

**A FIGHTER FOR THE UNION OF THE PRINCIPALITIES:
ANASTASIE PANU**

M. COJOCARIU

"I wish to restrict my speech for the time being and just praise with papers and documents the action of a statesman, who had *a great and overwhelming influence on removing the obstacles that hindered the third phase of our national renaissance.*

This statesman was *Vornic Anastasie Panu*, Member of the Kaymakam rule of Moldavia in 1858"¹.

Dimitrie A. Sturdza, 16 May 1911

Abstract. Between 20 October 1858 and 5 January 1859 (according to the old calendar), Anastasie Panu was a member of the Three-Kaymakam rule, installed in Moldova under a provision of the Paris Convention on the definitive organization of the Romanian Principalities. He was, in that capacity and for that 77-day period, the most important Unionist politician, with a decisive role in the "course" of the Moldavian events that preceded the election of Alexandru I. Cuza as ruler.

It is to him that we owe, to an overwhelming extent, the restoration of the freedom of the press (by reinstating Grigorie Al. Ghica's law of May 1856), the full affirmation of the country's autonomy through an effective exercise, ensuring a (relative) majority of the National Party in the Elective Assembly of Moldavia, the introduction of the letterhead of the United Principalities on all official documents; finally, through the so-called "*Panu Plan*", "paving" the road to the throne of Moldavia for Colonel Alexandru I. Cuza.

Therefore, this Unionist leader should be given not only our modest presentation, but a monument more enduring than bronze - if we may paraphrase the ancient poet: and not (almost) the oblivion bequeathed by an unjust posterity.

Keywords: the Three-Kaymakam rule, Ad-hoc Divan, Elective Assembly of Moldavia, 5 January 1859, Anastase Panu, Metropolitan Sofronie Miclescu, Alexandru Ioan Cuza.

¹ Dimitrie A. Sturdza, *Însemnătatea Divanurilor ad-hoc din Iași și București, în istoria Renașterii României*, Excerpt from "Annals of the Romanian Academy. Memories of the Historical Section", București, 1912, p. 502, our emphasis (hereafter, quoted as DAS). D. A. Sturdza presented a "series" of seven communications at the Academy, between 4 March and 2 Dec. 1911, which he collected in the volume with the above-mentioned title the following year. It was, in fact, *an annotated selection* of the massive collection (ten volumes, eleven tomes!) *Acte și documente relative la istoria Renascerei României* (hereafter, cited as AD).

We have chosen these words uttered by Dimitrie A. Sturdza as the *motto* of our presentation for several reasons. First of all, he was not only the best historian of the period to which he referred (we have in mind, of course, the well-known collection of *Acte și documente* of which he was the main editor), but he had also been *the secretary of the Three-Kaymakam rule of Moldavia* since the autumn of 1858 and, in this capacity, Anastasie Panu's confidant, thus, in our opinion, his closest collaborator. Besides, for us too, Anastasie Panu was a providential figure, who lived up to the expectations of an entire nation, being perhaps the main architect - as we shall endeavour to show - of the founding acts of the modern Romanian state of January/February 1859.

Let us review some contemporary opinions about our character. The same D. A. Sturdza considered elsewhere that Panu was "the political leader of the nation and Vasile Sturdza was united with him from the beginning" (one of the three kaymakams). He "was the first Romanian politician who, having reached the head of the government, faced up to the strong influence exerted by the Ottoman Porte and decided to break it"². The success of the double election of Colonel Cuza - seen as the founding act of the national state - was due, according to the French consul in Iași Victor Place (a close collaborator of the nationalists who moved in the autumn of 1858, to the camp of the "Gregorians", Beyzade Grigorie M. Sturdza's supporters), "in large part, to the attitude taken, in recent times, by the *real head of the Kaymakam rule of Iași*, Mr. Anastase Panu". He was, "by his prudent energy, by his activity, by his keen eye, the only one up to the challenge"³. Finally, let us note an indirect tribute from J. A. Vaillant, who was in Iași at the time and was very active among the Gregorians: he repeatedly told V. Place that, in order to be successful (i.e. imposing the French candidate, the same Grigorie Sturdza), we must "have" Anastasie Panu, advice that the consul chose to ignore⁴! In fact, there was such an attempt, only that Sturdza, *supported by Panu*, was not accepted by the Elective Assembly of Moldavia on the list of candidates to the throne - matter which will be explored further on.

This man, so important in his time, is almost completely forgotten nowadays: for the people of Iași he is just a street name, located, admittedly, in the heart of

² *Ibid*, p. 788.

³ Victor Place to Alexandre Walewski, Foreign Minister of France, Iași, 28 Jan./9 Feb. 1859, DAS, p. 803, respectively 804.

⁴ See, *Confidential Report* of J. A. Vaillant to Al. Walewski, 5 January (new rite) 1859, in AD, IX, published by Dimitrie A. Sturdza and J. J. Skupiewski, București, 1901, p. 299. As a "militant" "Gregorian", he published the violently polemical albeit untalented pamphlet *Glasul poporului, glasul lui Dumnezeu*, (Tipografia Buciumului Român, Iași, 1858, 35 p.).

the city⁵, possibly a character of the historical *past*. It is an example, conclusive in our opinion, of the fact that posterity, far from being "a great judge", does not always put things and people in their proper place. But, of course, there is also the political factor: Panu was not a man of the left and, moreover, linked (rather too much) to the Church and a portion of the high clergy. However, before portraying the exploits of kaymakam Anastasie Panu, we think we should take a look at his family, the beginnings of his political career and the achievements of the Unionist leader.

On the paternal line, he descends from a family of Greek or, according to some sources, Bulgarian origin; but Anastasie himself claimed that his grandfather, also called Anastasie, was "a Romanian from Missia", being the first to settle in Moldova and marry a Moldavian woman - "He wrote and published books in Romanian"⁶. His father, Panaiotache A. Panu (Panas Panaghiotis), would have been a wealthy merchant, with shops on Ulița Mare in Iași⁷. The turning point of his life was in 1821: he was an active eterist, one of the members of the Ephoria of the Greek movement in Iași⁸, sacrificing, according to his son, "a considerable fortune to the cause of the revolution [...]". He then fled with his family to Bessarabia, where he remained until 1828. Returning to Moldova, he settled in Huși, under the protective wing of Bishop Sofronie Miculescu, *his wife's first cousin*, and lived there until 1851. After this date, upon Sofronie's anointment as Metropolitan bishop, we also find this sinner in Iași, under the same

⁵ The present Anastasie Panu Boulevard has been named as such since 1884, replacing the old name of St. Friday Street. The parental house, which came into Anastasie's possession in 1856, was in fact on the "former Papafil Street". In 1865 the "Alexandru cel Bun" Gymnasium was established in that house. It was demolished in 1978 for the widening of the boulevard. It was on the vacant place (park) in front of Barnovschi Church. See Mircea Ciubotaru, „Misterele” *onomastice ale Iașilor*, Volume I, Ed. Dark Publishing, București, 2021, p. 79-80. A presentation of the house, with many exaggerations and inaccuracies, in Ion Mitican, *Din Ulița Domnească în "Arcărie"*, Ed. Tehnopress, Iași, [2011], p. 57-59.

