

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

ISTORIE

TOM LXXI
2025

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), Rudolf Dinu (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 Vițalaru (secretar de redacție),
Mihai-Bogdan Atanasiu (secretar de redacție).

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

Manuscrisele, 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

ISSN 1221-843X
eISSN 2821-4617
Printed in Romania

CUPRINS

Andi Mihalache, <i>Seninul întortocheat al cerului: cromatică, istorie și cultură (I)</i>	7
Daniel Mirea, <i>Datarea a patru documente din timpul lui Sigismund de Luxemburg și al lui Vlad Dracul</i>	47
Alexandru Simon, Petru Aron, Iancu de Hunedoara și Mehmed al II-lea în ajunul bătăliei de la Belgrad: informații dintr-un „raport venețian de sinteză” de la sfârșitul lunii aprilie 1456	73
Livia-Ioana Potop, <i>Instrumente notariale din Transilvania medievală: considerații privind păstrarea și transmiterea unor surse arhivistice mai puțin obișnuite</i>	91
Mihai Covaliu, <i>Între diplomație și primejdie. O misiune moldovenească la Veneția (1505-1506)</i>	101
Andrei Constantin Sălăvăstru, <i>Rebels for the faith: The Sorbonne's seditious propaganda during the French Wars of Religion</i>	113
Gheorghe Lazăr, <i>Despre logofeții de taină ai Cancelariei Țării Românești. Studiu de caz: Iane Dâmboviceanu</i>	129
Elena Bedreag, <i>Înrudiri, cheltuieli și alte „mărunțușuri” în câteva documente patrimoniale din veacul al XVIII-lea</i>	157
Iulian Moga, <i>Saint Xenia's Feigned Foolishness</i>	179
Alexandru Gorea, <i>Focul din 1784 și reconfigurarea centrului puterii domnești la Iași</i>	191

Laurențiu Rădvan, <i>Considerații cu privire la un plan rusesc al Focșanilor (1828)</i>	211
Simion-Alexandru Gavriș, <i>Centralism și autonomie locală în legislația administrativă a guvernării Lascăr Catargiu (1871-1876)</i>	225
Simion Câlția, <i>Reglementarea prețului pâinii în București (sfârșitul secolului al XIX-lea – începutul secolului al XX-lea)</i>	237
Tamara Botez, <i>„Monarhia de rol” și portul popular ca formă de legitimare în România (sfârșitul sec. XIX – începutul sec. XX)</i>	259
Ciprian-Lucrețius Suciu, Florin Marinescu, <i>Duhovnici români la Sfântul Munte Athos: superiorul Antipa Dinescu</i>	275
Claudiu-Lucian Topor, <i>România în vecinătatea războiului: chestiunea înarmărilor între 1914 și 1916</i>	287
Ana-Maria-Ioana Lupășteanu, <i>Război și propagandă în Bucovina austriacă. Misiunea lui Nathan Eidinger la București (1915)</i>	309

Bianca Șendrea, <i>Structura mării proprietăți și agricultura din Transilvania după reforma agrară din 1921</i>	319
Ionel Doctoru, <i>Sediul Legației române de la Paris (1922-1930). Între aspirații și realitate</i>	333
Bogdan-Alexandru Schipor, <i>Dragoș Cotlarciuc, an (almost) unknown expert on Baltic Region at the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1938-1939</i>	343
Árpád Hornyák, <i>Depiction of Hungarians in 20th century Serbian history textbooks</i>	353
Geanina-Ancuța Costăș, <i>Relații culturale româno-britanice: o analiză a programului de schimburi culturale (1963-1965)</i>	369
Iana Balan, <i>Imperative politice, schimburi culturale și strategii universitare. Lectori ieșeni de limba română la Universitățile din Polonia în anii 1967-1989</i>	381
Lucica Iorga, Lucian Leuștean, <i>Tribulații în cadrul lagărului socialist: întâlnirea de la Ialta (2 august 1971), cu România personaj principal în absența (un document și câteva considerații)</i>	409
Victor Rizescu, <i>Marxism și naționalism, continuitate și ruptură. Două teme de sociologie istorică în patru etape ale istoriei românești</i>	437

