

The Role of European Universities in Shaping the Romanian and South-East European Political Elites in the 19th Century

Siupiur, Elena

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Siupiur, E. (2014). The Role of European Universities in Shaping the Romanian and South-East European Political Elites in the 19th Century. *Annals of the University of Bucharest / Political science series*, 16(1), 113-128. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-397537>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

**THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES
IN SHAPING THE ROMANIAN AND SOUTH-EAST
EUROPEAN POLITICAL ELITES
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY**

ELENA SIUPIUR

Abstract (The Role of European Universities in Shaping the Romanian and South-East European Political Elites in the 19th Century): During the 19th century, the South East European countries experience a radical cultural, institutional and political change. Like throughout the rest of Europe, this change is intricately related to the university, in all its forms and expressions – higher education institution, as well as locus of forging, transmitting and reproducing ideas, cultures, university elites, and ultimately political elites. Within the Romanian space, this impact is particularly noticeable as the thousands of young people that studied abroad in European universities and returned home became not only its first intellectual and professional generations but also its reforming and modernizing elites.

Keywords: universities; political elites; 19th century; Romania; South Eastern Europe.

To clarify the meaning and purpose of the theme proposed, we first need to highlight and compare the contemporary context of Western and Central Europe, on one hand, and of South-East Europe, on the other. This “definition” of universities, conveyed in those days by the Russian tsar himself, is thus an indicative start: “... les Universités sont le principal mal (fruit immédiat de la révolution française) qui met en danger les fondements mêmes du nouveau système politique de l’Europe... Les causes de l’agitation qui règne en Allemagne, et qui, tôt ou tard, pourrait devenir un explosion, sont... les universités et les corporations qui forment un état dans le sein de l’État... animées d’un esprit de corps et de présomption héréditaires, qui ne sert qu’à égarer la jeunesse, à détourner l’esprit publique... elles sont maîtresses absolues de l’avenir d’une nation entière et nul gouvernement ne leur demande compte...”, Tsar Alexander I exclaims angrily at the meeting of the Holy Alliance in Aachen in 1818, requesting the urgent abolition of the German universities (M. de S. 1818).

A century later, Stephan d’Irsay presents with admiration the comprehensive leadership role claimed and mastered by the German intellectuals and universities of the 19th century: “... la naissance de la nouvelle

société intellectuelle de l'Allemagne s'accomplit... les foyers intellectuels remplissent les fonctions qui appartiennent en propre aux centres politiques, aux centres des initiatives sociales... Ce ne sont pas les mouvements philosophiques, pris en eux-mêmes... qui plaçaient les universités allemandes au centre de l'intérêt public et qui leur assuraient un tel prestige et une position dominante dans la société ; c'est plutôt leurs actions politique. En prenant parti sans équivoque contre l'absolutisme, en s'efforçant de rapprocher la nation de l'État, en montrant leur intelligence des besoins de la société et travaillant pour elle, les grandes écoles s'acquirent la sympathie permanente et même l'affection de l'opinion publique. Pour la première fois dans l'histoire moderne, les universités font partie intégrante de la société, qui évolue autour d'elles, et qui même, parfois, est guidée par elles" (d'Irsay 1933, 1935).

The tsar was right. Through the generations of intellectuals it sent Europe-wide, the University was becoming a danger for the autocracies. The renewal of the political and legislative ideas, the renewal of the social and intellectual structure of the political elite and the renewal of the political thought, of the idea of State and its functions in Europe and in South-Eastern Europe (Georgescu 1987) in the 19th century is strongly related to the European *University*, to the European university studies, and to the university culture.

Universities have functioned in Western and Central Europe since the 12th century. Over 75 catholic universities existed in the 15th century, and others continued to be set up until the 19th century. After the 15th century, protestant universities also thrived. Universities had thus been established in the Western world since the 12th century, beginning with Paris and Bologna, then Oxford, Cambridge, Prague, Wien, Heidelberg, Buda, Krakow, Leipzig, Göttingen, Jena, Erfurt, then Landshut-München, Brussels, Geneva, Florence, Berlin, Bonn, Rome etc. (d' Irsay 1933, 1935; Flechter 1977-1980; Müller 1990; Koch 2000; Hermes Handlexikon 1983; Wolgast 1986; Marcacci 1987; Szögi&Varga 1997).

Meanwhile in – orthodox – South Eastern Europe, there were no universities until the late 19th century. A university was founded in Athens, in independent Greece, in 1840. In 1861 the University of Iași followed, then in 1864 the University of Bucharest, while the University of Belgrad emerged in 1865 (Barriere 1961; Bottomore 1979; Charle 1994, 1996; Crozier 1995; v. Daalder 1982; Le Goff 1994; Guttsman 1963; Michels 1971; Shils 1972). Up until the 19th century, orthodox Russia did not provide any university either. The universities in Moscow, Sankt Petersburg, Kazan and then Kiev, all surfaced after 1818.

It is therefore understandable that between the 12th and the 19th century the intellectual, university, professional (theology, law, medicine, philosophy – with its seven domains), and, among these, the political elites of Western and Central Europe (including Transylvania) were mostly educated in universities. In time, university training became compulsory even for the political realm. Over the

centuries, Europe's intellectual-professional, political corps was created in universities. Universities became the main reserve for professionals in all cultural-political, confessional, administrative domains, in jurisdiction and legislation, in diplomacy and finance, economics, medicine, education, etc. (*Istoria Universităţii din Iaşi*, 1985; Balaci&Ionaşcu, 1964).