⁶ See, Anastasie Panu's *Protestation* to the European Commission of Observation and Investigation, Iași, 13/25 June 1857, in AD, IV, published by Ghenadie Petrescu, Dimitrie A. Sturdza and Dimitrie C. Sturdza, București, 1889, p. 960. We do not know which books are involved; on the other hand, it is obvious that, protesting against the non-recognition of his electoral rights, Anastasie's grandson "whitewashes", so to speak, his grandfather.

⁷ Cf. Vasile Panopol, *Pe ulițele Iașului*, edited and introduced by Mihai Sorin Rădulescu, Ed. ALLFA, București, 2000, p. 23. See also Sorin Ifțimi, *Pregătirea și desfășurarea mișcării eteriste la Iași, capitala Moldovei (1819-1821)*, in *Eteria în Principatele Române (1821). 200 de ani de la începutul mișcării de eliberare a Greciei. Iași - 27 February 2021*. UER Press, București, 2021, p. 163, fig. 14 - the shops on Ulița Mare, in front of the Metropolitan Church.

⁸ Sorin Ifțimi, *works cited*, p. 94-95. The author also mentions one of Panaitachi's brothers, Constantin.

administration: in 1857, we find *Postelnic* Panaitachi signing papers with the Kyriarch, as director of the Metropolitanate⁹.

So, through his mother, Elena Miclescu, Metropolitan Sofronie's first cousin, Anastasie was Metropolitan Sofronie's nephew or maybe even his son, if we are to believe the rumours of the time, including the pamphlet *Menuar de stegari și cocardiști*, once analyzed by us¹⁰. However, one thing is crystal clear: Metropolitan Sofronie was always a protector of the Panu family¹¹, and Anastasie, throughout his political career, was in close contact with the increasingly higher clergy of Moldova.

In what concerns young Nastasache's political career, he began as a member, then president of the Tribunal ("of first instance") of Fălciu, in 1840 (he remained there until 1847). This is when he was "arbitrarily" imprisoned "for five months" in the barracks of Galați. The great "leap" of his career, however, occurred during Grigorie Al. Ghica's reign: substitute member of the Princely Divan (Court of Appeal) and director of the Ministry of Justice (1854). He was also Minister of Justice, in which capacity he contributed to many of the important acts of the reign: the emancipation of the gypsies, the founding of a

⁹ See, *Circular* of the Metropolitanate of Moldavia to the abbots of the enclosed and unenclosed monasteries, Iași, 24 March/5 April 1857, AD, IV, p. 237. Panaitachi even became a great vicar!

¹⁰ Mihai Cojocariu, *Despre unele pamflete versificate din preajma unirii Principatelor*, in M. Cojocariu, Cristian Ploscaru (coordinators), *Retorica politică modernă în spațiul românesc. Origini și forme de manifestare (secolele XVII-XIX)*, Ed. Universității "Al. I. Cuza", Iași, 2013, p. 130-134. On the alleged love affair of Sofronie with Elenco Miclescu ("Pănoaia"), see Vasile Panopol (*works cited*, p. 24) and Artur Gorovei, *Un mănunchiu de documente cu privire la Unirea Principatelor*, Extract from "Junimea Literară", Year XV, 1926, p. 13; the pamphlet in question reproduced on pp. 13-14. The author of that text must have been Neculai Istrati - also deeply involved in the affairs of the Metropolitanate!

¹¹ Constandin Sion, the chief cupbearer, explains in detail: Panu the father "took one of Miclescu's daughters from Sărbești", "who had no dowry and no parents". As a worker at "Eforia Volintirească", in 1821, "after the defeat of those bandits", he had to flee to Bessarabia, where he stayed until 1827. From there, "finding himself in great want", "he came straight to Huși with his entire family, with no clothes on their backs, barely alive, a pitiable sight". Bishop Sofronie, "as a relative, helped them, gave them estates from the diocese with cheap possessions and they slowly recovered" etc., etc. Acc. to Constandin Sion, *Arhondologia Moldovei. Amintiri și note contemporane. Boierii moldoveni*, selected and established text, glossary and index by Rodica Rotaru, preface by Mircea Angheliescu, afterword, notes and comments by Ștefan S. Gorovei, Ed. Minerva, București, 1973, p. 203. For the head of the Moldovan-Wallachian church, see Dr. Nestor Vornicescu, *Unde-i turma acolo-i și păstorul. Participarea mitropolitului Sofronie Miclescu la înfăptuirea unirii Principatelor Române 1859*, Ed. Mitropoliei Olteniei, Craiova, 1984 (but that book is, in our opinion, uncritical!).

national bank, the abolition of censorship and the press law of May 1856¹² etc. At the same time, he also rose through the ranks: commissioner (1811), agha (1846), seneschal (21.08.1855), vornic (24.10.1855)¹³. He is already an active character, and his tendency (and talent!) to put himself in the spotlight is obvious; it is this boldness that is incriminated in the verses of a pamphlet criticising the members of the last government run by Grigorie Al. Ghica, as well as other figures (including some women!) in the entourage of the ruler¹⁴. But, in fact, as a politician, Anastasie Panu "possesses" some remarkable "talents": he has, as we have seen, guts, he is a classy political "player"/ capable of pulling political strings and orchestrating stunning tactical "coups"; he is, to put it shortly, a jack of all trades. In addition, he has extraordinary courage, as will be seen, especially, in the time of the Three-Kaymakam rule. He also has oratorical talent, being - together with Mihail Kogălniceanu and Constantin Hurmuzachi - among those who first showed us what parliamentary eloquence means. But not everyone liked his oratory. Neculai Suțu, who never acknowledged any qualities in others, considered him a "lover of popularity", not an orator, but a "declamateur", who uttered "snorting phrases" that "attracted the applause of the tribunes", but without "object or convincing arguments"¹⁵. Iorga also judged him harshly: "a fiery orator, who imposed, of course, more by gesture, by tone, than by the richness of ideas or the literary beauty of form" - in short, a "solemn and empty eloquence"¹⁶. As far as we are concerned, it seems to us that Panu's oratory is far from being a string of empty words: very often

¹² See *Protestation*, cited by us in note 6, pp. 960-961.

