

The Founding of the Cluj School of History, 1919–1922

PAUL E. MICHELSON

*“For a day of synthesis,
one needs years of analysis.”
(Fustel de Coulanges)*

Paul E. Michelson

is distinguished professor at Huntington University and is the president of the Society for Romanian Studies. His interests include Romanian historiography, 19th–20th century Romanian development, and the history of Modern Europe. Among his publications are **Romanian Politics, 1859–1871: From Prince Cuza to Prince Carol** (1998), and “Romania (History),” in **Encyclopedia of East Europe: From the Congress of Vienna to the Fall of Communism**, ed. Richard Frucht (2000).

Introduction

THE YEAR 1920 saw the founding of one of the premier Romanian academic institutions, the Institute of National History at the University of Cluj. Over the next quarter of a century, the Institute played a key role in both Romanian culture and the study of the Romanian past.¹ The interwar period is now recognized as a pivotal era in Romanian historiography.² Owing to the unification of Transylvania, Bukovina, and Bessarabia with the pre-war Romanian Kingdom as a result of the Great War, Romanian scholars for the first time in the modern era were able to mobilize their intellectual resources in a coherent fashion toward mostly academic ends. The ex-

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Fifth International Congress on Romanian Studies, Constanța, Romania, June 25–28, 2007. My thanks to Șerban Papacostea, Stelian Mândruț, Toader Nicoară, Ovidiu Cristea, and Victor Neumann—among others—for a number of helpful questions, comments, and disagreements shared in the discussion that followed.

hilaration produced by national unity and the sense of being part of a new generation energized Romanian intellectuals.³ This contributed to the coming of age of historical scholarship in Romania, as demonstrated by the number and quality of substantial monographs on a wide variety of subjects, by the emergence of numerous historical schools,⁴ institutes, and journals, and by the appearance of major scholarly syntheses of Romanian history as a whole.

During the period between 1880 and 1914, when modern Romanian historiography was emerging,⁵ Transylvania was not part of the independent Romanian Kingdom. The focus of the Romanian elite in Transylvania was on coping with ever increasing Magyar chauvinism. This gave scholarship in the region a primarily militant and defensive emphasis.⁶ In short, the research agenda for Transylvanian Romanian historians was in effect dictated by others and more by political than academic concerns. This meant that considerable attention and effort were often devoted to historical problems of less than primary importance.⁷

In addition, the abolition of Transylvanian autonomy in 1867 through the *Ausgleich* not only signaled the beginning of official Magyarization schemes in education, culture, and elsewhere; it also meant the transporting of major archival resources out of Transylvania to Budapest, where they were much less accessible.⁸ This was a significant impediment to the development of Transylvanian Romanian historical scholarship, particularly for the exploration of non-event oriented historical work: the study of political institutions, social and economic history, and the like.⁹

To all of this was added the problem of semi-interneccine debate between competing church loyalties among the Romanians, that is, between the Romanian Orthodox and the Romanian Greek-Catholics, an important difficulty because of the key role played by the church and by church history in the cultural life of Transylvania.¹⁰ Theological conflicts (to which can be added debates between clerical and lay historians) were a further impediment to the professionalization of history in Transylvania.¹¹

And, since there were no Romanian universities in pre-World War I Transylvania apart from the theological seminaries at Sibiu and Blaj, the opportunities for Romanian historians to affirm themselves academically were correspondingly limited. The Royal Francis Joseph University of Kolozsvár (hereafter the Hungarian University of Cluj) was founded in 1872, eventually becoming the second largest institution of higher learning in Hungary.¹² The university was “conceived of as markedly Hungarian, presenting the local ethnic minorities with the chance of upward social mobility by and large via a change in cultural and national loyalty in favor of the Magyar element.”¹³ Interestingly, nearly the same number of Romanian students attended the less-deliberately Magyarizing University of Budapest as they did the Hungarian University of Cluj. In fact, “the majori-

ty of the Transylvanian intelligentsia of the Dualist period was formed in institutions of higher learning outside of their native region.”¹⁴

Two courses of action were generally open to Romanian scholars: emigration to the Romanian kingdom or militant advocacy within the Habsburg dualist system as a “philosopher-patriot,” the Southeast European figure ably described by Alexandru Duțu.¹⁵ The number who chose the former path was significant: Ioan Bogdan (1864–1919), one of the founders of modern critical historiography in Romania, was a Transylvanian who chose to leave his home province for university education at Jassy and then a highly successful career at the University of Bucharest. Others included Ion Bianu (1856–1935; librarian of the Romanian Academy), Ioan Ursu (1875–1925; professor at Jassy until 1919, then Cluj, 1919–1923 and Bucharest, 1923–1925), Alexandru Lapedatu (1876–1954; with posts at the Romanian Academy Library and on two historical monuments commissions), and Ilie Minea (1881–1943; soon to be professor of history and leading light of historical studies in interwar Jassy).

National militancy was the route taken by Augustin Bunea (1857–1909), Ioan Lupaș (1880–1967), and Silviu Dragomir (1888–1962), all of whom who stayed in Transylvania. It is notable that their work took place within the context of professionalism and the limited opportunities open to them: Bunea as a professor at Blaj and then principal advisor to the Greek-Catholic bishop (his premature death was a great loss to Greek-Catholic scholarship); Lupaș and Dragomir as professors at the Romanian Orthodox Theological Institute in Sibiu, both were also Orthodox priests.

Thus, it should come as no surprise that Romanian historiography in Transylvania remained for a longer period of time tributary to the activist currents of Enlightenment and Romantic historical perspectives than it did in the Romanian kingdom.¹⁶ As Ion Moga noted in 1945: “A Transylvanian Romanian historiography . . . existed, but it was in too great a measure dominated by the political struggles of the Romanians for rights and liberty.”¹⁷

The Founding of the Cluj School of History, 1919–1922

THE YEARS immediately following World War I were, as one might expect, a period of painful and difficult adjustment, recuperation, and building. For many, the Union of 1918 was the culmination of a long journey: as Vasile Pârvan wrote in 1919, “The war which we carried out with such sacrifice for national union has led, in the end, after such suffering, to the desired result. The material and spiritual crisis through which we have passed should be an impetus for our activity.”¹⁸

However, it was one thing to achieve national unity; it was another to build a new society and culture on the foundations of that state. Romanian intellectual leaders recognized that the task of integrating the somewhat diversified cultural heritages and traditions created by centuries of separate development lay ahead of them. At the same time, the new institutions and organizations that had to come out of Romania's changed conditions faced the challenge of gaining credibility and respect from the larger European world emerging under the purview of the League of Nations.

