*, București, Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co. Soc. Anonimă, 1923.

⁸ The writer I. C. Vissarion, employee at the department of Military Censorship, subservient to the minister I. G. Duca. Ion C. Vissarion, *Sub călcăi (note și schițe din timpul Nemților)*, vol. I (12 September 1916 – 1 February 1917), București, Editura Cartea Românească, 1922.

⁹ Archibald (G. Rădulescu), *Porcii...*, vol. I-III; C. Bacalbașa, *Capitala sub ocupația...* [see also the recent edition, prefaced by I. Oprișan, București, Editura Saeculum I.O., 2018] Another journalist from „Adevărul” who left behind literary memoirs was Al. Ciurcu, *Sub ocupație. Struguri „Mackensen”*, București, 1920. See also the perspective of lawyer and conservative-democrat journalist Vasile Th. Cancicov, *Jurnal din vremea ocupației...*; idem, *Impresiuni și Păreri Personale din timpul războiului României. Jurnal zilnic. 13 august 1916-31 decembrie 1918*, with an introductory letter by Take Ionescu, vol. I-II, București, 1921. N. Georgescu, editor at the newspaper „România”, with „În puterea pumnului de fer”. *Ordonanțele comandamentului german. Viața la București și în țara invadată*, Iași, 1918.

¹⁰ Works like C. Stere, *Un caz de conștiință. Cuvântări rostite în ședințele Adunării Deputaților din 4,5 și 9 martie asupra validării alegerii din județul Soroca. Cu o prefată*, București, Editura „Viața Românească”, Librăria Alcalay, 1921; see also Idem, *Singur împotriva tuturor*, edition by Alina Ciobanu, Chișinău, Editura Cartier, 1997, p. 105-137; Idem, *Judecat și condamnat de el însuși*, Iași, Tipografia „Lumina Moldovei”, 1923.

done during the occupation: the politician Nicolae Iorga¹¹, the sisters Brătianu, especially Sabina Cantacuzino, whose evaluations, verdicts of collaborationism and immoral behaviors often caused uproar at the time because of the accusations made¹², Constantin Kirițescu, as official narrator of the war from the liberals' perspective¹³, I. G. Duca, who did not back away from belittling the Germanophiles who were waiting for the enemy's arrival as a sign of salvation¹⁴ and so on. As justification, the Germanophiles' discourse focuses on a different retelling of the war or of the German administration, the accent being placed on the „other's” responsibilities, referencing the Pro-Entente people, who „fled” (sought refuge) to Moldova. Later, Constantin Stere, Alexandru Marghiloman¹⁵, Virgil Arion, Alexandru Tzigara Samurcaș¹⁶, D. D. Pătrășcanu¹⁷, Lupu Kostachi, although not denying their beliefs, insisted on the necessity of their acts, on the personal political accountability that is meant to reduce the difficulties, the suffering of the many who were left here, without support to face the new masters and the hardships of the times, due to the Brătianu government's negligence.

The works mentioned do not include the entirety of approaches regarding the occupation and do not describe a unified culture, but subcultures of suffering or participation. The mostly ethical and spiritual pain of the elites, preoccupied as they were by the country's future (like the women from the Brătianu family, for example) is very different from the one of the sub-elites, of the Pro-Entente officials imprisoned at “Hotel Imperial”, for whom survival became important, even sublimating their humiliation and difficulties. For the Germanophiles, the occupation led to certain degrees of accommodation with the Central Powers and the participation to the country's administration or diverse political games regarding the immediate organization of Romania within the German European order. The Germanophile side itself was not homogeneous, as we can identify multiple groups, each with its own causes and limits for collaborationism.

¹¹ See the articles and stances in the newspaper „Neamul românesc” and in *Notele zilnice*, in fact the war journal published at Editura „Ramuri” from Craiova in 1922 (N. Iorga, *Războiul nostru în note zilnice*, vol. I: 1914-1916; vol. II: 1916-1917; vol. III: 1917-1918, 1 January – 31 March) or his *Memoirs* (especially vol. I and II, published at Editura „Națională” S. Ciorniei).

¹² Pia Alimănișteanu, *Însemnări din timpul ocupației germane. 1916-1918*, București, 1929; Sabina Cantacuzino, *Din viața familiei I. C. Brătianu. Războiul. 1914-1919*, illustrated by Ștef. Constantinescu, București, Editura „Universul”, 1937; with Severa Sihleanu's response, *Note și desmîntiri asupra „Amintirilor” D-nei Sabina Cantacuzino*, București, Tiparul „Cartea Românească”, 1938.

¹³ Constantin Kirițescu, *Istoria războiului pentru întregirea României....*

¹⁴ I. G. Duca, *Amintiri politice*, vol. II, München, Jon Dumitru Verlag, 1981, p. 70.

¹⁵ Alexandru Marghiloman, *Note politice*, especially vol. II: 1916-1917, vol. III, 1917-1918 and vol. IV: 1918-1919, București, Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Eminescu” S.A., 1927.

¹⁶ Al. Tzigara-Samurcaș, *Mărturisiri si-li-te*, București, Tipografia „Convorbiri literare”, 1920.

¹⁷ D. D. Pătrășcanu, *Vinovații 1916-1918*, București, Ziarul „Lumina”, 1918; eventually, he continued the argument, without accusing pathos, in *În fața națiunii*, București, Editura Librăriei Steinberg & Fiul, 1924. The well-known literate from the circle of the magazine *Viața românească*, close to C. Stere, turned the experience of the occupation into literature in a volume of stories *Domnul Nae. Scene din vremea ocupației*, București, Editura Librăriei Steinberg & Fiul, 1924.

But it wasn't only the contemporaries who instrumentalized the period of occupation by the Central Powers. The historians have been interested in this phenomenon, although, for a long time, their professional interpretations followed a political commandment with implicit nationalistic elements, which highlighted the spoliating administration of the Central Powers and the hardships of the Romanians, who were reduced to the status of despised work force¹⁸. Some Romanian historians came to re-evaluate the subject¹⁹ after seeing the archives from Berlin and the more nuanced approaches of Western academics regarding the German occupation in Eastern Europe during the First World War²⁰. Even though these works only occasionally clearly individualized the Romanian space (the contribution of American historian David D. Hamlin is immense when it comes to understanding the subject²¹). And yet, despite some research done recently with some elements of local specificity²², the German administration of one part of Romania between 1916-1918 is reduced, methodologically speaking, to the level of Bucharest and of life in the Capital.

¹⁸ The most comprehensive research belongs to Emil Răcilă, *Contribuții privind lupta românilor pentru apărarea patriei în timpul primului război mondial: situația administrativă, economică, politică și socială a teritoriului românesc vremelnic ocupat, 1916-1918*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1981; idem, *România în primul război mondial. Situația economică, social-politică și administrativă din teritoriul românesc vremelnic ocupat, 1916-1918*, București, Editura Argeș-Economist, 2005 (it is actually the second edition of the text from 1981). In the same manner, see Corneliu Tamaș, Petre Bardașu, Sergiu Purece, Horia Nestorescu-Bâlcești, *Județul Vâlcea în anii primului război mondial*, two volumes, Bâlcești pe Topolog, [Muzeul Memorial „Nicolae Bâlcescu”], 1979; Șerban Rădulescu-Zoner, Beatrice Marinescu, *București în anii primului război mondial, 1914-1918*, București, Editura Albatros, 1993; Corneliu Radeș, *București în vîltoarea Primului Război Mondial, 1914-1918*, București Editura Teora, 1993 etc. See Andrei-Florin Sora for a useful historiographic overview, *În slujba cui? Administrația și funcționarii publici în România ocupată, 1916-1918*, in *AIIH*, LIV (2017), p. 63-87.

¹⁹ See, within limits, Cornel Popescu, *Viața cotidiană în perioada ocupației germane din timpul Primului Război Mondial*, București, Ars Docendi, 2014, but, more importantly, Radu Tudorancea, *Frontul de acasă...* (the first edition, at the same publishing house, 2015) and also Claudiu-Lucian Topor, „*Auf nach Rumänien!*” *Beligeranța germano-română 1916-1918*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2020 (especially p. 147-171).

²⁰ Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius, *War Land on the Eastern Front: Culture, National Identity and German Occupation in World War I*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

²¹ David D. Hamlin, *Germany's Empire in the East. Germans and Romania in an Era of Globalization and Total War*, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2017. The American Historian studies in particular the rapports of economic subordination between the Romanians and the Germans, proving the rapid economic profitability for the Germans of a large part of the Romanian territory.

²² See, among others: Constantin I. Stan, *Buzăul și Râmniciu-Sărat în anii ocupației germane (1916-1918)*, Buzău, Editura Editgraph, 2008; Marinela Sima, *Focșani sub ocupația germană în anii Primului Război Mondial (1916-1918)*, Focșani, Editura Pallas, 2012; Mădălina Maria Iosifescu, *Județul Muscel în anii Primului Război Mondial*, Câmpulung, Editura Larisa, 2013; Mihaela Dudu (coord.), *Documente privind istoria Craiovei în timpul Primului Război Mondial*, Arhivele Naționale. Serviciul Județean Dolj, Craiova, Editura Aius, 2016; Ioan Munteanu, *Robia germană. Brăila sub ocupația dușmanului, 23 decembrie 1916 – 10 noiembrie 1918*, Brăila, Editura Proilavia, 2016.

However, the discussion about collaboration and conformism of one part of the masses/elites did not begin the day after the Entente's victory in 1918, but on the first day of occupation in Romania's southern region. Incriminating rhetoric came from those who were already reluctant about the politics of the Brătianu government and of the Pro-Entente elite's intention to involve the country in the war. Important as they were for the political debate at the time, the reasons behind Romania's participation in the world conflict do not represent the subject of the present study, even though, for the convinced Germanophiles who remained in the territory under Central Powers control, the choice to join the anti-Germany and Austro-Hungary justified the Romanians' attitude in 1916-1918. Their arguments for working with the occupants target the war, the defeat itself, but also the effects of the failed campaign from 1916. For many contemporaries, the way the retreat and refuge in Moldova took place only illustrated the Romanian catastrophe of the state and the country as they had been built after 1850; the desperation of ordinary Romanians who were running from the enemy troops and trying to save as much as they could of their belongings²³, the busy and blocked roads, delayed and overfilled trains going to Iași, numerous rumors circulating during the disorganized evacuations about scandalous advantages given to some of the day's potentates (especially liberals²⁴), the hospitals closing and leaving behind those gravely wounded²⁵, long marches of recruitable young men, boy scouts and even children between the ages of 10-12 sent to Milcov by the officials, to be used in tomorrow's army²⁶, refugees insufficiently prepared for the exodus in the context of deficient assistance offered by the state's institutions to its frightened citizens, the material

²³ A large part of the population from the occupied area loads its possessions into wagons and sets off towards the capital, a desperate endeavor in the attempt to save as much as possible of what they had earned until the moment of the refuge. The refugees loaded into wagons "everything they could: the furniture, the food, the birds" and behind the carts walked their tied animals: "horses, cows, pigs and calves" (C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 20-21).