¹³ Acc. to *Marea arhondologie a boierilor Moldovei (1835-1856)*, edited by Mihai-Răzvan Ungureanu, Ed. Universității "Al. I. Cuza", Iași, 1997, p. 215-216.

¹⁴ Here are the verses written about Anastasie Panu:

"All glorify him like the son of a *Holy Father*,
Panu, Panu does it all, he holds the world in his hand,
 All progress comes from him in our Romanian land.
 He is the beacon of politics, the protector of arts
 Of the *Chancellery* [Justice], worshipper of *Brambila*"

"*Moldova* will honour you even after your death like the offspring of a *Saint*,
 Everyone will come to kiss your sideburns".

This pamphlet also includes the insinuation that Metropolitan Sofronie is Anastasie's father. See *Iași 1856. Panorama Moldovei. Listă diplomatică adresată comisarilor puterilor Europei de către un spectator*, in Artur Gorovei, *works cited*, p. 12, emphasis A. Gorovei.

¹⁵ *Memoriile Principelui Nicolae Suțu mare logofăt al Moldovei 1798-1871*, Translation from French, introduction, notes and commentaries by Georgeta Penelea Filitti, Ed. Fundației Culturale Române, București, 1997, p. 321.

¹⁶ N. Iorga, *Unirea Principatelor (1909) povestită românilor*, Tipografia "Neamul românesc", Vălenii de Munte, 1909, p. 97 and 103.

we see meaningful conclusions, remarkable also in terms of form. Thus, to give an example of the significance of the work of the ad hoc Assembly of Moldavia in the autumn of 1857, he stated, on 21 December (according to the old calendar): the moment is unique in the book of the life of nations, among those that "decide the existence of nations", by the moral solidarity it provokes¹⁷. As for the "peasant issue", Panu thought this had to be postponed, since "each system must first be researched, discussed in public, and then passed into law"¹⁸. Let us also note a few words spoken by Anastasie Panu, *like a true head of state*, on 1/13 January 1859: "We are beginning, gentlemen, a new year and everything tells us that we are entering, with this year, a new life, a national life". "The past disappears behind us, full of prejudices and weaknesses, which always paralyse progress and happiness; the future opens up to us under new auspices"¹⁹!

As I have already said in passing, Anastasie Panu was a militant unionist, one of the recognized leaders of the National Party in Moldova, his name appearing on practically all the papers issued by the organized forms of this political party, starting with the *banquet* at "Villa Kogălniceanu", given in honor of Major Gh. Filipescu, who had returned from Russian captivity²⁰ (May 23/June 3, 1856), and up to the handover of power by the Three-Kaymakan rule to the new ruler of Moldavia, Alexandru I. Cuza, on January 5/17, 1859. He was therefore a member of the "Unirea" Society (founded in Mihalache Cantacuzino's house), of the Electoral Committee of the Union (February 1857) and of the Central Committee of the Union (1/13 March 1857). In the latter organisational structure of the National Party, he was part of the *first commission* in charge of the *Romanian correspondence*, together with Constantin Hurmuzachi and Vasile Mălinescu, and, in general, of the works in Romanian.

Although removed from the electoral lists of the first elections for the ad-hoc Assembly of Moldova by the anti-unionist Nicolae Conachi-Vogoride administration (by skilfully handling the complicated issues of land ownership - Constantin Hurmuzachi and Petre P. Mavrogheni were in the same situation!),

¹⁷ *Minutes No 31* of the meeting of 21 Dec. 1857 of the ad hoc Assembly of Moldavia, AD VI/1, published by Dimitrie A. Studza and C. Colescu-Vartic, București, 1896, p. 496-497.

¹⁸ *Minutes No 18* of the meeting of 14 Dec. 1857 of the ad hoc Assembly of Moldavia, AD, VI/1, p. 406.

¹⁹ *Primirea de anul nou de către Căimăcamia Moldovei*, Iași, 1/13 Jan. 1859, AD, VIII, published by Dimitrie A. Sturdza and J. J. Skupiewski, București, 1900, p. 224-225.

²⁰ To see Mihai Cojocariu, *Partida Națională și constituirea statului român (1856-1859)*, Ed. Universității Al. I. Cuza", Iași, 1995, *passim*, possibly consulting *the index*, voice Panu. For the "banquet" in question, see AD, III, published by Dimitrie A. Sturdza and Dimitrie C. Sturdza, București, 1889, p. 497-501.

Panu returned after this issue was sorted out, being elected deputy of Iași in the historic assembly in the autumn of 1857²¹.

Moreover, he is appointed secretary of the ad hoc Assembly and, not by chance, *secretary of the Clergy Committee* (we remind the reader that the work was carried out either in plenary or in the five committees corresponding to the electoral colleges: clergy, large landowners, small landowners, townspeople and the peasants who worked their landlords' lands). The president of the said Committee was the bishop *in partibus* Filaret Scriban, rector (at that time suspended from office!) of the Seminary of Socola. The bishop, as well as his elder brother, Neofit, archimandrite at the time - but this is true for all the clergymen of the Assembly - were left with an exceptionally positive memory of Anastasie Panu, who left this world too soon (1867)²².

In the ad-hoc Assembly, Panu had his own "pressure group", made up of clerics and 2-3 other lay deputies, whom we see voting as a bloc, according to the leader's "position", the numerous "motions" and conclusions to the "string of issues generated", or "wishes" of the majority and always adopting a moderate position. Naturally, priority was given to issues related to the state-church relationship (freedom of heterodox cults, recognition of the position of *dominant church* for Orthodoxy, etc.).

