

# Ways of Forgetting and Remembering the Eloquence of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century: Editors of Romanian Political Speeches

Roxana Patraş

**Abstract:** The paper presents a critical evaluation of the existing anthologies of Romanian oratory and analyzes the pertinence of a new research line: how to trace back the foundations of Romanian versatile political memory, both from a lexical and from an ideological point of view. As I argue in the first part of the paper, collecting and editing the great speeches of Romanian orators seems crucial for today's understanding of politics (politicians' speaking/ actions as well as voters' behavior/ electoral habits). In the second part, I focus on the particularities generated by a dramatic change of media support (in the context of Romania's high rates of illiteracy at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century): from "writing" information on the slippery surface of memory (declaimed political texts such as "proclamations," "petitions," and "appeals") to "writing" as such (transcribed political speeches). The last part of the paper problematizes the making of a new canon of Romanian eloquence as well as the opportunity of a new assemblage of oratorical texts, illustrative for the 19<sup>th</sup> century politics, and endeavors to settle a series of virtual editing principles.

**Keywords:** oratory, personal memory, political memory, recording strategies, professional editing

## 1. Introduction

Beginning with the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the Romanian politicians understand how crucial for one's career it is to have a good command over the art of eloquence, the interest in the selection, organization and editing of influential public speeches becomes manifest. Both the specialized community of political practitioners and their constituents involve in a fame-circuit that implies publishing, reading, commenting, citing, and then spreading the word. Some tribune "heroes" such as Nicolae Fleva and Nicolae Ionescu chose to publish their most complimented speeches immediately after their victory or as soon as they become aware of their speeches' historical importance. Thus, meant to speculate the crest of the wave, such pieces of elocution are flung, without further reflection and editing care, into cheap pamphlets or into the columns of parties' "official" newspapers. Others such as Titu Maiorescu and Take Ionescu are quite keen on giving a compact image of their political actions, so they decide to select, edit, and comment their own speeches, which brings around the first professional editions of political/ parliamentary speeches. The distinction

between the two behaviors already shows diverse specializations within the genre.

## 2. Personal Memory, Political Memory, and Recording Strategies

Let us notice that the haste to transfer oral deliveries to another type of media (i.e. the printed page) is not only the effect of modernization, but also the symptom of a *cultural crisis*. Glossing Sven Birkerts' fragment about how the "vestigial order" of prints has been replaced recently by new media (Birkerts 1994, 118), we might say that such dramatic shift happened in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century Romania. In this case, the political "tradition" passes from oral deliveries to written texts; the Romanians acknowledge their need to avail of professionally edited volumes of political speeches. This time, as said before, the volatile order of oral memory is replaced by the determinist order of historical documents, and the charm of public pronunciation is exchanged with mere close reading. As a matter of fact, some of the Romanian memorialists who catch a glimpse of 19<sup>th</sup>-century life – among them, Nicolae Suțu, Radu Rosetti, Rudolf Suțu, Constantin Bacalbașa or Sabina Cantacuzino, insist on the fact that their decision to turn themselves from tale-tellers into writers has been triggered by the general forgetfulness installed within the rapidly-modernized Romanian society. Weird as it may seem, the authors of memoirs are not people with prodigious memory, but people with a romantic infatuation for history and its objective premises:

Among the talents that the Providence has spent upon me rather covetously, the one that I have mostly missed is memory... I have always regretted the lack of memory, this faculty that replaces study so easily. The zeal to work would have spared two thirds of my misfortunes if memory would have been of any help<sup>1</sup> (Suțu 2014, 37, 81).

Paradoxically, modernization packs up with an accelerated obliteration of past. Apparently, there is a conflict between "the cautiousness not to lose" historical opportunities and "the cautiousness not to be lost" as identity (Bulei 1884, 37). But the new era – of printed speeches, of specialized editors, and of professionalized politicians – does not sweep away only the material proofs of traditional life (Rosetti 2013, 17), but also a ritualized way of interpreting the transcendence of power.