²⁴ "The people with high social standings, people who were actively for the war, politicians, started packing their bags" (C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, pp. 19 and 21). Most of the rumors that circulated regarded the liberal elite and the Minister of Agriculture and Domains, Alexandru (Alecu) Constantinescu, also known as "The Pig", was heavily criticized. Constantin Argetoianu accused him of sending 17 train wagons to Iași "stuffed with everything he had in his house": empty barrels, kitchen chairs, pickles and firewood; the Brătianu family was also said to have sent to Moldova seven barrels of wine and Bibicescu, the governor at the National Bank, loaded in a wagon even his wife's ficus. The same Constantin Argetoianu mentions the affairs of the Gorj prefect Numa Frumușanu, "who evacuated to Iași the material of the Red Cross and whatever he could requisition in the county at the last moment and then sold everything in Moldova", thinking that „every prefect and mayor did the same" (Constantin Argetoianu, *Pentru cei de mâine. Amintiri din vremea celor de ieri*, vol. III, *partea a V-a (1916-1917)*, București, Editura Humanitas, 1992, p. 64).

²⁵ In contrast, the nurses, ladies from the Red Cross and the lightly wounded soldiers went to Moldova (I. G. Duca, *op. cit.*, p. 70).

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 67. Many got sick on the road because of hunger, cold or various diseases, as C. Argetoianu recollects (Constantin Argetoianu, *op. cit.*, p. 64).

devastation caused by peasants²⁷ that followed the retreat, the destruction by Romanian authorities of essential installations²⁸ etc., all created the powerful image of a popular abandoned by the government. In the chaos of those days, panic reigned supreme, as I. G. Duca describes the sentiment felt by many Romanians:

„The city appeared lugubrious, the day and night bombardments were more and more often, the planes in particular came now multiple times a day, sowing death and terror (...). The city streets were empty, though, no one dared go outside anymore, you would think you were walking through death's fortress. The sky was dark, as if ordained specifically to act as suitable backdrop for the tragedy that played in every soul”²⁹.

Due to the burglaries that mainly Bulgarian and Hungarian soldiers indulged in, significant accusations of irresponsibility were aimed at the liberal political leaders, *Romania's undertakers*, who made preparations only for victory and failed to consider the negative scenarios in the evolution of the war, thus leading to the deficient management of the loss³⁰. The justification given for collaborating with the occupant added to the reasons why the resentment of those who remained for those who left in Moldova survived³¹. The acceptance was determined and facilitated by the fact that the occupant was mostly German and Austrian, not so much Bulgarian. While the neighbor south of the Danube was disregarded and seen as savage, uncivilized, guilty of atrocities in the battle that recently ended³², Germany and Austria were former allies, partners and

²⁷ Marghiloman accused the peasants of destroying the storage sheds of absent owners and used the wood to heat their homes; the officers supposedly told them to “take everything, so that the Germans won't find anything” (Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 270).

²⁸ The destruction of the oil industry is described tragically by Marghiloman, with colonel Thompson, the English military attaché in Bucharest, coordinating the process of covering up the oil wells, of setting fire to the shafts and oil rigs and blowing up the reservoirs. The refinery Vega had been destroyed by soldiers with axes (*ibidem*, vol. II, p. 338, note from 29 November/9 December).

²⁹ I. G. Duca, *op. cit.*, p. 70. See the confession of C. Kirițescu, who shared the liberal ideas: “Waiting for the difficult hours, the Capital was emptying little by little. However, the large crowd remained, those without means and without power, those without recommendations and without automobiles... The officials also remained, those with special orders, but also those who, despite not having any tasks relating to defending the country, thought it was their duty to stay, to try to guarantee, despite the risks, the continued function of the Romanian public institutions” (C. Kirițescu, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 1989, p. 554).

³⁰ “All the Germanophile scum threw hateful, threatening glances our way, we were Romania's undertakers, the wretches who destroyed a peaceful, rich and happy country” (I. G. Duca, *op. cit.*, p. 70).

³¹ From a Red Cross hospital in Craiova, Olga Gigurtu recorded the city abandoned in the authorities' exodus: “Most of those who asked fiercely for war ran away the moment luck changed! Darkness ruled everywhere, fearing the Zeppelins, all the lamps were unlit (...). The authorities also abandoned us, we were entirely in God's hands!” (Olga Gigurtu, *Amintiri și icoane din trecut*, second edition, preface by Georgeta Filliti, București, Editura Corint, 2019, p. 194-195). See also Ștefan Zeletin, *Retragerea*, București, Editura Revistei „Pagini agrare și sociale”, 1926.

³² The success was possible because the Bulgarians attacked the Romanians with hatred (Raymund Netzhammer, *Episcop în România. Într-o epocă a conflictelor naționale și religioase*, translated from German by George Guțu, vol. I, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005, p. 692. The journalist

representatives of the West. After the war, imprisoned at Văcărești and accused of treason, Ioan Slavici confessed in the courtroom that:

„however horrible were the Germans (*nemți*) who came here, you gentlemen should know without me telling you that on the eve of their arrival there was much persistence that the Hungarians, Turkish and Bulgarians do not enter Bucharest before the Germans. Why? Because we here feared the Hungarians, the Turkish and the Bulgarians and in other sad circumstances thought of the Germans as our protectors against their allies”³³.

The Romanians in the occupied region, both elites and masses, soon changed their conviction that the European War was an impossibility³⁴ to the necessity of involvement³⁵. Their adaptability created difficulties of representations for count Czernin, Austro-Hungary's minister in Romania and an expert regarding the political classes and public opinion in Bucharest; in a moment when he wanted to show the other's responsibility in waging the war, the politician from Vienna described the Romanians as „having undeniably great intelligence” but one that has “a feminine trait. Extremely vain and ruled by momentary dispositions”³⁶.

When they arrived in Bucharest, the Germans were confused by the way the Romanians welcomed them, more like liberating troops than forces of invasion. The catholic bishop from Romania, Raymund Netzhammer, illustrates the frantic atmosphere in his memoirs, with “women who scream, overcome by delirium, acting as if mad. Another woman is hanging on well to the saddle of the commander who leads the procession and offering her flowers, while laughing and talking and not wanting to be separated from the ‘neamț’”. This spectacle is repeated

G. Rădulescu (who wrote under the pseudonym Archibald), described the blood bath, “Bulgarian women gouged out the eyes of wounded, children threw scalding water over the moribund on the city streets and the elders, under the watchful gaze of German officers, cut the heads of prisoners with cleavers” (Archibald G. Rădulescu, *Porcii...*, p. 19). See also C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 43: “the Bulgarian have the behavior of savages. It's hatred”. Velburg mentions the speech of the mayor from Bordușani, Ialomița, who yearned for a long-lasting German occupation, because they were afraid of the Bulgarians: “the Germans are humane people, while with the Bulgarians, woe are we” (Gerhard Velburg, *În spatele frontului. Marele Război, aşa cum l-am văzut eu (decembrie 1916 – iunie 1918). Însemnările unui soldat german în România ocupată*, translated by Ștefan Colceriu, București, Editura Humanitas, 2018, p. 61).

³³ Ioan Slavici, *Închisorile mele. Amintiri. Lumea prin care am trecut*, the Constantin Mohanu edition, București, Editura Albatros, 1998, p. 136.

³⁴ In February 1914, Carol I mentioned the improbability of a war in Europe, general or in the Balkans (Raymund Netzhammer, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 486).

³⁵ In a speech at a meeting of the National Action held in Brăila on 8 March 1915, Nicolae Filipescu declared that “neutrality is the attitude of a country that reached national unity, which has nothing to claim and, through neutrality, wishes to keep it” (N. Filipescu, *Pentru România Mare. Cuvântări de războiu. 1914-1916*, f. 1, Biblioteca „Epopeea neamului”, 1925, p. 27-28).

³⁶ Ottokar Czernin, *Desătinuirile. Cu două documente secrete: Raportul confidențial către Împăratul Austriei. Protocolul asupra tratativelor de la București*, București, Imprimeriile „Independența”, 1918, p. 6.

for the other soldiers on horseback as well!”³⁷. The field marshal August von Machensen was scandalized by such scenes as the Germans taking pictures, many soldiers with their arms full of flowers, bread, wine and cognac bottles etc.³⁸. The amazement the Central Powers’ allied army commander experienced doubled the disregard for the way the Romanians had fought, given that the intimidating fortifications around the Capital had drained the country’s budget in the past³⁹. Even though eventually the idea was accredited that the crowd which welcomed the Central Powers’ soldiers in the streets was comprised of many Austro-Hungarian subjects, of Germans and Jews who were held captive, of the 300 women of questionable morality who were freed from Văcăreşti and Domneşti and that only the curious and the gapers applauded the enemy upon entering the Capital⁴⁰, while most of the Romanians watched the conqueror’s parade from behind windows, humiliated and afraid⁴¹, the fact itself announced the majority’s desire to adjust to the new reality of war⁴².

However, although the interpretive direction I’m suggesting involves precisely the way the occupation was perceived by the elites and the masses – two groups that interact too little even in that context of common suffering –, I believe that a succinct professional description of the German presence in Romania in 1916-1918 is necessary when it comes to understanding the subject.

The Central Powers’ military and administrative occupation during the First World War

The Central Powers’ military administration in Romania had different goals, depending on the actors involved: even though the economic spoliation of the occupied territory represents a common link in the actions of the powers involved, in those times of acute shortages, Germany’s objectives could be

³⁷ Raymund Netzhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 682.

³⁸ “We are cheered on by the same band of wretches that was screaming for war with us just before [...]. You might like this sort of behavior from a country you consider a friend, but in the country of your enemy, it simply fills you with disgust”, he declares to the Catholic bishop in Romania (*ibidem*, p. 693).

³⁹ He wonders with confusion “What, are we not among the population of an enemy capital? Is there no war? [...] We were not in fierce battle only a few hours before? Now, what do I see? In place of enemy bullets, we are touched with flowers?”, in *Briefe und Aufzeichnungen des Generalfeldmarschalls aus Krieg und Frieden* (ed. Wolfgang Foerster), Leipzig, 1938, apud *România în timpul Primului Război Mondial. Mărturii contemporane*, vol. II, 1914-1918, edition by Dumitru Preda, Bucureşti, Editura Militară, 2020, p. 177.

⁴⁰ 26.000 in the capital. cf. The Census done by the Germans and sent to be published on 11 January 1917 (Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 376). “You will be told there were many Germans and Jews”, noted the conservative leader prophetically (*ibidem*, p. 327). Anibal Stoenescu, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁴¹ C. Bacalbaşa, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁴² Similar scenes occurred in other cities. Gerhard Velburg notes about the German troops’ entering Craiova: “a sea of people welcomes us on the streets, especially women (...). They gape at us from all directions. Some elegant ladies wear horribly short dresses (...). The young women smile in a friendly manner” (Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 40).

described somewhat differently, by integrating the reason for waging a war in general; the victory in the autumn of 1916 and the occupation of Bucharest were given great symbolic significance by the Germans and defeating a state associated with the Entente gained connotation as a signal for the end of the world war. In the register of political imagination, Romania had to be punished politically and economic for what the Germans called “the betrayal from the summer of 1916”: led by a member of the German imperial family and caught in the alliance system of the Triple Alliance, Romania had chosen the war cause of the Reich’s adversary and had joined the fight against Austro-Hungary. Moreover, Romania’s resources had become vital to Germany’s war machinery, having the role of covering the scarcity of goods in the Empire, which was strongly affected by the two years of conflict.