But the moment of glory, the peak of Anastasie Panu's political career occurred in the autumn of 1858, *The Three-Kaymakam rule of Moldavia*, an interval of 77 days (between October 20, 1858 and January 5, 1859, according to the old calendar²³) in which he was effectively/fully in the position of a *real head of state*, except, of course, the formal recognition. It should be noted that this provisional government was installed under the Paris Convention of 7/19 August 1858, which adopted the solution provided by the Organic Regulations in case of vacancy of the throne - a quorum consisting of the President (Vasile Sturdza) and the Ministers of the Interior (Ștefan Catargiu) and Justice (Anastasie Panu) of the last government of former ruler Grigorie Al. Ghica. The latter reshuffled the government in June 1856, with the *express aim of leaving Moldova a*

²¹ It is in this context that *the Protest* to the European Commission, which we have already mentioned on two occasions (see *above, notes 6 and 12*), is devised.

²² See Archpriest Filaret Scriban (composed by), *Istoria bisericească a românilor pe scurtu*, published by Archpriest Iosif Bobulescu, Iași, Tipografia Adolf Bermann, 1871, p. 176: "his [Metropolitan Sofronie's] nephew Anastasie Panu", who was "on intimate terms with the author of this history"! Sofronie, on the other hand, "was a worthy shepherd"; Cuza Voda exiled him to Slatina because the vicar defended the Church from the "atheist spirit"! The bishop is only (too) slightly right!

²³ From this point onwards, we shall use *exclusively the old calendar*, because the day of January 5, 1859, which we must reach, is after that calendar.

Unionist Kaymakam rule. The most interesting "move", so to speak, was Dimitrie Ralet's appointment (who, until then, had been an *ecclesiastical vicar*!) as *full minister of Justice*. He was actually supposed to be the future kaymakam, and not the deputy, the director Anastasie Panu! But, at the time of the beginning of the work of the Kaymakam rule (October 20), Ralet was living his last days on his deathbed in his father's house in Botoșani - this martyr of the Union of the Principalities died on October 25, 1858²⁴.

From the very moment of the installation of the Three-Kaymakam Rule - as said, on October 20, 1858, Anastasie Panu was unhesitatingly placed at its head, being accepted in this position by all his colleagues in the interim government, except, of course, Ștefan Catargiu. Even Vasile Sturdza, the president of Grigorie Al. Ghica's last government, seemed - according to the insightful observation of Neculai Suțu - "overwhelmed" "by his unquestionable talent and the influence that circumstances had granted him"²⁵. Our impression is that Sturdza did not have enough energy, he seemed incapable of pursuing his own interests: he is simply a figurehead - but, after all, a good man.

Of all the ministers, the Secretary of State, Vasile Alecsandri, was probably in the most accomplished period of his political career. But he was never part of Anastasie Panu's political game. When Alecsandri had the chance to be nominated as the candidate of the National Party for the throne of Moldavia, he was in fact *alone*, he had no supporters among his cabinet colleagues - this is one of the explanations for his failure²⁶. Things are quite different with Al. I. Cuza, the ataman replacement, in fact the commander of the Moldovan Militia: he is "pushed" to the same throne by a manoeuvre - to which we shall return! - conceived and executed by this capable and versatile political man who was Anastasie Panu! The other ministers (Gh. Cuciureanu, Gh. Dulcescu, Panaite Donici, even Ioan Al. Cantacuzino "Zizin") had neither the ability, nor the prestige, nor the political support/backup to challenge Anastasie Panu's position in the least.

²⁴ See Mihai Cojocariu, *Două personalități botoșănene în contextul Unirii de la 1859, in Local și național la 100 de ani de la Marea Unire. Reflecții botoșănene*, Coordinators: Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu, Dănuț Huțu, Ed. Argonaut, Cluj-Napoca, 2019, p. 89-105 (1. *O „campionă” a vieții mondene: Didița Mavrocordat*, p. 89-94; 2. *Un martir al Unirii Principatelor: Dimitrie Ralet*, p. 94-105; see, especially, p. 94-95).

²⁵ *Memoriile Principelui...*, p. 310. Panu was, moreover, 'the champion of liberal ideas and backed by a prestigious popularity'.

²⁶ See Mihai Cojocariu, *Alt candidat la tronul Moldovei, spre 1859: Vasile Alecsandri, în Clio în oglindiri de sine. Academicianului Alexaxandru Zub: omagiu*, Volume edited by Gheorghe Cliveti, Ed. Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 2014, p. 549-566.

Therefore the latter - supported not only by the government, but also by a public opinion whose direction was dictated by Mihail Kogălniceanu, through "Steaua Dunării", ! - was able to manoeuvre unhindered, thus becoming the architect of some sensational 'tactical coups'.

Anastasie Panu did not agree that the three kaymakams should take over the ministries they had run under Grigorie Al. Ghica, and he advocated for a *collective leadership* (otherwise Ștefan Catargiu, who was seen from the beginning to be Mihail Sturdza's "man", *would have been given the Interior Ministry* - thus the possibility to control the elections for the Elective Assembly of Moldavia and to pave the way *for a certain candidate to the throne!*), imposing *the principle of majority in decision-making*. If Catargiu's point of view - who wanted *unanimity* - had been imposed, then it would have led to a catastrophic blockage of the "running" of public affairs. Moreover, Panu and Sturdza, on the basis of the so-called principle, appointed new administrators in the 13 counties of Moldova²⁷. In addition, the leader of the Kaymakam rule controlled, silently, *the Ministry of Justice and the Divan of Injunctions* - and thus *the files* of the deputies of the Elective Assembly and of the *candidates to the throne*. This explains the fact that only he could assure the "national" deputies, at 2 o'clock in the morning of 4 January 1859, that Alexander I. Cuza met the conditions of eligibility to the throne of Moldavia!!

Afterwards, Panu - together with the Secretary of State (Foreign Minister) Alecsandri - proclaimed the freedom of the press, by reinstating the *Press Law* of May 1856, suspended at the request (which came from within!) of the Porte, by kaymakam Toderiță-Balș, in September of the same year: this was meant to allow, in particular, the reappearance of "Steaua Dunării" and a formidable press campaign in favour of the National Party²⁸.

One of Anastasiy Panu's main concerns was the strengthening and assertion of the country's autonomy, most strikingly visible in the *conflict with the Porte's special envoy, Afif Bei* - matter worth exploring in more depth.

²⁷ One of those dismissed was Ghiță Căliman, the administrator of Iași, who refused to hand over his post and was arrested. Iordache Pruncu, a director in the Ministry of the Interior, also opposed the dismissal and was replaced by Alecu Teriachiu. Even some ministers in the former Vogoride government - among them the "emflamed separatist" Panait Balș - demanded reinstatement to their previous positions. Acc. to Mihai Cojocariu, *Partida ...*, p. 196. Interesting specimen of a man, that Ghiță Căliman: he became the perpetual "shadow", the faithful puppy of Cuza until the death of the former master!