Though the new Romania opened toward tantalizing new horizons, the grim facts of the disorder, destruction, and sacrifices of the war had to be coped with. Romania's years of poverty and renunciation were not yet over. In the midst of these realities, the Romanianization of the Hungarian University of Cluj¹⁹ and the opening of the new Romanian University of Cluj in the fall of 1919 was seen by Romanians as a major affirmation and as a significant step toward a better future.²⁰ "The university needs to be a fortress of Romanian culture," wrote Iosif Popovici in 1919, while an early rector of the University of Cluj, Iacob Iacobovici, saw the institution as an "illuminating beacon" for all Romanians.²¹

Historians played a key role in the founding of the new university.²² In March of 1919, a noted Romanian academic, the historian Vasile Pârvan, published an essay entitled "The National University of Upper Dacia."²³ Pârvan's plea was for a whole new kind of university, not only superior to the Magyar one that had preceded it, but also to its Romanian counterparts in Bucharest and Jassy. Though Pârvan's plan was far too utopian and costly to be implemented, it provided inspiration to those who founded and led the new university in the interwar period. It also served to rally the commitment of Romanian academics to building excellence at Cluj.

In July 1919, the interim Transylvanian Ruling Council appointed a University Commission to organize the new university and to recruit a faculty and student body in time to open the 1919 fall semester at Cluj.²⁴ Included in the Commission were the Transylvanian historian Ioan Lupaş and two influential Bucharest historians, Nicolae Iorga²⁵ and Vasile Pârvan,²⁶ all three members of the Romanian Academy. Their task was accomplished in remarkably short order and on October 1, the university was proclaimed a Romanian university.²⁷

The first professors of history named at Cluj in 1919 included the following: Ancient Romanian History: Al. Lapedatu, professor²⁸; Recent Romanian History and the History of Transylvania: Ioan Lupaş, professor²⁹; Ancient History: Emil Panaitescu, professor; History of Art: Coriolan Petranu, professor³⁰; South-East European History: Silviu Dragomir, professor;³¹ Institute of World History: Ioan Ursu, Professor³²; Byzantine Studies: Nicolae Bănescu, professor³³; Archaeology: Dimitru M. Teodorescu, professor. All of these left their mark on Romanian

historical scholarship. Five of them were or became members or corresponding members of the Romanian Academy.³⁴

On November 3, the fall semester was opened with a spell-binding inaugural address by Vasile Pârvan (who had taken a semester's leave of absence from the University of Bucharest to teach at Cluj), a clarion call entitled "The Duty of Our Lives."³⁵ Pârvan expanded on his ideas for a "new university," a deeply spiritual institution, not the ethically bankrupt materialist one of the bourgeoisie or of the socialists, an idealistic confraternity where the "new soul" was developed and nourished, instead of a simple "factory of culture." This spiritual undertaking, Pârvan declared, was "a work of revolution, created with revolutionary means, inspired by an unselfish love for the better."³⁶

Pârvan's address was followed by programmatic statements in the inaugural lectures of Al. Lapedatu and Ioan Lupaș. Lapedatu's address, "The New Circumstances for the Development of National Historiography," was delivered to inaugurate the Chair of Ancient Romanian History on November 6, 1919.³⁷ He noted that at long last a course on "Romanian national history" could be taught west of the Carpathians. This was a direct reference to Mihail Kogălniceanu's famous 1843 history inaugural in Jassy which Lapedatu used to compare and contrast the Romanians' situation in the 19th century with that of 1919. Interestingly, Lapedatu singled out for extended quotation some of the most pronounced and florid Romantic school of history statements made by Kogălniceanu concerning the beauty and value of national history, the patriotic scope of history, and the unity of Romanian national history despite the centuries-long separate existences of the three major Romanian principalities.

By 1919, according to Lapedatu, most of the battles of Romantic historiography had been won. The nation state and national self-determination were givens. Romanian professors no longer had to fear, as Kogălniceanu did,³⁸ having their classroom voices silenced. Romanians (such as Bariș, Bunea, Păcățianu, and others) had created a vibrant historical literature, a number of creditable written syntheses of the Romanian past which would provide context and unity for the study of that past, and had produced critical editions of texts and documents. A new generation of Romanian scholars had been trained in Western universities and in methods of the new historiography and were now applying these at home. A solid foundation had been laid; now was the time for affirmation and building, especially in connection with the neglected Transylvanian past and Romanian perspectives on that past.

Lapedatu identified a variety of historical themes that needed exploration, especially dealing with political, cultural, social, and institutional history. In regard to the political history of the Romanians, historians needed to go beyond chronology to consideration of the larger context in which the Romanians lived, the

unique circumstances which confronted them geographically, and the political contributions that they had made to the region, something that tended to be ignored west of the Carpathians. Culturally, more attention needed to be given to a comparative study of the diverse influences on the Romanian people and to make the distinctive Romanian synthesis more widely known. Institutional history, that is the forms and development of administrative, judicial, and military organization, as well as the social and agrarian history of the Romanian people and the influences and connections which they had with the institutional history of others were begging to be explored. In short, the general exclusion of the Romanian majority in Transylvania from most historical study prior to 1848 needed to be rectified.

Finally, Lapedatu stressed the need for continued archival study and the publication of sources (requiring the work “of several generations”). This area had not been neglected, but there was a good deal more to do, both in Romanian and foreign archives. These desiderata firmly anchored the new school of history at Cluj in the critical tradition of Romanian historiography. And, not so coincidentally, represented a triumph of the Braşov schools approach over that of Blaj.³⁹ Sextil Puşcariu recorded in his *Memoirs* being asked “But what have you done with Blaj?” His response? “Exactly what I have done with Braşov; I chose the best.”⁴⁰

Lastly, Lapedatu emphasized that the training of historians at Cluj had to have a dual focus: the production of scholars and the creation of teachers. The education of secondary school teachers could not take second place to scholarly activity; nor should the latter be sacrificed to the former. He was confident that he, his colleagues, and his students would succeed in this venture because Transylvanian Romanians had “a capacity for culture” and a “vocation for historical and philological study.” Lapedatu concluded his lecture with a final glance at the effects on historical studies in Transylvania of the previous fifty years of Magyarization: “The scientific attitude of which we speak can only be that of an absolute respect for historical truth, whatever and however it might be.” Transylvanian Romanian historiography was not going “to ignore or deprecate the past of their neighbors as we have been ignored and depreciated in our past; we will study and appreciate this past.” Unfortunately, these noble sentiments were somewhat diminished by Lapedatu’s closing nationalist peroration concerning the “historic mission” of the Romanian people: “to be the fullest and rightful representatives of Latin civilization on the Lower Danube.”