In the Romanian sphere, political elites with university training only become visible in the late 19th century. Here, the political stratum and the professional-intellectual elites were trained, in very small numbers, in Slavonic schools, and since the 18th century in the princely academies (Camariano-Cioran 1974) or with Greek tutors on the homestead. Therefore, the Romanian political strata lacked any intellectual and university education whatsoever. For the rest of the peoples in South-Eastern Europe (Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Herzegovina, Bosnia), up until the 19th century, there was simply no national or local political class, as these had been banned by the Ottoman occupation of the Balkans since the 14th and 15th centuries.

After the French Revolution, simultaneously with the political and national liberation movements in the Balkans, the process of reform or re-creation of the political classes and of the political elites is re-launched, together with the reform of the institutional system needed for a modern national state, of a European kind. This is a long-term process in the Balkans. For the better part of the 19th century, these peoples will seek the forms, the directions and the forces whereby they can realise such desiderata. The political class or elites and the institutional system are two dimensions with an essential role for the existence and type of evolution of a society. For these peoples, the 19th century in South Eastern Europe is the century dedicated either to remaking the national state (Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and – later, in the 20th century – Albania), or to the reformation and modernisation of the existing state (The Romanian Lands – The United Romanian Principalities – Romania) on one hand, and the century for connecting with the European institutional system and with its political values, on the other hand. The process is either accompanied or provoked by the remake of the elites and of the national political classes in the Balkans or by the modernization and reform of the political class and the existing elites – as in the Romanian case. The process of recovery or reform of the political elites and political class – the leading class – is simultaneous or sometimes preceded by the process of creating modern intellectuals and professional intellectual elites in universities and higher schools or colleges in Europe, elites which, throughout the 19th century, become the main reserve, *the professional and cultural fund* for reconstituting or reforming the political classes. In the 19th century, the modern intellectuality in the South East is educated exclusively in European universities (Amzăr 1940, 215-249; 1943, 21-40; Teutsch 1872, 182-192; Fabini & Teutsch, 1872: 386-416; Kotssowilis 1996; Berindei 1986, 1987; Bologna 1936; Chiorean 1994, 93-110; Cohen 1987, 36-53; Fotino 1983, 36-53;

Grimm 1981, 111-125; 1983, 475-484; 1983, 239-249; 1980, 263-276; V. Gomoiu & M. Gomoiu 1941, 488-496; Haselsteiner 1983, 294-302; Matula 1987, 155-161; Paskaleva 1987, 57-65; Todorova 1987, 65-82; Trgovcević 1987, 101-113; 1990, 35-47, 49-59; Turczynski 1959; 1961, 341-370; Triantafyllu 1983, 273-285; Tsirpanles 1983, 250-272; Zimmermann 1987, 250-255; Zub 1979, 21-40; 1984).

In this perspective, the emergence of a new *social elite* within the hierarchy of the local societies – the modern intellectual category or model – becomes one of the extremely important phenomena of the South Eastern European political history, of the Romanian history in particular, and of cultural *professionalism*, or rather of political professionalism on cultural grounds. Two are the main tendencies of this socio-professional category – *the intellectuals* – for the duration of its political evolution. The first: towards the middle of the 19th century and in its second half, this social elite begins to equal in social and political values either the single political class (the boyars) in Romania's case, or the political class and the “supra-national, imperial” elites, in the case of the other Balkan peoples. The second tendency of the intellectuals is that of assuming a *political function* by becoming intensely involved in political activities and decision-making, and being included in the leading class. Hence the interest in their identity as some of the main actors, conceptually and in terms of actualization, for two main changes in the South East European political life: the reform or reconstruction of the political class, and the reform of the institutional system. Our research concentrates on the education of groups and professional elites who acquired a new intellectual foundation and a new cultural level: humanist, economic, social, confessional, legal, military, political, etc. They contributed to the corresponding social, intellectual-professional structure, with an honorary membership in the academia. Moreover, they participated in the creation of modern society, by bringing an intellectual-cultural “luggage”, “made in Europe”, acquired in its universities and in the higher schools, as well as by the acculturation processes initiated, both as intellectual and as political acts. They can thus be regarded as a *European professional reserve* for the political level of South Eastern European societies and as a *new political force* – be it ever so “national”, but with *universal / European* background (training).

The European universities had a crucial role in training the new elites, in the universal or European education of the intellectual and political elites, in imposing them for functions and as decisive factors in the radical political reformation of the local societies.

The university gave them the know-how, the scholarship, the knowledge, professions with a practical applicability for society (*Praktische Beruf*, as the Germans would say), as well as an awareness of their own capacities as intellectuals, a mindfulness of their political responsibility towards their

countries of origin. It armed them with a sentience for their political mission towards their peoples. The 19th century is marked by this *political missionaryism* of the intellectual elites. In all, the European university of the 19th century catered for some of South Eastern Europe's most decisive intellectual and political personalities.

At the beginning of the 19th century, from this space that did not know university culture, waves of youth begin to flock towards the European universities, be these French, German, Swiss, Italian, Belgian, albeit less towards the English ones. France, Germany and Austria are the predilect destinations. After 1821 we discover waves of migration towards the European universities of the youth from all over East, South-Eastern and Central-Eastern Europe. This wave will grow and then remain stable until the Second World War, independently of the successive changes of the political situation all over Europe.

Since the beginning of the 19th century there is a fascinating circulation of the youth from these areas, towards and among different European universities, mostly German, French, Austrian, Swiss and Belgian: namely Romanian, Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian students, as well as Russian, German / Saxon / Schwab, Hungarian, Armenian and Jewish youth – with immigrant status in the Romanian principalities or in the Ottoman Empire. Likewise, our conclusions are based on careful research in the German university archives, the raw lists of names in the 19th century registers of students for the German universities (Siupiur, 1995a, 211-246; Siupiur 1995b; Siupiur 1995c, 75-95; Siupiur 1997, 299-314), corroborated with the research performed by fellow scholars in the French, Swiss, Austrian and other universities (Bengesco 1895, 1905; Amzăr 1940, 215-249; Amzăr 1943, 21-40; Stelling-Michaud 1959, 371, 380, 387; Turczynski, 1959; Zub 1979, 21-40; Zub 1984; Berindei 1986; Berindei 1987). The process of creating of the modern (national) intellectuality, very intense in the 19th century, opened, as in a trampoline effect, by means of the aforementioned “wave”, several phenomena: a) the sudden abandonment at the beginning of the 19th century of an entire linguistic teaching tradition in Slavonic and in Greek (typical for the area until the end of the 18th century), and the abandonment of the orthodox teaching space; b) entry to the German and French teaching spaces, entry to the catholic and protestant teaching spaces; c) tackling the university educational space (inexistent previously in the area – with some minor exceptions), the radical and real change of the cultural areas of influence in South Eastern Europe, and, fatally, the real and radical change of the areas of political influence for the entire 19th century and for the first half of the 20th century. Since until the second half of the 19th century there was no university in the whole of South Eastern Europe, all intellectuals with university training could only obtain in in Central and Western Europe, and are the product of the European university. By 1860 – 1880, their numbers were so large that they give the impression of a “wave”, which we find around the departments of

law, philosophy (with seminars on history, modern and classical philology, mathematics, physics, financial administration, finances, architecture, the arts), *medicine*, *political science(s)*, *Staatswissenschaft* / *accounting (kameralia)* and *theology*. These thousands of youngsters with university studies – some crowned by a PhD, some not, some unfinished – represent the completely new cultural-professional background of the South Eastern societies, the intellectual-professional elites, and become the reserve fund of the modern elites and political classes in the 19th century.

Coming back to the university training of the Romanian and South Eastern European intellectuals, we mentioned earlier they are in thousands; we meant the total number (unknown exactly until now) of youth who have gone through the European universities, which are the foundation of their education. In the 19th century Eastern European students had been enlisted in some 50 French-speaking universities in Western and Central Europe: Paris, Aix-en-Provence, Montpellier, Toulouse, Brussels, Ghent, Geneva; in fewer Italian-speaking establishments: Rome, Padova, Bologna, Naples; in English-speaking universities (in negligible numbers): Cambridge; but especially in German-speaking universities: Prague, Wien, Graz, Zürich, Berlin, Bonn, Erlangen, Freiburg, Gissen, Göttingen, Greifswald, Halle, Heidelberg, Jena, Cologne, Leipzig, Marburg, München, Tübingen, Würzburg, and others. There were 16 such universities on the current German territory, whose courses had been attended by young Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Romanians (and citizens of various nationalities from the homonymous countries of origin). South Eastern European foreign students are most frequent in French and German universities. Moreover, our research is restricted to universities, as the only establishments that could deliver PhD diplomas; very many young people from this area also sought their professional higher education in Central and Western Europe from Polytechnic Schools, Art Academies, Architecture Institutes and Construction Institutes, Military Schools, etc.

But who from South-Eastern Europe chose to study abroad, and what was it that they studied?

The Greeks went first; the high waves of Greek emigration from Austria, Germany, France, the aftermath of the Greek revolts of the beginning of the 19th century draws towards the West the young people who are sent to the European schools. They were sons of merchants, sons of priests, as well as orphans of great Greek revolutionary fighters, who were granted scholarships, first from the Greek companies working in the West, then from the independent, newly founded Greek state (Kotssowilis, 1996). Among them there were also Greeks from the Romanian Principalities, sons of rich merchants or sons of Greeks who had joined the ranks of the local nobility. Yet studying in Europe can be quite expensive; thus the wealthy parents were the first to send their progeny to these costly schools, in addition to which a quite number of

philanthropists set up scholarships for the capable young men without pecuniary resources. One among many such grant recipients, the young Bulgarian Petar Beron, an immigrant to the Principalities, had been sent in 1825 to the Faculty of Medicine of the University of München (and then on to Würzburg) by a rich merchant of Braşov. Having returned to the Principalities, Beron then became a leader of the modern Bulgarian culture and the founder of the modern Bulgarian education system.

As for the Romanian students, in 1824, the old boyar Dinicu Golescu discovered “the other Europe” during his journeys (Golescu 1824), as well as the value and the influence of a European university education; as a result, in 1828 his sons Ştefan and Nicolae Golescu could be found as students of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Geneva (Stelling-Michaud 1959, 371, 380, 387) colleagues of the same year and study group with Karl Anton of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, father of the future king of Romania – Karl I. Constantin Filipescu in 1832, then in 1838 Alexandru Şuţu and Alexandru Plagino would follow in their footsteps. The Golescu brothers would surface among the leaders of the Romanian Revolution of 1848, then as members of the regency (*Locotenenţa domnească*) of 1866, after the fall of prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza in the year that Karl I was invited to take Romania's throne. The others joined the government, several governments and the diplomacy.

After 1866, tens and hundreds of young men began to leave Romania for the Universities of Paris, Aix-en-Provence, Toulouse, Bonn, Heidelberg, München, Göttingen, Berlin, Leipzig, Wien, Geneva, Brussels, etc. In the beginning, the boyars' sons prevailed, backed by their financial patrimony, and most of them got to law schools or to political science departments. Gradually, the boyars' sons were followed by the sons of merchants, teachers, priests, even by sons of peasants taking advantage of the newly instituted scholarships, provided by their communities of origin, by the boyars and later on by the state itself.

The Serbs would follow, in high numbers especially in the German universities, and mostly in law and political science departments. Almost all these Serbs would be found among the political elites, the governments, the parliaments, the diplomacy, and even as founders of universities and fields for higher studies (Trgovcević 1987, 101-113; Trgovcević 1990, 35-47, 49 –59). The Bulgarians came next, although there was no Bulgarian state until 1878, not even any autonomy as that enjoyed by the neighbouring states, so they concentrated their higher studies and their political activity abroad. It is from abroad that they sent their youth to take up studies in Europe or in Russia, with scholarships from the big merchants, some sent by their parents, some even with grants provided by the Romanian state; after 1878, these young men would then populate all the institutions of the new autonomous Bulgarian state: in the Parliament, in the government, as magistrates, in the diplomacy, in all the administrative network, running the education, research, and health system.

Monitoring their choice of fields of study, one concludes that at least the Romanians and the Serbs preferred law, political science and administration, in short that which the Germans name *Staatwissenschaft*, the science of the state. At least the Romanian boyars directed their children predominantly towards law and political science. The “bourgeois” social categories preferred to enrol for studies in medicine or philosophy.

The short list of faculties and fields of study where we find a huge concentration of South Eastern European students throughout the 19th century, the gradual abandonment of the initial specialities by more and more students to choose others, the simultaneous attendance of two or more disciplines that were similar or complementary – these are trends that combine into a telling image of the local societies' professional needs. These reflect a need for European modern institutionalization, for a clear social, legal, political organisation and for the domination of the social and political reality which was revealed as increasingly relative and uncertain in this area. The choice of fields of study – or rather, of future professions – made by the students (parents, society, community financing these studies) was, in part, different for each South-East European society. Upon a closer look, we notice that it was determined by the hopes for actualization offered by the social and political realities of each society, by the possibilities to practice the profession one has acquired, by the possibilities to influence or to modify this reality in the near future.

The structure of the fields of study – hence that of the chosen professions – conveys the intentions of each social category: what they intended to do with the profession they had mastered, and in which direction of social and political life, at which level of society, they aimed to take up roots. This structure of the disciplines of study conveys the mentality and the self-awareness of each class or social category in connection to its place in the social hierarchy, and to what extent, by the chosen profession, each of them aimed to insert itself in the political class, to seek political power and take action, or whether it was ready to give up such political influence; finally, to what extent there was an awareness of the right to seek and take up political power.

It is certain that the young people who drew their origin from the ranks of nobility, whose parents were boyars, had this awareness of their political rights and even duties, since they would study law and political science almost exclusively. Likewise, it is equally certain that other categories were persuaded that they did not have this right, as in the case of the Jewish students, who were not even assimilated to citizens of the countries from which they left for studies abroad, and who had no political rights and no access to the political class, so they chose to study mostly medicine and pharmacy, and later philosophy. There is always an entire medley of mentalities, personal constraints, and social conditioning in the choice of one's future profession. However, here all these complexes and mentalities merely express the social and political reality of the

world wherein the youngsters originated and the needs of their world at this crucial moment in its troubled history. Therefore the choice of the fields of study was very seldom the result of a personal wish or vocation, but rather the result of a social and political mandate.

In the 19th century, all the German universities were organised in four classical departments: theology, medicine, law and philosophy. The University of München was an exception: it had a fifth department – none other than *Staatswissenschaft*. In any case, the typical philosophy departments included several seminars in numerous academic disciplines and specialisations: philosophy, philology, history, natural sciences, mathematics, physics, chemistry, astronomy, geography, arts, architecture, and political sciences. So let us now list the options of the South Eastern European youth as fields of study. All the four departments (all five in München) together with the other European universities, have yielded the main modern *Lehrer – Forschungs – Rechts – und Politischeberuf* in our societies (*the professions connected with teaching, research, law and politics*), by the intellectuals trained in these universities. After Humboldt's reform of the German universities, the Germans began to present the results of university training as *Praktische Beruf* / practical professions. The departments with the highest rates of registration and attendance were *philosophy, law and medicine*. The law department, which yielded one of the most powerful and influential elites of South-Eastern Europe, educated the youth in *Staatsrecht, gemeinen und landischen Civil-Processes, römischen Rechts, französischen Civilrechts, Civilrechts, Criminalrechts, Landrechts, deutschen Privatrechts, deutschen Reich- und Rechtsgeschichte, Kirchenrechts* (the latter was also studied in the Theology department), *Jurisprudenz* and others. The law department and the philosophy department (including accounting studies – *kameralistika*) were the most popular among the Romanian students from Germany (Siupiur 1995a, 211-246). At the University of Paris, the Romanian students preferred to attend the *Faculté de droit, Faculté de médecine, Faculté des Sciences* (with the same fields as in the German philosophy departments) (Bengesco 1895, 1905). The University of Geneva had a *Faculté de droit, Faculté de philosophie* (later it would be renamed *Faculté des sciences et lettres*), *Faculté de médecine* and *Faculté de théologie* (Stelling-Michaud 1959).

We now propose a case study regarding the elites of the legal profession, with a special focus on the Romanian law students who had attended any of the European universities.

The lawyers – largely trained in the German universities – proved to be one of the most important intellectual elites of South Eastern Europe, with the strongest role and impact for the institutional and political modernization of the area, as well as for the modernization of the education for the local societies in the European tradition. Law studies were favoured by the Romanians, especially those from the ranks of nobility, who were aware of their entitlement to political

power, and the great bourgeoisie (in the second half of the 19th century), because they were firmly determined to continue to be or to become the next *political class*; by the Serbs (although accounting studies – *kameralistika* – took precedence); and later by the Greeks. Both latter categories were very active in the institutional and political organisation of their new national states in accordance with the European model. In the process of reform of all South Eastern European societies, the *lawyers* – and to a great extent the *accountants* – proved to be the professions that were most needful, and indeed demonstrated the professional thought patterns that were most efficient for the foundation of the new institutional system and of the (totally renewed) legal system; these professionals were most widely represented in the new political class structure and in the political power structure. On a personal level, the legal profession was most efficient for the speedy attaining of social prestige on the social and political hierarchical scale. A period of great reformation and of proliferating upstarts in South Eastern Europe, the 19th century would be dominated especially by lawyers. From the middle of the century onwards, lawyers (with their professional temperaments) began to dominate several important fields of society in South Eastern Europe. They were the most numerous among the political elites, as founders of parties and party leaders – Petre Carp and Titu Maiorescu are the most remarkable Romanian figures, dr. Konstantin Stoilov and Dimităr Grekov are best known for Bulgaria; by virtue of their profession, they became members of the new political classes in Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria, they predominated in the national governments, in the network of high state staff, in parliaments; in diplomacy, and above all they represented – as a unitary professional corps – a third power in the state, the legal power. They were the authors and co-authors of the new laws, the authors of the Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, and Romanian constitutions, the authors of the new South East European institutional systems. The new political elites – the new political class – crystalized through them.

Let us now compare the student registries of the European universities and the names comprising the social and political structure of the Romanian modern political class after 1848.

From 1850 and up until 1895, the University of Paris lists 97 doctors in law, 167 doctors in medicine and 4 doctors in sciences. The number of students in all the departments was of course larger, but the only lists available are those of alumni who concluded their studies with a PhD, as required in the 19th century in the European universities. The list of doctors in law was identically reflected in the Romanian political class and political elite: with ministers, prime-ministers, department directors, deputies in the national assembly, senators, ambassadors (Ministers Plenipotentiary), staff in the diplomatic agencies, professors and deans at the Faculty of Law, founded in Bucharest after

1864, members of the Courts of Appeal, of the Courts of cassation (appellate courts of the highest instance), magistrates, etc., thus pervading all the four state powers.

In 1850, *George Costaforu* obtained his PhD in law. We then see him in Romania as minister of justice, minister of foreign affairs, diplomatic agent; he was succeeded by *George Cantacuzino*, who later became President of the Senate and then minister; *George Vernesco*, who was then minister; *Constantin Boerescu* – minister, professor in the Faculty of Law; *Nicolae Predescu* – Councillor in the Court of Cassation; *Jean Kalindero* – general administrator of the Crown possessions, Councillor in the Court of Cassation; *Alex. N. Lahovari* – minister of foreign affairs; *Ch. Ferekides* – Councillor at the Court of Cassation; *Mihail Ferekides* – minister of foreign affairs; *Jean Lahovari* – minister plenipotentiary in Paris; *Dumitru Știrbei* – senator; *Constantin Nacu* – minister, professor in the Faculty of Law; *Vasile Brătianu* – deputy in the national assembly; *Constantin Stoicescu* – also deputy; *Constantin G. Dissescu* – professor in the Faculty of Law; *Constantin C Arion* – again, deputy; *Alexandru Marghiloman* – minister of justice; *Alex. Em. Lahovari* – who was an attaché of the Legation and minister plenipotentiary in Paris, etc. The political class would recruit also doctors and alumni of the Faculty of Sciences: *Spiru Haret* – with a PhD in mathematics – would become the minister for education and would produce the most efficient education reform to this day; *N.A. Cretzulescu*, PhD in medicine, would be the president of the Council of Ministers, minister plenipotentiary in Berlin, Rome, Sankt Petersburg, and president of the Romanian Academy; doctor *Constantin Exarhu* – minister of foreign affairs and minister plenipotentiary in Paris, etc. (Bengesco, 1895, 1905). These personalities cumulate their state functions with membership in the two political parties of the 19th century: either the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party – as founding members and often with high political functions in the party hierarchy.

The German universities supply an equally impressive list. Extrapolating from the number of PhDs, I am tempted to conclude that many more youth from the Romanian principalities studied in Germany, with an obvious predilection for the Faculty of Law, doubled by the celebrated *kameralia* (at the faculty of Philosophy), which – far beyond simple accounting – translates as the science of finances, economics, and administration. By 1880, the six German universities under scrutiny – Bonn, Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, Leipzig, and München – had enrolled more than 2700 youth from South Eastern Europe, of which about 1150 came from Romania.

Let us see who studied law and *kameralia*, and what became of them when they returned to Romania.

Many of the future political figures of Romania had studied in Berlin: *Mihail Kogălniceanu* (in 1837) together with *princes Dimitrie and Grigore Sturdza* – which led to a plethora of state functions for Kogălniceanu and the Sturdza family (some 40 years later a certain *Constantin Kogălniceanu* studied

law, also in Berlin); *Emanoil și Grigore Costaki* were present subsequently in parliaments, governments, and political parties; *Alexandru Orăscu* - architect, top official at the Ministry for Research and Public Education, author of the building that houses even now the University of Bucharest, and rector thereof, with a huge influence at the time; *Ion Paladi*, magistrate; *Demetrius von Balsh*, kaymakam, senator, top official; *Grigore Lahovari* – în guverne și senat; *Nicolae von Burghela* – top official and magistrate; *Grigore, Demetrius* and *Eugen Ghyka* (who studied in München and Heidelberg – then were members of parliament, government, with top functions in the courts and in diplomacy; *Matei Sturdza, Georg Sturdza, Ion Sturdza*, and most importantly *Dimitrie Al. Sturdza* (the latter with studies at the universities of Göttingen, Heidelberg, Bonn, Berlin) – who would take up the functions of minister of foreign affairs, minister of justice, minister of education, diplomat, secretary general and president of the Romanian Academy, as well as president of the Liberal Party; *Titu Maiorescu* – university professor, dean, lawyer, minister of education, prime-minister, founder of the Conservative - Junimist Party together with Petre Carp, was one of the most powerful figures in the Romanian culture and political life of all times; *Nicolae Mișu* – minister plenipotentiary in Sofia, London, Wien, minister of foreign affairs; prince *Alexandru Mavrocordat*; *Mihai Eminescu* (active in the political analysis of the Romanian political and cultural scene, not only great poet); *Jacques Negruzzi* – junimist and political figure of great influence; *G. Negruzzi* – also from the Conservative – Junimist party; *Constantin C. Penescu, Nicolae Xenopol*. In Bonn, we found *Petre Carp*, the great head of the Conservative party, who joined the diplomatic ranks upon his return (in Paris, Wien, Petersburg), then became minister of foreign affairs, minister of education, senator and author of a series of draft laws fostering social and economic development; in Bonn he was the colleague of Karl Prinz zu Hohenzollern, future king of Romania, studying in the same department; also in Bonn he had joined one of the celebrated secret societies of German students, joined by tight links of friendship with von Radovitz and other German diplomats and top officials; *Vasile Ghika* also studied in Bonn, - to later become kaymakam; *Grigore* and *Alexandru Ghika* are also alumni of the University of Bonn – later always either members of parliament or Romanian governments; *Dimitrie A. Sturdza* and *Lascăr Rosetti* continued with brilliant careers after their studies in Göttingen. The Heidelberg registries list *Eugen Predescu, Gregorie Kostaki, Vasile* and *Alexandru Ghica, Alexandru Rosetti, Grigore Ventrura* and *Mihail Paleologu, von Gregoriadi-Bonachi, George Cantacuzino* and *M. B. Cantacuzino*, while Leipzig could boast of alumni such as *Al. Cantacuzino, Emanoil Bacaoglu* (high official in the Ministry of Research and Public Education), while München registries list *Ion Strat, Constantin Bossy, George, Mihail* and *Paul Balș* (Amzăr 1940, 215-249; Amzăr 1943, 21-40; Siupiur 1995b, 83-99; Siupiur 1995c, 75-95; Siupiur 1999; Cain 2007). These

names represent a political generation with a solid cultural and intellectual foundation, who reformed the Romanian society to the highest standards and modernised it in just a few decades.

These generations of professional intellectuals, coming from the European universities, are instrumental in the move from an unique political class – the boyars –, to an elite and a cultural class with a European culture, crystallised on the basis of other criteria and other qualities than an aristocratic origin. The European University reformed the character, the tasks and the dimensions of the evolution of the European societies, in our case the South Eastern European ones, and created the forces that could render this new dimension concrete. The university modified gradually the identity and character of the political actors, of the members of the political class, modified the criteria that structured the modern political class, the state leadership, and the political power. Culture and intellectual professionalism became the grounds for educating the elites and the new political classes.

Crossing over to the political elites, to the political class and gaining access to political power, intellectuals accomplished the function and mission that had been bestowed upon them via the university education, accomplished their mission to reform and reorganise both the political classes, and the institutional systems in the area. The process of founding a new institutional system – one of the main accomplishments of the new intellectual and political elites – occurred mainly along four dimensions, which had been top priority for the society and for the state at the time: the political, legislative, administrative, and legal spheres. That included the Constitutional Assembly, the Constitution itself, the electoral law, the Parliament, the institution of foreign representation – diplomacy, the government and all the ministries, the ministerial councils, the state administration, the central administrative institution and all the regional branches, the civil and criminal codes, the institutions regulating property, the laws originating in customs and commercial conventions, taxation, the banking system, the organisation of the cultural system, of the education and health system etc.

All these institutions required the intervention and presence in action of competent professionals, of experts in the European institutional system, familiar with it and who have accepted and internalised it politically and mentally. These are the intellectuals trained in European universities. It is this generation of intellectuals called to inaugurate new societies in South Eastern Europe that A.D. Xenopol would describe in 1869 as follows: “Educated in Europe, it would not know the difference between the East and the West that had embarrassed our predecessors; with critical spirit, modern in soul and aspirations, it will support progress unconditionally, without opposing it to the past, but seeking to integrate it” (*apud* Georgescu 1987. 86). Liubuša Trgovcević (Trgovcević 2003) found an excellent characterization for the action and efforts of the South East European societies to shape the new intellectual, professional

and political elites, in the term: “planirana elita” – meaning a planned, programmed elite. This is the perfect definition of the relationship between the South Eastern European societies and the European university in the 19th century.

REFERENCES

- ***. 1959. *Le Livre du Recteur de l'Académie de Genève (1559-1878)*. I-VI, Geneva: Ed. S. Stelling-Michaud.
- ***. 1985. *Istoria Universității din Iași*. Iași.
- Amzăr, D.C. 1940. „Studenti români în străinătate. Universitatea din Berlin”. *Cercetări literare*. IV: 215-249.
- Amzăr, D.C. 1943. „Studenti români la universitatea din Leipzig”. *CL*, V: 21-40.
- Balaci, A. & A.I. Ionașcu. 1964. *Universitatea din București, 1864-1964*. Bucharest.
- Barriere, Pierre. 1961. *La vie intellectuelle en France du XVI^e siècle à l'époque contemporaine*. Paris.
- Bengesco, George. 1895 (1905). *Bibliographie franco-roumaine depuis le commencement du XIX^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours*. Bruxelles, Paris.
- Berindei, D. 1986. *Cultura națională română modernă*. Bucharest.
- Berindei, D. 1987. „Rumänischen Studenten im Ausland und die Entstehungen des modernen Rumänien im 19. Jahrhundert”. In R. Plaschka und K. Mack (Eds.). *Wegenetz europäischen Geistes. II. Universitäten. und Studenten vom 18 bis 20 Jahrhundert*. Wien (WEG II).
- Bologa, L. 1936. „Deutsche Einflüsse auf die Entwicklung der rumänischen Medizin”, *Südost Forschungen*, I, München.
- Bottomore, T.B. 1979. *Elites and Society*. Penguin Books.
- Cain, Daniel. 2007. *Un trimis al Majestății Sale. Nicolae Mișu*. Bucharest: Ed. Anima.
- Camariano-Cioran, Ariadna. 1974. *Les Académies princières de Bucarest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs*. Thessaloniki.
- Charle, Chr. 1994. *La République des universitaires*. Paris.
- Charle, Chr. 1996. *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIX^e siècle. Essai d'histoire comparée*. Paris.
- Chiorean, I. 1994. *Rolul Vienei în formarea intelectualității românești din Transilvania în secolul al XVIII-lea*. In *De la umanism la iluminism*. Târgu-Mureș: 93-110.
- Cohen, Gary B. 1987. „Die Studenten der Wiener Universität von 1860 bis 1900”. *WEG II*: 36-53.
- Crozier, Michel. 1995. *La crise de l'intelligence. Essai sur l'impuissance des élites à se réformer*. Paris.
- D'IRSAY, Stephan. 1933, 1935. *Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères des origines à nos jours*. I, Paris, 1933; II, Paris. 1935.
- de S., M., Conseiller d'état de S.M.I. de toutes les Russies. 1818. *Mémoire sur l'état actuel d'Allemagne*. Paris.
- Fabini, Th. & Fr. Teutsch. 1872. „Die Studierenden aus Ungarn und Siebenbürgen auf der Universität Leipzig von den Gründung derselben 1409 bis 1872”. *Archiv des Vereines für siebenbürgische Landeskunde*. III Heft: pp. 386-416.
- Flechter, J. M. 1977-1980. *The History of European Universities*. 1-2, Birmingham.
- Fotino, N. 1983. „Die Entstehung der rumänischen Rechtschule”. *Wegenetz europäischen Geistes*, I, Wien (WEG I): 36-53.
- Georgescu, Vlad. 1987. *Istoria ideilor politice românești (1369-1878)*. München: Ion Dumitru-Verlag.
- Golescu, Dinicu. 1824. *Însemnare a călătoriei mele*. Bucharest.
- Gomoiu, V., M. Gomoiu. 1941. „Germanismul în trecutul nostru medico-farmaceutic”. *Mișcarea medicală românească*. 5-6: 488-496.

- Grimm, G. 1980. „Promotionen bulgarischer Studenten an der Universität München von ihrer Gründungen in Ingolstadt (1472) bis zum Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges”. In *Bulgarische Sprache, Literatur und Geschichte*. Neuried: 263-276.
- Grimm, G. 1981. „Die Bildung der modernen slowenischen Intelligenz”. In *Serta Balcanica – Orientalia Monacensia*, München: 111 –125.
- Grimm, G. 1983. „Die Rolle der Universität München im geistigen Austausch mit den Ländern Südosteuropa zwischen 1826-1914”. *WEG I*: 239-249.
- Grimm, G. 1983. „Studenten aus 'Jugoslawien' an der Universität Ingolstadt – Landshut (1472-1826)”. In *Festschrift für Nikola R. Pribic*, Neuried: 475-484.
- Guttsman, W.L. 1963. *The British Political Elite*. London.
- Haselsteiner, H. 1983. „Die Rolle und Bedeutung Wiens als Universitätstadt in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhundert am Modell der slowenischen Studenten”. *WEG I*: 294-302.
- Hermes Handlexikon*. 1983. Universitäten und Hochschulen in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz, Laetitia Boehm, Reiner A. Müller (Eds.). Düsseldorf.
- Koch, Hans-Albrecht. 2000. *Die Universität. Geschichte einer europäischen Institution*. Darmstadt.
- Kotssowilis, K. 1996. *Die griechischen Studenten Münchens Universität unter König Ludwig I – von 1826 bis 1844*. München.
- Kotssowilis, K. 1996. *Die griechischen Studenten Münchens Universität unter König Ludwig I – von 1826 bis 1844*. München.
- Le Goff, Jacques. 1994. *Intellectualii în Evul Mediu*. Bucharest: Ed. Meridiane.
- Marcacci, Marco. 1987. *Histoire de l'Université de Genève. 1559-1986*. Geneva.
- Matula, Vl. 1987. „Die politischen Kreise slawischer Studenten in Wien”. *WEG II*: 155-161.
- Michels, Robert. 1971. *Les Partis politiques*. Paris.
- Müller, R.A. 1990. *Geschichte der Universität. Von der Mittelalterlichen Universitas zur deutschen Hochschulen*. München.
- Paskaleva, V. 1987. „Bulgarische Studenten und Schuller in Mitteleuropa in den vierziger bis siebziger Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts”. *WEG II*: 57-65.
- Shils, E. 1972. *The Intellectuals and the Power and Other Essays*. Chicago.
- Siupiur, Elena. 1995a. „Die deutschen Universitäten und die Bildung der Intelligenz in Rumänien und den Ländern Südosteuropas im 19. Jahrhundert”. In *New Europe College. Yearbook 1994-1995*. Bukarest: Humanitas: 211-246.
- Siupiur, Elena. 1995b. „Intellektuelle aus Rumänien und den Südosteuropäischen Ländern in den deutschen Universitäten (19. Jahrhundert)”, I Teil, Universität Bonn. *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes (RESEE)*, tome XXXIII, 1-2: 83-99; II Teil, Univ. Göttingen, in *RESEE*, XXXIII, 1995, 3-4: 251-265; III Teil, Univ. Heidelberg, *RESEE*. tome XXXIX, 2001, 1-4: 143-196; IV Teil, Univ. München, *RESEE*. XLII, 1-4: 133-157.
- Siupiur, Elena. 1995c. „Les intellectuels roumains du XIX^e siècle et la réorganisation de la classe politique et du système institutionnel”. *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*. tome XXXIV, 1-2: 75-95.
- Siupiur, Elena. 1997. „Étudiants de l'espace roumain et sud-est européen dans les universités allemandes au XIX^e siècle”. *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*. XXXVI, 3-4: 299-314.
- Siupiur, Elena. 1999. „Die rumänischen Intellektuellen im 19. Jahrhundert und die politische Macht”. In Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu. *In Memoriam*. Bucharest.
- Szögi László, Júlia Varga. 1997. *Universitas Budensis. 1395-1995*. Budapest.
- Teutsch, Fr. 1872. „Die Studierenden aus Ungarn und Siebenbürgen auf der Hochschule in Heidelberg von den Gründung bis 1810”. *Archiv für siebenbürgische Landeskunde*. III Heft: 182-192.
- Todorova, Cv. 1987a. „Migrationen bulgarischer Studenten an europäischen Universitäten seit der Befreiung Bulgariens von den Türken bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg”. *WEG II*: 65-82.
- Trgovcević, Liubuša. 1987b. „Die Erste im Ausland ausgebildete Professorenengeneration der Universität Belgrad”. *WEG II*: 101-113.

- Trgovcević, Liubuša. 1990a. „Die Erste im Ausland ausgebildete Professoren generation der Universität Belgrad”. *WEG II*: 101-113.
- Trgovcević, Liubuša. 1990b. „Studenti iz Srbije u Heidelbergu od 1840 do 1870 godine und Studenti iz Srbije u Bonu od 1870 do 1914 godine”. *Mesovita gradja Misscellanea*. XX, Beograd.
- Trgovcević, Liubuša & Elita Planirana. 2003. *O studentima iz Srbije na evropeiskim univerzitetima u 19 veku*. Beograd: Ed. Istoriceski Institut.
- Triantafyllu, T.T. 1983. „Griechische Bildungssysteme. Ein historischer Abriß”. *WEG I*: 273-285.
- Tsirpanles, Z.N. 1983. „Die Ausbildung der Griechen an europäischen Universitäten und deren Rolle im Universitätsleben des modernen Griechenland (1800-1850)”. *WEG I*: 250-272.
- Turczynski, Em. 1959. *Die deutsch-griechischen Kulturbeziehungen bis zur Berufung König Ottos*. München.
- Turczynski, Em. 1961. „München und Südosteuropa”. In *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Südosteuropas*. München: 341- 370.
- v. Daalder, H. (Ed.). 1982. *Universities, Politicians and Bureaucrats*. Cambridge.
- Wolgast, E. 1986. *Die Universität Heidelberg. 1386-1986*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Zimmermann, W.G. 1987. „Serbische und bulgarische Studenten an der Universität Zürich bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg”, *WEG II*: 250-255.
- Zub, Al. 1979. „Rumänische Studierende an europäischen Universitäten”. *Zeitschrift für siebenbürgische Landeskunde*. 2 (739): 21-40.
- Zub, Al. 1984. *Cunoaştere de sine şi integrare*. Iaşi.