²⁸ See the excellent work by Liviu Iulian Roman, *Presa din Moldova și problematica unirii Principatelor (1855-1858)*, Ed. Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 2014, especially Chapter IV, *Studiu de caz: "Steaua Dunării" (1855-1858)*, p. 417 and the next.

That Turk was, at the time of his arrival in Iași (18 October 1858), as we can see from the letter of recommendation of the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha, "Grand Chancellor of the Imperial Divan and official of the first degree of the Empire". *His mission, expressly stated in the said letter*, was to transmit to the capital of Moldavia "the Hatti-sheriff in accordance with the stipulations of the Convention of 7 August 1858 and intended to promulgate the provisions contained in that Convention, relative to the fundamental organisation of the two Principalities", as well as "the Imperial Edict of installation of the Three Principalities"²⁹. This, we reiterate, was *his official mission* indicated by Aali Pasha, but, in reality, Afif stayed in Iași for more than two months, assuming the position of adviser/instigator of the "conservative party" (in fact, the separatist party of the time of the Kaymakam rules of Balș and Vogoride), which strove to push the former ruler Mihail Sturdza to the throne. Inevitably, the imperial envoy got into a serious conflict with the "nationalists", whose leader was, until the election of the new ruler, Anastasie Panu, seconded by the kaymakams Vasile Sturdza and I. A. Cantacuzino (Zizin, Ștefan Catargiu's replacement, who became a brother of the cross/crescent with Afif Bei), the other members of the provisional government as well as the old Unionist staff, from which Mihail Kogălniceanu could not be absent, the one who conducted, as said before, not a press campaign, but a war campaign in the "Steaua Dunării". But let's return to our topic! Received with military honours right from the Socola barrier, Afif was led by "a guard of honour" to the residence that had been prepared for him, "Logothete Milu's house", as "Gazeta de Moldova" informs us, on Ulița Măjilor, the current building of the "Octav Băncilă" High School of Arts³⁰. Personally, we believe that the Turk and Neculai Millo, for he is the Milu in question, had known each other at least since the previous summer, when the latter had travelled to Istanbul, driven by the illusion that he would have a chance to the throne with Turkish support. Although always found among the separatist leaders, he was, at the same time, Victor Place's informant, the French consul and the main supporter, among the representatives of the Powers accredited in Iași, of the unionist movement. Place gave Millo a letter of recommendation to Edouard Thouvenel, the ambassador in Constantinople, because he had served him "as a spy for more than a year in the Vogoride Ministry"; he continues to do the same for him "to this day" and will continue

²⁹ Letter to the Grand Vizier, 9 Oct. 1858, in DAS, p. 503. The two documents were brought to București by Kiamil Bei, chief of protocol at the High Porte.

³⁰ Cf. "Gazeta de Moldova", no. 83 of 20 Oct. 1858; DAS, p. 503.

to do so in the future³¹ ! It is plausible to state, therefore, that Afif Bei's "whereabouts" were known to the Unionist kaymakams, through the Neculai Millo -Victor Place "channel", *before they were made public*.

In fact, Afif, apparently sent to Iași only on a protocol mission (as the bearer of the mentioned documents), was undoubtedly authorized to stay here *indefinitely*, to serve the interests of Turkey and the "conservative party". Actually, around the beginning of November, a group of nobles asked Aali Pasha for *the support of the Porte* in order to put an end to the "anarchy" caused by the Kaymakam rule³². Perhaps the very next day (9 November), Ștefan Catargiu recognised Afif Bei's *official position* - *to communicate on behalf of the Porte* - as well as the right of intervention of the Suzerain Power, in the cases provided for by articles 8 ("the restoration of order, should it be compromised") and 9 ("Should the immunity of the Principalities be violated") of the Paris Convention³³. Besides, on 17 November, the Kaymakam received a telegraphic message from Fuad Pasha, then Foreign Minister: "Afif Bei is instructed by the High Porte to send you communications on behalf of the Ottoman government. You are invited to comply with them"³⁴. It is most obvious that *Afif Bei* was intended to be the instrument of the Turkish interference in the confrontation in Moldova !

The latter, who came to Iași accompanied by a whole retinue, including the secretaries Adossides and Costan, as the bearer of the two documents mentioned before, (however, in the case of the edict of the installation of the Kaymakam Rule, Place noticed a "difference" between the Turkish and Romanian text, on the one hand, and the French one - the original! - on the other hand: in the first two the kaymakams are named *with their functions*, in the second *with their*

³¹ Victor Place to Edouard Thouvenel, [Iași], 4 July [1858], in *Documente privind Unirea Principatelor* (hereafter cited as DUP), VI, *Corespondență diplomatică franceză*, Collection of Documents, Introduction, Regeste and Index by Grigore Chiriță, Valentina Costake, Emilia Poștăriță, [București, 1980], p. 156. It is clear that the ambassador reproached the consul for sending Millo to him!

³² See the supplication attached to the report of Rudold Oskar, knight of Gödel Lannoy, Austrian consul in Iași, to the foreign minister Karl-Ferdinand Count Buol von Schauenstein, Iași, 8 Nov. 1858, in DUP, II, *Rapoartele consulatului Austriei din Iași (1856-1859)*, edited by Dan Berindei, București, 1859, p. 593-594.

³³ Șt. Catargiu to Afif Bei, 9 Nov. 1858, appendix to Gödel Lannoy's report to Buol, 11 Nov. 1858, p. 396. Articles 8 and 9 of the Paris Convention in DAS, pp. 601-602

³⁴ The text of the deposition is inserted in the *Procesul verbal nr. 17 din 18 nov. 1858* of the Kaymakam Rule of Moldavia, AD, VII, published by Ghenadie Petrescu, Dimitrie A. Sturdza and Dimitrie C. Sturdza, București, 1892, p. 854.