<i>Recenzii și note bibliografice</i>	449
<p>Duane W. Roller, <i>Imperiul Mării Negre. Gloria și decăderea lumii lui Mitridate cel Mare</i>, trad. Sergiu-Adrian Adam, București, Editura Humanitas, 2025, 372 p. (Alex-Marian Cornea); Martyn Rady, <i>Habsburgii. Ambiția de a stăpâni lumea</i>, traducere din limba engleză de Lia Decei, prefată de Matei Cazacu, București, Editura Corint, 2023, 585 p. (Ana-Maria-Ioana Lupășteanu); Avram Iancu – un om între oameni. <i>Lucrările Conferinței Internaționale: Avram Iancu – 200 de ani de la naștere: omul, contemporanii, epoca</i>, Deva, 9-10 mai 2024, coord. Ioan Bolovan, Ioan Sebastian Bara, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Academiei Române, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2024, 713 p. (Constantin Ciobanu); Pierre-Antoine Dessaux: <i>Vermicelles et coquillettes. Histoire d'une industrie alimentaire française</i>, Tours, Presses Universitaires François-Rabelais, 2023, 308 p. (Simion Călția); Carmen-Sorina Rîjnoveanu (coord.), <i>The wars of independence, diplomacy and society. New perspectives and approaches on the Great Eastern Crisis 1875-1878. Războaiele de independență, diplomație și societate. Noi perspective și abordări privind Marea Criză Orientală 1875-1878</i>, București, Editura Militară, 2023, 284 p. (Maria Cerniș); <i>Relații politice și militare româno-otomane-turce 1878-1989: documente</i>, volumul I, 1878-1938 = <i>Romanian-Ottoman-Turkish Political and Military Relations 1878-1989: documents</i>, volume I, 1878-1938, coord. Carmen-Sorina Rîjnoveanu, responsabil de vol. Manuel Stănescu, București, Editura Militară, 2023, 559 p. (Andrei Grigoraș); Eduard Andrei, Laurențiu Vlad, <i>Două istorii ale participării României la Expoziția Universală de la New York (1939-1940)</i>, Târgoviște, Cetatea de scaun, 2024, 281 p. (Mădălin Anghel); Constantin Hlihor, <i>Cu mâinile altora: România și războaiele prin intermediari în Africa (1970-1985)</i>, București, Corint, 2025, 364 p. (Teodor-Petru Bărgăoanu).</p>	
<i>Abrevieri</i>	473

Dragoş Cotlarciuc, an (almost) unknown expert on Baltic Region at the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1938-1939

Abstract: On March 17, 1938, the Polish minister in Tallinn handed the Lithuanian minister in the capital of Estonia a communique by which Warsaw asked Lithuania to immediately establish diplomatic relations, without any preconditions. The Polish government considered this to be the only way by which the border problems between the two states could be settled without jeopardizing the peace.

Our analysis is focused on the way in which diplomacy from Bucharest received and analysed an element that often remains a secondary one in the evolution of Europe since 1938. The transformation of the Polish ultimatum into a favourable precedent for Germany or other great powers with interests in the region also raised the concern of public opinion in Romania. In this context, the Political Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bucharest ordered the drafting of a study on the Polish-Lithuanian Border in March 1938. The document was drawn up by two authors (a rare thing in itself for such a document), two career diplomats, Dan Geblescu and Dragoş Cotlarciuc, both of whom were at that time at one time secretaries of legation first class in the Central Administration of the Ministry and, certainly, experienced diplomats. Almost unknown in historiography, the study of the two diplomats has two components. The first interprets and explains the legal status of the Vilna region within the borders of the Polish state, arguing and justifying its inclusion in the borders of the Polish state, and the second part explains the situation in March 1938 and the context of the Polish ultimatum to Lithuania. The conclusion of the study, although it finds arguments for Poland's gesture of force, questions its compatibility with certain international commitments of the two states, including the Briand-Kellog Pact, signed by both Poland and Lithuania. However, at the beginning of 1939, the same Dragoş Cotlarciuc draw another study, this time entitled *The Neutrality of the Baltic States*, dated on February 3, 1939. The Romanian diplomat emphasized that Poland had always sought to attract the Baltic countries into its zone of political influence. However, the Polish plans in this direction were constantly opposed by Latvia and Lithuania, which did not want to give up their neutrality. On the other hand, Dragoş Cotlarciuc pointed out that the German press was writing in 1938 about the Polish plans to create a Helsinki-Bucharest axis or a large block of neutral states, which would connect the Baltic Sea

* CS II PhD, "A. D. Xenopol" History Institute Iaşi, Romania; bogdan_schipor@yahoo.it.

with the Black Sea, under the tutelage of Warsaw. Such a political construction would have been a variant of the Warsaw-Budapest-Belgrade-Rome axis.

Keywords: The Baltic States; Romania; Poland; Alliance; Neutrality; Ultimatum.

After a rapid succession of political events in 1935-1936, the year 1937 was relatively quiet in Europe, with the somewhat isolated exception of the Spanish Civil War. However, things would change completely a year later, in 1938, a year marked, first and foremost, by two events that foreshadowed the evolution of European politics towards a major conflict. These were the *Anschluss* and the Sudetenland crisis.

Coincidentally or not, during the Austrian crisis, there was another dispute in Europe that was troubling the Western powers. On March 17, 1938, the Polish minister in Tallinn handed the Lithuanian minister in the Estonian capital a communiqué in which Warsaw demanded that Lithuania immediately establish diplomatic relations, without any preconditions. The Polish government considered this to be the only way in which the border issues between the two states could be regulated without endangering peace.