Thus, Germany made the administration of the Romanian territory a priority, becoming prominent in rapport with their own allies. In the name of bureaucratic efficiency and making the controlled territory profitable, the Germans were often preoccupied with limiting the Bulgarian anarchism or the Austrian rapacity. They suggested to their war partners a system of organization and administration of occupied Romania and the pattern of occupation decided upon in the autumn of 1916 and applied as soon as the Romanian front was stable was the same with the one already implemented in Belgium and Serbia⁴³. The Occupation Military Administration (Militärverwaltung in Rumänien M.V. i. R.) was reporting to the High Command (Oberkommando Mackensen O.K.M.), which had its headquarters at hotel Athénée Palace, and included numerous administrative organs: the Supreme military commandment, which solved general and military problems; Verwaltungsstab (Major administrative state), which handled aspects regarding administration, finances, resupplying, telecommunications, transport and had several sections; Wirtschaftsstab (the Major economic state) – initially organized in 10 sections, later in 17⁴⁴; Militärverwaltungspolizei (the Administrative military police)⁴⁵. The occupied territory was divided in 4 military administrations: the internal one, which was of interest to the major economic state, despite having a military governor, then the area along the river Buzău to the Danube, the front area (the counties Buzău, Râmnicu-Sărat, Brăila and Putna), where the 9th operations Army was, and Dobrogea⁴⁶.

⁴³ The discussions took place in Berlin (28-29 October 1916) and Vienna (the end of November 1916) Cf. Emil Răcilă, *op. cit.*, p. 89-90.

⁴⁴ The Major Economic State, with headquarters in Bucharest, was organized in 10 economic sections (geography of the country, finances, food and fodder, raw materials, fats and mineral oils, agriculture, wood, workers, expedition and the use of machines) See Ilie I. Georgianu, *România sub ocupație dușmană*, București, Cultura Neamului românesc, 1920, p. 9 and the following.

⁴⁵ See Eugen C. Decusară, *România sub ocupație....*

⁴⁶ Wishing for the optimal exploitation of the occupied territory, the Major Economic State reorganized the 14 counties under control in five military zones: the Bucharest Commandeer Zone, including the northern part of Ilfov County and the Capital, the Pitești zone (Râmnicu-Vâlcea,

Romania's disappearance as significant military factor in Eastern Europe, capable of taking major offensive action, made the rigorous exploitation of Romanian economic resources the occupation administration's main task. In the winter of 1916, the prosperity in Romania was stunning to the Germans of all social classes, who were affected by repeated deprivation and rationalizations after two years of war. The soldiers who went to a tavern "simply devour the menu from top to bottom". To Gerhard Velburg, white bread to his discretion seemed to be a "miracle"; think "how many measures the barkeeper would have broken if we were in our beloved Germany"⁴⁷. The fact that he could buy a kilogram of ham with one Mark needed to be written down, "because I fear that the German homemaker will not believe it"⁴⁸. But it was not only the inferior ranks that enjoyed the relative normality. The German aristocrats saw Romania as a chance to recover a social status, symbolically and visibly. Delighted by the fabrics he found, the prince de Reuss told Marghiloman that in Berlin, if you wanted to order a new suit, you needed a certificate from the Police that the old one was tattered and couldn't be worn anymore⁴⁹. Some people brought with them their large dogs, because in the Empire's capital it would have been impossible to feed them⁵⁰. The abundance of food and goods turned occupied Romania, and also the "cultural" life in the big cities, into an "Eldorado behind the front", a privileged place where the German soldiers could recuperate and raise their morale: on Calea Victoriei, one of the main streets of Bucharest, nothing reminded of war and the joy of life "shone in many eyes"⁵¹.

The exploitation of the Romanian territory was initially circumscribed to the necessary internal consumption of the occupation army; food was taken from warehouses and butcher shops, automobiles (all forms of locomotion actually), gasoline, petroleum, rubbing alcohol, empty bottles, shirts, furs⁵², mattresses and duvets, axes and hatchett were all requisitioned or demanded from the local authorities, sometimes in exchange for requisition receipts, without any real value, which were settled in new "lei" (the Romanian currency) by the General Romanian

Romanăi, Argeș, Olt and Teleorman), the Craiova zone (Mehedinți, Gorj and Dolj), the Ploiești zone (Muscă, Dâmbovița, Prahova and Vlașca) and the Călărași zone (Ialomița and southern Ilfov).

⁴⁷ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 40-41. See also C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 45-46 („Germanii sunt înfometăți” [„The Germans are hungry!”]).

⁴⁸ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁴⁹ Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, p. 411. Some are acting less aristocratically however: the prince Schaumburg Lippe, upon his return to German, took all the jams and cans from the house of G. Lucasievici, also „borrowing” a large chest to carry everything in (*Ibidem*).

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 494.

⁵¹ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 45-46 and p. 173 (for the Eldorado metaphor). General Ludendorff, *Amintiri din războiu*, vol. I, București, Editura „Răspândirea Culturii”, 1919, p. 437.

⁵² On 23 January 1917, Marghiloman notes that the German army made a requisition order of 15.000 duvets, 20.000 shirts, 1.000 furs etc. (Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 388-389). For every missing blanket, the local authorities had to pay a fine of 200 lei; for every fur not handed over, the fine was 500 lei (Anibal Stoenescu, *op. cit.*, p. 70).

Bank⁵³. The extensive confiscation of consumption goods for local use was accompanied by a huge export of petroleum⁵⁴, wood⁵⁵, metal⁵⁶ and food⁵⁷ to Germany and Austro-Hungary, traditional markets for Romanian commerce, relations which were blocked by the world conflict. Due to its resources, occupied Romania quickly became an indispensable space to waging the war on the main stage, the Western one, and the source of products meant to make day-to-day life in Germany bearable. However, the export statistics did not include the packages with food and clothing that the German officers and soldiers sent home in wooden crates weighing 5-10 kg, which were considered mail delivery⁵⁸. Generally paid through bank notes by the General Romanian Bank, which did not have financial coverage and circulated exclusively in the occupied territory⁵⁹, the requisitions between 1916 and 1918 took the shape of a real hemorrhage of goods which somewhat explains the famine and economic difficulties in Romania immediately after the war. The studies and works which appeared after the war – embodiment of the Romanian authorities' endeavor to learn the level of economic spoliation, which had a

⁵³ Șerban Rădulescu-Zonner, Beatrice Marinescu, *op. cit.*, p. 138. For some plastic descriptions of these forced requisitions, see C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 48-49 or Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

⁵⁴ 1.140.809 tons of petroleum and oil products (gas, light gasoline, crude gasoline, lubricant oils, engine oil, raw petroleum) were taken from Romania, most of it by Germany, secondly by Austro-Hungary. Cf. Ilie I. Georgianu, *op. cit.* p. 23. The oil was essential for the German war effort (General Ludendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 424).

⁵⁵ The export reached impressive numbers (122.620 tons of wood, cf. Ilie I. Georgianu, *op. cit.*, p. 124). Along with the rationalization of wood, the requisition of it took extensive forms, referencing the scaffolding of houses in construction and the boards (C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 69).

⁵⁶ Ilie I. Georgianu says that between 1 December 1916 and 20 December 1917, 19.945 tons of metal and machines or machine parts were exported to Germany and Austro-Hungary (Ilie I. Georgianu, *op. cit.*, p. 114).

⁵⁷ According to Ilie I. Georgianu's works, between 1 December 1916 and 31 October 1918, 2.130.756 tons of cereals, vegetables and fodder were exported (*ibidem*, p. 21), to which we can add 1.029.020 tons of cereals and fodder consumed by the administration and the occupation armies (*ibidem*, p. 270). Moreover, 58.833 tons of fresh, dried or processed fruit, marmelade, fresh, dried or processed vegetables were sent to the Central Powers states (*ibidem*, p. 78). In terms of food, cheese, fresh eggs or egg powder were sent in wooden boxes to Germany (2.099 tons of eggs or egg powder were sent to Germany and Austro-Hungary until 10 October 1918, the majority of that, 1.573 tons, to Germany, cf. *ibidem*, p. 67). The requisition of horses and cows was also significant (*ibidem*, p. 93), the total of animals exported during the occupation was 290.104, most of them to Austro-Hungary. Another product exported was tobacco, with 3.810 tons of tobacco and tobacco products (*ibidem*, p. 68).

⁵⁸ Other than packages sent through mail, the German officers and soldiers who went on leave with the special trains were allowed luggage up to 25 kg. Gerhard Velburg talked about his first military leave, when he took 75 pounds of flour, a sack of beans, several kilograms of butter, tobacco, garlic and onion and the owners of the house where he lived killed a sheep, two geese and four ducks for him (Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 219). A confidential report to the Austro-Hungarian Ministry of War from 7 September 1917 mentions that the traffic of mail packages sent from Romania to the original countries reached 322 train wagons by the end of August 1917; according to Ilie I. Georgianu, in the entire occupation period, 1.002 wagons were sent, 970 for Germany and 32 for Austro-Hungary, at 6.000 Kg. per wagon, with such aids (Ilie I. Georgianu, *op. cit.*, p. 20-21).

⁵⁹ Between December 1916 and October 1918, bank notes worth approximately 2,2 billion lei were issued, made by Germany on a low-quality paper, with Romanian writing and few safety marks.

probative character, from the perspective of the reparations the defeated would have to pay after the Peace Conference, also meant to recover the national pride (the Germans' bitter hatred of Romania highlighted the country's military value) –, all emphasized the image of a spoliating, greedy and vengeful Germany⁶⁰.

The economic operation of the Central Powers bore the mark of the German efficiency and bureaucracy. Subsumed to the war objectives, the German administration sought to make the exploitations and enterprises profitable. The German specialists repaired and restarted the oil rigs in Valea Prahovei, which were destroyed by the Romanian government before retreating; at the same time, the petroleum products were rationalized for the Romanians⁶¹. In fact, given the need to know the Romanian reality, an ad-hoc census of the population and goods gave the occupation authorities an image of the industrial and agricultural potential of the country⁶² and simplified the organization of the territory, social control, the issuing of travel passes and more importantly, the level of the stocks. To prevent speculation and food restrictions, the Germans introduced food ration cards⁶³. The act of keeping inventory had immediate practical consequences for the population in terms of impositions and obligation to work; for example, the hens in cities and villages were part of a register and the population was subjected to an egg quota⁶⁴; the working of the soil was reorganized to be as productive as possible and the Romanians were forced to grow vegetables on all the fields, gardens, vacant places and parks; the Capital's esthetic suffered because of the war imperatives: "Cișmigiu and Colței Boulevard shine with cabbage and tomatoes", as a

⁶⁰ From among the works proving the level of spoliation, but also Romania and the Romanian's placement on the good side of history, see Ilie I. Georgianu, *op. cit.*; Mihail Manoilescu, *Problema despăgubirilor de războiu și în special cele cuvenite industriei*, București, Institutul de editură „Reforma socială”, 1919; A. Berindey, *La situation économique et financière de la Roumanie sous l'occupation Allemande*, Paris, Librairie de Jurisprudence ancienne et moderne Edouard Duchemin, 1921; Mihail C. Vlădescu, *Problema despăgubirilor de război*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice și Editura „Îndreptarea”, 1925 etc.

⁶¹ General Ludendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 440; Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol II, p. 354. The Romanians received oil cards: initially 1 liter of lamp oil per month per family, later only half the quantity.