*titles*³⁵), quickly came into conflict with Anastasie Panu and Vasile Sturdza, and the "whole rebellious party"³⁶ immediately rallied behind him. The reaction of the two kaymakams was prompt: they only recognized Afif as a "guest"³⁷, not allowing him to use the Moldovan telegraph to send *encrypted* messages³⁸ (incidentally, the Kaymakams had previously dismissed the head of the telegraph, an Austrian, Striegel³⁹) and, in fact, not taking his "communications" into account in any way, as long as they were not given *in writing*. Moreover, the Kaymakams dismissed Ioan Fotiade⁴⁰, Moldova's chief of staff in Istanbul (the fact turned out to be "illegal" and was immediately speculated by the Turks!) and ordered the administrators of Corvurlui, Putna, Bacău, Neamț, Suceava, Dorohoi, Botoșani and Ismail that, in case of the appearance of a new Turkish "envoy", they would apply article 10 of the "treaty" concluded by Vasile Lupu with Sultan Mehmed IV, in 1634: Turks coming with letters from the High Porte *will not cross the Danube*, they will stop on the opposite bank, giving the

³⁵ V. Place's address to the Moldavian Kaymakam Office, 19 Oct, 1858, AD, VII, p. 586. The explanation for this only apparent "mistake"/"slip-up" is Ștefan Caragiu's desire - and the desire of the men behind him - to keep control, as mentioned above, of the Ministry of Interior in view of the elections for the Elective Assembly and, later, the ruler. Panu and Sturdza supported - even under the condition of the "strike" and then separation from Ștefan Catargiu - the *collective* authority of the Kaymakam rule, in which decisions, as has been said before, would be taken *by majority*. They had, from the start, a score of 2 to 1! A strikingly similar case is the two versions of the *Memorandum concerning the Kaymakam Rule of Moldavia* drawn up by the representatives of the Guarantor Powers in Constantinople: on the one hand, the original in French, dated 16 Nov. 1858; on the other hand, the "version" sent to Iași, by *telegraphic dispatch*, by the Porte, on 18 Nov. The two texts have been published in two columns for comparison in AD, VII, p. 774-777 and DAS, p. 573-576. Obviously, the version transmitted by the Porte greatly exaggerates the alleged "unruly" behaviour of the Kaymakam Rule!

³⁶ *Petițiunea moldovenilor către Căimăcămie (Petition of the Moldavians to the Kaymakam office)*, 23 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, pp. 1007-1008 ("illustrious person [Afif!] to be recalled"); *Address of the Kaymakams of Moldavia to the representatives of the Guarantor Powers in Constantinople*, 14 Dec. 1858; AD, VII, p. 1339-1343 and DAS, p. 584-588 (the Porte has no right to appoint "agents" in Iași, etc.).

³⁷ V. Sturdza and A. Panu's *Address* to Alexandre Walewski, 3 Dec. 1858; AD, VII, pp. 1174-1179 and DAS, pp. 563-567.

³⁸ See *Memoriul lămuritor* of 19 Oct. 1858 by V. Alecsandri; AD, VII, p. 1084-1093 and DAS, p. 549-556.

³⁹ Cf. Gödel Lannoy to Buol, Iași, 1 Nov. 1858, DUP, II, pp. 385-386.

⁴⁰ *Telegraphic dispatch* from the State Secretary Office to Ioan Fotiade, 5 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, p. 764. Fotiade was Mihail Sturdza and Nicolae Conachi-Vogoride's brother-in-law. He was also Lascăr Cantacuzino Pașcanu's brother-in-law, but the latter had divorced another daughter of Ștefan Vogoride, Haricleea.

papers in the hand of the "governor" (burgrave!) of Galați; the answers will be given in the same manner! So let them comply, and all "honours" and "facilities" will be given to the respective envoy "on the opposite shore of the country", "where he shall remain"⁴¹ !!!

In the meantime, Ștefan Catargiu - the former leader of the National Party, who had demanded, in the name of the "frightened peasantry", the restoration of the "trampled" firman: in fact, he had asked for external intervention⁴² - was forbidden to send telegrams to the Porte, and was finally replaced by Ioan A. Cantacuzino (Zizin).

The essence of the conflict between the kaymakams - from which, thanks to the courage of the provisional government, the country's autonomy emerged much strengthened and practically completely recognised - came as a result, as Alecsandri explained to Lord Bulwer, of the fact that Moldova had "patiently suffered the vogoridisms that had cheered up so much of Europe", and was also due to its "guests", "the agent of Austria and Afif Bei". They pushed Catargiu into "occult" combinations, so that the fight was waged between a "government that walks the path of legality" and "an old nobleman who serves as a blind instrument to the machinations of Turkey and Austria"⁴³. In December Alecsandri knew that behind Catargiu stood Mihail Sturdza, supported by Turkey: "The plan of this old bandit is to have the entire government changed"; a similar action was undertaken in Constantinople, where Baragnon (Pierre Baragnon, former French secretary of Nicolae Conache-Vogoride, the separatist kaymakam) was authorized "to make *all kinds of promises*" in his name⁴⁴. The victory of the "Nationals" in that conflict was possible, on the one hand, thanks to *the collective guarantee* (the Paris Convention, as the same Alecsandri declared in the Elective Assembly - fact that was actually understood by almost

⁴¹ *Circulara nr. 72* of the Moldavian Kaymakam Office, 23 Dec. 1858, AD, VIII, p. 126, sub. ns.

⁴² See *Protestația lui Șt. Catargiu în contra colegilor săi, adresată Marelui Vizir*, 3 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, p. 732-733. In his *second letter* to his kaymakam colleagues (5 Nov.), Catargiu declares that he 'remains *in expectation and complete reserve until the reception of the high commands*'; AD, VII, p. 759, our emphasis.

⁴³ V. Alecsandri (Secretary of State) to Henry Lytton Bulwer (British Ambassador to Istanbul, former Commissioner to the European Commission of Observation and Investigation), 18 Nov. 1858, in V. Alecsandri, *Opere*, VIII, *Corespondență 1834-1860*, edited edition, translations, notes and indexes by Marta Anineanu, Ed. Minerva, București, 1981, p. 350-355.

⁴⁴ V. Alecsandri to Iancu Alecsandri, 9 Dec. 1858, in V. Alecsandri, *works cited*, VIII, p. 360-363; DUP, III, *Corespondență politică (1855-1859)*, Collected documents, introductory study, summaries, notes and index by Cornelia C. Bodea, București, 1963, p. 456-459.

all our politicians - is "a wall of defence built around the United Principalities and in that wall there is no gate through which foreign interventions can pass in the future", so "protests", like the one Metropolitan Sofronie was guilty of, not to mention Ștefan Catargiu's statements, "*are destined to drown in the Danube*"⁴⁵), but, above all, thanks to the patriotism, courage and abnegation of the Moldavians themselves. Even Constantin Hurmuzachi, who had switched to the "Gregorians" and was angry with "Catilina" (Kogălniceanu!) and Alecsandri, urged, through D. A. Sturdza (secretary of the Three-Kaymakam Office), not to give "the Turk who comes with the Hatti-sheriff any money"! Let the "desire to be sent with firmans to the Principalities"⁴⁶ cease! As for Ștefan Catargiu, "Steaua Dunării" proposed "to have his "protest" written on his tombstone, "to be judged by the One above; for here, below, the whole of Moldavia judged him"⁴⁷. On the other hand, the defenders of the "rights" of the Principalities, A Panu and V. Sturdza, are due "honour and neighbourly gratitude"⁴⁸!