The explanations for this gesture in historiography are quite varied, but the most plausible seems to be the Polish government's attempt to strengthen its position in the face of an increasingly aggressive Germany in its foreign policy, Berlin also benefiting from "understanding" from the conciliatory Western powers. Also, the proximity to the Soviet Union determined, in turn, the Polish leaders to opt for a certain policy of expansion and the creation of zones of influence, which would counterbalance, as much as possible, the possible German and/or Soviet danger.

During this time, in Romania, the failure of the National Liberal Party and the inability of political parties to collaborate, both in terms of forming a government and with King Carol II, represented as many elements that supported the affirmation of extremist parties at the end of 1937 and the beginning of 1938 and paved the way for the establishment of the authoritarian regime that the king wanted. It is difficult to assess the contribution of Gheorghe Tătărescu, the future interim foreign minister from February to March 1938, to the establishment of this regime, especially since he was neither the only nor, certainly, the most zealous of Carol II's supporters, but most often the former prime minister is considered to be an adept of strengthening the central power of the state, of revising the Constitution in this sense, but, at the same time, a moderate and a partisan of compromise in the relationship with the monarch. It was probably for this reason that Gheorghe Tătărescu accepted, on February 10, 1938, to be part of the king's project to form a government made up of personalities, receiving the interim Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The king was thus trying to send a signal that the tensions and changes on

the Romanian political scene would not have repercussions on the country's traditional foreign policy¹.

Carol II transmitted this signal to the French ambassador in Bucharest, Adrien-Joseph-Marie Thierry, immediately after the investiture of this government, led by Patriarch Miron Cristea and former Prime Minister, Gheorghe Tătărescu, as Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. The French diplomat reported on February 15, 1938 to the Foreign Minister in Paris, Yvon Delbos, the fact that he was received in audience by the king, the sovereign of Romania assuring him that the fears generated in Paris by the actions and declarations of the previous government, led by Octavian Goga and by A. C. Cuza, regarding a possible slippage of Romania alongside Germany and Italy were no longer relevant. On the other hand, Carol II complained about the slowness with which France honoured the commercial contracts concluded with Romania, especially in the case of arms purchases. In any case, beyond certain difficulties registered in the case of commercial exchanges, Ambassador A. Thierry communicated to the Romanian sovereign that French diplomacy was happy to note that the takeover by Gheorghe Tătărescu of the leadership of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs represented, as in the case of Victor Antonescu before him, a guarantee of Romania's loyalty to its allies².

The loyalty of Romanian diplomacy to its usual line was tested sooner than one might have thought, during the interim mandate of Gheorghe Tătărescu at the head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bucharest between February 11 and March 29, 1938. Hitler was ready, in the spring of 1938, to modify the national borders of Germany, fixed by the Treaty of Versailles. Thus, after securing the support of Italy and the neutrality of Poland³, on March 12, 1938, after a whole month of tensions and threats, German troops crossed the border with Austria, almost as soon as Berlin addressed an ultimatum to Vienna⁴. The fact that Great Britain had protested, the day before, in the strongest terms, against the German ultimatum and the threat of the use of force if Berlin's demands were not immediately satisfied, had no result⁵.

In response to the events in Austria and Lithuania, Gheorghe Tătărescu attempted to convene a conference of the Little Entente, so that the three allied countries could adopt a common, coordinated attitude in the face of the danger

¹ Nicolae Şerban Tanaşoca, *Cuvânt înainte*, in the volume Gheorghe Tătărescu, *Mărturii pentru istorie*, edition edited by Sanda Tătărescu-Negroponte, Foreword by Nicolae Şerban Tanaşoca, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică, 1996, p. XXXIII-XXXIV.

² Maria G. Brătianu, *Roumanie 1938-1940 vue de France. Recherche dans les archives françaises*, Paris, 1996, p. 22-23.

³ Emilian Bold, Ioan Ciupercă, *Europa în derivă (1918-1940). Din istoria relaţiilor internaţionale*, Iaşi, Casa Editorială Demiurg, 2001, p. 196.

⁴ Henry Kissinger, *Diplomaţia*, translated from English by Mircea Ştefancu, Radu Paraschivescu, Bucureşti, Editura All, 1998, p. 282.

⁵ *Documents on British Foreign Policy 1919-1939*, edited by EL Woodward, MA, FBA, and Rohan Butler, MA, third Series, volume I, 1938, London, His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1949, doc. no. 39, p. 18-19.

created by the annexation of Austria by Germany. Unfortunately, however, Gheorghe Tătărescu's initiative was not successful, the Romanian foreign minister informing the French ambassador in Bucharest of this on 13 March 1938⁶. The consequences of this failure were not long in coming, because at the end of March, Jan Szembek, undersecretary of state in the foreign affairs ministry in Warsaw, informed Alexandru Duiliu Zamfirescu, the Romanian minister in the Polish capital, that recent events in Europe had created the immediate possibility of resolving the disagreements between Romania and Hungary. However, it was necessary, from the Polish diplomat's point of view, for this matter to be resolved as soon as possible, because in the fall it would already be far too late, by then important events were expected, which would affect the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia, Romania's ally⁷.