⁶² The population had to fill in a form with over 100 items regarding age, state protection they enjoyed, the work they carried out, the number of people in their family etc.; disobedience, false information or false declarations were punished harshly (Al. Tzigara-Samurcaș, *op. cit.*, p. 95; Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 376 etc.). However, through Bestandlisten (inventory lists), the Germans mainly kept track of the reserves of cereals, wood, petroleum, coal, sugar, flour and other food products in warehouses, the products of bakeries and mills (Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, p. 212). The census done in all 14 counties of the Military Administration showed 3.438.002 people in Romania, to which the 100.000 inhabitants from Dobrogea are added (Ilie I. Georgianu, *op. cit.*, p. 157).

⁶³ Bread ration cards (375 g of wheat flour, which meant 400 g of bread per day) and meat ration cards (200 g per week, reduced to 150 g in 1918) were received in towns with population larger than 5.000. The poor harvest in 1918 led, however, to smaller rations (Pia Alimănișteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 42).

⁶⁴ Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 356. If he didn't manage to collect the necessary items, he would receive a repeated fine, 0.5 lei for every missing egg or prison, as was the same of a peasant working on Alexandru Marghiloman's estate (Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 542).

contemporary said sarcastically⁶⁵. The regulations from May 1917 focused on restarting and profiting from the collection of taxes, stamp and registration taxes⁶⁶.

The new leaders guaranteed the Romanian's contest through favorable management of the occupation territory. The mixed economic commission in Romania (Rumänischer Wirtschaftsverband), founded on 28 April 1917, included Lupu Kostaki, Grigore Antipa and others; coordinated by a committee led by a German president and including representatives of the Central Powers, of the Ministries of Internal Affairs, Agriculture and Domains and of other Romanian institutions (banks, agricultural unions), this representative and district-based structure was the economic link between the Romanian and occupation administrations, especially the Major Economic State⁶⁷. Because of their need to mention public order and an administration without high human and material costs, which would facilitate the economic exploitation of the occupied territory and solve punctual problems like accommodating foreign troops, overseeing the supplies, doing the requisitions and impositions etc., the German kept the Romanian bureaucratic system and collaborated with Germanophile politicians, who were placed at the front of certain governmental positions and were meant to be a useful interface when it came to relations with the local population⁶⁸. Prefects, prefecture directors, administrators, mayors, local notaries, policemen etc. were allowed to keep their posts and only those who were openly against the German during the neutral period were let go⁶⁹. Moreover, the partial activity of the Romanian justice system after March 1917 was allowed, even if the military justice (*The Imperial Government Court*) was also functioning, especially organized to defend German interests⁷⁰.

But the various forms of legitimacy the Central Powers tried in relation to the Romanians paled due to the need to capitalize on the victorious campaign in

⁶⁵ Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 356. See also General Ludendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 488.

⁶⁶ Andrei Sora, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

⁶⁷ Ilie I. Georgescu, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁶⁸ E. Răcilă, *Contribuții privind lupta românilor...*, p. 109. Although the Romanian public services were subordinated to the military occupation Administration of the "Quadruple Alliance", under the direct coordination of the Major administrative state, on 23 April 1917, the following people were named to lead Ministries: Lupu C. Kostake at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Dumitru Nenitescu, at Finances, Grigore Antipa, at Domains, Al. Hinna, at Justice, C. Litzica at Instruction and cults (starting on 31 May 1917, Virgil Arion).

⁶⁹ Andrei Sora, *op. cit.*, p. 76; Emil Răcilă, *op. cit.*, p. 88. Or the ones who protested, like Emil Petrescu, the capital's mayor, who was close to the Brătianu family and wrote a memorandum regarding the danger of starvation in the population as a result of the requisitions. He was replaced by Victor Verzea, former general director at the Post, a more cooperative individual and, what's more, a Germanophile (Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 40; Șerban Rădulescu-Zonner, Beatrice Marinescu, *op. cit.*, p. 131).

⁷⁰ E. Răcilă, *op. cit.*, p. 111. Decisions were no longer made in the name of king Ferdinand, but in the name of the law (Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 426). The Court of Imperial Government was found in Bucharest, as supreme justice authority and there were imperial courtrooms in Craiova and Constanța as well; there were also simple military courts, within each district or commandment (Emil Răcilă, *op. cit.*, p. 84).

Romania. The fulfillment of the economic and political plans required the existence of a vast administrative bureaucracy and a rigorous police system (including an Intelligence Police) with clear tasks, such as taking note of political meetings and pro-Entente politicians, setting up a counter-espionage network, arresting those who hid and supported Romanian soldiers escaped from prisoner camps or those who tried to avoid requisitions and confiscations, carrying out harsh punishments for disobeying rules.

Specific to the war and an occupied territory, the confiscations, the requisitions of goods and residences (not only empty houses, but especially the inhabited ones, picking the best rooms under the slogan *Wir sind die Sieger!*)⁷¹, the impunity of soldiers who committed abuses etc, were phenomena that accompanied the measures taken by German authorities, which derived from the conviction that their civilization was superior to the Romanian one. A process of Germanization, equated to an action of “civilization”, started in Romania after December 1916, mainly due to reasons of power and dominance, but it showed a difference favorable to the conquerors. The Romanians were quasi-excluded from the public space, fact initially justified by the war imperative: while in the cities the electric trams stopped running because of electricity restrictions⁷², the civilians were not allowed to travel by rails either, the Romanians could use the train only in exceptional circumstances with the permission of German officials; they would issue a travel permit and only after that the applicant could make a request for a travel ticket. The liberalization of the travel in April 1917 did not reduce discrimination, since Romanians could only pick the third class on trains; the possibility of interacting with citizens of Central Powers states forced the Romanians who wished to travel in second class to apply for special travel permits and to pass through a delousing process⁷³. Moreover, it quickly became mandatory to permanently wear the identity cards introduced in April 1917⁷⁴.

The Germans seemed to be targeting a long-term domination in Romania, fact suggested by the imposition of German as the new official language of the administration, used also in mediums of public communication⁷⁵ and the changed

⁷¹ „Noi suntem învingătorii” (Pia Alimănișteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 10). The German’s preference for private houses showed their wish to avoid the barracks, the shared space and the epidemics, beyond the comfort and the wish to profit from the Romanian’s willingness. See also C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 39; Virgiliu N. Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁷² Șerban Rădulescu-Zonner, Beatrice Marinescu, *op. cit.*, p. 145. The horse trams were not used either, to avoid traffic.

⁷³ Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, p. 535. The luggage on the train was limited and taxes were introduced for carrying more.

⁷⁴ The ordinance on 8 February 1917 made it mandatory that everyone older than 15 years carries identification (*Aussweis*).

⁷⁵ Anibal Stoenescu, *op. cit.*, p. 86. The first newspaper published in the Romanian territory under Central Powers administration was *Bukarester Tagblatt* (starting from 28 November/11 December 1916), whose appearance was interrupted, but this was followed shortly after by its Romanian edition, *Gazeta Bucureștilor* (from 12/25 December 1916).

names of streets, squares, hotels, restaurants⁷⁶ etc. Moreover, the military administration organized regular courses of Romanian for the soldiers and their companions, where attendance was very important, even for the ranked individuals⁷⁷. Starting on 22 December 1916, the Germans imposed the Gregorian calendar and changed the time to that of Berlin, even if, in the attempt to earn the goodwill of the Romanians and to keep public peace, the Orthodox believers were allowed to celebrate Christmas following the old calendar⁷⁸. The desire to separate the Romanian Orthodox Church from the Russian one can be inferred also from the list of holidays which would be celebrated throughout the year.

The Romanians and the Occupation

On 23 November/ 6 December 1916, Emil Petrescu, the mayor of Bucharest, sent a letter to field marshal von Mackensen to inform him that the Central Powers soldiers will not be met with resistance from the population and to ask him to take measures so that the normal life of city can be guaranteed, “in the interest of the occupation troops, as well as the protection of the calm citizens of the capital”. The mayor’s words generated confusion for the Romanians regarding what military occupation was going to mean, since they had “a peace-time soul”, as Constantin Bacalbașa said metaphorically⁷⁹; a witness of those times, the journalist showed the preoccupation of many to understand the proclamations made by the Capital’s police prefect, general Mustață, who announced the capital punishment for those who robbed, committed “predatory acts”, “set fire” and “disobeyed”; moreover, the Romanians were informed in a severe manner that they had to surrender all weapons, they were not allowed to leave their houses after 9 in the evening (the sole exception being the policemen and lamplighter), they were forbidden from organizing assemblies in private homes or public places; incidentally, many venues would be closing at 8 in the evening and any theatrical, cinematographic manifestations or cafe-concert were stopped altogether; also, newspapers and other publications were suspended. There were also some recommendations regarding welcoming the German troops, where the residents were advised to treat the occupants like old friends. They were asked to leave the

⁷⁶ The plaques with the street names and numbers were often changed; thus, „Calea domnească”, which passed by Curtea domnească, was renamed „Hindenburg Strasse” (Virgil N. Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 185). But this practice even reached the villages, where the commandment, full of solicitude, named all the dirt streets and added wooden signs with the street name on every corner. “Now the peasants at least know the name of the street where they were born and spent most of their life” (Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 121). Although Velburg is not aware of the peasants’ illiteracy, after all he presents this fact rather ironically, the main street of every village earned the name of Kaiser Wilhelm (*ibidem*, p. 121-122).

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 272-273.

⁷⁸ Raymund Netzhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 699.

⁷⁹ C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

lights on, the gates open and doors unlocked. At the same time, they had to behave decently around the occupants and offer them accommodation⁸⁰.

Despite the material requisitions from the first days of German administration and the moral constraints (they were the enemy after all), the occupation was initially seen as a unique visual spectacle, of the others. In his diary, Vasile Th. Cancicov made note of the spectacular martial parade, with the differences between the German helmet, the Turkish hat or the Bulgarian cap etc.⁸¹. Besides, the Germans made an effort to impress, by parading the most well-built soldiers, preceded by a musical fanfare and proud officers on horseback⁸². The enthusiastic crowd that welcomes the conquerors upon entering the big cities, Craiova or Bucharest, contrasts with the sadness of the pro-Entente people left in occupied Romania. Hidden behind their windows, they show their disappointment with the attitude of many Romanians and with the state of things, preoccupied by the country's future. Without being heroes and organizing direct manifestations against the occupation, which would constitute a sort of gathering, they were the target of the new leaders' suspicion due to their recent Francophile attitudes or belonging to important political families. The fact that they remained in the occupied territory was symbolic, a sign that the retreat to Iași did not mean that the authorities abandoned the Romanians to foreign dominators. Oftentimes, Ententophiles were arrested or had a mandatory residence and their houses were looted. The women of the Brătianu family, Sabina Cantacuzino and her sister-in-law, Lia, Vintilă Brătianu wife, were sent to Păsărea monastery, near Bucharest⁸³. Considered to be adversaries or potential factors of anti-German coagulation, Ionel Brătianu brothers-in-law, C. Cantacuzino and Ion Pilat, the magistrates Matei Ciocârdia, Ion Duca and Aristide Andreescu, the lawyers Victor Duculescu and Alexandru Donescu, the last mayor's assistant of the Capital, ing. N. Zane, doctor Mina Minovici, journalists Alexandru Ciurcu or Dimitrie Burileanu etc. were imprisoned at Hotel "Imperial", on Calea Victoriei, and forced to pay for maintenance at prohibitive costs⁸⁴. M. Socianu, former official at the Capital's Police Prefecture, was accused of espionage for Romania and imprisoned in harsh

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 24-28; Netzhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 679; Anibal Stoenescu, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁸¹ Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, p. 207. See also C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 40-41: "The officers have a martial and impeccable appearance, almost like they all have the same measurements and type. What else is there to say: this race is special in its purity and quality. The uptightness of the troops and the shouted commands make an impression. These people impose and carry in their nature the principle of authority...".