Another important issue, from the perspective of strengthening the autonomy and defending the national dignity by A. Panu and V. Sturdza - to whom, for the "case" we are presenting below, we must add the Secretary of State V. Alecsandri - is the so-called "*passport issue*".

It all started on October 31, 1858, when several *indigenous Jews*, with passports issued by the State Secretary Office of Moldavia, informed Minister Alecsandri, through a "collective petition", that they had been refused a visa by the Consul General, Rudolf Oskar, Knight of Gödel Lannoy, when they had presented themselves at the Austrian Agency. Alecsandri was alerted to this situation and annoyed by the complaints of the Jews, who were worried about the ruin of their

⁴⁵ Sitting of the Elective Assembly of Moldova on 2 Jan. 1859; AD, VIII, p. 235, our emphasis.

⁴⁶ C. Hurmuzachi to D. A. Sturdza, Dulcești, [5 Oct. 1858]; DUP, III, p. 429.

⁴⁷ Cf. AD, VII, p. 733-734, note 1.

⁴⁸ *The second article* of the "Steaua Dunării", no. 4 of 8 Jan. 1859; AD, VIII, p. 379. In the Elective Assembly, Kogălniceanu - supported by Iacovache, Gheorghide, P. Cazimir, Silion, C. Hurmuzachi (!), I. Radu - proposed *public thanks* to Panu and Sturdza, who, defending "the autonomy and dignity of the nation against blows and influences from within and without", "deserved from their motherland" *a medal* that would commemorate their victory! The assembly approved the "motion". See AD, VIII, p. 509.

business⁴⁹, and in a note he asked the Austrian agent for an explanation⁵⁰. His reply, dry and clear-cut, came the very next day: the *only* reason for refusing the visa was the title of the *United Principalities* on the passports⁵¹.

In his new intervention, Alecsandri is more explicit: the name of United Principalities was given by the Paris Convention, which "has been in force in the country since the day of its promulgation"; it was recognized by "the representatives of the seven Powers", therefore also by that of Austria, so that "the Imperial and Royal Agency" does not recognize, in substance, the validity of a right granted to Moldavia by "M. S. Emperor of Austria himself". Thus the Agency is guilty of harming the interests of those Jews who applied for the visa⁵². Gödel Lannoy, however, remains adamant. Although the Convention established the name of the United Principalities, it nevertheless maintained the "principle of political separation". Thus the power of the present and future Lords "could only extend to one principality". And he, Gödel, is accredited "to the government of the Principality of Moldavia"⁵³. Even after the Secretary of State, at the request of the Kaymakams Panu and Sturdza, had gone to the Agency to settle the conflict, Gödel Lannoy maintained his position⁵⁴ - which

⁴⁹ In Moldavia, many Jews are Austrian subjects (sudites); sometimes they were used as a bargaining chip for purely political purposes. The Nazi-Czarian agent in Iași also had a number of Sudeten starosts in every part of Moldavia, whom he could "activate" when necessary. Let us give an example, suggestive in our opinion: when, in April 1857, the Knight Liehmann-Palmrode, Austria's representative in the European Commission, came to Iași, "he was received with coldness", and only eight Moldavians went to the barrier to welcome him, "whose names I have", the French consul Victor Place reported; however, in compensation, the commissioner was awaited by "the Jewish plebs", protected by Austria and whom "the agency's captains led before him". See V. Place to Alexandre Walewski, 10 Apr. 1857, AD, IV, p. 388.

⁵⁰ Note by V. Alecsandri to Gödel Lannoy, 31 Oct. 1858, AD, VII, p. 679; DAS, p. 556.

⁵¹ Note from Gödel Lannoy to Alecsandri, 1 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, p. 698-699; the next day, the consul also informs his superior in Vienna, Minister Count Buol von Schauenstein, of this refusal; in addition, *in București, the title United Principalities is not put on the passports* (but there, we add, the Kaymakam rule is a completely different matter!). See DUP, II, p. 386 (ciphered dispatch).

⁵² Note by V. Alecsandri to Gödel Lannoy, 3 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, pp. 730-731; DAS, pp. 557-558.

⁵³ Note from Gödel Lannoy to the State Secretary Office of Moldavia, 4 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, pp. 753-754; DAS, p. 558. See also Gödel Lannoy to Buol, 6 Nov. 1858, 11.15 p.m., ciphered dispatch, DUP, II, p. 290.

⁵⁴ Gödel Lannoy to Boul, 6 Nov. 1858, DUP, II, pp. 390-391. In addition, the agent gave detailed instructions about the 'business' of the passports to the starosts in the territory and to the Austrian consul in Galați.

was essentially Austria's desperate effort to prevent the formation of a Romanian nation state.

As a result, on the same day of November 6, 1858, the decree of the Kaymakam Office of Moldavia was sent to the Ministry of Justice, "instructing" "all courts" that, "in the future, judicial acts" should bear the "title" of "United Principalities. The Kaymakam Office of Moldavia"⁵⁵. Only three days later, the Kaymakam office adopted, by decree, *a new seal* (stamp!) for the use of the "various" administrative and judicial authorities, with the same title of United Principalities⁵⁶.

Inevitably, this led to a blockage of communications with the Home Office Agency, as official letters from the provisional government were returned by Gödel Lannoy unopened⁵⁷. It is fair to say that we do not know, for want of a clarifying paper, when the conflict ended: we only suspect that at some point the Agency gave in, no doubt following an order from Vienna.

So the issue was overwhelmingly a political one and only in a subsidiary way can it be related to the status of indigenous Jews⁵⁸. Under no circumstances does

⁵⁵ See DAS, p. 559.

⁵⁶ *Decree* no. 26 of the Kaymakam Office of Moldavia to the Extraordinary Administrative Council, 9 Nov. 1858, AD, VII, p. 797. Also there and a facsimile of the nine seals.