Beyond this initiative, we record the decision of Minister Tătărescu to request the drafting of a paper, within the ministry, on the situation of the Polish-Lithuanian border and the relations between the two countries. The document, dated March 19, 1938, is entitled *The Polish- Lithuanian Border* and, interestingly, has two sections and was drawn up by two diplomats: Dan Geblescu and Dragoș Cotlarciuc, both of whom were first-class legion secretaries at the time. Who were the two?

Dan Geblescu was born in Craiova on April 3, 1901. He completed his university studies in Paris, graduating in Law. He entered the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs on July 1, 1924 as a legion attaché. He went through all the steps of a normal career in diplomacy, up to the rank of Minister Plenipotentiary Class II, a rank obtained on April 1, 1943. His first appointment to a post abroad was at the Romanian legation in Paris, in February 1926. He was recalled to the central administration of the ministry the following year, then following secondments and recalls to Paris, The Hague, Belgrade. He was delegated to the Permanent Secretariat of the Little Entente in 1938, Consul General Class II in Prague in July 1939, and in 1941 he was responsible for the Consulate General in Cluj. Two years later, he was consul general of Romania in Geneva, being recalled to Bucharest in 1946⁸.

⁶ Maria G. Brătianu, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁷ Nicolae Dascălu, *Relații româno-polone în perioada interbelică (1919-1939)*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1991, p. 68. Rumours that Germany, in the event that it was forced to force the resolution of its claims against Czechoslovakia, intended to ensure the neutrality of Poland and Hungary, promising them the Czechoslovak territories inhabited predominantly by Polish and Hungarian minorities, respectively, appeared as early as the end of February and the beginning of March 1938. See *British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Reports and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print*, general editors Kenneth Bourne, D. Cameron Watt and Michael Partridge, part II: *From the First to the Second World War*, Series F, *Europe, 1919-1939*, volume 66, *Scandinavia and Baltic States, January 1938 – December 1938*, University Publications of America, 1996, doc. no. 25 and 26, p. 26-27.

⁸ Adrian Vițalariu, *Anuar Diplomatic și consular al Regatului României, 1946. Din istoria Ministerului Afacerilor Externe*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2016, p. 213-214.

Dragoş Cotlarciuc, the one we are focusing on in our study, was certainly, in 1939, an experienced diplomat. Born in 1902, in Chernivtsi, in the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, Dragoş Cotlarciuc entered the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania in January 1927. After almost six years in the Central Administration of Ministry⁹, his first post abroad was at the Legation of Romania in Tirana, where he was transferred in February 1933. He was also general consul of Romania in Cologne and chargé d'affaires in Sofia and Budapest during the Second World War.

In the document already mentioned, Dan Geblescu emphasizes that the eastern borders of Poland were established following the decisions of the Conference of Ambassadors, in accordance with art. 87 of the Treaty of Versailles. Since Lithuania had repeatedly requested, through the Council of the League of Nations, this Conference to decide on its border with Poland, the Romanian diplomat considered that the authorities in Kowno had thus recognized the competence of the Conference in this regard. The decision of the Conference of Ambassadors, however, recognized the state of affairs of 1923 regarding the city and area of Vilna, thereby the Romanian diplomat considered that Poland remained in legal possession of these territories, despite the protests formulated by Lithuania. Furthermore, the Council of the League of Nations considered that in this case both states recognized the competence of the Conference of Ambassadors, so it refused to admit the challenge of the decision before the Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague. However, Lithuania continued to refuse, in 1938, to recognize the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors in this case¹⁰.

Dragoş Cotlarciuc, on the other hand, notes in his part of the document that in the early 1920s in the Polish-Lithuanian dispute most of the Polish claims were accepted and fulfilled, while the requests of the Lithuanian side were almost constantly removed. According to Cotlarciuc, in order to understand the context at that time, one had to take into account the fact that the Soviets were not yet part of the League of Nations, while Poland was “the favourite of the Great Powers, who looked with love and indulgence at their latest creation”. Lithuania, on the other hand, was a “small, primitive country, born on the basis of the self-determination of peoples and not out of a need for European balance”, having been forced to “resign itself to smaller claims”. From the author’s point of view, it was useless to search in 1938 on which side was or was right. Rather, it was important, in March 1938, whether or not Poland had committed aggression through the ultimatum given to Lithuania. It was the first time that a Romanian diplomatic document, even if for internal use by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bucharest, evoked this variant/possibility.

⁹ Vitalie Văratice, *Dragoş Cotlarciuc, Son of the Metropolitan of Bukovina and a Successful Wartime Diplomat*, in Adrian Vițalaru, Ionuț Nistor, Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu (eds.), *Romanian Diplomacy in the 20th Century: Biographies, Institutional Pathways, International Challenges*, Berlin, Peter Lang, 2020, p. 161-162.