⁸² Talking about entering Craiova, Gerhard Velburg mentions that, on 19 December 1916, "our entrance in the city of fifty thousand residents is made with much elegance. The orchestra does its best and every instrument player feels that this is the historical moment of the winners entering a conquered country. Behind the orchestra walks the horse of the Major and, next to him, the adjutant. It goes unnoticed that for both of them horse riding is unusual and somewhat difficult" (Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 39-40).

⁸³ See Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*

⁸⁴ A day of accommodation cost 7 lei and a tea or coffee could reach 2 lei (D. N. Burileanu, *op. cit.*, p. 32). See also C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

conditions and lived a true drama, since his wife committed suicide to avoid being forced to make declarations against her husband⁸⁵.

The majority of Romanians quickly got used to the new reality of power; the motivational support varied, from the ideological hatred towards the Russians and the Tzar's Empire, to pro-German feelings and the human instinct of survival. For those who often shows enthusiasm in relation to Germany, Romania's occupation by the Quadruple Alliance troops was seen as a chance for salvation and evolution of the country. The pragmatic consideration at the end of 1916, that victory in the war would belong to the Central Powers, especially in the context of their victories in the autumn of 1916, intersected the belief in the German civilization's superiority. In his memoirs, in the note corresponding to the day Bucharest capitulated, the archbishop Netzhammer wrote that the previous day he was stopped on the street by "a Romanian" who said "It's good that the Germans are coming! Finally, we'll have some order too"⁸⁶.

The officials adapted quickly to the new reality, profiting morally from the double favorable context, the personal one, of their and their family's survival and the feeling of duty to the country. The desire of the new German authorities to maximize the benefits of the occupation, with the lowest costs possible, made it necessary to keep the Romanian officials; they would represent a useful interface with the local population and an instrument which would facilitate the collection of certain good and services that were essential to the German structures in Romania or to the Central Powers' war effort in general. At the same time, despite being intensely accused by Germanophiles that it was not prepared for the military defeat in the autumn of 1916 and it left the Romanians when the state took refuge in Moldova, the Brătianu Cabinet Office looked for solutions at the level of administrative authorities which would make the lives of those left in the territory easier. Despite the governmental disorganization and the structural deficiencies of the Romanian state which became obvious in the days of the retreat, the numerous public officials who had not received the direct order or approval to join the Government in Moldova were expected, from the liberals' point of view, to guarantee the population's interests and communication with the occupant. Figures known for non-adhesion to the war on the Entente's side or "individuals uncompromising when it comes to the enemies or even found sympathetic by them" (like Lupa Kostaki, the conservative politician with a long experience in administration who got a position in Internal Affairs) were delegated moments before the refuge to guarantee for the ministries as secretary generals⁸⁷. With the exception of Dobrudja, the Brătianu government discouraged the retreat in

⁸⁵ M. Socianu, *op. cit.*, p. 11 și 25.

⁸⁶ R. Netzhammer, *op. cit.*, note from 23 November/6 December 1916, p. 170. An image that the Germans wanted multiplied, the letters of the Romanian officers reaching officers in Germany presenting this country as a "model of order and diligence" (Gerhard Verlung, *op. cit.*, p. 191-192).

⁸⁷ C. Kirițescu, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 1989, p. 555.

Moldova of the state agents in administration and the public officials were paid even three months in advance⁸⁸.

The public service between 1916-1918 made it that the majority of Romanian officials who remained in the occupied territories disregarded the voice that accused them of “collaborationism” or “treason”, after the Great War ended⁸⁹. The idea of sacrifice was also brought up by the Germanophiles who agreed to the Romanian administration and guaranteed the necessary connections with the occupation authorities. Especially after March 1917, when the secretary generals (the delegates) were replaced by co-signing ministers, they openly claimed the national role; Al. Marghiloman was ironic towards the political claims of “these gentlemen” who „call themselves ‘government’ and make believe that they are ministers”, in the conditions that every department had a German curator and the German were the ones to name people in administrative positions⁹⁰. Despite the control the Central Powers’ representatives had, the “guarantor government” was active until the Bucharest Treaty was signed (April/May 1918); the new Cabinet Office chosen by king Ferdinand and led by Alexandru Marghiloman also received jurisdiction over the territory occupied by the armies of the Triple Alliance. The change implied the resignation of the guarantor ministers, the naming of new prefects, other local officials and the organization of parliamentary elections. The role of the Germanophile conservative elites, officials and politicians, requires some nuance from an administrative point of view. Often, they were powerless to stop the illegalities of the Central Powers’ soldiers and military officials; however, through their intervention, especially Lupu Kostaki, but also P. P. Carp and Al. Marghiloman managed to put pressure on the German decisive factors for the removal or transfer of “unworthy” soldiers of the conquerors and, in the best-case scenario, their punishment⁹¹. Beyond the limits of their possibilities, they still offered the Romanians the illusion of continuity of the times from before the war.

On the topic of *national service*, the journalists from “Gazeta Bucureștilor”, a former publication of Germany’s Legation in Bucharest, stopped in August 1916, but republished in December the same year as a part in Romanian

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 555. The officials’ presence in the country was also justified by the need not to complicate the situation in Moldova, which had already reached a surplus of inhabitants. The writer I. C. Vissarion, employed at the Department of Military Censorship, subordinate to Minister I. G. Duca, attributes to the latter a measure to allow the withdrawal to Moldova of those officials who wanted to leave and which, most likely, was also used in other institutions: “On November 12, 1916, Minister Duca told us briefly: Military Censorship is moving to Iași. Those who have money and think you will be able to live there, receive orders to go; who have no means, receive orders to remain where you are. I don’t want to regret that I dragged you to Moldova to die of hunger or disease. I’ll let you decide for yourself...” (Ion C. Vissarion, *op. cit.*, p. 65).

⁸⁹ See the discussion about “collaboration, traitors, opportunists or patriots?” suggested by Radu Tudorancea, *op. cit.*, p. 227-247.

⁹⁰ Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 406 and 453. Șerban Rădulescu-Zoner and Beatrice Marinescu thought that by naming the guarantors we could have “a semblance of government, whose undeclared leader was P. P. Carp” (Șerban Rădulescu-Zoner, Beatrice Marinescu, *op. cit.*, p. 159).

⁹¹ Andrei Sora, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

of *Bukarester Taglebat*. In the trials after the war, Metaxa Doro, Tudor Arghezi, Victor Anestin, D. D. Pătrășcanu, Ioan Slavici, I. Karnabat, A. Camburopol, Lucreția Karnabat, A. Davidescu etc. claimed the necessity of informing the public as deontological principle of their own innocence.

The innocence displayed by officials, politicians or journalists regarding their previous relations with the German was a method of survival after the war. The conviction of many of them that the occupation would be a long-term process somewhat explains certain slips in the so-called functionalist collaboration with the Central Powers. Especially in the spring and summer of 1917, as a way to show the attachment to the government of "guarantors" and the occupation authorities, many agents of the Romanian embraced a discourse that condemned the liberal government and king Ferdinand: by siding with the Entente, the Romanian state showed a lack of loyalty not only towards Germany or Austro-Hungary, logical allies, but also towards the Romanians and the future of the country. The pressure of legitimacy for the occupants and their effort in the war pushed the political, cultural-religious or administrative establishment into the area of "national treason", fact hotly discussed after 1918. Aware of the importance of religion in Romanian society, the Germans used the Orthodox Church for social control, enlisting the clergy's help in promoting their own interests; the Great-Bishop Conon, frightened by conflict, but wishing to remain close to the parishioners⁹², signed alongside his vicar Nifon Ploștean, high priest Valerian Râmniceanu, high priest Meletie Constantineanul, director of the church books Iosif etc, the manifesto *The Call of the Metropolitan Primate*, through which he asked the Romanians in Moldova to stop the resistance and the soldiers to desert and come back to the occupied territories⁹³.

However, the adaptation and collaboration were widespread in various social groups, which were searching for the comfort of everyday life and were preoccupied with forgetting or avoiding the tragedy of war. Lacking moral inhibitions, many women left in Bucharest or other large cities, even those whose husbands were fighting on the front were trying to gain the attention of German officers and thus to guarantee for themselves a plentiful life, with expensive clothes and entertainment⁹⁴. Also, some families tried to use German officers or soldiers,

⁹² Duca supposedly asked him to remain in Bucharest, but he asked to leave: "he doesn't want to stay under any circumstances. He is afraid he'll be taken by the Germans or Bulgarians and killed" (I. G. Duca, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 21-22 și p. 65-66).

⁹³ Pia Alimănișteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 103; Anibal Stoescu, *op. cit.*, p. 334. Very critical of the high prelate, Duca described the gesture as „an act of senile unawareness” (Duca, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 151-152); written by Grigore Pișculescu (Gala Galaction), at Virgil Arion's initiative, the manifest, with a circulation of 40.000 copies, was thrown in the trenches at Mărășești, along with an edition of *Gazeta Bucureștilor* (Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 77, nota din 10 august 1917). See C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 155 or, from a historiographic point of view, Lucian Boia, *Germanofilii...*, ed. 2010, p. 155.

⁹⁴ C. Bacalbașa writes about the pitiful confession of a priest who admits about a party thrown by the Austrian soldiers "around 12 ladies who come to my church. All of them have the husband on the front". The journalist adds in a moralizing spirit that the vast majority of the remaining women were

so that they would take care to supply food, firewood or other necessary goods, in the spirit of the policy “do ut des”⁹⁵. Even the Romanian officers taken prisoner and held in the concentration camp „Tonola” near Bucharest accepted their fate with serenity: abandoning their own prestige, they went to town “dressed up and powdered”; the fact itself was speculated in a propagandistic manner by the conquerors and *Gazeta Bucureștilor* highlighted such situations as if to say „we are happy and content to have fallen into their hands and be free of the war”⁹⁶.

For very different social and professional categories, the large cities remained essential spaces of the before-war world, even under German administration. Allowed under military censorship, terraces, promenades, plays in Romanian or German, magazine or cinematographic shows etc. gave the occupation a benign character⁹⁷.

For the majority of Romanians, life found a new sense of normality, one that surprised the dominant Germans through the joy of life, the luxury shown by women or the quality clothing owned by officials. When he came to Bucharest at the beginning of September 1917, Gerhard Velburg exclaimed with surprise: „wherever you looked there was pure joy. Everyone was out and wanted to spend the day in peace and without worries. On the streets and in parks, a happy crowd bustle”⁹⁸.

In the first half of 1917, the rural space also knew a favorable situation, of normalization of everyday and economic life. Despite the requisitions, the peasants could practice commerce and could keep a part of the cereals. The image of the rational and fair German, who is not an enemy, especially when compared to the abusive, looting Bulgarian, eventually suffered some changes. Due to the necessities imposed by the Western war and the one on the home front, with Germany lacking raw materials, the German administration and occupation army in Romania turned to large scale collections of cereals, cattle and other items, especially clothing. Even Velburg mentioned the harshness of the requisitions, since the Germans’ perseverance was fueled by their thirst for revenge: “since our folks back home have been starving for a long time, it’s only fair that our enemies also get to know hunger eventually”⁹⁹. “The peasants were plucked with a systematical tenacity that soon left them hopeless”, exclaimed Constantin Bacalbașa¹⁰⁰. Revolts and even the killing of enemy soldiers¹⁰¹ became commonplace in the countryside.

dignified, “were true Romanian women, carrying the grief of a bleeding country in their heart. But... there were plenty of the other sort too” (C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 66).