⁵⁷ On 12 Nov. 1858, Lannoy requests instructions from Count Buol on how to proceed further. He also adds that Ștefan Catargiu has told him that he does not agree with the title "United Principalities". Cf. AD, II, p. 397.

⁵⁸ I recently came across an article by Elias Schwarzfeld, *În chestia pașapoartelor. Episod din istoria Evreilor Moldoveni*, which appeared in a publication more than a century ago (from "Egalitatea", Year XXIII, 1912, no. 22, Friday, 8 June, p. 169-170), which Miss Maria Mădălina Irimia kindly sent me, and I thank her for this.

Schwarzfeld was prompted to write the article by the "new regulation on passports, intended to give a new lease of life to Romanian Jews" - of 1912, we understand, but we have no knowledge of its contents -, wishing to show how, in the past, in October-November 1858, the free foreign Jews, who had no recognised citizenship, were nevertheless issued passports, and *were implicitly recognised as citizens of the land/earthlings*. At that time, during the Three-Kaymakam Rule of Moldavia, a Romanian minister, "an illustrious name", defended the Jews, "also on the issue of some passports", relying precisely on "their quality of citizens of the land". It was "the great poet Vasile Alecsandri, *the anti-Semite, who took every opportunity - no other than him, who was of Jewish descent - to strike at the Jews, who actually defended them*". Alecsandri made this gesture with "*great, heart-rending pain*", because "the battle was being fought for the greatness of the country of Moldavia and the United Principalities" (emphasis added).

These claims are, at least some of them, either exaggerations or not in line with reality. So are Alecsandri's soul experiences (heartbreaks, etc.), which we have no way of knowing. Then the insinuations about his alleged Jewish ancestry and, consequently, the transformation of the poet into a *renegade* (the traitor hides his treachery, the renegade boasts of it!) have

the issue of a Moldavian passport to an "earthling" Jew imply the granting of civil and political rights to him, reserved, by the same Paris Convention, only to Christians of any denomination recognised as legal⁵⁹. On the other hand, as Foreign Minister in the government of the Three-Kaymakam Rule, Alecsandri absolutely lived up to expectations, even if the major decisions were taken by the tandem A. Panu-V. Sturdza: possibly the high point of his political career. And this was because he analysed and tried to solve the whole problem exclusively through the prism of national interests. It was obviously this national interest, the state reason, that forced Alecsandri to support the Jewish petitioners on the issue of the passports.

As for the elections for the Elective Assembly, Anastasie Panu organized/conducted them in the spirit of the time, i.e. biased. His role in the nomination of Alexandru I. Cuza as candidate of the National Party and, consequently, his election as ruler of Moldavia was essential, as we have endeavoured to demonstrate in a study already published⁶⁰ - this is also the reason why we do not think it appropriate to return to it in the present paper. Let us just say that, in our opinion, Cuza's refusal to execute the *Panu Plan* for the "revolutionary" achievement of the Union of the Principalities, even after its rejection by France, may be a possible explanation for the cooling of the relationship between the two, especially on the former Kaymakam's part. And this even despite the fact that he - Anastasie Panu - was entrusted by the ruler with the formation of the first government after the election of 5 January 1858

definitely nothing to do with the "trouble" of October-November 1858. Moreover, there was no anti-Jewish connotation, no "defence" or, on the contrary, persecution of *indigenous* Jews (the latter attribute appears in French texts of the time, "translated" exactly into Romanian by D. A. Sturdza - at that time secretary of the Three-Kaymakam Office - in 1911; in our opinion, *indigenous* and *earthling* are not entirely synonymous notions).

And speaking of "Alecsandri the anti-Semite", it seems to us that the term is not entirely appropriate, as, on the other hand, it is used too lightly. As far as we know, the notion/concept of *antisemitism* was "invented"/launched by a German, Wilhelm Marr, in 1879 (as in *Encyclopedia of Judaism*, 2nd edition, coordinated by Geoffrey Wigoder, translated by: Radu Lupan and George Weiner, București, Hasefer, 2016, *sub voce*, p. 50), so the word did not exist in 1858; people at that time judged/qualified attitudes towards Jews in other words. Then, the political man Alecsandri should not be confused with the literary man Alecsandri!

⁵⁹ See, for a broader problematic, Mihai Cojocariu, "*Problema evreiască*" în contextul luptei pentru unirea Principatelor, in M. Cojocariu, *Zimbrul și Vulturul. Cercetări privitoare la unirea Principatelor*, Ed. Universității "Al. I. Cuza", Iași, 2010, p. 93-107.

⁶⁰ Mihai Cojocariu, *Din istoria unei nopți: Iași, în 3 spre 4 ianuarie 1859*, în vol. *160 de ani de la Unirea Principatelor: oameni, fapte și idei din domnia lui Alexandru Ioan Cuza*, Editors: Petronel Zahariuc, Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu, Ed. Universității "Al. I. Cuza", Iași, 2020, p. 15-36.

in Iași - enterprise in which he failed, as most of the personalities he turned to refused him without much ado. There was, however, a government of Moldavia presided over by Anastasie Panu between January and October 1861, but this time, at least in Neculai Suțu's opinion, he failed to live up to the expectations⁶¹. So, to formulate a conclusion, the Moldavian Kaymakam rule - *headed by Anastasie Panu*, from the autumn of 1858 and the beginning of the following year, described by the "Steaua Dunării" as "the most patriotic government we could ever have"⁶², gained a historical merit because it did not only claim autonomy or "national rights", nor only uttered "wishes" - but also *consecrated them through an effective exercise*. Across the Milcov, C. A. Roseti made a statement in much the same spirit: on leaving the government, they - *Anastasie Panu and Vasile Sturdza* - "left traces there *that will never be erased and on which any government will be obliged in the future to tread*"; because they are *the only ones* who, "for hundreds of years in our countries", "have known how to hold the banner of autonomy and national dignity high in their hands "⁶³ ! Unfortunately, as we mentioned before, these two are almost completely forgotten nowadays.

⁶¹ *Memoriile Principelui ...*, p. 321.

⁶² As in *Reacția în agonie*, in "Steaua Dunării", no. 99 of 15 Dec. 1858; AD, VII, p. 1346.

⁶³ C. A. Rosetti, *Trecut și viitor*, in "Românul", no. 2 of 8 Jan. 1859; AD, VIII, p. 396.