¹⁰ AMAE, Fund 71/Romania, vol. 494, p. 269-270.

Dragoş Cotlarciuc emphasized, however, that the Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations of December 10, 1927, taking note of the official statements of the representatives of Poland and Lithuania according to which they were not in a state of war, recommended that both states begin direct negotiations as soon as possible. As Lithuania did not show itself willing to negotiate until 1938, Poland decided to proceed alone to obtain recognition of its borders. This decision took the brutal form of an ultimatum addressed to Lithuania. Under these conditions, according to Cotlarciuc, Poland's legal situation was unassailable. From the point of view expressed by the Romanian diplomat, art. 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations did not exclude the possibility that Poland could use force to enforce the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors, but nevertheless the Polish action contradicted the Briand- Kellogg Pact, signed by both Poland and Lithuania¹¹.

Ultimately, the easing of the crisis and the possibility that the Kaunas authorities would comply with Polish demands only led to a decrease in the already relatively low interest shown by the Bucharest authorities in resolving the disputed issues between Poland and Lithuania. It was practically believed that by resolving this crisis, "Warsaw and Kovno will each have one more diplomat and Europe one less worry", Poland not having much to gain in terms of its prestige or position, and Lithuania losing what it did not have through this forced regulation of bilateral relations. On the other hand, in Romania it was believed that a real improvement in relations between Poland and Lithuania could only lead to a strengthening of the position of the Baltic states and an expansion of Warsaw's influence in the region, with positive implications for the political stability of the region, in a turbulent and tense European context¹².

On the other hand, the transformation of the Polish ultimatum into a precedent favourable to Germany or other great powers with interests in the region aroused concern in Romania¹³, and Bucharest seemed, at least officially, extremely reserved regarding the Polish ultimatum towards Lithuania. Obviously, there are sufficient explanations for this attitude adopted by the Romanian authorities. The alliance with Poland was extremely important, in the tense political context in Europe and primarily in Central and Eastern Europe, especially since political leaders in Warsaw had often emphasized the fact that Poland's borders with Germany and Romania were considered definitive¹⁴. On the other hand, the lack of reaction of the Western powers and *The Anschluss* eclipsed, in importance, amplitude and potential consequences, what seemed to be just a regulation of

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 271-272.

¹² *Conflictul dintre Polonia și Lituania*, in "Universul", no. 79, March 21, 1938, p. 1.

¹³ The fact is clearly emphasized in the Romanian press of the time. See, for example, the article titled *Relations between Poland and Lithuania inspire concern*, in the newspaper "Universul", year 55, no. 75, Thursday, March 17, 1938, p. 15.

¹⁴ Nicolae Dascălu, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

bilateral relations between two neighbouring states, even if the method chosen by Warsaw to obtain such a regulation remained questionable.

Finally, the distant and reserved attitude of Bucharest regarding the Polish-Lithuanian crisis of March 1938 did not go unnoticed and did not remain without a response from Warsaw. Polish political leaders conveyed to Romania their gratitude for the attitude adopted and for the fact that Romanian diplomacy understood the reasons behind the Polish actions, not showing any opposition¹⁵. In fact, as early as March 23, 1938, Josef Beck thanked Bucharest, through the Romanian Legation in Warsaw, “for the beautiful attitude of the Romanian public and press during the Polish-Lithuanian conflict, which was highly appreciated by the entire Polish public opinion and fully corresponds to the spirit of the alliance”¹⁶.

Even so, the warning given to Warsaw by the Western chancelleries – primarily by the British one – and which we could also identify in Romanian public opinion, according to which the Polish ultimatum represented a precedent that Berlin could use in the future to expand its influence in the Baltic area, to the obvious detriment of Poland, would remain valid and materialize a year later.

A year later, Grigore Gafencu asked the same Dragoş Cotlarciuc to write a new study on the Baltic States. Entitled *The Neutrality of the Baltic States*, Dragoş Cotlarciuc’s analysis has, among its premises, the fact that the three Baltic states were geographically located between two great powers, Germany and the Soviet Union, which obliged them to a cautious attitude towards them, but also to collaboration, as long as they had common political and economic interests. On the other hand, the divergences between the three Baltic states had their origin, from the Romanian diplomat’s point of view, in the fact that they belonged to different, distinct spheres of influence. Dragoş Cotlarciuc placed Lithuania in the Soviet sphere of influence, a factor that had kept the Kaunas government’s relations with both Germany and Poland tense. Only after Moscow’s influence on Lithuania diminished was the latter’s collaboration with Latvia and Estonia possible. And the decline of Soviet influence led to an increase in German influence in the region. On the other hand, the Baltic Entente, created in 1934, had been built on the alliance between Latvia and Estonia. Even in this construction, Lithuania remained a vulnerable element, with interests distinct from those of the other two states.