⁹⁵ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 107-108.

⁹⁶ N. Russu Ardeleanu, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁹⁷ Cristian-Tudor Șerban, *Activitatea de divertisment în timpul ocupației germane din 1916-1918. Teatrul și cinematograful*, în „*Studium*”, VIII, 2015, p. 119-133.

⁹⁸ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

⁹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 81.

¹⁰⁰ C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

¹⁰¹ About the killing of a German soldier at Jilava see Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 500, note from 4 May 1918: “the requisitions bore results: a German soldier was killed at Jilava

For the large majority of the population, the war and occupation showed their hideous face in this way. Overlapping the tendency of rapid enrichment of the winners, many of which slipped towards corrupt practices and usury¹⁰², the draconic exploitation of the occupied territory brought about misery, shortages of all sorts and the diseases that come with hunger, malnutrition and pellagra. Fighting for food became chronic for common people, despite the ration card system introduced by the German administration. The brawls started very early, as Pia Alimănișteanu described “last night I was woken up by screaming and wailing... I realized it was the sergeants roaring and the crowd wailing, fighting in front of the bakery on Willow Street (strada Sălcilor) to get bread”¹⁰³. The raw materials from food were replaced with ersatz versions: the cigarettes were made out of tomato leaves, the coffee out of barley, the cheese out of potatoes and the jam out of beets¹⁰⁴. Sugar was scarce and many Romanians were willing to sell their silver or gold jewelry in exchange for the coveted sweetener¹⁰⁵. The revolt of some women pushed to desperation by the supplying conditions in the city frightened the occupation authorities, since a potential wave of social dissatisfaction due to economic reasons would be difficult for any administration to manage. The Germans promised to rectify the supply problem and to introduce meat twice a week¹⁰⁶. The black market for food products thrived as a survival outlet for many Romanians in the reality of everyday penury. The Central Powers’ rigorous control through barriers at the city outskirts were combated in unorthodox way: meat was brought to cities in milk jugs, in coffins (cropped beef in a casket)¹⁰⁷, in the box seats of carriages with a double bottom etc.; lambs were dressed as children with the cheeks covered by a handkerchief¹⁰⁸ and lard was put inside pumpkins¹⁰⁹.

It wasn’t only the lack of food that generated public unrest. The requisitions of firewood, the rationalizations on fuel and energy in the harsh winter

and the best judges say that we will surely have other crimes, since the rural population is exasperated to such a degree”. Other information also in C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 218, about the killing of a German sentinel, whose firearm was crushed. The German authorities offered a prize of 2000 lei to those who gave information.

¹⁰² The phenomenon of usury involved the Romanians selling a part of the requisitioned goods: the Germans took the bread in sacks and sold it again for 1 leu for 880 g bread, even though the official price was 40 cents (Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 542-543). A similar thing happened with wheat, requisitioned with 800-1.300 lei and sold again at the mill with 2.400 (see Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 513 and 534-535).

¹⁰³ Pia Alimănișteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

¹⁰⁴ Arhibald (G. Rădulescu), *op. cit.*, p. 175-176.

¹⁰⁵ Anibal Stoeneșcu speaks openly about the deceit, because the sale was postponed and they received the value in paper from the General Bank (Anibal Stoeneșcu, *op. cit.*, p. 142).

¹⁰⁶ Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 124-125; Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 472-476 (note from 23 March 1917).

¹⁰⁷ Anibal Stoeneșcu, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

¹⁰⁸ Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

¹⁰⁹ Virgiliu Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

of 1916-1917, the planned deforestation in the Cişmigiu area ordered by the military administration, despite the opposition of Tzigara Samurcaş¹¹⁰, evened out the conditions of those well-to-do and the ordinary Romanians against the cold. The difficulties of finding materials for heating became endemic for the Romanians and the administration introduced cards in this area as well¹¹¹. Given the war conditions, it was the Germans' need for metal for their industry of armament that had a major psychological impact on the population. The buckets and brass dishes for cooking or cleaning were confiscated from private residences¹¹², along with the brass roofs of certain institutions, like the Palace of Justice¹¹³, followed by the bells on church steeples. The decision of the military administration that every town is to have a single church bell caused the Romanians visible distress¹¹⁴ and it was only the risk of revolt from the residents of Bucharest that saved the bell from the Metropolitan Church from destruction¹¹⁵.

The ostentatious way they acted as winners, the aggression of the economic spoliation and the indifference towards local sensibilities lost the Germans much of the sympathy they enjoyed in Romanian society. In the Germans' case, the field of covering the necessities of a victorious army was woven together with the conviction of their superiority: the confiscation of all horses also meant that hearses no longer had means of locomotion, so the deceased were left literally on the street¹¹⁶; on the other hand, for many Romanians it was problematic that the local city dwellers were being humiliated and forced to travel on foot in almost all situations; German officers ostentatiously wore requisitioned furs¹¹⁷, some of which were gifted to mistresses¹¹⁸; newspaper sellers were forbidden from yelling before 8 o'clock in the morning, as to not disturb the sleeping officers¹¹⁹; peasants were forced to plough the land on the second day of Easter¹²⁰; prisoners of war were made to fulfill agricultural tasks; simple people were forced to work to reach increasingly large production goals in various

¹¹⁰ C. Bacalbaşă, *op. cit.*, p. 69; Al. Tzigara-Samurcaş, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

¹¹¹ Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, p. 543. See the chapter „O iarnă fără milă”, in C. Bacalbaşă, *op. cit.*, p. 68-72.

¹¹² Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

¹¹³ Anibal Stoenescu, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

¹¹⁴ Vasile Th. Cancicov, *op. cit.*, p. 447. C. Bacalbaşă, *op. cit.*, p. 63, shows some sort of agitation; especially the women fought back („up in arms”), posting themselves in front of the churches when the bells were taken down, bowing and cursing. Archibald, *op. cit.*, I, p. 196-197. Velburg: “these simple-minded peasants will never forgive us for taking their church bells” (Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 194).

¹¹⁵ Raymund Netzhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 719. However, the silver items were taken and also the icons (Pia Alimănişteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 82).

¹¹⁶ Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

¹¹⁷ “Every officer insists on having his own fur for the epaulets to hang over” (Virgiliu Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 44); see also C. Bacalbaşă, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

¹¹⁸ Oftentimes, the coats were taken straight off the Romanian's back on the street (C. Bacalbaşă, *op. cit.*, p. 70).

¹¹⁹ Virgiliu N. Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

¹²⁰ Sabina Cantacuzino, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

economic sectors etc. Virgiliu Drăghiceanu summarized the reality of those days: “The population is terrorized by constables and local agronomists is beaten, sent to solitary confinement. The bugle rings in the middle of the night to wake the village in time for work”¹²¹.

The hostility of a large part of the population manifested itself increasingly in this symbolic sense. The recruitment of officers fallen prisoner and the formation of a Romanian pro-German army through the action of deserting colonel Alexandru D. Sturdza was unanimously rejected by the elites and the masses. The acceptable collaboration in a political, journalistic or administrative register was negatively represented by the Romanians for the army institution and the project was ultimately abandoned by the Germans: Alexandru D. Sturdza found it impossible to remain in Bucharest, since he wasn’t welcome even in the house of his father-in-law, P. P. Carp¹²².

Beyond the impositions caused by the war, the Romanians often saw the measures taken by the German military administration, which attempted to civilize the locals, as another conflict likely to generate a loss of their own individuality. Expression of the rigor of the authorities, come after *ausweiss* and ration cards, an immense number of ordinances organized the Romanians’ economic, cultural, social and legal life systematically, triggering the fear of people with a relatively limited understanding of bureaucracy. Incidentally, the regulatory excess ended up exasperating even the German soldiers in Romania, as Gerhard Velburg said:

“It wasn’t enough that they filled Germany with legions of such papers, now they’re flooding enemy territories with them (...) what a monstrous system. How everything is traced down to the smallest details, to the irrelevant detail”. In the conclusion, he has an outburst, saying “if the war could be won with decrees, we would have won it already”¹²³.

¹²¹ Virgiliu Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

¹²² Married with P. P. Carp’s daughter, with studies in Germany, gymnasium at Jena, university at Breslau and military studies in Germany, Romanian officer in the German army, he had been prepared as connection officer (see more about this case in Petre Otu, Maria Georgescu, *Radiografia unei trădări. Cazul colonelului Alexandru D. Sturdza*, Bucureşti, Editura Militară, 2011), strictly for the attempt to build a new Romanian army, see I.G. Duca, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 153. He went to Germany, to the concentration camp at Krefeld and Stralsund, where the Romanian officers had to sign a declaration with four points (not to fight or plot against the Central Powers; not to get involved in politics when returning in their country; not to interfere with measures taken by Germans, propaganda or acts of espionage). Only 100 are said to have signed (Anibal Stoescu, *op. cit.*, p. 97), but the rumors suggested 800 Romanian officers, a framework of the new Romanian army that was to fight with Germany against Moldova (C. Bacalbaşa, *op. cit.*, p. 141). Iorga showed other ways of attracting the officers, removing their death sentence, a life-long income for the family and administrative positions for them (N. Iorga, *Memorii (Însemnări zilnice maiu 1917-mart 1920. Războiul național. Lupta pentru o nouă viață politică)*, vol. I, f.1, Editura „Națională” S. Ciornoi, f.a., p. 209).

¹²³ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 199. Between 20 March and 20 December 1917, 363 ordinances were published in German. Of course, in the war conditions, many of the ordinances regarded “the dissemination of inexact news”, the confiscations of alcoholic drinks, photography and cameras etc., but also “*Simulium columbacensis*” (a venomous fly that could kill cattle or even children) etc.

Brought to the population's attention through special periodic publications with explicit names, many of the numerous military ordinances had "a spoliating role", according to Constantin Bacalbașa. Creating a true "diptych" of the "unending number of ordinances", the well-known journalist retrospectively appreciated that the Germans „did not kill and did not torture, instead they drained the population where they passed”¹²⁴. However, representing the legal frame of the occupation, the regulations, the orders and the circulars brutally charged the day-to-day life of the Romanians, under threat of fines and other penalties: switching to the Gregorian calendar and to "Central Europe Time"¹²⁵, "the spring sowing", the method of manufacturing certain products and the prohibition of producing others (soap, for example), the days for sacrifice animals, "the picking of medicinal weeds by the population", the collection of communal taxes for dogs etc. The German practices of registering individuals, of forcing them to always carry identification cards caused confusion, all the more because this was associated with the requisitions and the economic exploitation¹²⁶. As the Romanians didn't understand the purpose of participating within their community, Velburg was surprised by the passivity of the locals during the fire at Fetești, where they did not move from their beds and waited for the authorities to put out the fire¹²⁷. The Romanians' reluctance towards the ordinances was triggered by the fact that the documents were insufficiently talked about or explained, but also because their imposition was seen as humiliating, representative of the increasing corruption among German officials. Due to the need to prevent outbreaks which could affect the German army, fighting diseases required a strict protocol and the locals had to visit „păduchelnitele" (Lausoleum) regularly:

„boarding school girls, escorts and gypsies were dragged to promiscuity in that hell. In a room that serves as undressing room and cloakroom, they all stand in a biblical nudity, trembling for hours on end... The rags and best clothes go to an oven... after the suspects take showers they wait for the return of their clothes”¹²⁸.