By losing old material references such as state buildings and former political, social and legal institutions, modern people grow into the awareness that they cannot rely on what may be properly called *political memory*. Also the transmission of the few notions anchoring a feeble political memory is very

---

<sup>1</sup> "Printre însușirile cu care providența a fost zgârcită față de mine cea pe care am regretat-o cel mai adesea a fost memoria." "Am regretat întotdeauna lipsa memoriei, această facultate care înlocuiește atât de lesne învățătura. Sârguința la lucru mi-ar fi economisit două treimi din neazuri dacă și memoria mi-ar fi venit în ajutor" (all English translations of original quotations are mine).

problematic since the Romanian society is 78 % illiterate (Manuilă and Georgescu qtd. in Mihăilescu 2015). The ideological frames freshly imported from the Western world are being grafted now on a discourse of authority, that, lacking a specialized lexis, sounds rather inaccurate, and thus it is forced to resort to literary legitimations and to rhetoric figures (Patraș 2015, 183-218). It is no wonder that later on the politicians themselves will blame the mixture of fabricated political notions and literary memory, chiefly because this slips into verbal prolixity or in something that has been generally called “politicianism.”

Directly linked with the symptoms described above, two categories of “recorders” or “memory-keepers” can be defined: 1. the executants, that is, the orators themselves, who play the part of experts, and try to spread a set of successful practices; 2. the witnesses, or the connoisseurs, who brand the quality of variations. Belonging to a community defined institutionally, political orators are both executants (of their own speeches) and witnesses (to the other’s speeches). The aggregation of the two statuses into one single person leads to an interesting phenomenon. Not only the personal memories subsist in a stylized and transfigured form, but also the various perceptions of the performance’ excellency is resumed through labels such as “sorcery,” “art,” “mystery,” “transfiguration,” and so forth. All in all, something-out-of-common is, most of the times, the chief quality of an eloquent speaker. This is why, his art is “divine” in the same fashion as Pythia’s.

Massive textualization of (political) speeches drives to the idea that “speech scripts” are the most reliable deposits of oratorical performance. The perceptions awoken by one’s talk become truly coherent only when there is also acknowledgement of the instance’s exceptionality. According to the type of judgments issued in the aftermath of the performance, attendants to oratorical shows can be defined as *experts* or as *witnesses*. *Experts* are prone to note the way the orator and his public relate to tradition, either generic (the schools of oratory) or cultural (the past of the Romanian oratory). *Witnesses* are recruited from the public sphere too, being *political literates*, that is, able to read the ideological message and apt to engage into a political relationship with the speaker. They can brand the quality of variations by departing from the instituted model of oratory. Experts tend towards political disengagement, while witnesses are prone to political engagement.

Anyhow, 19<sup>th</sup>-century Romanian politicians usually resort to a system of internal evaluation. Generally, the executants that operate as *experts/ evaluators* of the others’ performances connect poetical invention to the universal “institutes” of eloquence, as defined in ancient treatises written by Quintilian, Cicero and others. But, this translates immediately into a conflict between objective appreciation (as expert) and subjective submission (as witness), between political disengagement (as expert) and political engagement (as witness), between a technical approach (as expert) and a metaphysical perspective (as witness), between the impulse of originality (as expert) and the

need for clichés (as witness), between past and present, between spirit and letter, and so forth (Patraș 2015, 294-299).

Valuable information about the actual staging of political speeches may be found in the theoretical texts authored by “experts” in the art of eloquence (G. Panu, Anghel Demetrescu, Titu Maiorescu, Ion Petrovici, I.G. Duca, Sterie Diamandy, and so forth), among the recollections of “practitioners” or in the biographies devoted to public personalities of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, the most authoritative sources are the series of collected speeches, edited by professional historians or philologist.