If Lithuania was in the Soviet sphere, Dragoş Cotlarciuc placed Estonia in a strong philo-Polish current, while Latvia tried to maintain an intermediate position, which would also maintain the interests of the great Western powers in the region, primarily the British ones.

Poland, on the other hand, had always sought to attract the Baltic countries to its area of political influence, with the aim of forming a bloc capable of opposing

¹⁵ See Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate of Diplomatic Archives, *România-Polonia. Relații diplomatice*, I, 1918-1939, Foreword by Mircea Dan Geoană, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2003, doc. no. 93, p. 192.

¹⁶ AMAE, Fund 71/Poland, vol. 59, f. 198.

both Germany and the Soviet Union. However, according to the Romanian diplomat, Polish plans in this direction were constantly opposed by Latvia and Lithuania, who did not want to give up their neutrality. Even at the Riga Conference in June 1938, Josef Beck failed to persuade the three Baltic states to accept a more intense collaboration with Warsaw. On the other hand, the Romanian diplomat pointed out that the German press wrote in 1938 about Polish plans to create a Helsinki-Bucharest axis or a large bloc of neutral states, which would link the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, under the tutelage of Warsaw. Such a political construction would have proceeded as a variant of the Warsaw-Budapest-Belgrade-Rome axis¹⁷.

The idea was not new. A year earlier, on March 24, 1938, a telegram from Washington had signalled to the headquarters of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bucharest that Warsaw's ambassador to the United States, Count George Potocki, had told the American press that, following its recent rapprochement with Lithuania, Poland harboured hopes of forming a so-called "neutral belt" of Eastern European states, stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. The idea was to organize a group of states on the Scandinavian model, which would declare themselves against aggression, conclude economic treaties with each other, and avoid any engagement in both Eastern and Western Europe. Poland, Romania, Finland, and the three Baltic states were to compose this "belt". Warsaw, however, was to try to extend this arrangement, but through bilateral treaties, because Polish diplomacy had lost confidence in the effectiveness and functionality of collective security. A confidential discussion between Romanian diplomats in Washington and Ambassador Potocki revealed a different reality, however. The Polish diplomat had only wanted to revive an older plan of Marshal Piłsudski. It was desirable, on the other hand, that the Baltic countries cooperated more closely with Poland, but it was unlikely that Finland would accept such a security arrangement. The Romanian diplomats also tried to find out the opinion of their Baltic colleagues on this project, especially since the Polish ambassador had given the impression that the whole plan was only intended to extend Warsaw's influence to Kaunas, Riga and Tallinn. Latvia and Estonia welcomed the resolution of the Polish -Lithuanian conflict. This could strengthen the Baltic Entente, with the prospect of its evolution into a Baltic Union. However, any kind of acceptance or participation by Poland in such a Union was excluded¹⁸.

Certainly, in February 1939, Dragoş Cotlarciuc emphasized the sympathies of the three Baltic states for Germany were not very great, but the latest events (from 1938 and the beginning of the following year) had amplified German influence in the Baltic area, and the Reich clearly demonstrated that it was the only "dynamic power" in the Baltic countries. This element had the gift of influencing and changing the opinions of the political leaders of the three Baltic states towards

¹⁷ AMAE, Fund 71/Romania, vol. 494, f. 296.

¹⁸ AMAE, Fund 71/Poland, vol. 6, f. 208-210.

a power that, although it was not loved or sympathized with, was feared and respected. Berlin was interested in the states of northern Europe and the Baltic Sea to maintain their neutrality, the condition being that this neutrality was benevolent to the Reich. Under these conditions, the Baltic states could represent for Germany a kind of barrier against Soviet interference in the Baltic Sea, but, in Cotlarciuc's opinion, this barrier of neutral Baltic states could not preserve its status in the event of a conflict in the region¹⁹.

On the other hand, an intensification of relations between Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania with Poland, manifested in the last months of 1938, showed that the three small Baltic states were trying to preserve as much as possible a certain freedom of action through a neutral attitude. As for the Soviet Union, Dragoş Cotlarciuc considered that Moscow, due to internal (the Great Purge) and external (a long diplomatic isolation) difficulties, had considerably diminished its influence in the Baltic area. Even in the case of Lithuania, this trend could be identified, especially since in the previous year the degree of collaboration of the Kaunas government with Warsaw and Berlin had considerably improved. Germany, on the other hand, was considered a power that needed a benevolent neutrality from the Nordic states, but also a strong influence on the Baltic states, since they constituted a barrier against Soviet interference in the Baltic Sea. In the event of a possible armed conflict, however, the DC considered the three Baltic states too weak and exposed to truly maintain their neutrality. Not only was the Soviet Union a potential adversary to German policy and influence in this area, but so was Poland, which was seeking, in turn, to gain the same kind of control and extend its own influence²⁰.