The second address, “Historical Factors of Romanian National Life,” was delivered by Ioan Lupaş on November 11, 1919, to inaugurate his Chair on the History of Transylvania.⁴¹ Lupaş was much more the pre-war militant than Lapedatu and his language tended to be more polemic than that of his colleague.⁴²

Lupaș's address was anchored in the success, as he saw it, of the national principle in World War I. Thus, a primary task of the new University of Cluj would be to correct the mistakes of the formerly Magyar university.

However, Lupaș was in no mood to provide alibis for his Transylvanian Romanian compatriots and colleagues. "If in the past, many of our national failures, shortcomings, and imperfections were easily excusable" because of the situation that the Transylvanian Romanians found themselves in, "From here on out we can no longer invoke such excuses. We alone now bear the responsibility" for the future. Romanians, both professors and students, had important role to play both in scholarship and in teaching, teaching which had to extend to all, not just the elite. And, of course, the study of history would play a key role in all of this.

The duty of the nascent department of history at the new University of Cluj, Lupaș argued, was to graft a new branch on to the tree of national culture. In the way stood a number of severe barriers: a lack of library resources, the lack of central archives, and the lack of a historical bibliography. On the plus side, Transylvanian Romanians had been able to make noteworthy contributions before the war, working in virtual isolation under much more trying conditions. Now they could work freely and together. The most pressing need was to create an institute of national history to concentrate means, resources, and individual effort toward developing a world-class historiography in Transylvania.⁴³

This would not be a simple task, Lupaș noted, since, as Fustel de Coulanges wrote: "History is not an easy science . . . it is unendingly complex . . . *For a day of synthesis, one needs years of analysis.*" "Let us not," Lupaș stressed, "be lacking in patience, hard effort, prudence, or daring!"⁴⁴

The bulk of Lupaș's lecture was devoted to outlining what he called the seven principal historical factors in the development of the Romanian nation and Romanian national consciousness: the geographical factor, the ethnographic factor, the religious factor, the linguistic factor, the traditional factor, the juridical factor, and the moral factor. Obviously the study and analysis of these factors provided a kind of research agenda for the Chair of Transylvanian history from 1919 onward.⁴⁵ Lupaș, indeed, remained focussed on these seven factors throughout his long academic career; one can assume that his students were constantly made aware of their importance.⁴⁶

Lupaș's lecture concluded with a strongly nationalistic paean to his people, calling for "the awakening of national consciousness in every Romanian, . . . [of] the sense of indestructible solidarity." And in contrast to Lapedatu, in Lupaș's vision of the history of Transylvania, no Hungarian scholarship was recognized or even mentioned, while the Magyars appear throughout only as a negative influence on Romanian development. Unfortunately, this provides an example of the kind of "ignoring and depreciation" Lapedatu's address had called for an

end to. It was also disappointing, though less surprising, that so little was said by either speaker about the relationship of Romanian history to European and world history, or the place of Romanian history in the broader context of international development.⁴⁷

On the other hand, both lectures struck an appropriate balance between tradition and innovation, possibly a healthier one than that which would be found in Bucharest or Jassy. Though there was a stress on the traditional, chronological element of history, there was an open recognition that history was more than the story of politics.⁴⁸ And to some extent, steps were indicated that would affirm the usefulness of interdisciplinary study; something fostered both by academic organization in Cluj and the relationships between the historians, linguists, philologists, classicists, and others (such as Vasile Bogrea, Sextil Pușcariu) that seemed to exist more easily there than elsewhere in Romania.⁴⁹ Lastly, Lapedatu and Lupaș's lectures were welcome affirmations of the need for the rigorous study and application of modern, critical historical method. This, in turn, was useful both from a scholarly point of view and from a pedagogical one.

Lapedatu and Lupaș's principal appeal bore fruit almost immediately. On February 1, 1920, the official inauguration of the University of Upper Dacia (as the new Romanian University of Cluj was initially called) was held.⁵⁰ As part of the festivities, King Ferdinand gave an address which he concluded by announcing that he was creating an endowment for the establishment of an institute for the study of Romanian history.⁵¹

Lapedatu and Lupaș were named as the co-directors of the new institute, which was housed in two rooms of the central University building (one for offices and one for the library).⁵² The immediate goals of the leaders of the Institute were as follows:⁵³ to develop a comprehensive research library in Romanian history, hitherto lacking in Cluj; to compile on an ongoing basis a bibliography of Romanian history; to publish a journal and eventually other publications concerned with the history of the Romanians, particularly in the former Hungarian Kingdom and especially by younger scholars; and to stimulate historical study and public interest in history by awarding prizes, sponsoring commemorative celebrations and excursions, and supporting societies concerned with the subject interests of the institute.

How well did the Institute of National History meet these challenges? Just two years later, in 1922, the Institute was able to publish the first volume of its flagship journal, the *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională*. This impressive work boded well for the future: it spanned some 434 pages including a comprehensive index, and dealt with a broad range of subjects.

In the same volume, the fledgling institute had a good deal of success to report in connection with the four desiderata outlined in 1920: a research library of nearly 5,000 volumes and 700 periodicals had been accumulated;⁵⁴ bibliographi-

cal materials had been systematically gathered in collaboration with the University Library and the library of the Museum of the Romanian Language with a view toward publishing regular bibliographical reports⁵⁵; monetary awards had been made for two research projects, and a regular program of historical commemorations inaugurated. And, the directors noted, they could have done even more had the material means (both financial and typographical) been available.⁵⁶ The founding stage in the existence of the Institute had been completed.

Some Conclusions

THE FOUNDING of the Institute of National History at the University of Cluj was an important step in the development of Romanian historiography. What were its contributions and successes?

Its first achievement was itself: the establishment of an institute and a historiographical school to concentrate means, resources, and individuals toward the emergence of a world-class historiography in Transylvania.⁵⁷

Secondly, the Institute was able to set in motion the integration of Transylvanian history into the history of Romania generally while maintaining a number of healthy regional traditions and perspectives. This would persist into the future.⁵⁸

At the same time, it began to make important strides toward dealing with neglected areas, aspects, and types of Transylvanian history, such as social history, economic history, and institutional history—in fact, most of the areas identified by Lupaș in 1919 as “principal factors” in the Romanian past—as well as in the publication of documents and sources.⁵⁹ In addition, the Institute promoted what we would now call interdisciplinary studies, something that Sextil Pușcariu had envisioned for the University of Cluj from the start.⁶⁰

Its journal became a pace setter in Romanian historical scholarship,⁶¹ its bibliographical work was crucial to the advance of Romanian historiography and a model for others,⁶² and the numerous publications series edited by the Institute created a whole library of new and promising work.⁶³ The momentum and spirit created in the interwar period by the Institute carried on after 1945, despite the incarceration of its key leaders. And the new University of Cluj was able to furnish a very friendly and positive home for historical study.

The Institute thus gained considerable scholarly credibility for Transylvanian historians. The contributions of Institute personnel to the work of the Romanian Academy was a further indicator.⁶⁴

Members of the Institute actively participated in the Cluj University extension movement founded by Virgil Bărbat in 1924, thus fulfilling several of Pârvan’s desiderata for the new university in terms of service, national community build-

ing, and the enlightened application of scholarship.⁶⁵ They were also active in the ASTRA cultural association, both in terms of publications and leadership, and in other similar groups.

From a didactic point of view, the Institute was also very successful. The number of teachers and researchers prepared between 1919 and 1945 was nearly 400.⁶⁶ Ioan Lupaș, for one, was extremely preoccupied with pre-university education: “The basis of our national culture is and will remain the schools.”⁶⁷ The Institute also sent eight of its best and brightest abroad for advanced study.

All in all, a significant achievement, made even more impressive when one takes into account the difficulties under which the Cluj historians labored in 1919–1922. In terms of the goals and research agenda set forth in 1919–1920, the Institute’s record of success was high and constituted one of the major successes of interwar Romanian culture. Though it did not, in the end, escape from its militantist heritage, this was at least partly the fault of the times in which they had to function.⁶⁸ But much of the depressing parts of this tale transpired in the subsequent stages of the Institute’s history after 1922. It is unfortunate that the period of really “independent” development of 20th century Romania and Romanian historiography was so short.



Notes

1. On the history of the Institute, see A. Borza et al., *Institutul de Istorie Națională din Cluj-Sibiu, 1920–1945* (Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1945), especially Ioan Moga, “Contribuția membrilor Institutului de Istorie Națională la istoriografia română în primul sfert de veac (1920–1945),” 12–45; Ioachim Crăciun, “Publicațiunile Institutului de Istorie Națională din Cluj-Sibiu și colaboratorii lor de la 1920–1945: Cu o bibliografie a publicațiunilor,” 26–98; Ștefan Pascu, “Metoda de muncă științifică la Institutul de Istorie Națională din Cluj-Sibiu în primul sfert de veac (1920–1945),” 99–105, and Septimiu Martin, “Organizarea Institutului de Istorie Națională din Cluj-Sibiu în cel dintâi sfert de veac, 1920–1945,” 106–112; Ștefan Pascu, “L’École historique de Cluj pendant l’entre-deux-guerres,” in *Études d’historiographie*, ed. Lucian Boia (Bucharest: Universitatea din București, 1985), 217–226; Ioan Bolovan, ed., *Institutul de Istorie Cluj-Napoca 1920-1995* (Cluj-Napoca: Biblioteca Institutului de Istorie, 1995), especially Pompiliu Teodor, “Rolul Institutului de Istorie din Cluj în dezvoltarea istoriografiei românești,” 19–31; Vasile Pușcaș, “The Institutional Structure of the Cluj University (1919–1940),” in *University and Society: A History of Cluj Higher Education in the 20th Century*, ed. Vasile Pușcaș (Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 1999), 203–205; and an unpublished paper that the author, Stelian Mândruț, was kind enough to give me, “Istoricii clujeni, membri ai Academiei Române, cercetători și universitari în epoca interbelică,” whose scope is much wider than the title indicates.

2. I have discussed the post-World War I era in more detail in two other studies: “Inter-War Romanian Historiography in Transition: The Debut of Gh. I. Brătianu, C. C. Giurescu, P. P. Panaitescu, and the Școala Nouă, 1919–1931,” in Boia, *Études d’historiographie*, 227–240; and “The Master of Synthesis: Constantin C. Giurescu and the Coming of Age of Romanian Historiography, 1919–1947,” in *Romania Between East and West: Historical Essays in Memory of Constantin C. Giurescu*, eds. Stephen A. Fischer-Galati, Radu R. Florescu, and George R. Ursul (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1982), 23–108. The most comprehensive treatment of this era is provided by A. Zub’s two massive studies: *De la istoria critică la criticism: Istoriografia română sub semnul modernității*, revised edition (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2000), and *Istorie și istorici în România interbelică* (Iași: Junimea, 1989). See also N. Georgescu-Tistu, “Pubblicazioni storiche rumene dalla guerra in poi,” *Archivio Storico Italiano*, new ser., 7, 13 (1930): 115–136; Paul Henry, “Histoire roumaine,” *Revue Historique* 176 (1935): 486–537, and “Histoire de Roumanie,” *Revue Historique* 194 (1944): 42–65, 132–150, 233–252; P. P. Panaitescu, “Rumänische Geschichtsschreibung (1918–1942),” *Südost-Forschungen* 8 (1943): 69–109; A. Boldur, “Știința istorică română în ultimii 25 ani,” *Studii și cercetări istorice* 20 (1947): 1–96; Pompiliu Teodor, “Noi orientări în istoriografia română în deceniul trei al secolului XX,” *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Historia* 26, 2 (1981): 46–62; and Lucian Boia, *Evoluția istoriografiei române* (Bucharest: Universitatea din București, 1976).
3. See Mihai Ralea, “Misiunea unei generații” (1928) and “Misiunea generației tinere” (1930), in Mihai Ralea, *Fenomenul românesc* (Bucharest: Albatros, 1997), 114–124, 172–175; and Iuliu Hațieganu, “Generații vechi și nouă,” *Gând Românesc* 1, 1 (1933): 13–16.
4. The phrase “school” is loosely used in this paper to mean people who worked and published together on similar problems, with enough in common historiographically to foster a sense of unified purpose and direction, and who felt a strong collegial bond and *esprit* among themselves.
5. See my “The Birth of Critical Historiography in Romania: The Contributions of Ioan Bogdan, Dimitrie Onciul, and Constantin Giurescu,” *Analele Universității București: Istorie* 32 (1983): 59–76.
6. On the development of the Romanian intelligentsia in Transylvania, see Cornel Sigmirean, *Istoria formării intelectualității românești din Transilvania și Banat în epoca modernă* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2000).
7. Moga, “Contribuția,” 14.
8. See David Prodan, “Problema arhivelor românești,” *Gând Românesc* 1 (1933): 364–365, “Arhivele noastre istorice de la Budapesta,” *Gând Românesc* 2 (1934): 77–86; and “Însemnări (Problema arhivelor românești),” *Gând Românesc* 2 (1934): 364–365.
9. Moga, “Contribuția,” 14.
10. Cf. Keith Hitchins, *Orthodoxy and Nationality: Andreiu Șaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1846–1873* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 199 ff. It correspondingly played a primary role in Transylvanian historiography before the war: cf. C. C. Giurescu, “Considerații asupra istoriografiei românești în ultimii douăzeci de ani,” *Revista Istorică* 12 (1926): 167.

11. Ioan Lupaș, “Factorii istorici ai vieții naționale românești” (1919), *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 1 (1921–1922): 25–26; Moga, “Contribuția,” 13–14. Cf. Keith Hitchins, “The Cult of Nationality,” in Keith Hitchins, *The Idea of Nation: The Romanians of Transylvania, 1691–1848* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1985), 141–171.
12. For the history of the Hungarian University of Cluj, see Cornel Sigmirean, “The Cluj University (1872–1919),” in Pușcaș, ed., *University and Society*, 39–59; Zoltan Pálffy, *National Controversy in the Transylvanian Academe: The Cluj/Kolozsvár University in the First Half of the 20th Century* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2005), 51–111; and Sándor Bíró, *The Nationalities Problem in Transylvania 1867–1940: A Social History of the Romanian Minority Under Hungarian Rule, 1867–1918 and of the Hungarian Minority Under Romanian Rule, 1918–1940* (Boulder–Highland Lakes–New York: Social Science Monographs, 1992), 271 ff.
13. Pálffy, 51. Pálffy argues, in a section of his book entitled “Education and Nationalism,” 45–50, that assimilation of minorities was a wide-spread goal of liberal state builders in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, the Hungarian University of Cluj didn’t do a very good job of this since, although the Romanian population of Transylvania was an absolute majority of the total in 1910, Romanian students at Cluj in the same year totaled only 11% of the enrollment.
14. Pálffy, 87. Pálffy also notes the irony that the Hungarian University of Cluj was a wholly secular university, with no theological faculty, unlike Budapest or Vienna. Pp. 102–103.
15. Alexandru Dușu, *European Intellectual Movements and Modernization of Romanian Culture* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1981), 70 ff. Cf. A. Zub, *Biruit-au gîndul* (Iași: Junimea, 1983), passim.
16. For a survey of pre-war Transylvanian historiography, see A. Lapedatu, *Istoriografia română ardeleană în legătură cu desfășurarea vieții politice a neamului românesc de peste Carpați* (Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1923); and Ioan Lupaș, “Desvoltarea istoriografiei române din Transilvania în sec. XV–XIX,” in Ioan Lupaș, ed., *Cronicari și istorici români din Transilvania*, 2nd edition (Craiova: Scrisul Românesc, n.d. [1941]), v–xlii.
17. Moga, “Contribuția,” 13. Cf. Lapedatu, *Istoriografia*; and Lupaș, “Factorii istorici,” 25–26. Lupaș points out that much of pre-war Transylvanian Romanian historiography was spare or free time work since most of its practitioners had other jobs.
18. Vasile Pârvan, *Correspondență și acte*, ed. A. Zub (Bucharest: Minerva, 1973), Acte, No. XVIII, 325.
19. The Hungarian University of Cluj had become a notorious degree mill of dubious quality by 1914. In 1910–1911, while 4% of the students in law at the University of Budapest received degrees, 55% of those at Cluj did. Further, though Cluj awarded 10,000 degrees in its forty years of existence, according to Pálffy (79–81), not one of them went to a person (whether Hungarian, German, or Romanian) that became a public figure of any consequence.
20. For the founding of the Romanian University of Cluj in the cultural and political context of the times, see Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics and Greater Romania:*

Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918–1930 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 218–227. For details on the formation of the new University of Cluj by two prominent insiders, see Sextil Pușcariu, *Memorii*, ed. Magdalena Vulpe (Bucharest: Minerva, 1978), and Onisifor Ghibu, *Universitatea Daciei Superioare* (Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1929). For a roughly parallel West European case, see John E. Craig, *Scholarship and Nation Building: The University of Strasbourg and Alsatian Society, 1870–1939* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

21. Quoted in Vasile Pușcaș, ed., *Alma Mater Napocensis: Idealul universității moderne: Prelegeri inaugurale la Universitatea din Cluj în perioada interbelică (1919–1940)* (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Fundația Culturală Română, 1994), 11–12.
22. For the history of the University of Cluj, see Pușcaș, *University and Society*; Stelian Neagoe, *Viața universitară clujeană interbelică*, 2 vols. (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1980); Pálffy, 112 ff.; and Bíró, 579 ff. For this period especially, see Pușcaș's contributions in Pușcaș, *University and Society*, 1999, 61–283, as well as his book, *Universitate, Societate, Modernizare: Organizarea și activitatea științifică a Universității din Cluj (1919–1940)*, 2nd edition (Cluj-Napoca: Eikon, 2003), the preface to Pușcaș, *Alma Mater Napocensis*, 5–48, and his articles: “Însemnătatea și semnificația înființării Universității românești din Cluj și opinia internațională,” *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai: Historia* 25, 1 (1980): 39–63, “Proiecte de organizare a Universității din Cluj (1919),” in *Civilizație medievală și modernă românească: Studii istorice*, eds. Nicolae Edroiu, Aurel Răduțiu, and Pompiliu Teodor (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1985), 296–313; “Idealul universitar clujean interbelic,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj-Napoca* 28 (1987–1988): 407–438; and “Universitatea din Cluj în serviciul națiunii (1919–1940, Cluj–Sibiu, 1940–1944),” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie A. D. Xenopol* 25, pt. 2 (1988): 129–138.
23. Vasile Pârvan, “Universitatea națională a Daciei Superioare” (1919), reprinted in Vasile Pârvan, *Scrieri*, ed. A. Zub (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1981), 159–172. On Pârvan and Cluj, see A. Zub, *Pe urmele lui Vasile Pârvan* (Bucharest: Sport-Turism, 1983), 145 ff.
24. On the work of the Ruling Council generally, see Gheorghe Iancu, *The Ruling Council: The Integration of Transylvania into Romania, 1918–1920* (Cluj-Napoca: Center for Transylvanian Studies, Romanian Cultural Foundation, 1995). On their educational concerns, see pp. 206 ff.
25. For details, see Petre Țurlea and Stelian Mândruț, eds., *Nicolae Iorga și Universitatea din Cluj: Corespondență (1919–1940)* (Bucharest: Academia Română, 2005); and N. Iorga, *Memorii* (Bucharest: Editura Națională S. Ciornei, n.d.), 2: 230 ff. For Iorga's fear that giving the University of Cluj too much autonomy was “dangerous,” see Livezeanu, 223. There were charges that the new University would promote “regionalism” and counter-charges that Transylvania was being “colonized” by the *Regat* (Old Kingdom). The fears of “separatism” (whether real or just a pretext), resulted in a steady encroachment on the University's autonomy, which was completely extinguished by the 1930s. Pálffy, 152–153; and Pușcaș, *Universitate, Societate, Modernizare*, 339 ff.
26. Pârvan was able to apply some of his university reform ideas to the faculty of letters. Pușcaș, *University and Society*, 93.

27. Pușcariu, *Memorii*, 409–410, said that the Ruling Council quickly recognized that following “normal procedures” would have meant taking two or three years to get the job done. Instead, they cut to the chase by establishing the extraordinary commission. For the structure of the new university’s faculties dealing with history, see Ioan-Aurel Pop, “Structura învățămîntului istoriei la Universitatea din Cluj în perioadă interbelică,” *Revista de Istorie* 36, 2 (1983): 169–177. That this “takeover” was not viewed as unusual for the era, see John S. Brubaker, *A History of the Problems of Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 73.
28. On Lapedatu, see *Fraților Alexandru și Ion I. Lapedatu la împlinirea vârstei de 60 de ani* (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1936); Ioan Opreș, *Alexandru Lapedatu în cultura românească (Contribuții la cunoașterea vieții politice și culturale românești din perioada 1918–1947)* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1996); Ioan Opreș, *Al. Lapedatu și contemporanii săi* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Alabastră, 1997); and Daniela T. Sechel, “Al. Lapedatu, concepție și metodă istorică,” *Acta Musei Napocensis* 34 (1997): 111–123.
29. See *Omagiu lui Ioan Lupaș la împlinirea vârstei de 60 de ani* (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1943); Ștefan Pascu and Pompiliu Teodor, “Introducere,” in Ioan Lupaș, *Scriseri alese*, eds. Ștefan Pascu and Pompiliu Teodor (Cluj-Napoca, Dacia, 1977), 1: 7–28; and James P. Niessen, “Ioan Lupaș and the Cluj School of History Between the World Wars,” *Balkanistica* 7 (1981–1982): 78–91.
30. See Nicolae Sabău and Marius Porumb, “Coriolan Petranu (1893–1945)—cercetător al artei transilvane,” *Ars Transsilvaniae* 5 (1995): 5–12.
31. See Pompiliu Teodor, “Silviu Dragomir, istoric al revoluției din 1848,” in Silviu Dragomir, *Studii privind istoria revoluției române de la 1848*, ed. Pompiliu Teodor (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1989), 7–43; and Sorin Șipoș, *Silviu Dragomir—istoric* (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Fundația Culturală Română, 2002).
32. Cf. Ioana Ursu and Dumitru Preda, *Biografia unei conștiințe: Ioan Ursu* (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1987); and Sergiu Columbeanu, “Activitatea istoriografică a lui Ioan Ursu și lupta sa pentru unitatea națională (1875–1925),” *Revista Istorică* 298 (1975): 1711–1723.
33. Tudor Teoteoi, “Nicolae Bănescu (1878–1971) și sinteza sa de istorie bizantină,” in Nicolae Bănescu, *Istoria Imperiului Bizantin*, ed. Tudor Teoteoi (Bucharest: Anastasia, 2000), 5–27; and Petre S. Năsturel, “Bibliographie des travaux du Professeur Nicolas Bănescu,” *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 7 (1969): 9–17.
34. Source: Dorina N. Rusu, *Membrii Academiei Române 1866–1999: Dicționar*, 2nd edition (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1999). Lapedatu, corresponding member 1910, member in 1918, was vice-president of the Academy twice (1934–1935, 1938–1939), president (1935–1938), and secretary-general from 1939 to 1948; Lupaș, corresponding member 1914, member in 1916, was president of the historical section (1932–1935); Dragomir, corresponding member in 1916, member in 1928, was president of the historical section (1945–1948); Ursu was corresponding member in 1910; Bănescu, corresponding member in 1920, member 1936, vice-president of the Academy (1946–1948). For further discussion see Mândruș, “Istorici clujeni.”
35. Vasile Pârvan, “Datoria vieții noastre” (1919), published in Vasile Pârvan, *Ideii și formele istorice: Patru lecții inaugurale* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1920), 7–42.

36. Pârvan's enthusiasm was to give way by 1922 to deep disillusionment. In a letter to Marin Simionescu-Râmniceanu, he described "our moral atmosphere" as one in which "a life of perfect political and moral rectitude is an anachronism, where sincerity is an idiocy and faithfulness a crime." Pârvan, *Corespondență și acte*, letter of 25 January 1922, p. 409. Five years later, at age 44, psychologically and spiritually burned out, he was dead.
37. A. Lapedatu, "Nouă împrejurări de desvoltare ale istoriografiei naționale," *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 1 (1921–1922): 1–18.
38. And rightly so: his 1843 course was shut down after a few weeks under direct Russian pressure. On Kogălniceanu's 1843 inaugural, "Cuvânt pentru deschiderea cursului de istorie națională în Academia Mihăileană," see A. Zub, *Kogălniceanu istoric* (Iași: Junimea, 1974), 374 ff.
39. Lapedatu's adherence to the ideas of the Romanian critical school was no coincidence. He was a student of Dimitrie Onciul, one of its founders, and a collaborator with both Onciul and Ioan Bogdan on the Historical Monuments Commission (of which Lapedatu was secretary, 1904–1919) and the Romanian Historical Commission (of which he was also the secretary, 1909–1919). His interests in documents, medieval history, and text editing paralleled those of Onciul and Bogdan. See Ioachim Crăciun, *Bio-bibliografia D-lui Alexandru Lapedatu: Cu ocazia împlinirii vârstei de 60 de ani, 1876–1936* (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1936); and Opriș, *Lapedatu*, 16 ff. On the critical school, see my "Birth of Critical Historiography," *passim*.
40. Pușcariu, *Memorii*, 395. On the same page, he relates an anecdote which illustrates Pușcariu's opinion that the Blaj approach often confused scholarship with the mere reading of thick books. Cf. pp. 384–385, where Pușcariu states his conviction that the influence and tradition of the Brașov schools were critical for the formation of the new University of Cluj. Cf. Zub, *Istoria critică*, 196 ff.
41. Ioan Lupaș, "Factorii istorici ai vieții naționale românești" (1919), *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 1 (1921–1922): 19–45.
42. Small wonder, given Lupaș's pre-war persecution under the Habsburgs, which cost him his job several times and led to a stint in Szeged prison. Cf. Ioan Lupaș, "Amintiri din temnița ungurească de la Seghedin," in Ioan Lupaș, *Paralelism istoric* (Bucharest: Universul, 1937), 27–33.
43. The model here was the new University of Cluj's Institute of Speleology created in 1919 specifically to attract Emil Racoviță, the founder of biospeleology, to the university from a similar institute he had founded in France. This led to the establishment of a network of institutes in interwar Cluj, such as the Institute of Classical Studies, the Museum of the Romanian Language (despite its name, a research institute), the Institute of World History, and so forth. Cf. Pușcaș, *University and Society*, 149 ff.; and Pușcaș, *Universitate, Societate, Modernizare*, 293 ff.
44. Lupaș' mentor was Ioan Bogdan, a founder of the Romanian critical school. In addition, Bogdan and Lupaș had worked closely together in the Romanian Academy between 1910 and 1918. Both were part of the Brașov approach and critical of the Blaj approach, which Lupaș felt made the same "Romanomania" mistakes in history as they had in philology. In Lupaș's view, Bogdan did for Romanian histo-

- riography what Maiorescu did for the Romanian language. See Ioan Lupaș, “Desvoltarea istoriografiei,” passim; and two pieces reprinted in Lupaș, *Scrieri*: “Ioan Bogdan (1862–1919)” (1930), 195–202, and “Ioan Bogdan în lumina unor fragmente din corespondența sa” (1944), 203–229.
45. See Lupaș’s course-opening lecture of October 21, 1920, entitled “Individualitatea istorică a Transilvaniei,” in Ioan Lupaș, *Studii, conferințe și comunicări istorice* (Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1927), 49–72.
 46. See, for example, Lupaș’s text book on Romanian history, *Istoria Românilor pentru cursul superior*, fifteenth edition (Sibiu: Dacia Traiană, 1944), whose first chapter, pp. 9–24, is entitled “Factorii determinanți ai vieții istorice românești.” An expanded version, unfortunately affected by time and place, was delivered at the University of Tübingen during World War II, on May 27, 1942: “Die Grundlagen der rumänischen Volkseinheit,” in Ioan Lupaș, *Zur Geschichte der Rumänen: Aufsätze und Vorträge* (Sibiu: Krafft & Drotleff, 1943), 1–32.
 47. On the other hand, to be fair, their chairs were focussed directly on Ancient Romanian History (Lapedatu) and Recent Romanian History and the History of Transylvania (Lupaș). For general history from the medieval period onward there was only the Institute of World History (founded in 1921) at the University headed by Ioan Ursu, whose brief tenure at Cluj (he was transferred to Bucharest in the fall of 1923) was relatively unproductive. In addition, there was a chair of Southeast European Studies (held by Silviu Dragomir), but its focus was largely on Romanians in the Balkans. In 1924, Constantin Marinescu reinvigorated the Institute of World History, but there seems to have been little cross fertilization, possibly because Marinescu was a disciple of Nicolae Iorga, an opponent of the Critical School. See Țurlea and Mândruț, for extensive correspondence between Marinescu and Iorga. In 1927, Marinescu edited the first volume of *Mélanges d’Histoire Générale*; vol. 2 appeared only in 1938. For a bibliography of Romanian contributions to world history up to 1938, see Ioachim Crăciun, “Contributions roumaines à l’historiographie générale,” *Mélanges d’Histoire Générale* 1 (1927): 343–379; and Ioachim Crăciun, “La contribution roumaine à l’historiographie générale: Bibliographie (1927–1938),” *Mélanges d’Histoire Générale* 2 (1938): 521–562. Cluj historians also were less likely to participate in interwar international historical congresses: Lupaș was the only one from the Institute to attend one of these congresses (Zurich, 1938). Constantin Marinescu attended all four congresses; the other three from Cluj were archaeologists (E. Panaitescu, Oslo 1928 and Zurich 1938; G. Mateescu, Oslo 1928) and a historian of art (Coriolan Petranu, Warsaw 1933). This owed mainly to funding shortages, but Cluj had only 9 of 37 papers presented by Romanians (if we count Marinescu’s 1923 paper presented before he came to Cluj in 1924) or slightly less than a quarter of the total. See Lucian Boia, “Congresele internaționale de științe istorice din perioada interbelică și participarea românească,” *Revista de Istorie* 32 (1979): 703–715.
 48. Cf. Lupaș’s November 1, 1923 course-opening lecture, “Sensul și scopul istoriei,” in Ioan Lupaș, *Studii, conferințe și comunicări istorice*, 35–47.
 49. See Mândruț, “Istorici clujeni.”

50. See *Serbările pentru inaugurarea Universității din Cluj: 31 ianuarie–2 februarie 1920* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1920).
51. Text in *Serbările, 1920*, 14–17.
52. Details in Martin, “Organizarea,” 106–112. The Institute eventually acquired a substantial building on Iorga St. (now Napoca St.) in the mid-1930s, where it remains to the present.
53. Ioan Lupaș and A. Lapedatu, preface to vol. 1 of the *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* (1921–1922): vii.
54. By 1945, despite losses incurred by the peripatetic fate of the Institute during World War II, the library had reached 18,000 volumes and 314 periodicals. See Martin, “Organizarea,” 110.
55. The first of these appeared as Ioachim Crăciun and Ion Lupu, “Istoriografia română în 1921 și 1922: Repertoriu bibliografic,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 2 (1923): 405–506. This was followed by Ioachim Crăciun, “Istoriografia română în 1923 și 1924: Repertoriu bibliografic,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 3 (1924–1925): 773–988; and Ioachim Crăciun, “Istoriografia română în 1925 și 1926: Repertoriu bibliografic,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 4 (1926–1927): 481–729. Unfortunately, because of financial problems, the bibliographies were suspended with vol. 5 of the *Anuarul*. This thread was taken up by Ioachim Crăciun with the publication of the series *Bibliotheca Bibliologica*, 19 volumes, 1933–1946. See Ioachim Crăciun, “Cîteva amintiri și precizări despre începuturile bibliologiei la Cluj,” *Studia Bibliologica* 2 (1965–1966): 31–147; and Nicolae Edroiu, *Ioachim Crăciun și bibliologia românească: Studiu și bibliografia operei* (Cluj-Napoca: Philobiblon, 1994). The journal of the Muzeul Limbii Române, *Dacoromania*, had its own extensive bibliographical sections.
56. Lupaș and Lapedatu, *Anuarul* (1921–1922): viii–xii.
57. Cf. Pop, “Structura,” and Zub, *Istorie și istorici*, 179–181.
58. The bibliographical resources for this are rich: Aurel Decei, “Istoriografia română transilvană în cei douăzeci de ani de la unire,” *Gând Românesc* 7 (1939): 191–208; N. Georgescu-Tistu, “Wissenschaftliches Schaffen in Siebenbürgen im Bereiche der humanistischen Disziplinen von 1918–1940,” in *Siebenbürgen*, ed. C. C. Giurescu (Bucharest: Institutul de Istorie Națională, 1943), 2: 499–517; Moga, “Contribuția,” 12–25; and the resources given in note 3 above. For a comprehensive bibliography relating to Transylvanian scholarship, see Ioachim Crăciun, “Bibliographie de la Transylvanie roumaine, 1916–1936,” *Revue de Transylvanie* 3, 4 (1937). This was extended up to 1944 by Lucia Turc, *Bibliografia istorică a Transilvaniei (1936–1944)* (Cluj: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1998).
59. See Moga, “Contribuția,” 12 ff. for details.
60. Pușcariu, *Memorii*, 407.
61. In addition to vol. 1 (1921), the *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* included vol. 2 (1922), published in 1924; vol. 3 (1924–1925), published in 1926; vol. 4 (1926–1927), published in 1929; vol. 5 (1928–1930), published in 1930; vol. 6 (1931–1935), published in 1936; vol. 7 (1936–1938), published in 1939; vol. 8 (1939–1942), published in 1942; vol. 9 (1943–1944), published in 1944; and

vol. 10 (1945), published in 1945. Lapedatu and Lupaș were co-editors of volumes 1–8; Lupaș edited vols. 9–10, as well as a volume 11 (1946), which was printed but never distributed.

62. See Ioachim Crăciun, “Considerații despre începuturile bibliologiei la Universitatea din Cluj,” in *Probleme de bibliologie* (Bucharest, 1970), 87–120.
63. Founded in 1927, the Library of the Institute of National History eventually totaled 21 volumes. To this was added three volumes in the Historical Library ASTRA, 1928–1945; 19 volumes in the Bibliotheca Bibliologica, 1933–1946; six volumes in a historical monograph series, 1928–1945; festschriften for the Lapedatu brothers and for Lupaș, in 1936 and 1943; volume 1 of a projected *Documente Istorice Transilvane* series; and *La Transylvanie* published in 1938 under the auspices of the Romanian Academy, a book designed to present the Romanian Transylvanian story to Western audiences. There are two bibliographical accounts of the work of the Institute: Crăciun, “Publicațiunile Institutului de Istoria Națională,” in Borza et al., *Institutul*, 26–98; and Doina Dițu et al., *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională. Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie din Cluj-Napoca (1921–1981): Indice bibliografic* (Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea Cluj-Napoca/Biblioteca Centrală Universitară, 1984). For the period 1920–1930, see also Ioachim Crăciun, “Activitatea științifică la Universitatea Regele Ferdinand I din Cluj în primul deceniu 1920–1930,” in *Universitatea Regele Ferdinand I din Cluj, 1920–1930: Primul deceniu de activitate al Universității românești. Serbările jubiliare din 20 și 21 octombrie 1930* (Cluj: Cartea Românească, 1930–1933), 211–528. Publications by members of the Institute of National History are listed on pp. 389 ff. In addition, members of the Institute were deeply involved in the publication of the *Revue de Transylvanie*, 1934–1944, and the work of the Center for Research on Transylvania, 1943–1946, which developed out of the *Revue* and published 21 volumes in its Bibliotheca Rerum Transilvaniae series. See Stelian Mândruț, “*La Revue de Transylvanie et l’école d’histoire de Cluj (1934–1944)*,” *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai: Historia* 32 (1987): 65–75; “*Revue de Transylvanie, 1934–1944 (Bibliographie)*,” *Revue de Transylvanie* (1999): 195–207; and Stelian Mândruț and Liviu Ursuțiu, *Repere istoriografice: Destinul unei instituții* (Cluj-Napoca: Fundația Culturală Română, 1995). Of course these works were of uneven quality and became more and more polemical as time passed, but there was a noteworthy amount of excellent scholarship being published under increasingly stressful circumstances.
64. See Mândruț, “Istorici clujeni.”
65. See Pușcaș, *University and Society*, 236–244, and Neagoe, 1: 240 ff.
66. Ioan Lupaș, “Cuvânt de încheiere,” 114.
67. See Ioan Lupaș, *Probleme școlare* (Bucharest: Cugetarea, 1936). His interest in education is well-described by Vasile Crișan, “Ioan Lupaș (1880–1967): Gîndirea și acțiunea pedagogică,” *Repere sibiene: Studii și referate* 3 (1982): 11–76, and Eugen Lazăr, “Ioan Lupaș și conceptul de învățămînt sătesc modern,” *Repere sibiene: Studii și referate* 3 (1982): 77–88.
68. Pálffy, 151–152, argues that by 1922 the Transylvanian Romanian elite had become disillusioned with the Old Kingdom’s domination of the new Romania, with its ruthless centralization, and with its transplantation of *Regat*-style corruption across the

Carpathians. The result was a politicization of the Cluj professoriate, more or less in self defense. Between 1919 and 1929, 21 of the 80 professors at Cluj were members of the Romanian Parliament, nine had high governmental positions, and two were cabinet ministers. Coupled with activities in the heavily-political Romanian cultural associations (such as ASTRA), “more than half of the academic staff was involved in politics in one way or another.” This not only took them out of the classroom or away from their academic tasks; Transylvanian academics would be increasingly corrupted by *Regat* politics. Lord Acton would not have been surprised by this outcome. This issue is also discussed in Mândruț, “Istorici clujeni.”

Abstract

The Founding of the Cluj School of History, 1919–1922

The paper examines the main events and the context in which the Cluj School of History was established after the Great Union. The paper begins with a presentation of the historical factors that had previously influenced the local historiographical discourse, such as Magyarization policies, church divisions among the Romanians themselves, and the education system. Then comes a presentation of the actual creation of the new university, with the contribution of many leading Romanian historians, amid the hardships following the end of World War I. Attention is also given to the challenges faced by the school founders (A. Lapedatu, I. Lupaș), to their dilemmas and their choices. The conclusions present the main contributions and successes of the Institute of National History operating within the University of Cluj.

Keywords

University of Upper Dacia, Cluj School of History, Cluj Institute of National History, A. Lapedatu, I. Lupaș