### 3. Professional Editors of Political Speeches

Gh.Gr. Cantacuzino (1832-1913), for instance, becomes the main champion of tradition recovery – especially the political tradition established during the Organic Regulation (1834-1858). In his position as President of the Lower Chamber, he encourages the publication of *The Parliamentary Annals of Romania* (“Analele Parlamentare ale României”), which comprise speeches dating back in 1837. Titu Maiorescu himself, wishing that his own parliamentary deliveries had a better representation than the base and cheap shorthand reproduced in *The Official Gazette of Romania* (“Monitorul Oficial al României”), starts to put them together in 1897. By doing this, he proves himself both an excellent editor and a practical manager of his own posthumous image. Owing to his activity as a leading critic of the “Junimea” literary circle of Iași, Maiorescu is also a professional commentator of other MP’s oratory. Even though twenty years younger than the highly-esteemed “Junimist”, Take Ionescu smells the opportunity of publishing his political speeches into one single book. In the same year when Maiorescu launches the first volume of speeches (*Parliamentary Speeches on the Political Development of Romania under Charles 1<sup>st</sup> Reign*, vol. 1, 1897), he asks his fellow and “secretary” Cristu S. Negoescu (1858-1923) to prepare for publication his abundant oratorical production (*Political Speeches*, vol. 1, 1897).

Then, following this trend, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, more and more MPs decide to either commit their speeches to professional historians or to persons from their entourage. Hence, C.C. Giurescu, N. Georgescu-Tistu, G. Marinescu and G. Greceanu take upon themselves the publication of I.C. Brătianu’s massive 8-volume edition of *Acts and Speeches*, Anghel Demetrescu gathers Barbu Katargiu’s scattered parliamentary interventions (1887), Al.G. Florescu and Em.N. Lahovary show the greatness of Alexandru Lahovary’s oratory (1915), while Petre V. Haneș publishes or re-issues various speeches delivered by tribune celebrities such as Mikhail Kogălniceanu, Alexandru Lahovary, Barbu Katargiu.

So, until Vasile V. Haneș publishes in 1944 (a dramatic year for Romania’s foreign politics within the context of World War II) his short *Anthology of Romanian Orators* (*Antologia oratorilor români*), one might notice that our

culture had already crystalized a tradition of jotting down political talk with a certain preciseness. Moreover, a protocol of speech-editing got standardized. This implied not only the collection of texts as such, but also the accurate dating of public deliveries, proposing the most appropriate title, writing the introduction (including information on historical, political and social context) and sometimes supplementary notes on the persons that occasionally interrupt or co-occur within the selected political speeches, and thus deviate their (pre)established course of ideas. Therefore, editing the oratorical text was a difficult and time-consuming endeavor, based on structuring the data that reflected the reception of these “historical” speeches, as well as an in-depth knowledge and interpretation of recent history. Enhanced beforehand through the publication in *The Official Gazette of Romania* – which, in spite of its “official” attire, hosted a section entitled “The un-Official Part”, the political talk is being “tasted” by an expert audience who knows that political activity has now acquired the dignity of any other job. Imposed to the public opinion as mandatory references, the collections of speeches start being disseminated, known, read, and cited. Yet, editing these “spoken texts” also implies a good collaboration between the editor and the orator himself, if the latter is living and agrees to garnish his speeches with personal recollections and information from private archives.

Even though it is still having the air of a “spade work,” Vasile V. Haneș’ collection of speeches was not built on a set of clear editing principles, be they generic, typological or chronologic. *The Anthology of Romanian Orators* (Vasile V. Haneș 1940) looks like a bird’s-eye view on all eloquence genres and on all prominent tribune figures, from Antim Ivireanul (1650-1716) to Mihail Antonescu (1904-1946). No doubt that the volume stands on a broad reading of Romanian political oratory and on a poor knowledge of other types such as juridical, academic or religious oratory.

For instance, the author chose a few speeches of Reception in the Romanian Academy and none from the bibliography of famous pleas (juridical oratory). Among the figures of democratic and nationalist claims that had been voiced during the 48’ Revolution, the anthologist picked only Simion Bărnuțiu (*The Speech from Blaj Cathedral/ The Romanians and the Hungarians*). And this happens even though the texts of Moldova and Wallachia insurgents had been “celebrated” and already packed together – and acknowledged as a coherent corpus, in a 6-volume edition entitled *Year 1848 in the Romanian Principalities. Acts and Documents published with the support of the “I.C. Brătianu” foundation* (“Anul una mie opt sute patruzeci și opt în Principatele Române. Acte și documente publicate cu ajutorul comitetului pentru ridicarea monumentului lui Ion C. Brătianu”), published between 1902 and 1910. In the same vein, Vasile V. Haneș brands as representative for the 19<sup>th</sup> century names such as Vasile Boerescu, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Barbu Katargiu, I.C. Brătianu, P.P. Carp, and Alexandru Lahovary. It goes without saying that the list above conveys a good-

enough “family picture” and a sure judgment of values; it could stand, as the anthologist had surely planned, for a raw canon of Romanian eloquence. Yet, other remarkable speakers who had been consecrated by the 19<sup>th</sup>-century tastes and standards are left aside: Dimitrie Brătianu, Anastasie Panu, C.A. Rosetti, Nicolae Ionescu, B.P. Hasdeu, Petru Grădișteanu, Nicolae Fleva, Dim. A. Sturdza, Nicolae Blaremburg, Manolache Costache Epureanu, and George Vernescu. The anthologist’s decision is grounded on no other reason than the fact that their form did not please his taste, which anyway was formed a century later.

At a closer look, one can easily notice that, on the one hand, Vasile V. Haneș willingly ignored the tribune activity of a score of Liberals, even if they had almost the same reputation as their Conservative colleagues. On the other, public personalities such as Titu Maiorescu, Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea, Alexandru Marghiloman, Nicolae Filipescu, C. C. Arion, Alexandru Djuvara, and Take Ionescu are represented in the book only through their mature political activity. Briefly, they are proposed to the readers as full-time orators of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and lesser as experimented political “players” of the previous century. Finally, the last objection to Vasile V. Haneș’s anthology refers to the totally unprofessional editing; the author excerpts/ selects speeches without showing if fragments are skipped, without summarizing the contents ruled out, and without clear indications about the original sources. As the speech samples gathered here are extremely curtailed, a perspective on the performativity of oratory is difficult to discern.

Anyhow, coming just before the changing of political regime (1945), Haneș’s endeavor should be placed rather on the finish than on the starting line of an editorial tradition. This abridged and somehow caricatured version of past shows the reader that underneath there is a rich corpus that should be searched for. As said above, immediately after the establishment of the Communist power, these scripts of political memory succumb under the insidious agency of the official Censure. The following attempt to build a panorama of Romanian eloquence – thus, to propose a canon of great masters, comes 4 decades after, when Vistian Goia publishes the volume *Orators and Romanian Eloquence* (“Oratori și elocință românească”). More rigorous than Haneș’s previous pursuit, the new selection grounds on a diachronic perspective, as well as on a typology of individual “signatures”/ styles. For example, Gheorghe Lazăr, Petrache Poenaru, Ion Maiorescu and Timotei Cipariu are considered “fore-goers.” The 48’ rhetoric is illustrated through Ion Heliade Rădulescu and Simion Bărnuțiu. The next category includes “the orators of the Principalities’ Union, of Independence War, and of the Great Union,” that is, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Vasile Boerescu, Barbu Katargiu, C.A. Rosetti, Ion C. Brătianu, Vasile Goldiș, Iuliu Maniu, Ion I.C. Brătianu. Another chapter is devoted to “Junimea orators,” and it is exemplified through P. P. Carp and Titu Maiorescu. The chapter including “parliamentary orators” comprises Alexandru Lahovary, Spiru C. Haret, and Take Ionescu. Eventually, the anthology closes with a series of “pathetic and visionary orators,”

formed of Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea, Nicolae Iorga, Vasile Pârvan, Octavian Goga, and Nicolae Titulescu.

The effort of systematization and reshaping the old canon (established once with Haneș's anthology) is obvious here. Nevertheless, Vistian Goia gives the utmost to the personality of the orator and devotes lesser attention to the art of speaking in public as such. Therefore, the organization principles are not, by far, homogenous. Hence, "Junimea orators" could have been inserted, without great effort, among the series composed of "historical figures" (Chapter 3, 1866-1877). More than that, they also qualify for chapter with "parliamentary orators," since "Junimea" obstinately upheld the cause of parliamentary behavior and regulations (coined as "parlamentarism") and the cause of dynasty. Ultimately, a "pathetic and visionary" orator should be also considered Mikhail Kogălniceanu, even though his art is more prudent than the one of those selected in the last chapter. All criticisms suspended, Vistian Goia's unique effort of systematization provides us with a span of suggestions for future editors.

Noteworthy is also Gheorghe Buzatu's idea to gather the most "important parliamentary" speeches between 1864 and 2004, by this intending to follow the Parliament's evolution in time, therefore a history of the institution through political speeches. Yet his anthology entitled *Speeches and Parliamentary Debates(1864-2004)* ("Discursuri și dezbateri parlamentare...") has also a multifarious aspect. It includes figures selected according to principles that are not always transparent. Consequently, the list is opened by Alexandru Ioan Cuza, and closes with the highly contested ex-Prime-Minister... Adrian Năstase. Underlining the amplitude of a project that was carried out only partially, the anthologist's preface meets further research with a useful bibliography of Romanian oratory. Unfortunately, these very bibliographic references are not fully exploited in the process of selection and editing of texts. For instance, Buzatu's volume does not have an apparatus of minimal explanatory notes as the previous ones. Thus, some of the titles turn into casual mentions, downgraded in the preface's footnotes.

#### **4. Toward a New Edition. Re-Making the Canon of Romanian Eloquence**

The scripts of political talk (textualized political oratory) can be approached from various points of view: as "works" authored under the regime of literary production; as cameos bearing the hidden effigy of "prominent personalities", of "heroes", in Carlyle's terms; as recorded pieces of political memory; as facets of modernity and so on. Eventually, all these might be reduced to two perspectives: the first that considers (political) oratory a literary expression and judges public deliveries according to the aesthetic criterion; the second that considers (political) oratory a document of positive history.

We have seen that, trying to give a canon of Romanian eloquence, the previous attempts failed to offer an organic picture of Romanian public speaking. Therefore, future endeavors should make a more varied and complex selection

than the mentioned examples have made. In a nutshell, the next edition of political speeches should be able to leapfrog from political talk to political thinking. The great stake is to show how the political thinking got into adulthood through linguistic and ideological acquisitions, through a variegated range of individual styles and rhetoric approaches.

As already suggested, the coming editor will have to keep a good balance between the artistic attire of oratory and the fanatic rendering of historical details. A fresh list of eloquence masters should depart from the following principles: 1. to contrast, compare and, eventually, corroborate the lists provided by the previous anthologists (Vasile V. Haneș, Vistian Goia, and Gheorghe Buzatu); 2. to include those texts indicated as relevant by the prefaces of 19<sup>th</sup>-century editions, either for the evolution of Romanian literature or for national history as such; 3. to evaluate the bibliography of the orators who did not collect their speeches, and who had not got the opportunity to be perceived as “authors” (from this point of view, one has to take into consideration those speeches which had already acquired autonomy through their separate publication, in pamphlet form); 4. to profit from information on the political orators’ shows, brought either by direct witnesses or by press.

For the second principle, there are still limits of reliability that should be dealt with. If some of these collections seem reliable enough while others do not, the virtual editor should embark on such a project by judging the professionalism of original editions. For instance, Titu Maiorescu, Take Ionescu, Ion C. Brătianu, Al. Lahovary, Vasile Boerescu, Barbu Katargiu, Nicolae Filipescu, Al. Marghiloman, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea, Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu, and Ion Heliade-Rădulescu are advantaged figures. Professional editors managed the publication of their political speeches.

Politicians such as Nicolae Fleva, Dim. A. Sturdza, G. Panu, Vasile Morțun, Nicolae Ionescu, Petru Grădișteanu, Al. G. Djuvara, Constantin Dissescu, Constantin C. Arion, Nicolae Blaremburg, Gh. Vernescu, and Manolache Costache Epureanu are still waiting for this opportunity! Unfortunately, they caught neither the interest of publishers nor that of researchers. Nevertheless, among them there are extremely complex personalities, who may just bring atonement, and change their stock quotes on Romania’s market of cultural values.

Apart from reliability of contextual information and fragmentary publication, a third problem refers to the mixed nature of these texts (oral and written at the same time). On the one hand, some documents of 48’ Revolution entitled “proclamations”, “protestations” or “appeals” do not have an exclusive “written” quality. If considered so, this trait should be as debatable as the “oral” quality of some parliamentary speeches. Some of them are rehearsed beforehand, being probably delivered as read-aloud texts. As a matter of fact, both situations imply – in the moment of elaboration and, after, in that of public pronunciation – “writing” on two types of media: the first entails “writing” on paper, the second entails “writing” on the fragile surface of collective memory. The petitionary text



## Ways of Forgetting and Remembering the Eloquence of the 19th Century

is written (before speaking) so as to be proclaimed, while the speech is declaimed so as to be transcribed (after speaking).

A very interesting timeline of this development should come out from Titu Maiorescu's view from *Orators, Rhetoricians, Gabblers (Oratori, retori și limbuți)* – a study written in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The official critic of “Junimea” took year 1899 as a reference point.

If we try to figure out the art of eloquence in our country, the way it has developed from the new Constitution of 1866 on, one has to make distinction (regarding its evolution and, chiefly, the public's appreciation of it) among three stages, that can be dated, with a certain approximation, as follows: from 1866 to 1884, from 1884 to 1899, and from 1899 to our day. (Maiorescu 2005, 688).<sup>2</sup>

[Note that Maiorescu published this general account of Romanian political oratory in 1902] Beyond the shadow of a doubt, when fixing such dates, the literary critic and politician had in mind the establishment of a bourgeois ethos governed by Guizot's famous incentive “Enrichissez-vous!,” seeded by the Liberal leader Ion C. Brătianu in the Romanian soil. But he must have also considered the gradual acceptance of the dynastic idea in the new South-Eastern European state.

Hence, looking at the aesthetic value of political speeches as such, the “classical” chronologic limits should be fitted as proved by Maiorescu himself: from 1848 to the Union of the two Romanian Principalities (1859); 2. the reign and the reforms of Alexandru Ioan Cuza (1859-1866); 3. The establishment, on the throne of the United Principalities, of the Hohenzollern dynasty and the declaration of Independence (1866-1877). However, for the rest of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, that is, the period between 1877 and 1899, an attentive evaluation brings out that the historical landmarks are not so effective, because neither the Proclamation of the Romanian Kingdom (1881) nor the turbulent debates on the amending of the old Constitution (1884) determine a change of eloquence fashions and styles. Far more pertinent would be to consider the fall of Ion C. Brătianu's Govern (in March 1888) as a borderline. Before this particular moment, the rallying of the Opposition forces raises the rate of violent expressions and trains the public to tolerate such discursive behavior. Anyway, after Brătianu's withdrawal, the ex-spokesmen of the United Opposition as well as their public have a tendency to emancipate former practices of eloquence and to impose a specific protocol. In other words, the evolution to a higher level of political literacy is marked by the whole society's agreement on the acceptable limits of verbal violence. As proof to this, there are the ample commentaries concerning the necessity of morals in politics and the theorizing articles about the art of speaking in public.

---

<sup>2</sup> „dacă încercăm să ne dăm seamă de arta oratoriei la noi, așa cum s-a dezvoltat de la noua Constituție din 1866 încoace, trebuie să deosebim în manifestarea ei, și mai ales în judecata publicului asupra ei, trei faze, pe care le-am putea data, cu oarecare aproximație, astfel: de la 1866 la 1884, de la 1884 la 1899, și de la 1899 încoace”.

## 5. Conclusion

With a view to the disinterested manner of looking at the local deposits of political memory (pieces of lexis and ideology), I evaluated critically the existing anthologies of Romanian oratory and tried to analyze the opportunity of a new research line. The main question for young researchers in the field of history and philology is the following: How is it possible to trace back the foundations of our versatile political memory, both from a lexical and from an ideological point of view? Collecting and editing the great speeches of Romanian orators seems crucial for today's understanding of politics, the latter implying the politicians' speaking/ actions as well as the voters' behavior/ electoral habits. Within the context of Romania's high rates of illiteracy at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the second part focuses on the particularities generated by a dramatic change of media support: from "writing" information on the slippery surface of memory (declaimed political texts such as "proclamations," "petitions," and "appeals") to "writing" as such (transcribed political speeches). This transition brings about a league of professional editors who publish either series of "collected speeches" or anthologies, a generous raw material for building future political corpuses.

The last part problematized the making of a new canon of Romanian eloquence. But it also introduced the project of a new assemblage, gathering illustrative speeches for the 19<sup>th</sup>-century politics, and endeavored to settle a series of virtual editing principles. From now on, Romanian eloquence (political eloquence in particular) should act as a domain fully aware of its artistry and importance. After the blackout of Communism, new generations should make an effort of recollecting the lost items of Romanian political memory and reconfigure their research agenda.

## References

- Birkerts, Sven. 1994. *The Gutenberg Elegies: the Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age*. Boston: Faber
- Brătianu, Ion C. 1930-1941. *Acte și cuvântări*. vol. 1-8. Edited by C.C. Giurescu, N. Georgescu-Tistu, G. Marinescu, and G. Greceanu. București: Cartea Românească.
- Bulei, Ion. 1984. *Lumea românească la 1900*. București: Eminescu.
- Buzatu, Gheorghe. 2006. *Discursuri și dezbateri parlamentare (1864-2004)*. București: Mica Valahie.
- Goia, Vistian. 1985. *Oratori și elocință românească*. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.
- Haneș, Vasile V. 1944. *Antologia oratorilor români*. București: Socec.
- Ionescu, Take. 1897. *Discursuri politice*. Vol. 1 (1886-1896). București: Storck & Muller.
- Katargiu, Barbu. 1914 [1886]. *Discursuri parlamentare 1859-1862*. With a Foreword, a Historical Note on Katargiu family, and a Biography of Barbu Katargiu by Anghel Demetriescu. București: Minerva.

Ways of Forgetting and Remembering the Eloquence of the 19th Century

- Kogălniceanu, Mihail. 1943. *Împroprietărirea țaranilor*. Speech published by Petre V. Haneș. București: Tip. Române Unite.
- Kogălniceanu, Mihail. 1936. *Autobiografie. Desrobirea țiganilor. Ștergerea privilegiilor boierești. Emanciparea țiganilor*. With an Introductory Note by Petre V. Haneș. București: Alcalay.
- Lahovary, Alexandru. 1915. *Discursuri parlamentare 1888-1891*. Published by Al. G. Florescu, Petre V. Haneș and Em. N. Lahovari. București: Sfetea.
- Lahovary, Alexandru. Not dated. *Discursuri parlamentare. II*. Gathered by Al.G. Florescu. București: Dor. P. Cucu.
- Maiorescu, Titu. 2005. *Opere. I. Critice*. Edited, annotated and commented by D. Vatamaniuc. Prefaced by Eugen Simion. București: Fundația națională pentru știință și artă – Univers Enciclopedic.
- Maiorescu, Titu. 2006. *Opere. III. Discursuri parlamentare* ["Discursuri parlamentare cu priviri asupra dezvoltării politice a României sub domnia lui Carol I". vol 1-3, 1897-1899]. Edited, prefaced and commented by D. Vatamaniuc. With an Introduction by Eugen Simion. București: Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă – Univers Enciclopedic.
- Mihăilescu, Vintilă. 2015. *Istoria României: Noul Val?*, 30.05.2015, accessed at <http://www.contributors.ro/cultura/istoria-romaniei-noul-val/>.
- Patraș, Roxana. 2015. *Consecvență doctrinară și libertate estetică în dezbaterile publice românești din a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea*. In *Repere ale comunicării interculturale*, eds. Irina Frasin and Daniel Șandru, 183-218. București: ProUniversitaria.
- Patraș, Roxana. 2015. "The Memory of Romanian Political Speech: 19<sup>th</sup> Century Experts and Witnesses." In *Proceedings of the International Conference "Humanities and Social Sciences Today. Classical and Contemporary Issues,"* eds. Mihai-Dan Chirițoiu and Ioan-Alexandru Tofan, 293-299. București: ProUniversitaria.
- Rosetti, Radu. 2013. *Amintiri. Ce am auzit de la alții. Din copilărie. Din prima tinerețe*. Prefaced by Neagu Djuvara. București: Humanitas.
- Suțu, Nicolae. 2014. *Memoriile Principelui Nicolae Suțu, mare logăfăt al Moldovei (1789-1871)*. București: Humanitas.