In this context, the Baltic states could seek, attempt a collaboration with the neutral Nordic states, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, but Dragoş Cotlarciuc emphasized that the neutrality of the Nordic states depended, to a large extent, on their attitude towards Germany. The Reich could allow these states to remain neutral only if this neutrality was very benevolent. In a future conflict, Dragoş Cotlarciuc emphasized that the Nordic countries could only afford the same attitude as during the First World War, which considerably diminished the probability of an association with the Baltic states. Germany, Poland and the Soviet Union would not allow Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to maintain their neutrality in the event of a future major conflict. This element practically eliminated the access of the three Baltic states to the Nordic bloc, where Finland was already considered a potential vulnerable point. In this context, considered DC, the declaration of the Nordic states regarding the fact that art. 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations was not considered mandatory was explained. The Baltic states tried until the last moment not to renounce the guarantee of that article, but they counted on the weakness of the Soviet Union and were influenced by the attitude of Poland

¹⁹ Ibidem, f. 297.

²⁰ Ibidem, f. 295.

and the Nordic states when they finally rallied to the Scandinavian point of view in September 1938²¹.

Regarding the main objective of his report, Dragoş Cotlarciuc emphasized that the Baltic states had recently adopted laws regarding their neutrality in the event of conflict, but these laws had aroused the dissatisfaction of the British government, which considered that some provisions in the text of the laws, regarding submarines, aircraft and armed merchant ships of the belligerent powers, were contrary to previous international commitments, which could not be restricted unilaterally²².

We are therefore dealing, in the royal ministry of foreign affairs, with a diplomat to whom not only Gheorghe Tătărescu, but also Grigore Gafencu, as heads of Romanian diplomacy, entrusted the documentation and drafting of important studies, which influenced and defined Romania's position towards the Baltic states, both in the tense moment of March 1938 and at the beginning of 1939, a year marked in turn by convulsions and tensions in Europe, which would culminate in the outbreak of a new world conflagration. The two documents, little known by historians and almost not valued historiographically, prove, in the case of their author, an experienced, analytical diplomat, whom historians have not yet identified, until now, as an expert on Baltic issues in the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs around the outbreak of the world war.

²¹ Ibidem, f. 298-299.

²² Ibidem, f. 301.

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 ediție, Parigi 1863-1870
<i>AB</i>	= Arhivele Basarabiei
<i>ACNSAS</i>	= Arhivele Consiliului Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității
<i>AE</i>	= L'Année Epigraphique, Paris
<i>AIR</i>	= Arhiva Istorică a României
<i>AIAC</i>	= Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj
<i>AIIAI</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>ANSMB</i>	= Arhivele Naționale. Serviciul 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>	= Acta Poloniae Historica, 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

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

<i>CTh</i>	= <i>Codex Theodosianus</i> . Theodosiani, Libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis, I, edidit adsumpto apparatu P. Kruegeri, Th. Mommsen, Hildesheim, 1970-1971
<i>Cv.L</i>	= Convorbiri literare (ambele serii)
„ <i>Dacia</i> ”, <i>N.S.</i>	= Dacia. Nouvelle Série, Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne, București
<i>DGAS</i>	= Direcția Generală a Arhivelor Statului
<i>DI</i>	= Diplomatarium Italicum
<i>DIR</i>	= <i>Documente privind istoria României</i>
<i>DIRRI</i>	= <i>Documente privind Istoria României. Războiul pentru Independență</i>
<i>DOP</i>	= Dumbarton Oaks Papers
<i>DTN</i>	= <i>Din trecutul nostru</i> , Chișinău
<i>DRH</i>	= <i>Documenta Romaniae Historica</i>
<i>EB</i>	= Études Balkaniques
<i>EBPB</i>	= Études byzantines et post-byzantines
<i>EDCS</i>	= <i>Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby</i> (http://www.manfredclauss.de/)
<i>EDR</i>	= <i>Epigraphic Database Roma</i> (http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php)
<i>EpigrAnat</i>	= Epigraphica Anatolica, Münster
<i>ERAsturias</i>	= F. Diego Santos, <i>Epigrafia Romana de Asturias</i> , Oviedo, 1959.
<i>EuGeSta</i>	= <i>Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity</i>
<i>Gerión</i>	= Gerión. Revista de Historia Antigua, Madrid
<i>GB</i>	= Glasul Bisericii
<i>GCS</i>	= <i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller</i> , Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1897-1969
<i>GLK</i>	= <i>Grammatici Latini Keil</i>
<i>HEp</i>	= <i>Hispania Epigraphica</i> , Madrid
„ <i>Hierasus</i> ”	= <i>Hierasus</i> . Anuarul Muzeului Județean Botoșani, Botoșani
<i>HM</i>	= Heraldica Moldaviae, Chișinău
<i>HU</i>	= Historia Urbana, Sibiu
<i>HUI</i>	= Historia Universitatis Iassiensis, Iași
<i>IDR</i>	= <i>Inscripțiile din Dacia romană</i> , Bucurști-Paris
<i>IDRE</i>	= <i>Inscriptions de la Dacie romaine. Inscriptions externes concernant l'histoire de la Dacie</i> , I-II, Bucarest, 1996, 2000
<i>IGLN</i>	= <i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de Novae</i> , Bordeaux
<i>IGLR</i>	= <i>Inscripțiile grecești și latine din secolele IV-XIII descoperite în România</i> , București, 1976
<i>IILPecs</i>	= <i>Instrumenta Inscripta Latina. Das römische Leben im Spiegel der Kleininschriften</i> , Pecs, 1991
<i>ILAlg</i>	= <i>Inscriptions latines d'Algérie</i> , Paris
<i>ILB</i>	= <i>Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria repertae. Inscriptiones inter Oescum et Iatrum repertae</i> , Sofia, 1989
<i>ILD</i>	= <i>Inscripții latine din Dacia</i> , București
<i>ILN</i>	= <i>Inscriptiones latines de Novae</i> , Poznan
<i>ILLPRON</i>	= <i>Inscriptionum Lapidarium Latinarum Provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices</i> , Berlin, 1986
<i>ILS</i>	= <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i> , 1892
<i>IMS</i>	= <i>Inscriptiones Moesiae Superioris</i> , Belgrad
<i>IN</i>	= „Ioan Neculce”. Buletinul Muzeului Municipal Iași
<i>ISM</i>	= <i>Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor grecești și latine</i> , București, vol. I-III, 1983-1999
<i>JGO</i>	= <i>Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas</i>
<i>JL</i>	= Junimea literară
<i>JRS</i>	= The Journal of Roman studies, London
<i>LR</i>	= Limba română
<i>Lupa</i>	= <i>Ubi Erat Lupa</i> (http://lupa.at/)
<i>MA</i>	= Memoria Antiquitatis, Piatra Neamț