¹²⁴ C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 48; see also Radu Tudorancea, *op. cit.*, especially the chapters „Ocupația germană în România primului război mondial. Poziționări, mecanisme de control, vectori de imagine”, p. 151-207 and „Propagandă, control și persuașiune: ordonanțele și afișele de propagandă” (p. 207-226).

¹²⁵ Starting on 19 December 1916/1 January 1917, hour 0. A gesture that was sure to generate dissatisfaction and Bacalbașa spoke ironically of also changing the climate conditions throughout decrees (C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 68).

¹²⁶ About the mess of individuals' identity from the German perspective, given that peasants did have family names, see Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

¹²⁷ The community was fined 1000 lei (Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 93).

¹²⁸ Virgil N. Drăghiceanu, *op. cit.*, p. 196. „Păduchelnite” is the Romanian word for the place people went to have their lice removed.

If they wished to travel by train, civilians and even the most sophisticated of ladies had to present a ‘parasite certificate’, required to purchase such a document¹²⁹.

Not all cultural differences of the Western modernity were viewed negatively by the Romanians. The order of general vaccination of the population, as a means to combat the smallpox that appeared in the occupied territory with great virulence, made C. Bacalbașa exclaim that “this measure is very good!”¹³⁰. Incidentally, many Romanians agreed that many of the civilizing measures of the German administration were excellent, such as the imposition to keep the front of the house clean, whether it be summer or winter, with the residents required “to sweep, to water and to shovel snow off of sidewalks”, collecting the rubbish in closed containers¹³¹, catching the stray dogs¹³² etc.; in a capitalist register, it was appreciated that the Romanians were taught that they can earn a fortune by turn fruits into marmalade, using wild chestnuts in the industry, letting natural products and animals reach maturity¹³³ etc. Preoccupied with denigrating the occupation authorities right after the war, but also with criticizing the liberal governors, Constantin Bacalbașa ultimately admits that “the Germans had good qualities as well”. They “know how to administrate and make order. Especially in a country as badly administered as Romania, the German knowledge in the field is impressive”. The control over prices and the speculators, the organization of the railway system, where, despite not being much material to circulate, there were still a number of trains people could travel decently with, are positively compared to the lack of fear at the market after 1918 and the trains in Moldova, which were “in a state of filth that knows no name”¹³⁴.

Conclusions

The Central Powers’ occupation in Romania generated little variety of attitude from the Romanian elites or the masses. The Romanian’s thoughts and actions were centered around accommodation, regardless of social status. The acceptance of the “foreigner’s” domination was facilitated by the locals’ feeling of being abandoned after the autumn of 1916, but also the fact that occupation meant Germany, with its reputation of great military and civilizational power, with the organization, order and fairness that they introduced. The dilution of the German’s wish to punish their former allies made occupation bearable for most people, for most of the period between November 1916 and December 1918. Excluding the

¹²⁹ Gerhard Velburg, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

¹³⁰ Like many other Romanians, he appreciated the fight against diseases, against typhus (C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 123).

¹³¹ Pia Alimănișteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 83; Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 542.

¹³² Even though there was a rumor circulating that they made soap out of the dogs (Arhibald, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 273; C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 48).

¹³³ C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

¹³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 47; p. 115.

cases of the pro-Entente militants, the majority of those under occupation tried to adapt to the new administrative reality, even if they did it without enthusiasm and, oftentimes, without negotiating. “In general, the population was more demure and humble with the occupation than it would have been necessary”, fact which generated the German’s contempt towards the Romanian’s conformism¹³⁵. Despite the drastic requisitions, the cases of revolt against the occupation military administration were singular¹³⁶. Even against the backdrop of news regarding the defeat of the Central Powers and in the context of the return of the demobilized Romanian soldiers after the Peace treaty from Bucharest in May 1918, the resistance was minimal, without impact. As Constantin Bacalbașa notes bitterly, “the Romanians were not for physical deprivation, nor moral tremors (...). The spirit of sacrifice, which is inextricable from the sense of true patriotism, was absent”¹³⁷.

The German military occupation in Romania (1916-1918) and its representation

Abstract

In the present study, I analyze the realities of the Central Powers’ occupation (mainly Germany’s) in Romania between 1916-1918 and its representation for the Romanians left in the territory and that not fled to Moldova. Although I include details about how the Central Powers’ occupation was researched in the historiography, I focus on the way in which the experience of Romanians under German administration was subsumed to the need for public legitimacy after the war. A literature of some Romanians’ suffering and resistance during the Germano-Austro-Hungarian domination intersects exculpatory texts regarding those accused of collaborationism. The sides after the war make the moment of the occupation overlap the rift pro-German/pro-Entente.

Unlike the decision to participate in the war, where the spokesmen were exclusively members of the political and cultural elites, the subject concerning the position during the conquest of the others generated a more “democratic” debate. It was not only the members of the upper classes who were involved in discourse, on one side or the other, but also secondary characters who became authorized voices in the inter-war context, drawing from the experience from the “German” territory of Romania. Their endeavors are not equal in terms of intentionality, development and language or circulation. The memorialistic works, as auto-referential literature, co-exist with incriminating brochures and newspapers articles, with the parliamentary polemic approaches and those outside the legal forum,

¹³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 48-49.

¹³⁶ Radu Tudorancea, *op. cit.*, „Fațetele rezistenței”, p. 227; Andrei Sora, *op. cit.*, p. 77. Until the summer of 1917, the presence of a group of partisans was attested in the counties Gorj and Mehedinți, formed around the teacher Victor Popescu, sub-lieutenant in the Romanian army, with brave actions against the occupation forces.

¹³⁷ C. Bacalbașa, *op. cit.*, p. 19-20.

which are subsumed to the dynamics of the political game. They are violent in their language or references as they express the euphoria of success and present the treason trials. However, in all these conjectural materials, the authors try to pass verdicts or, on the contrary, to clear them of blame and to justify an act. Due to their diversity, the moral endeavors and the attempts to explain a position are, thus, dissolved in the social texture. These works do not describe a unified culture, but subcultures of suffering or participation. But, The Central Powers' occupation in Romania generated little variety of attitude from the Romanian elites or the masses. The Romanian's thoughts and actions were centered around accommodation, regardless of social status. The acceptance of the "foreign" domination was facilitated by the locals' feeling of being abandoned after the autumn of 1916, but also the fact that occupation meant Germany, with its reputation of great military and civilizational power, with the organization, order and fairness that they introduced. The dilution of the German's wish to punish their former allies made occupation bearable for most people, for most of the period between November 1916 and December 1918. Excluding the cases of the militant pro-Entente, the majority of those under occupation tried to adapt to the new administrative reality, even if they did it without enthusiasm and, oftentimes, without negotiating.

Keywords: First World War; Military Occupation; pro-German / pro-Entente Figures; Public Representation.

ABREVIERI

<i>AARMSI</i>	= Analele Academiei Române, Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice
<i>AARMSL</i>	= Analele Academiei Române, Memoriile Secțiunii Literare
<i>AARPAD</i>	= „Analele Academiei Române”, seria II, București, 1879-1916
<i>AA.SS.</i>	= <i>Acta Sanctorum</i> , ed. Bollandisti, III ^a edizione, Parigi 1863-1870
<i>AB</i>	= Arhivele Basarabiei
<i>ACNSAS</i>	= Arhivele Consiliului Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității
<i>AE</i>	= <i>L'Année Epigraphique</i> , Paris
<i>AIR</i>	= Arhiva Istorica a României
<i>AIAC</i>	= Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj
<i>AIAI</i>	= Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol”, Iași
<i>AIIC</i>	= Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Cluj
<i>AIINC</i>	= Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională, Cluj
<i>AIIX</i>	= Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „A. D. Xenopol”, Iași
<i>ALIL</i>	= Anuarul de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară, Iași
<i>ALMA</i>	= <i>Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi</i> . Genève.
<i>AM</i>	= Arheologia Moldovei, Iași
<i>AMAE</i>	= Arhiva Ministerului Afacerilor Externe
<i>AmAnthr</i>	= American Anthropologist, New Series, Published by Wiley on behalf of the American Anthropological Association
<i>AMM</i>	= Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis, Vaslui
<i>AMMB</i>	= Arhiva Mitropoliei Moldovei și Bucovinei, Iași
<i>AMN</i>	= Acta Musei Napocensis
<i>AMR</i>	= Arhivele Militare Române
<i>AMS</i>	= Anuarul Muzeului din Suceava
<i>ANB</i>	= Arhivele Naționale, București
<i>ANC</i>	= Arhivele Naționale. Serviciul Județean Cluj
<i>ANDMB</i>	= Arhivele Naționale. Direcția Municipiului București
<i>ANG</i>	= Arhivele Naționale. Serviciul Județean Galați
<i>ANI</i>	= Arhivele Naționale, Iași
<i>ANIC</i>	= Arhivele Naționale Istorice Centrale
<i>ANR-Cluj</i>	= Arhivele Naționale, Cluj-Napoca
<i>ANR-Sibiu</i>	= Arhivele Naționale, Sibiu
<i>ANRM</i>	= Arhivele Naționale ale Republicii Moldova, Chișinău
<i>ANRW</i>	= Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Berlin-New York
<i>ANSMB</i>	= Arhivele Naționale. Serviciul Municipiului București
<i>ANV</i>	= Arhivele Naționale, Vaslui
<i>AO</i>	= Arhivele Olteniei
<i>AP</i>	= Analele Putnei
<i>APH</i>	= <i>Acta Poloniae Historica</i> , Varșovia
<i>AqLeg</i>	= <i>Aquila Legionis. Cuadernos de Estudios sobre el Ejército Romano</i> , Salamanca
<i>AR</i>	= Arhiva Românească
<i>ArchM</i>	= Archiva Moldaviae, Iași
<i>ArhGen</i>	= Arhiva Genealogică
„Arhiva”	= „Arhiva”. Organul Societății Științifice și Literare, Iași
<i>ArhMold</i>	= Arheologia Moldovei
<i>ASRR</i>	= Arhiva Societății Române de Radiodifuziune
<i>AȘUI</i>	= Analele Științifice ale Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași

<i>ATS</i>	= Ancient Textile Series, Oxbow Books, Oxford și Oakville
<i>AUAIC</i>	= Arhiva Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
<i>AUB</i>	= Analele Universității „București”
<i>BA</i>	= <i>Biblioteca Ambrosiana</i> , Roma, Città Nuova Editrice
<i>BAR</i>	= Biblioteca Academiei Române
<i>BArchB</i>	= Bundesarchiv Berlin
<i>BAR int. ser.</i>	= British Archaeological Reports, International Series
<i>BBRF</i>	= Buletinul Bibliotecii Române din Freiburg
<i>BCIR</i>	= Buletinul Comisiei Istorice a României
<i>BCMI</i>	= Buletinul Comisiei Monumentelor Istorice
<i>BCU-Iași</i>	= Biblioteca Centrală Universitară, Iași
<i>BE</i>	= Bulletin Epigraphique
<i>BF</i>	= Byzantinische Forschungen, Amsterdam
<i>BJ</i>	= Bonner Jahrbücher, Bonn
<i>BMI</i>	= Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice
<i>BMIM</i>	= București. Materiale de istorie și muzeografie
<i>BNB</i>	= Biblioteca Națională București
<i>BNJ</i>	= Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher
<i>BOR</i>	= Biserica Ortodoxă Română
<i>BS</i>	= Balkan Studies
<i>BSNR</i>	= Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române
<i>ByzSlav</i>	= Byzantinoslavica
<i>CA</i>	= Cercetări arheologice
<i>CAI</i>	= Caiete de Antropologie Istorică
<i>CartNova</i>	= <i>La ciudad de Carthago Nova 3: La documentación epigráfica</i> , Murcia
<i>CB</i>	= Cahiers balkaniques
<i>CC</i>	= Codrul Cosminului, Suceava (ambele serii)
<i>CCAR</i>	= Cronica cercetărilor arheologice din România, CIMEC, București
<i>CCh</i>	= <i>Corpus Christianorum</i> , Turnhout
<i>CChSG</i>	= <i>Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca</i>
<i>CCSL</i>	= <i>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</i> , Turnhout, Brepols
<i>CDM</i>	= <i>Catalogul documentelor moldovenești din Arhivele Centrale de Stat</i> , București, vol. I-V; supl. I.
<i>CDTR</i>	= <i>Catalogul documentelor Țării Românești din Arhivele Statului</i> , București, vol. II-VIII, 1974-2006
<i>Chiron</i>	= Chiron: Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, 1971
<i>CI</i>	= Cercetări istorice (ambele serii)
<i>CIL</i>	= <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berlin
<i>CL</i>	= Cercetări literare
<i>CLRE</i>	= <i>Consuls of the Later Roman Empire</i> , eds. R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, K. A. Worp, Atlanta, 1987
<i>CN</i>	= Cercetări Numismatice
<i>CNA</i>	= Cronica Numismatică și Arheologică, București
<i>CSCO</i>	= <i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i> , Louvain
<i>CSEA</i>	= <i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiae Aquileiensis</i> , Roma, Città Nuova Editrice
<i>CSEL</i>	= <i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> , Wien, De Gruyter
<i>CSPAMI</i>	= Centrul de Studii și Păstrare a Arhivelor Militare Centrale, Pitești
<i>CT</i>	= Columna lui Traian, București
<i>CTh</i>	= <i>Codex Theodosianus. Theodosiani, Libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis</i> , I, edidit adsumpto apparatu P. Kruegeri, Th. Mommsen, Hildesheim, 1970-1971
<i>Cv.L</i>	= Convorbiri literare (ambele serii)

„Dacia”, N.S.	= Dacia. Nouvelle Série, Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne, Bucureşti
DANIC	= Direcția Arhivelor Naționale Istorice Centrale
DGAS	= Direcția Generală a Arhivelor Statului
DI	= Diplomatarium Italicum
DIR	= <i>Documente privind istoria României</i>
DIRRI	= <i>Documente privind Istoria României. Războiul pentru Independență</i>
DOP	= Dumbarton Oaks Papers
DTN	= <i>Din trecutul nostru</i> , Chișinău
DRH	= <i>Documenta Romaniae Historica</i>
EB	= Études Balkaniques
EBPB	= Études byzantines et post-byzantines
EDCS	= <i>Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby</i> (http://www.manfredclauss.de/)
EDR	= <i>Epigraphic Database Roma</i> (http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php)
EpigrAnat	= Epigraphica Anatolica, Münster
ERAsturias	= F. Diego Santos, <i>Epigrafía Romana de Asturias</i> , Oviedo, 1959.
Gerión	= Gerión. Revista de Historia Antigua, Madrid
GB	= Glasul Bisericii
GCS	= <i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller</i> , Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1897-1969
GLK	= <i>Grammatici Latini Keil</i>
HEp	= <i>Hispania Epigraphica</i> , Madrid
„Herasus”	= <i>Herasus</i> . Anuarul Muzeului Județean Botoșani, Botoșani
HM	= Heraldica Moldaviae, Chișinău
HU	= Historia Urbana, Sibiu
HUI	= Historia Universitatis Iassiensis, Iași
IDR	= <i>Inscripțiile din Dacia romană</i> , București-Paris
IDRE	= <i>Inscriptions de la Dacie romaine. Inscriptions externes concernant l'histoire de la Dacie</i> , I-II, Bucarest, 1996, 2000
IGLN	= Inscriptions grecques et latines de Novae, Bordeaux
IGLR	= <i>Inscripțiile grecești și latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite în România</i> , București, 1976
IILPecs	= Instrumenta Inscripta Latina. <i>Das römische Leben im Spiegel der Kleininschriften</i> , Pecs, 1991
ILAlg	= <i>Inscriptions latines d'Algérie</i> , Paris
ILB	= <i>Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria repertae. Inscriptiones inter Oescum et Iatrum repertae</i> , Sofia, 1989
ILD	= <i>Inscripțiile latine din Dacia</i> , București
ILN	= <i>Inscriptions latines de Novae</i> , Poznań
ILLPRON	= <i>Inscriptionum Lapidarium Latinarum Provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices</i> , Berlin, 1986
ILS	= <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i> , 1892
IMS	= <i>Inscriptiones Moesiae Superioris</i> , Belgrad
IN	= „Ioan Neculce”. Buletinul Muzeului Municipal Iași
ISM	= <i>Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor grecești și latine</i> , București, vol. I-III, 1983-1999
JGO	= Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas
JL	= Junimea literară
JRS	= The Journal of Roman studies, London
LR	= Limba română
MA	= Memoria Antiquitatis, Piatra Neamț
MCA	= Materiale și cercetări arheologice
MEF	= <i>Moldova în epoca feudalismului</i> , vol. I-XII, 1961-2012, Chișinău
MEFRA	= <i>Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Antiquité</i> , Roma

<i>MGH</i>	= <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum et quingentesimum auspicis societatis aperiendis fontibus rerum Germanicarum mediæ aevi</i> , Berlin 1877-
<i>MI</i>	= Magazin istoric, Bucureşti
<i>MIM</i>	= Materiale de istorie și muzeografie
<i>MM</i>	= Mitropolia Moldovei
<i>MMS</i>	= Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei
<i>MN</i>	= Muzeul Național, Bucureşti
<i>MO</i>	= Mitropolia Olteniei
<i>MOF</i>	= Monitorul Oficial al României
<i>Navarro</i>	= M. Navarro Caballero, <i>Perfectissima femina. Femmes de l'elite dans l'Hispanie romaine</i> , Bordeaux, 2017.
<i>NBA</i>	= <i>Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana</i> , Roma, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum
<i>NDPAC</i>	= <i>Nuovo Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane</i> , I, A-E, 2e edizione, Marietti, 2006; III, P-Z, 2e edizione, Marietti, 2008
<i>NEH</i>	= Nouvelles études d'histoire
<i>OI</i>	= Opțiuni istoriografice, Iași
<i>OPEL</i>	= <i>Onomasticon provinciarul Europæ latinarum</i> , vol. I-IV, Budapesta-Viena, 1994-2002
<i>PG</i>	= <i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris, 1886-1912
<i>PIR</i>	= <i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Saec. I.II.III.</i> , editio altera, Berlin.
<i>PLRE</i>	= <i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , 3 vol., eds. A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, Cambridge, 1971-1992
<i>RA</i>	= Revista arhivelor
<i>RBAR</i>	= Revista Bibliotecii Academiei Române, Bucureşti
<i>RC</i>	= Revista catolică
<i>RdI</i>	= Revista de istorie
<i>REByz</i>	= <i>Revue des Études Byzantines</i>
<i>RER</i>	= <i>Revue des études roumaines</i>
<i>RESEE</i>	= <i>Revue des études Sud-Est européennes</i>
<i>RHP</i>	= <i>Die römischen Hilfstruppen in Pannonien während der Prinzipatszeit. I: Die Inschriften</i> , Viena
<i>RHSEE</i>	= <i>Revue historique de Sud-Est européen</i>
<i>RI</i>	= Revista istorică (ambele serii)
<i>RIAF</i>	= Revista pentru istorie, arheologie și filologie
<i>RIB</i>	= <i>Roman Inscriptions of Britain</i> , Londra
<i>RIM</i>	= Revista de Istorie a Moldovei, Chișinău
<i>RIR</i>	= Revista istorică română, Bucureşti
<i>RIS</i>	= Revista de istorie socială, Iași
<i>RITL</i>	= Revista de istorie și teorie literară
<i>RIU</i>	= <i>Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns</i> , Budapesta
<i>RJMH</i>	= The Romanian Journal of Modern History, Iași
<i>RM</i>	= Revista muzeelor
<i>RMD</i>	= <i>Roman Military Diplomas</i> , Londra
<i>RMM</i>	= <i>Römische Militärdiplome und Entlassungsurkunden in der Sammlung des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums</i> , Mainz
<i>RMM-MIA</i>	= Revista muzeelor și monumentelor, seria Monumente istorice și de artă
<i>RMR</i>	= Revista Medicală Română
<i>RRH</i>	= <i>Revue roumaine d'histoire</i>
<i>RRHA</i>	= <i>Revue roumaine de l'histoire de l'art</i>
<i>RRHA-BA</i>	= <i>Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art. Série Beaux Arts</i>
<i>RSIAB</i>	= Revista Societății istorice și arheologice bisericesti, Chișinău
<i>Rsl</i>	= Romanoslavica

<i>SAHIR</i>	= <i>Studia et Acta Historiae Iudaeorum Romaniae</i> , Bucureşti
<i>SAI</i>	= <i>Studii şi Articole de Istorie</i>
<i>SCB</i>	= <i>Studii şi cercetări de bibliologie</i>
<i>SCh</i>	= <i>Sources Chrétiennes</i> , Paris
<i>SCIA</i>	= <i>Studii şi cercetări de istoria artei</i>
<i>SCIM</i>	= <i>Studii şi cercetări de istorie medie</i>
<i>SCIV/SCIVA</i>	= <i>Studii şi cercetări de istorie veche (şi arheologie)</i>
<i>SCN</i>	= <i>Studii şi Cercetări Numismatice</i> , Bucureşti
<i>SCŞI</i>	= <i>Studii şi cercetări științifice</i> , Istorie
<i>SEER</i>	= <i>The Slavonic and East European Review</i>
<i>SHA</i>	= <i>Scriptores Historiae Augustae</i>
<i>SJAN</i>	= <i>Serviciul Județean al Arhivelor Naționale</i>
<i>SMIC</i>	= <i>Studii şi materiale de istorie contemporană</i> , Bucureşti
<i>SMIM</i>	= <i>Studii şi materiale de istorie medie</i> , Bucureşti
<i>SMIMod</i>	= <i>Studii şi materiale de istorie modernă</i> , Bucureşti
<i>SOF</i>	= <i>Südost-Forschungen</i> , München
<i>ST</i>	= <i>Studii Teologice</i> , Bucureşti
<i>StAntArh</i>	= <i>Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica</i> , Iaşi
<i>T&MBYZ</i>	= <i>Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et de civilisation byzantines</i>
<i>ThD</i>	= <i>Thraco-Dacica</i> , Bucureşti
<i>TR</i>	= <i>Transylvanian Review</i> , Cluj-Napoca
<i>TV</i>	= <i>Teologie şi viaţă</i> , Iaşi
<i>ZPE</i>	= <i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
<i>ZSL</i>	= <i>Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde</i>