<i>MCA</i>	= Materiale și cercetări arheologice
<i>MEF</i>	= <i>Moldova în epoca feudalismului</i> , vol. I-XII, 1961-2012, Chișinău
<i>MEFRA</i>	= <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 auspiciis societatis aperiendis fontibus rerum Germanicarum medii aevi</i> , Berlin 1877-
<i>MI</i>	= Magazin istoric, București
<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, București
<i>MO</i>	= Mitropolia Olteniei
<i>MOF</i>	= Monitorul Oficial al României
<i>Navarro</i>	= M. Navarro Caballero, <i>Perfectissima femina. Femmes de l'élite 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>	= <i>Nouvelles études d'histoire</i>
<i>OI</i>	= Opțiuni istoriografice, Iași
<i>OPEL</i>	= <i>Onomasticon provinciarum Europae 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, București
<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>RGI</i>	= Revista Generală a Învățământului
<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, București
<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>	= <i>The Romanian Journal of Modern History</i> , 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>	= Revue roumaine de l'histoire de l'art
<i>RRHA-BA</i>	= Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art. Série Beaux Arts
<i>RSIAB</i>	= Revista Societății istorice și arheologice bisericești, Chișinău
<i>Rsl</i>	= Romanoslavica
<i>SAHIR</i>	= Studia et Acta Historiae Iudaeorum Romaniae, București
<i>SAI</i>	= Studii și Articole de Istorie
<i>SANIC</i>	= Serviciul Arhivelor Naționale Istorice Centrale
<i>SCB</i>	= Studii și cercetări de bibliologie
<i>SCh</i>	= <i>Sources Chrétiennes</i> , Paris
<i>SCIA</i>	= Studii și cercetări de istoria artei
<i>SCIM</i>	= Studii și cercetări de istorie medie
<i>SCIV/SCIVA</i>	= Studii și cercetări de istorie veche (și arheologie)
<i>SCN</i>	= Studii și Cercetări Numismatice, București
<i>SCȘI</i>	= Studii și cercetări științifice, Istorie
<i>SEER</i>	= The Slavonic and East European Review
<i>SHA</i>	= <i>Scriptores Historiae Augustae</i>
<i>SJAN</i>	= Serviciul Județean al Arhivelor Naționale
<i>SMIC</i>	= Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană, București
<i>SMIM</i>	= Studii și materiale de istorie medie, București
<i>SMIMod</i>	= Studii și materiale de istorie modernă, București
<i>SOF</i>	= Südost-Forschungen, München
<i>ST</i>	= Studii Teologice, București
<i>StAntArh</i>	= <i>Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica</i> , Iași
<i>T&MBYZ</i>	= <i>Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et de civilisation byzantines</i>
<i>ThD</i>	= Thraco-Dacica, București
<i>TR</i>	= Transylvanian Review, Cluj-Napoca
<i>TV</i>	= Teologie și viața, Iași
<i>ZPE</i>	= Zeitschrift für Papyralogie und Epigraphik
<i>ZSL</i>	= Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde