

## The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 10 (2013)

Responding to Economic Crises in Historical Perspective, nineteenth and twentieth centuries

The *H*istorical Review  
La Revue *H*istorique



VOLUME X (2013)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques  
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research  
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

**A “Dynasty” of Hellenists in twentieth-century Bucharest: Demosthene Russo, Ariadna Camariano-Cioran and Nestor Camariano**

*Leonidas Rados*

doi: [10.12681/hr.314](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.314)

### To cite this article:

Rados, L. (2012). A “Dynasty” of Hellenists in twentieth-century Bucharest: Demosthene Russo, Ariadna Camariano-Cioran and Nestor Camariano. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 10, 265–296. <https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.314>

A “DYNASTY” OF HELLENISTS IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY BUCHAREST:  
DEMOSTHENE RUSSO, ARIADNA CAMARIANO-CIORAN  
AND NESTOR CAMARIANO\*

*Leonidas Rados*

---

ABSTRACT: Romanian academic circles became more interested in the study of Greek-Romanian relations towards the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth. Demosthene Russo, a young Greek immigrant to Romania, educated at Constantinople, Athens, Berlin and Leipzig, profited from this favourable trend; he managed to establish at the University of Bucharest, after 1915, a powerful centre for Byzantine and Neohellenic research and to impose his own critical school, based upon a rigorous method, in direct competition with the line directed by the most highly acknowledged Romanian historian, Nicolae Iorga, a researcher with many achievements and famous initiatives in South-East European studies. In the interwar period Russo took on the responsibility for the education of his nephew and niece, Nestor and Ariadna Camariano, to whom he transmitted his appetite for detailed research and critical methods in his field and whom he left to continue his work. The three have deeply marked the study of the history of Hellenism; they distinguished themselves, sometimes under unfavourable circumstances, by their valuable scientific production, opening new directions in the cultural history of South-East Europe.

---

*I. Introduction*

The study in Romania of Greek-Romanian cultural relations and, in general, of the history of Modern Hellenism has had a syncopated evolution, complicated by the deeply negative image of the Phanariot regime and by the accusations against the sociopolitical and cultural influences of that period. After 1821, when direct contact with Enlightened Europe intensified, and while the modern state extended its structures, the genre of historiography become more and more appreciated and present in Romanian public life, with a decisive role to play in the process of crystallization of the national conscience and of the official ideology. In this context, Neohellenic cultural and political influences were underappreciated, if not violently criticized for

---

\*This research was made possible with the financial support of the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources Development, 2007-2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/89/1.5/S/61104, with the title “Social Sciences and Humanities in the Context of Global Development: Development and Implementation of Postdoctoral Research”.

attempts of Hellenization and for the “undermining” of Romanian traditional society; the Phanariot regime became a favoured target, following the model of the *ancien régime* in France. The paradigm in which nineteenth-century Romanian historiography analyzed all the productions of a period regarded as an ill-fated one had been built by the historians of the 1848 period, starting with Mihail Kogălniceanu and Nicolae Bălcescu, and they transmitted this passionate perspective to the following generations. It was only at the end of the century that historians such as Constantin Erbiceanu and A. D. Xenopol managed to reassess, partially at least, the influences that Hellenism had on the Romanians and to rebalance the situation; in his turn, Nicolae Iorga succeeded, by the force with which he used to promote his opinions, in disseminating at the level of the educated public the new interpretations and, as he suggestively put it in a conference paper, in making “respectable figures out of the schoolbooks’ stigmatized figures”, an allusion to the process of the rehabilitation of the Phanariots.<sup>1</sup>

In the early twentieth century, when favourable conditions existed for a less passionate study of Greek-Romanian relations and especially of the influences of Neohellenism, a researcher appeared on the Romanian intellectual scene who promised to widen the openness started by his predecessors by using a critical method borrowed from German culture. Demosthene Russo was born in 1869 in Thrace, as an Ottoman subject. Within a few years of his immigration to Romania in 1894, he became one of the leading experts in the field of South-East European cultural relations, a respected and feared scholar, a seminal personality and a central figure in the interwar Romanian cultural environment, who entered into a strong disputation – a famous one, in cultural circles – with Iorga, the most highly acknowledged Romanian historian.<sup>2</sup>

By bringing his niece and nephew, Ariadna and Nestor Camariano, under his care and by initiating them into the secrets of field studies, Russo became

---

<sup>1</sup> N. Iorga, *Cultura română sub fanarioți*, Bucharest: Socec, 1898.

<sup>2</sup> In a paper presented in 1944, the historian M. Berza noted that Romanian historiography after World War I evolved in two distinct directions, “under the influence of two deeply different minds: N. Iorga’s one and D. Russo’s one”. He deplored the fact that these schools, inspired and run by these two scholars, according to their own features, priorities and values, did not meet in order to fuse, but they developed one against the other, each of them stressing one of the qualities that Bernheim required from a historian: *Geist* (Iorga) and *Methode* (Russo). Berza acknowledged Russo’s “vast culture, passion for investigation and sharpness”, but, bringing forward indirect arguments suggested by a 1942 text of Gabrielle Pepe (“Introduzione allo studio del medioevo latino”), he opted for Iorga’s school, considering that the wide influence that the hypercriticism promoted by Russo enjoyed eventually led to a qualitative decline of historiography. Cf. M. Berza, “Metodă istorică și falsă erudiție”, *Revista istorică* 30 (1944), pp. 96-108.

the “founder” of a dynasty of specialists who strongly, even fundamentally, marked the field of the history of Hellenism in Romania and offered models to follow for scientific accuracy, limpidity of presentation and methodology. The two descendants carried on their uncle’s work and completed it with their own research and findings, building, one paper after the other, one book after the other, one of the most powerful and influential directions in the field of cultural studies.

I should specify that among the three characters dealt with here there are important differences, on several levels. I will insist on only two of them. On the one hand, Russo had the advantage of his position as a university professor in Bucharest, which allowed him to establish a school; he surrounded himself with students and faithful collaborators, who had fond memories of him over the decades. His niece and nephew generally worked as solitary researchers, opting, wherever they could, for individual projects. On the other hand, unlike their uncle, Nestor and Ariadna published an obviously greater amount of material, benefitting from free access to the notes and projects initiated by the “founder”. The first difference led to a *de facto* situation in which the professor is referred to in several papers, articles, notes and obituary notices, while this is not the situation in Nestor and Ariadna’s case. Consequently, the bibliographic sources I could resort to in writing this article are not, for objective reasons, equally distributed.

Aside from the specialized literature, I consulted public archival sources, memoirs and the correspondence of the time (edited or not), but, above all, I had at my disposal what is preserved in the family archives. For the great chance to research in Russo’s famous house, in Vasile Lucaci Street in Bucharest, to read the drafts, manuscripts, notebooks, materials in different stages, the family’s letters and documents, and for all the time they spent to help me in recent years, I am deeply grateful to the descendants of the illustrious family, Doroteia Cioran (Ariadna’s daughter) and Emil Papadopol (Nestor’s nephew). As far as the unedited documents are concerned, the situation remains unbalanced, as there are many “traces” that the professor left behind, but few from Ariadna and hardly any from Nestor. The rich unpublished correspondence that Russo left behind, amounting to over 1000 items, especially with scholars from Romania<sup>3</sup> and from Greece,<sup>4</sup> on whose

---

<sup>3</sup>I. Bianu, Șt. Berechet, I. Bogdan, Fr. Babinger, N. G. Dossios, N. Cartoian, I. Caragianni, Al. Elian, I. C. Filitti, C. Giurescu and C. C. Giurescu, Vasile Grecu, D. Gusti, C. Rădulescu-Motru, B. Munteanu, P. P. Panaitescu, Sextil Pușcariu, Al. Rosetti, Orest Tafrali, etc.

<sup>4</sup>C. Amantos, N. Veis, I. Vernados, D. Vosniakos, I. Gennadios, Sp. Lambros, M. Laskaris, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameous, N. Politis, Manolis Triantafyllides, C. Triantafyllopoulos, G. Sotiriou, etc.

publication I am now working, proved to be fundamental, as we can find here much information about the three principal actors and their relationships with the different personalities who strongly influenced cultural life in the ante- and interwar periods.

Unfortunately, over the last few decades, little has been written, in an analytical way, on this “house” ennobled by science:<sup>5</sup> Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu wrote an obituary for Nestor and a notice of homage for Ariadna when she turned 80, followed by an obituary, and K. K. Hatzopoulos published two obituaries for Nestor (all quoted below); more recently, there appeared a short note on Russo in a journal,<sup>6</sup> a few of my own papers (published or forthcoming) and, finally, Ariadna Camariano-Cioran’s posthumous volume of contributions.<sup>7</sup>

## II. *The “Founder”: Demosthene Russo (1869-1938)*

### 1. Educational Path and Immigration to Romania

Born in 1869, in Peristasi, in Eastern Thrace, Demosthene Russo attended elementary school there and was then sent by his parents to the school of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He was a hard-working student, attaining high marks in all subjects: Christian ethics, religious knowledge, Church history, Ancient Greek and Latin, philosophy, history, elementary mathematics, physics, experimental chemistry, natural history, geography, French, Turkish, and the history of Greek and Latin literature. The diploma he obtained, in 1888, allowed him to teach in both the public and the private system as well as to attend university courses.<sup>8</sup>

Russo chose to continue his education and in the autumn of 1888 he enrolled at the philosophy faculty of the University of Athens. Unexplainably, from the notes preserved, he seems not to have attended the history courses of C. Paparrigopoulos, an eminent and prolific belated representative of

---

<sup>5</sup>I am grateful to Ms Elena Lazăr and to the Omonia publishing house in Bucharest for full understanding and support of the editorial project in progress, dealing with the memory of the three great Hellenists.

<sup>6</sup>Eugen Marinescu, “Un cercetător al trecutului nostru cultural”, *Studii de bibliologie și știința informării* 3 (1997), electronic edition: <http://ebooks.unibuc.ro/StiinteCOM/bibliologie/14.htm>.

<sup>7</sup>*Relații româno-elene. Studii istorice și filologice (secolele XIV-XIX)*, ed. Leonidas Rados, Bucharest: Omonia, 2008; reviewed [in French] by Anna Tabaki, *The Historical Review / La Revue Historique* VI (2009), pp. 253-258.

<sup>8</sup>His diploma is preserved in his archives.

Neohellenic historiographical Romanticism who was also the rector; but he benefitted from the courses held by G. Mistriotis (history of Greek literature), K. Kontos (Aristophanes) and the famous Spyridon Lambros (Greek history, Roman history, geography of Northern Greece).<sup>9</sup>

After two years spent in Athens,<sup>10</sup> Russo went to Germany, intending to specialize in philosophy and philology. Besides the Humboldtian ideals and the academic freedom, the *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*, so appreciated in the academic world of the nineteenth century, German universities also guaranteed an intense intellectual life and thorough specialization. The perfect organization of German universities, the rigour of lectures, the academic staff, counting many celebrities, the variety of disciplines, and, not least, the real competition amongst the universities, used to make that model an exemplary one all over the world.<sup>11</sup> That is why a South-East European young man’s attendance at a German university would have provided a useful boast to his career and social promotion, especially in the last decades of the nineteenth century.

In the autumn of 1890, Russo was already enrolled at the University of Leipzig, one of the most frequented German universities, situated in an active commercial city, of renown in the whole South-East European region. Such famous professors as Theodor Mommsen, Wilhelm Wundt, Karl Brugmann, Karl Lamprecht and Curt Wachsmuth attracted, by their name and competence, crowds of students from all over Europe and made

---

<sup>9</sup>Cf. school documents kept in his archives. See also D. Oikonomidou, “Δημοσθένης Ρούσσοσ ο Θράξ, 1869-1938” [Demosthenes Roussos the Thracian, 1869-1938], *Αρχαίον Θρακικού Λαογραφικού και Γλωσσικού Θησαυρού* 15 (1949), pp. 225-261.

<sup>10</sup>I have not located any graduation or bachelor’s degree diploma obtained at Athens in the archives; the two years spent there were too short a span (but not impossible) for him to complete his bachelor’s degree. About this possibility, see Costas Lappas, *Πανεπιστήμιο και φοιτητές στην Ελλάδα κατά τον 19ο αιώνα* [University and students in Greece during the nineteenth century], Athens: INR / NHRF, 2004, pp. 175-250.

<sup>11</sup>Of course, an important impediment was the German language, regarded as more difficult than its direct rival, French. Elena Siupiur called attention to the exaggerations made in literature regarding the French-speaking communities and the exclusive French influence in South-East Europe, insisting on the idea of a Franco-German pair in this respect, demonstrated with statistical figures. She also indicated the appetite for the German faculties of philosophy and law of students coming from South-East Europe; this was often the case for the intellectual proletariat members, who could turn, over night, from minority to majority and vice-versa, following the frequent changes of the frontiers and the amplexness of the immigration phenomenon. Elena Siupiur, *Intelectuali, elite, clase politice moderne în Sud-Estul european. Secolul XIX*, Bucharest: Domino, 2004, pp. 264, 267.

Leipzig a favoured destination for those who aimed at specializing and overspecializing, particularly in the field of (classical) philology.

Russo studied at Leipzig for two semesters, from 16 October 1890 to 15 August 1891; he attended courses held by Professors Johannes Adolph Overbeck (Introduction to Greek mythology; Greek art history), Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt (*Völkerpsychologie*), Ludwig von Strümpell (Introduction to philosophy and logic), Curt Wachsmuth (History of Greek literature during the Roman and Byzantine periods), Justus Hermann Lipsius (Explanations of excerpts from Thucydides) and Johann Karl Otto Ribbeck (History of Roman literature until Augustus). As itinerancy was one of the main features of studies in Germany, Russo transferred, in October 1891, to the University of Berlin for the winter semester, where he followed the lectures of Eduard Gotlob Zeller (General history of philosophy), August Döring (Kant's writings and teachings; Aesthetics; Contemporary philosophical directions) and Ernst Curtius (History of Greek and Roman art).

It seems that the more cosmopolitan spirit in Berlin did not satisfy the young Greek, as in the spring of 1892 he returned to Leipzig for two more semesters, the summer and the winter ones, the latter uncompleted, however. He attended other courses of Professors Overbeck (on the Archaeological Museum and the teaching of ancient art), Lipsius (on Aeschylus) and Franz Friedrich Max Heinze (psychology) and he decided to defend his doctorate there. He passed first his oral examinations (28 April 1893) in philosophy, Ancient Greek and pedagogy, *cum laude*, in front of Professors Masius, Wachsmuth and Heinze. His doctoral thesis was accepted by the faculty on 13 May 1893, when all the academic authorities still waited for were the legal number of abstracts of the thesis in order to declare him *philosophiae doctor*.<sup>12</sup>

Russo's dissertation, *Τρεῖς Γαζαῖοι. Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς φιλοσοφίας τῶν Γαζαίων* [Three natives of Gaza: their contributions to the history of philosophy] (published in Constantinople in 1893), immediately drew the attention of the scholarly community. It dealt with the writings of the Christian authors Aeneas, Zacharias and Procopius, natives of Gaza,

---

<sup>12</sup> According to a document from the family archives. In the imagination of Russo's intimates, a wrong idea formed over the years, according to which Russo had attended courses in Munich as well. The error is present in Al. Rosetti, "Demostene Russo", *Lucefărul* 10 (1967), note 48, who wrote that Russo was the "student of the famous Byzantinologist Karl Krumbacher" at Munich. We deal here with a stereotype quite frequent in Romanian public mentality: as the epicentre of Byzantine studies was Munich, with its centre created by Karl Krumbacher, a renowned specialist could emerge only from that environment.

indicating their pagan reminiscences and, most importantly, arguing the fact that the treaty against the neo-Platonist Proclus, attributed to Metropolitan Nicholas of Methoni (twelfth century), was originally written by Procopius, which Nicholas then copied.<sup>13</sup> Soon after, favourable responses, reviews and appreciations appeared from experienced Byzantinists. The first one who adopted Russo’s standpoint was L. Eisenhoffer, in *Procopius von Gaza* (Freiburg 1897), followed by Karl Krumbacher, in the second edition of his monumental work dedicated to the history of Byzantine literature, then by W. von Christ, in the fourth edition of *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (and in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* IV [1895], p. 636, and V [1896], p. 362), while J. Dräseke wrote a rather moderate and neutral review (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift* VI [1897], p. 56).

After one year spent at home, in Peristasi, Russo decided, on the suggestion of his Romanian friend in Leipzig, C. Rădulescu-Motru, who remained faithful throughout his life, to emigrate to Romania,<sup>14</sup> a country to which, every year, thousands of Greeks were coming, looking for a better future, attracted by the business opportunities or the great employment possibilities. Freshly arrived in Romania in 1894, Russo found quite a tense climate, with the background of the Zappa affair and of the Macedonian Question. Not having Romanian citizenship was a significant limitation, reducing his perspectives to the areas of the Greek communities, so he contented himself with the position of secondary teacher at the most famous Greek high school, the Venieri Boarding School in Galați. After a few years spent there, he moved to Bucharest, where he contributed to the Greek newspapers, worked as an editor for the *Patris* newspaper or gave private lessons.

Russo’s failure in the selection competition for a vacant position at the Library of the Romanian Academy, which was apparently caused by his origin, was a hard blow for him. He then wanted to emigrate to England, but listening to the advice of a friend who worked in the Greek-language press, he postponed his departure; in 1900 he managed to obtain a position as a translator in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This was a decisive moment, as financial stability now allowed him the necessary time and energy to study, preparing him for the huge challenge to come.

---

<sup>13</sup>The issue is still debated by specialists, some of them refusing to accept Russo’s opinions.

<sup>14</sup>See Al. Elian, “Demostene Russo. Notiță bio-bibliografică”, *Convorbiri literare* 71 (1938), pp. 290-294.



## 2. First Publications in Romania and Appointment to the Chair of Byzantine Studies at the University of Bucharest

The organization of Romanian academic institutions became, by the end of the nineteenth century, a major topic of public debate. A given superficiality was brought forward, as was the adoption without criticism of Western forms of culture, as well as the very quality of the academic staff. The history field was also threatened by a lack of rigour, and a stronger inclination towards a documentary basis was needed. Thus, the late nineteenth century could be characterized, in this area too, by what was called “the triumph of method over philosophy” and the application of a new set of positivist practices to the research and writing of history, an adaptation to the Western direction, facilitated by the historians’ apprenticeship in the scholarly milieu of the great European university centres. The tone in historical writing was set by the “Critical School”, easy to identify in the multitude of nuances of Romanian historical writing by the positivist method in fashion in the “civilized” world.

In this climate, there appeared a trend favouring academic specialization in the field of Byzantine studies, the decision makers becoming aware that an important category of internal historical sources, written in Greek, could provide vital information for the study of the Romanians’ past, on the condition that there were researchers with competence in the field. A specialized series of conferences with various titles (“Byzantine philology”, “Byzantine studies”, etc.) had begun in 1907, with Constantin Litzica, a protégé of Titu Maiorescu, in locum tenancy, and it transformed into a chair in 1913, but the positive results had yet to appear.<sup>15</sup>

Meanwhile, Russo’s first works, published at the end of the nineteenth century and start of the twentieth, were small and relatively modest in terms of importance (on topics such as the Greek press in Romania, and the laments on the Fall of Constantinople) and were meant for a Greek-speaking public; these evolved into more elaborate papers, on similar topics, published in journals and magazines in Greece. The shift to writings intended for the scholarly community was made gradually, while Russo integrated himself into the Romanian scientific context and became known for his preoccupations with Greek-Romanian relations and the influence of Hellenism. The characteristic feature of these early papers is a passionate, sometimes excessive tone, more visible until 1915, but risky for an emerging

---

<sup>15</sup> We confine ourselves here to generalities. On Litzica’s role in the development of Byzantine studies, see L. Rados, “Constantin Litzica et les études roumaines de byzantinologie au début du XXe siècle”, *Revue roumaine d’histoire* 44, 1-4 (2005), pp. 263-277.

specialist. He started in 1901 with a review of an article by Litzica about the Hellenic manuscripts in the rich Library of the Romanian Academy; after a pause of several years, publications grew more frequent, while his critical attitude strengthened. In *Studii bizantino-române* (Bucharest 1907) Russo established the non-veracity of the Bogumil origin of some texts published by B. P. Hasdeu in his well-known *Cuvinte din bătrâni* and he analyzed the filiation of the old Romanian text *Învățăturile lui Neagoe*, which, after several visits to the Holy Mountain, where he researched the archives, he thought to be derived from *Κατάνυξις* [Compunction], the writing of a tenth-century author, Simeon the Monk.<sup>16</sup>

The book immediately won the favourable appreciation of such reputed scholars as Sextil Pușcariu, S. Petrides and O. Densușianu,<sup>17</sup> but it also drew criticism. The ideas referring to *Învățăturile lui Neagoe*, in particular, were criticized by N. I. Apostolescu<sup>18</sup> and Stoian Romansky, a young Bulgarian researcher who in 1908 had published his dissertation, *Mahnreden des Walachischen Wojwoden Neagoe Basarab an seinen Sohn Theodosios*.<sup>19</sup> In 1910 another volume, *Studii și critice*, attracted the attention of the scientific community, already stirred up by the previous publication.<sup>20</sup> This was, in fact, a small collection of four autonomous papers; in the first two, Russo answered Stoian Romansky’s and N. I. Apostolescu’s criticisms; the third was research on *Hristoitia*, translated from Serbian, Romanian and Bulgarian following a Greek prototype, which he considered, in its turn, a translation from Erasmus (*De civilitate*); whereas the last one is an occasionally harsh but constructive criticism of *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești* published by

<sup>16</sup>See Michel Lascaris, “Démosthène Russo (1869-1938). Ses recherches sur les rapports gréco-roumains à l’époque byzantine et phanariote”, excerpt from *Nέον Κράτος* 2 (1938), p. 1384.

<sup>17</sup>*Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 29 (1908) p. 803; *Échos d’Orient* 10 (1907), pp. 317-318; *Viața nouă* 3 (1907), p. 257.

<sup>18</sup>*Literatura și arta română* 9 (1907), p. 423.

<sup>19</sup>Russo answered the latter in “O carte nouă asupra Învățăturilor lui Pseudo-Neagoe” and “Răspuns unui critic nepregătit”, *Convorbiri literare* 42, 2 (1908), pp. 63-78, pp. 253-263. The polemic was joined by Mario Roques (*Romania* 40 [1911], p. 143), who supported Russo’s opinions, as well as by N. Iorga, who, together with other voices, vehemently rejected the Hellenist’s demonstration. The issue has not yet been resolved, but it is interesting that over the years Russo’s text has been regarded as one that weakened forever the arguments of his “tempestuous opponent”, Iorga. See M. Bucur, *Istoriografia literară românească*, Bucharest: Minerva, 1973, p. 216.

<sup>20</sup>See *Viața românească* 6 (February 1911), pp. 291-292, Mario Roques in *Romania* 40 (1911), pp. 143-144, and N. G. Politis in *Λαογραφία* 2 (1910), pp. 709-716.

Litzica, in which Russo wished to perfect several aspects and to propose a “correct” procedure for the editing of an instrument of such importance.

The next publication, *Din corespondența doamnei Ana Racoviță, 1708-1709* (Bucharest 1911), though addressed to both the expert and the dilettante public, brought Russo to the centre of attention. He had discovered in Athens a collection of unpublished Greek letters from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – the Principalities princes’ and high boyars’ correspondence – and, by publishing two of them, he expressed his wish to make a complete bilingual edition (the Greek text and the translation into Romanian). He carefully argued the merits of his project, considering this correspondence fundamentally significant to the deciphering of the cultural environment, of mentalities and of the everyday life of those times, as they revealed part of the political secrets of the period, the intrigues and the rivalries in the Ottoman capital.<sup>21</sup>

The Romanian academic environment – like all the region – lacked effective instruments for the detailed research of the national past, and one of the most critical segments was that of the sources written in Greek. Since 1910, Romania’s Historical Committee, a body that brought together renowned historians and philologists, had insisted that Russo, co-opted as a member on the suggestion of I. Bogdan and C. Giurescu, should draw up a guide for those interested in editing and criticism techniques. Thus, in 1912 *Critica textelor și tehnica edițiilor* appeared, an extended and well-composed study that brought the author both fame and his contemporaries’ respect.<sup>22</sup> Using examples from classical Greek, Byzantine and ancient Romanian literature, Russo succeeded, in this genuine method guide, in bringing together even closer his friends and in tempering his critics, thus preparing his way towards an academic chair. Russo’s next book, *Elenismul în România* (Bucharest 1912), also enjoyed a great reception; he underlined here the significance and necessity of Byzantine studies (and, in general, of studies dedicated to the history of Hellenism) for Romanian scholars, moderately insisting upon the Byzantine and Phanariot influences on the local culture.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> The book generated a strong, serious debate with one of the most highly acknowledged Romanian philologists, Nerva Hodoș, with criticisms and answers that seemed endless.

<sup>22</sup> Even Iorga, his future enemy, praised this important contribution in the grounding of the field, stating that in Russo’s writing there is “much erudition and a variety of pieces of information, many good counsels, much diligence for perfection” (See *Neamul românesc literar*, Bucharest 1912, p. 512). Over the years, in an attempt by literary history, the book was deemed “the most authorised study on text editing”. See Bucur, *Istoriografia literară românească*, pp. 215-216.

<sup>23</sup> Iorga admitted, before and after Russo’s passing away, that the writing is “objective and civilized”: *Drum drept* I (1913), p. 62; *Un om, o metodă și o școală*, Bucharest 1940, p. 19.

Therefore, over one decade, Russo built, meticulously, an image of “proverbial scientific probity”,<sup>24</sup> with the necessary characteristics for a substantial work that should not repeat the errors of the other researchers who ventured upon the field of Byzantine and Neohellenic studies. At the same time, the lack of visible results in Litzica’s didactic activity led to the general opinion that a change was needed in the teaching of Byzantinology at the University of Bucharest, and the Dean, I. Bogdan (vice-president of the Romanian Academy as well), did not conceal the esteem he had for Russo. In his turn, Russo focused his attention on Litzica, whom he presented in his writings as a dilettante with “null results”;<sup>25</sup> moreover, he proposed the modification of the name of the chair, from “Byzantine Studies” to “Medieval and Modern Greek Philology” (considering that, especially in Romania’s case, the medieval Greek language and the Byzantine influences are inseparably linked to Modern Greek and to Neohellenic influences), as well as the concentration of teaching and research efforts at the level of language and literature.<sup>26</sup>

The fame Russo won with works of fine erudition, together with I. Bogdan’s total support, led to his tenure of the Chair of Byzantine Studies on 5 November 1915, a position to which he was appointed without competitive examination,<sup>27</sup> on the basis of a proposition report signed, in May 1915, by most of the professors, and in which Russo was regarded as the “only scholar

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, “Iluminismul neogrecesc și cultura română (Etapetele studiilor neogrecești în România)”, *Viața românească* I, 1 (1994), pp. 61-66.

<sup>25</sup> D. Russo, “Datoria criticei și bilanțul unei activități științifice”, *Noua revistă română* 15, 9 (1914), pp. 129-136.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*, “Filologia greacă medie și modernă la Universitatea din București”, *Noua revistă română* 13, 17 (1913), pp. 254-256. As will be seen in the details of the chair issue, in the Department of Letters there were two trends, one promoted by the historians (Iorga, Pârvan, Onciul), who would have wanted a historical type of Byzantinology, and the other by the philologists, who wished for a stronger stress to be put on philological study. This is also mentioned, in a rather allusive way, in a notebook from Nestor Camariano’s archive, where he wrote (29-1-1932) a few pages about the history of his uncle’s appointment at the university, as told by Russo himself.

<sup>27</sup> According to the same notebook, it seems that Russo himself had urged the dean for the position to become his without competitive examination, on the basis of his work (a fact that the rulings allowed); he was inspired by the case of Ramiro Ortiz, a philologist of Italian origin who had been appointed, in the same way, professor at the University of Bucharest. The calculation was a simple one: considering the official status of the chair, the members of the board would have been primarily the historians who were against him (Iorga, Onciul, Pârvan).

who promises to fulfil the hopes that our Faculty had when it established the Chair of Byzantine Philology or of Medieval and Modern Greek Philology, as he prefers to call it".<sup>28</sup> Thus began an interesting page in academic history and in Byzantinology history, given that the absence of a competition brought forth some tense moments in the academe of Bucharest. Important names (Iorga, Bogdan, Pârvan, Rădulescu-Motru, D. Onciul, etc.) were involved in the dispute, as well as institutions or bodies such as the Department of Philosophy and Letters, the Senate of the University, the Rectorate and the Ministry of Education.

Despite the protests and the interventions at the Ministry of Education (where the report sat for several months), Russo occupied his position in the autumn of 1915. This episode also meant his definitive break with Iorga, with whom he had had cold relations before, but also with N. Bănescu, one of the most productive and eminent Romanian Byzantinists. The common projects that should have united the three, in the interest of the discipline they were serving, became impossible to start. Beyond these regrettable malfunctions, Russo would exert, from this position, a considerable influence not only among the students, but especially among his colleagues, professors of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy.<sup>29</sup>

### 3. General Considerations on Russo's Work and Method: The School of Bucharest and Influence

Russo's œuvre is not extensive. It comprises about 30 studies on Greek-Romanian relations, and quantitative insufficiency provoked criticism during his life, and of unfair ridicule after death. It is true, however, that after World War I, occupied with guiding his students and colleagues and with increasingly poor health, Russo did not publish with the frequency that was expected of him.

Russo worked constantly on his synthesis of Greek-Romanian relations, *Elenismul în România*, the plan of which he had conceived starting from the 1912 study of the same title, gathering material and information all the time,<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup>For a detailed description of the struggle for the position of professor, see L. Rados, "O pagină controversată din istoria bizantinisticii române. 'Dosarul' numirii lui Demosthene Russo la Universitatea din București (1915)", *AIX* 42 (2005), pp. 585-602.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Franz Babinger, "In memoria lui Demosthene Russo (1869-1938)", excerpt from *Însemnări ieșene* 4, 1 (1939), p. 7.

<sup>30</sup>In a late presentation of the two posthumous volumes, a prestigious French publication recalled, in eulogistic terms, the synthesis that Russo had worked on, a writing in which would have been concentrated "l'expérience d'une brillante carrière". Cf. *Revue historique* (May-July 1948), p. 299.

but avoiding the final stage of composition for fear that he might lack an adequate public. However, in 1935 he signed a contract with the publishing house of the Carol II Royal Foundation, inspired by the success his close collaborator, C. C. Giurescu, had with his synthesis of Romanian history.<sup>31</sup> Alas, it was too late for Russo to start such a laborious enterprise: his health condition had worsened, with several difficult surgical interventions in France and Romania, and he passed away in 1938. Meant, maybe, to answer the expectations of the professor’s friends and disciples, one year after his death (1939), when he would have turned 70, two posthumous volumes appeared (*Studii istorice greco-române*), edited by Ariadna and Nestor Camariano, under the close supervision of C. C. Giurescu himself. The editors selected some of Russo’s studies, parts of them not finalized and regarded by him as not ready to publish, a fact that we are warned about in the preface and in the edition note. We are tempted to consider this posthumous publication an initiative by which C. C. Giurescu took his revenge on the failure of the *Mélanges Russo* project (discussed below), but also as a homage to the professor.<sup>32</sup>

As he was careful with everything that concerned him, always wanting to be perfectly informed, Russo could not finalize some of his writings for print. This is mentioned by all of his intimates,<sup>33</sup> and the fact can be easily comprehended in his published texts. A few studies appeared after 1915, and others in preparation phases are witness to the strong inhibitions he experienced when finalizing a study.<sup>34</sup> Another element he was criticized for was his absence from all Byzantine Studies congresses and, in general, from any other academic meeting where he should have spoken in public,

---

<sup>31</sup> About Russo’s continuously postponed synthesis, see also C. C. Giurescu, “D. Russo”, *Revista istorică română* 8 (1938), p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> The last words of the preface written by his former student deemed Russo’s work “very solid grounds on which one could build for a long while”, and the author “the most important figure [...] in the field of Byzantinology and Greek-Romanian relations” (p. vi).

<sup>33</sup> C. C. Giurescu presented in detail the professor’s method and explained the relatively small number of printed contributions, noting also the advanced phases in which different projects were before the scholar’s death (Giurescu, “D. Russo”, p. 5); see also N. Cartoian, “D. Russo”, *Cercetări literare* 3 (1939), p. XVI, or Dan Simonescu, “Un reprezentant de seamă a criticii textelor și tehnicii edițiilor. Profesorul doctor Demostene Russo”, *Studii și cercetări de documentare* 38, 3-4 (1986), p. 288.

<sup>34</sup> The famous historian of religions Mircea Eliade wrote, in a presentation of the posthumous edition of *Studii istorice greco-române* that the attraction to exact detail, the obsession for perfect precision, turned against the Hellenist, transforming into a genuine “toxin” that hindered him from finalizing his work. See Mircea Eliade, “Opera postumă a lui D. Russo”, *Universul literar* (1940), p. 7.

which led to a restricted audience for him, particularly in Europe.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, Russo was elected a corresponding member of the Romanian Academy in 1919 (his work counted then 24 titles)<sup>36</sup> and of that of Athens,<sup>37</sup> and in 1934 D. Gusti, future president of the Romanian Academy, started the procedures for his election as a full member,<sup>38</sup> but, because of the increasingly acute conflict between the “Școala nouă” [New School] and Iorga, the project was postponed until more favourable circumstances prevailed.

The “perfectly documented and up-to-date with everything that appeared every year”<sup>39</sup> kind of scholar, thorough in details, Russo established in Bucharest an efficient centre, similar to the one run by August Heisenberg in Germany, oriented towards a Byzantinology of philological essence.<sup>40</sup> Illustrious names issued from here – N. Cartoian, Dan Simonescu, I. C. Chițimia, Victor Papacostea, Alexandru Elian, Nestor and Ariadna Camariano, etc. – not to mention the collaborators who improved their knowledge near Russo, confirming, by the value of their own works, the irony against the school formed around the scholar or the statements regarding this school’s lack of real value.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Kleobul Tsourkas explained Russo’s absence from public academic meetings, in spite of his friends’ and collaborators’ insistence, by his preference for intimacy, for non-public arenas, where, by his companions’ side, he could focus and let free his subtle mind. Russo’s reply to public invitations was: “επιστήμη με τραπέζια είναι [...] εκτός επιστήμη” [Science with dinners is (...) without science]. Cf. K. Tsourkas, “Ο Δημοσθένης Ρούσσοσ” [Demosthenes Roussos], *Ελεύθερον Βήμα* (20-11-1938). Another friend, G. T. Kirileanu, mentioned, as for the congress of Bucharest, some of Iorga’s teasing; see G. T. Kirileanu, *Corespondență*, Bucharest: Minerva, 1977, p. 356. Russo’s discretion, his modesty in the public arena, but his intimacy as well, were enough and explicitly underlined by those who knew him closely and wrote about him. An important clue comes from an unpublished handwritten document “Ultima mea voință” (25-7-1937) – one day after the writing of his testament – in which he forbade his family to wear mourning clothes and insisted on a simple ceremony, with no newspaper announcements or calls to friends and acquaintances, for the reason that “people should not be bothered with such unpleasant walks”.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Elian, “Demostene Russo”, pp. 391-393. A bibliography of the scholar’s work can also be found in Giurescu, “D. Russo”, annex 2, but it is incomplete.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Oikonomidou, “Δημοσθένης Ρούσσοσ”, p. 241.

<sup>38</sup> See Kirileanu, *Corespondență*, p. 96.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. C. C. Giurescu, *Amintiri*, Bucharest: Ed. Sport Turism, 1976, p. 48.

<sup>40</sup> From the beginning of 1915, with the start of his lectures at the Institute for Studies on South-East Europe, a creation of Iorga’s efforts, Russo underlined the importance of the Byzantine and Neohellenic philological field, motivated by centuries of Greek influence, when the Principalities made a series of cultural borrowings, which, he felt, required attentive and competent research.

<sup>41</sup> Ironically, Iorga himself was the one who would notice, after Russo’s death, the survival of the school and the tight relations between the students and the professor’s

Russo carefully observed the priorities of the field and outlined them in his inaugural course in 1915: the publication and study of Greek chronicles referring to Romania's past, with rigorous and critical methods; the publication of the varied Greek documents housed in the libraries and archives in the country and abroad; the gathering and publication of Greek inscriptions in a comprehensive *Corpus inscriptionum*; researching the cultural contribution of the monastic establishments; and drawing up a Greek-Romanian dictionary, with terms in their medieval and Modern Greek forms, as well as a history of Byzantine and Modern Greek literature, which would facilitate the discovery of the Greek filiations, direct or by Slavonic intermediary, of some Romanian writings, whether they were poetry, religious or popular texts, chronicles or histories.<sup>42</sup>

Russo's inclination towards teaching, the warm relations he had with his students, and the availability he showed in guiding them are other fundamental features for which he was so loved. "Almost the whole young generation of professors from the Faculty of Letters in Bucharest benefitted from his advice," wrote C. C. Giurescu, many of them establishing emotional relations with this "affectionate older friend";<sup>43</sup> the Orientalist Franz Babinger remembered that the scholar had a "pedantic, professorial something" that made his students fond of him.<sup>44</sup> His involvement and benevolence towards serious researchers can also be found in the scholar's correspondence with different actors of the Romanian and Hellenic intellectual arenas;<sup>45</sup> furthermore, the weekly meetings on Wednesdays and the seminar held in the Byzantinist's house every Saturday were famous and appreciated in the local cultural

---

memory. Out of an excess of prudence, I exclude, among the different opinions, those belonging to Russo's disciples and I mention only the comments of the people who were not related to this powerful school. Besides the interesting affirmations made by M. Berza (see above), Bucur, *Istoriografia literară românească*, p. 215, regarded Russo as the creator of the school of research of South-East Europe, and Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, "Nestor Camariano", *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 21, 3 (1983), pp. 283-284, spoke about the scholar as the "founder of the school of Neohellenic research in Romania".

<sup>42</sup> See "Bizațul reabilitat" in Demosthene Russo, *Studii istorice greco-române. Opere postume*, Bucharest 1939, Vol. I, pp. 3-15.

<sup>43</sup> Giurescu, "D. Russo", p. 6.

<sup>44</sup> Babinger, "In memoria lui Demosthene Russo (1869-1938)", p. 5.

<sup>45</sup> For example, Gh. Cioran, a former student of Russo (and future husband of Ariadna Camariano), who did a three-year specialization at the University of Athens (1935-1938), where he defended his doctoral thesis in ecclesiastical history. See L. Rados, "Istoria unui doctorat la Atena. Gheorghe Cioran și preocupările sale de istorie ecleziastică", in Petronel Zahariuc (ed.), *Contribuții privitoare la istoria relațiilor dintre Țările Române și Bisericile Răsăritene în secolele XIV-XIX*, Jassy: Universității Al. I. Cuza, 2009, pp. 189-204.



environment.<sup>46</sup> Russo was also known as a passionate bibliophile, and his position as an academic, which he valued, in Iorgu Iordan's assessment, "as much as a good domain", allowed him to afford this passion.<sup>47</sup> His library had become famous among researchers, and the scholar's attention was focused on both new releases and rare old books, which he looked for assiduously at booksellers all over Europe, and which he very generously put at the disposal of his closest students and collaborators.

In order to render homage to their professor, his students and collaborators began preparing *Mélanges Russo*, a Festschrift volume to celebrate his sixtieth birthday (1929), a well-established tradition in European academic circles since the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>48</sup> The history of that project is a fascinating one, fully revealing the professor's character and modesty. Fortunately, Russo's archives preserve a set of correspondence in Romanian, French, Greek and German with regard to this initiative, which allows for a reconstruction of the episode.<sup>49</sup>

Started in strict confidence, so as to surprise the professor, the volume was edited by Iulian Ștefănescu, a collaborator of Russo at the Department, and by C. C. Giurescu, but they proposed an overly restrictive thematic framework (studies on Byzantium and on its influence among different cultures), to such an extent that the number of essays was significantly reduced. In spite of the advanced phase of the volume, one of the contributors (Georgios Sotiriou,

---

<sup>46</sup> Exemplary friendships were formed here, which survived Russo's death. After investigating the scholar's correspondence and other existing evidence, I was deeply impressed by the warm and sincere relationship between Russo and G. T. Kirileanu, the long-time librarian of the royal house, a friendship that lasted even after the latter's retreat to the town of Piatra Neamț in north Romania; a few decades after Russo's death, Kirileanu continued to think highly of him, was preoccupied by the destiny of his nephew and niece (Nestor and Ariadna), and presented him to the new generation as the perfect "scholar", recounting funny episodes from their common past and growing sad every time that human vanity prejudiced the memory of his great friend. Furthermore, Russo's nephew himself dedicated to this friendship several very emotional pages: Nestor Camariano, "Sub semnul erudiției. G. T. Kirileanu și D. Russo", in C. Bostan (ed.), *G. T. Kirileanu sau viața ca o carte*, Bucharest: Eminescu, 1985, pp. 87-97.

<sup>47</sup> Iorgu Iordan, *Memorii*, Vol. II, Bucharest: Eminescu, 1977, p. 175.

<sup>48</sup> See also Françoise Waquet, "Les 'mélanges'. Honneur et gratitude dans l'université contemporaine", *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 53, 3 (2006), pp. 100-121.

<sup>49</sup> It contains 23 letters, covering a span of several months, from the autumn of 1929 to July 1930. They were published in the annex of a study that reconstructs the project: Leonidas Rados, "Un proiect interbelic eşuat. Mélanges Russo (1929-1930)", *Anuarul Institutului "George Barițiu" din Cluj-Napoca*, Historica series, 49 (2010), pp. 259-288.

director of the Byzantine Museum of Athens) made an indiscretion, writing to the professor himself to explain his non-participation. This led to Russo’s firm intervention – he asked the initiators for their correspondence file and stopped the project.<sup>50</sup>

Russo continued to direct his students at the Faculty of Letters closely until 1 October 1938, when he retired, at the age of 69, on the basis of new legislation on age limits in the higher educational system. This new position of retirement affected him probably more than he showed, and, seriously ill, he survived for only four days.

Russo’s school without doubt had an influence in the Romanian academic milieu, especially due to his critical method, to the image of him as the perfect scholar and an erudite person, but also due to the way in which he treated his students and collaborators. His long-term conflict with Iorga (both of them strong, influential personalities), the most prolific Romanian historian, had a part to play in the increasing size of his audience, among whom were those who did not agree with the authoritarian way in which Iorga used to control, directly or indirectly, the important institutions with a cultural or scientific role or those who were bothered by a cult of personality formed around the latter. An interesting aside is that both scholars (Iorga and Russo) benefitted from specializations in Leipzig and Berlin, and, even if there are no indications that they met in that context, they defended their doctoral theses at Leipzig in the same year (1893). The relations between them were, in the first years, cold (Russo had amended some erroneous or contestable findings in Iorga’s writing), after 1915 worse, and towards the end of their lives disastrous, especially after the emergence of the dissenting historiographic group of the “New School”.

A new generation of historians, trained in the favourable conditions of the period after the war and mainly having studied in France (unlike the previous generation, trained, in its majority, in German), was waiting for the right moment to impose itself on the academic stage. The major break occurred in 1929-1931, when Iorga found himself attacked, indirectly at the beginning, by some of his own students. Simplifying an otherwise complex phenomenon, this was a revolt against what C. C. Giurescu, one of the group leaders, called “the dictatorship that is exerted today on us in science and the quality of the science mandarins”.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup>This explains how letters that were not addressed to him came to be in his archive.

<sup>51</sup>Basil Munteanu, *Correspondențe*, Paris: Ethos, 1979, letter of 4-7-1929, pp. 431-432.

A relevant fact is that, while Iorga was the chief target, the main positive model that the “New School” referred to was Russo. If today this relationship remains almost unknown, at that time the connections between the scholar and the dissenters were notorious, so that the “medicine” was even harder for Iorga to swallow. One of the rare studies signed by Russo (“O scrisoare a lui Evghenie Vulgaris tradusă în limba română”) found a place in the first issue (1931) of the group journal *Revista istorică română*, prominently placed right after the preface, in which the editorial staff explained the purposes and meaning of the new publication.<sup>52</sup> As C. C. Giurescu wrote some years later, the study in question “made a deep impression due to its erudition”,<sup>53</sup> so that, besides the suggestion that the “New School” appreciated truth, thoroughness and accuracy in writing to the detriment of quantity, we should also see here a political and editorial calculation meant to concentrate the supporters and ensure a strong impact for the new journal. Moreover, upon the scholar’s death in 1938, a year when the group of young men that had comprised the “New School” had grown, the first paper published in the journal, under C. C. Giurescu’s signature, was dedicated to Russo’s personality. The editors mentioned, on that occasion, the consistent support that the professor had provided since the release of the first issue, by attracting collaborators and by the pieces of advice he offered for improved quality. Thus, the publication wished to render a “grateful homage” to the memory of the “great scholar and great friend”.<sup>54</sup>

Iorga had equally apprehended Russo’s role in the evolution of the new direction, so in 1940 he published the booklet *Un om, o metodă și o școală*, which was intended to be a review of Russo’s whole work and activity. Formally, the publication was occasioned by the release of Russo’s two posthumous volumes in 1939, but his actual purpose was to demolish his rival’s personality and therefore to compromise the group of dissenters. He saluted the passing away of the “dry philologist” (alien, anyway, to the country and its interests), considering it the only possibility to destroy the “spell” that united Russo’s students and collaborators and to “save their souls”.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>In each issue of the magazine, references were made to Russo’s works, and the authors acknowledged his guidance and support in the writing of the papers. Russo also opened the fourth volume of the magazine (1934), with an important paper: “Mitrofan Gregoras, *Cronica Țării Românești (1714-1716)*”, pp. 1-42.

<sup>53</sup>Giurescu, “D. Russo”, p. 4.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 2 and 6.

<sup>55</sup>In their long-term conflict, both scholars had their share of guilt, and innocence had been lost; there were attempts at reconciliation, out of initiatives coming from third

In the posthumous fight for image, Iorga was the obvious winner, but his victory was not a complete one, because, in spite of some circumstantial and isolated cases, most of Russo's students and collaborators continued to recall the methodical philologist with admiration and pleasure.<sup>56</sup> Yet, the fascinating story of the character, of the method and of the research direction he imposed was known in smaller and smaller circles, as the generation that had had direct contact with him passed away.

We notice, nevertheless, that because of a superficial understanding of the parameters in which academic life evolves, Demosthene Russo's memory was rejected into a shadowed area, where bursts and vehement criticism go together with a policy of deliberate ignorance, making the debate on controversial episodes an impossible thing. For a long time, it has not been understood that the cultural and scientific environment is, by its very nature, populated with strong personalities (with their black and white spots), in inherent expansion, who clash for reasons pertaining to their own values and experiences or because of an interpersonal chemistry, but with no assumption that the existence of one entity should mean the removal of the other.

### III. *Ariadna Camariano-Cioran (1906-1993): Between Analytical Reconstruction and the Era of Synthesis*

Born in 1906 at Peristasi, Ariadna Camariano attended elementary school there. Her family was forced to immigrate to Romania after the 1922 Asia Minor Catastrophe, so that Ariadna and then her brother Nestor arrived in Constanța, and then in Bucharest, to be looked after by their uncle, Professor Demosthene Russo. The young woman adapted herself gradually to the Romanian environment; she learnt the language and, after private secondary studies, she obtained her secondary education diploma in 1931. Afterwards, she attended the courses of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the

---

parties, who apprehended the value on both sides and wanted the energy that was thus uselessly lost to be utilized for other objectives, and even for common projects. The scholar Vasile Bogrea, close to Russo's spirit with his passion for exact detail, but to Iorga as well, by its openness, was one of those who, in the early 1920s, when this was still a possible situation, offered to mediate a conciliation; but the pride of one of them and the vanity of the other undermined the attempts of the brave intellectual. See some notes on this in Kirileanu, *Correspondență*, p. 21.

<sup>56</sup>In a letter from Paris (1-6-1939) to Nestor Camariano (preserved in the family archives), for instance, Basil Munteanu, a specialist in comparative literature and a future professor at the University of Bucharest (1940-1946) regarded Russo, without being part of his school, as a "complex phenomenon of humanity, sensibility and intelligence".

University of Bucharest, obtaining her bachelor's degree in 1936 and her doctoral degree a few years later. Although between 1937 and 1939 she worked as a lecturer of Modern Greek language in the Chair of Ancient Romanian Literature of Professor Cartojan, her destiny after Russo's passing away was rather complicated; in 1943 she barely found positions as a researcher in the Institute of Balkan Studies and Research, run by Victor Papacostea, and as a lecturer of Modern Greek at the School of Slavonic and Oriental Languages of the Institute.

After the war, Camariano married Gheorghe Cioran, one of Russo's students (see note 45 above); after a few years, their only daughter, Doroteia, was born. From a professional standpoint, changes came one after the other. In 1948 she joined the History Institute, subsequently renamed after Nicolae Iorga, where she was charged with finding, transcribing and translating the Greek documents and manuscripts from the Library of the Academy and from the collections of the National Archives;<sup>57</sup> from 1963 to her retirement in 1968, she worked for the South-East European Institute, under the direction of Professor Mihail Berza, where she continued her research in the area of Hellenic-Romanian studies, obtaining international acknowledgement for the scientific value of her results.<sup>58</sup> Well-known in her circles for her thorough research, for the clear style of her publications and her critical, sometimes biting spirit, inherited from her uncle, her interests concerned the field of cultural studies: research in history and literature, historical Greek-Romanian relations, mutual literary influences, the paternity of works of ancient Romanian literature, and Greek education in the Principalities.

True recognition came after the publication of her volume on the Princely Academies (1971), which enjoyed an enthusiastic reception from specialists all over the world, becoming a classic text in this specialized field. This was also the period when her infamous dispute with Al. Duțu (probably the most valuable Romanian researcher of cultural studies) grew more acute; the golden apple of debate was the mediating role of Greek culture between the Western and the Romanian cultures and the impact of the Princely Academies.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Together with her brother Nestor, she worked on the preparation of the volumes of documents regarding the 1821 Movement, on the editing of the text of the *Cronica Ghiculeștilor* and on an edition of Dapontes' *Ephemerides*. The last one remained unpublished, as the material, handed over years previously to the Academy's publishing house, was lost in unknown conditions in the early 1990s.

<sup>58</sup> See also Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, "Ariadna Camariano-Cioran à 80 ans", *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 27, 2 (1987), pp. 197-199.

<sup>59</sup> See, for instance, Ariadna Camariano-Cioran, "Precizări și identificări privind unele traduceri românești din greacă (sec. al XVIII-lea)", *Revista de istorie și teorie literară* 22, 2 (1973), pp. 271-279.

After 1978 her activity was restricted, but she still found time and energy for a few studies and contributions, for a book dedicated to Greek-Romanian relations, published in 1984,<sup>60</sup> and for another book, following the same model, on Romanian-Macedonian relations. The last one remained unfinished, at the stage of notes, as on 11 March 1993, with discretion and dignity, Ariadna Camariano-Cioran died, at the age of 87.<sup>61</sup>

Ariadna excelled at studies of a philological nature, which distinguish her œuvre, as well as at historical research. The assiduity with which she pursued the filiation of texts is outstanding, as she resorted to the comparative method and she supported her statements with parallel texts. Every manuscript is identified and carefully analyzed, while the characters she dealt with benefit from micro-biographies, and, wherever possible, from corrections of erroneous statements made in the specialized literature. She was well-connected to the discourse of ideas specific to her field, sending texts and participating herself in international scientific meetings, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, as much as the communist regime allowed.

With no pretension to exhaust the levels that an activity of half a century reached, we recall here two major themes in Camariano-Cioran's work: first of all, the influences of Greek literature and the circulation of the works of the French Enlightenment and the German *Aufklärung* in the Romanian Principalities; and second, Greek education in the country, especially in the Princely Academies. To this, we can add a series of articles on historical (socio-economic and politico-diplomatic) topics that – accidentally – do not go beyond the time limit of 1821.<sup>62</sup> In this thematic diversity, one can perceive a few common elements: the clear, precise, but at the same time polemic exposition (passionate, here and there), the meticulous documentation and, above all, the critical method learnt from Russo and refined by contact with the élite researchers of her time.

Ariadna started her research career in 1935, while she was a student, with a study dedicated to the influences of Modern Greek lyric poetry, presented first in the Seminar of Modern Romanian Literature and Folklore.<sup>63</sup> The analysis of models and imitations occasioned vivid polemics, without

---

<sup>60</sup> *Contributions à l'histoire des relations greco-roumaines. L'Épire et les Pays Roumains*, Ioannina 1984, 292 pages.

<sup>61</sup> One of the obituaries was signed by her younger friend and collaborator, who meanwhile had passed away too: Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, "Ariadna Camariano-Cioran", *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 32, 1-2 (1994), p. 206.

<sup>62</sup> I discuss this only briefly here, as Ariadna's work is dealt with extensively in my introduction to *Relații româno-elene* (see note 7 above).

<sup>63</sup> *Influența poeziei lirice neogrecești asupra celei românești. Ienăchiță, Alecu, Iancu Văcărescu, Anton Pann și modelele lor grecești* Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1935.

inhibitions, between her and some Romanian notables, including B. P. Hasdeu and I. Odobescu. The in-depth documentation and clarity of ideas, presented in an attentively established order, are characteristics that would mark her entire scientific production. The next text she published was her doctoral thesis, *Poricologos și Opsarologos grecesc*,<sup>64</sup> considered by D. Caracostea of an exceptional value, and by N. Iorga, “un travail très utile, d’une large érudition”.<sup>65</sup> In a technical style, she presented the satirical poems in question, comparing them with meticulousness and outstanding scientific correctness to the Byzantine originals.

In 1946, after three years of waiting in the difficult conditions of World War II, Ariadna Camariano published her first book, *Spiritul revoluționar francez și Voltaire în limba greacă și română* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească). With a favourable review by L. Gáldi and Leandros Vranoussis, her work was intended to be a useful instrument for researchers in Romania, Greece and France, and concentrated around the idea that the oldest French influences in Romania should be looked for in Greek literature and among the Greeks settled in Romania. In two other studies, she dealt with the sociopolitical circumstances that led to the publication of theological, anti-Enlightenment works in Greek and in Romanian, establishing with accuracy their paternities and presenting the translation variants;<sup>66</sup> in the text on the translation of *Teatrul politic*, attributed until then to Nikolaos Mavrokordatos,<sup>67</sup> she put to good use her skills as an erudite philologist and historian,<sup>68</sup> polemicizing with C. Erbiceanu, C. Litzica, A. Papadopoulos-Vretos and V. Mihordea, correcting, where necessary, the inaccurate observations circulating in this specialized environment.

Particularly interesting is her contribution to the history of Modern Greek theatre in Bucharest,<sup>69</sup> probably the first coherent analysis of the issue, insisting upon the beginnings, but also on the staged plays, which represented, by their subject and interpretation, an important patriotic stimulus for the Greek intelligentsia. She made a selection of sources, choosing the “safest

<sup>64</sup> In *Cercetări literare* 3 (1939) and in an extract of 140 pages.

<sup>65</sup> See “Chronique”, *Revue historique du sud-est européen* 17, 1-3 (1940), p. 89.

<sup>66</sup> “Spiritul filosofic și revoluționar francez combătut de Patriarhia Ecumenică și Sublima Poartă”, extract from *Cercetări literare* 4 (1941), pp. 114-138; “Catehismul mitropolitului Platon tradus în limba greacă și română”, extract from *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* LX, 1-4 (1942), pp. 51-69.

<sup>67</sup> “Traducerea greacă a ‘Teatrului politic’ atribuită greșit lui N. Mavrocordat și versiunile românești”, extract from *Revista istorică română* 11-12 (1941-1942), pp. 216-258.

<sup>68</sup> See the review by Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu in *Revista arhivelor* 2 (1943), p. 468.

<sup>69</sup> “Le théâtre grec à Bucarest au début du XIXe siècle”, *Balcania* 6 (1943), pp. 381-416.

information” and criticized G. V. Tzokopoulos, but also Nikolaos Laskaris, to whom she imputed a lack of discrimination in the publication of sources, disputable affirmations and an absence of apparatus.

Ariadna Camariano had already distinguished herself as a remarkable researcher, and her subsequent studies dealing with issues as varied as the translations of Giovanni Del Turco and Voltaire into Romanian<sup>70</sup> or the filiation of some anti-Ottoman texts from the beginning of the nineteenth century<sup>71</sup> fully demonstrated her erudition. As an acknowledgement of her value, she received approval for four contributions to *Istoria literaturii române*, an important work published in 1964 and utilized by both philologists and historians.

Although Ariadna had approached her second thematic register as early as 1945-1946 in a short article in the Greek newspaper *Nέα Ελλάς*, we should note her late contribution dedicated to Jeremiah Cacavelas,<sup>72</sup> published in full creative maturity, which represented, by the meticulousness of analysis and the polemic spirit, one of the most accurate and interesting contributions signed by the researcher. One year later, in 1966, her contribution on Iosip Moisiadax was published, in which she discussed the ethnic origin of the scholar, reconstructing with accuracy the phase of his education and his activity in the Romanian Principalities, opening a door towards the universe of the philosophical, mathematical and pedagogical preoccupations of the director of the Princely Academy of Jassy.<sup>73</sup>

Of Ariadna Camariano’s entire historiographic production, the monograph on the Princely Academies in Bucharest and Jassy distinguishes itself from the point of view of its value and echo. The work had a particular destiny, being published in two editions, a smaller Romanian one and a complete French one.<sup>74</sup> A huge quantity of documentary material, mostly unpublished, allowed the author to analyze almost all aspects of the education in the Academies, from the teaching staff, to the organization and the educational-pedagogical methods, and the role of the institutions in Romania and South-East Europe.

<sup>70</sup>“Voltaire și Giovanni Del Turco traduși în limba română pe la 1772”, in the homage volume *C. Giurescu*, Bucharest 1944, pp. 175-182.

<sup>71</sup>“Despre poema patriotică antiotomană *Trâmbița românească*”, *Studii și materiale de istorie medie* 2 (1957), pp. 457-464.

<sup>72</sup>“Jérémie Cacavela et ses relations avec les Principautés Roumaines”, *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 3, 1-2 (1965), pp. 165-190.

<sup>73</sup>“Un directeur éclairé à l’Académie de Jassy il y a deux siècles. Iosip Moisiadax”, *Balkan Studies* 7 (1966), pp. 297-332.

<sup>74</sup>*Les Académies princières de Bucarest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs*, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1974, 830 pages.



If the Romanian edition was very well received by the public,<sup>75</sup> awarded by the Romanian Academy, the French edition (almost double in size, as it included the two chapters with the professors' bio-bibliographies, refused by the Romanian Academy), awarded in its turn by the Academy of Athens, quickly became a standard in the research of the history of education and of the South-East European area.<sup>76</sup> We should mention also the substantial study dedicated to Romanian aid to Greek schools, in which the author discussed the consistent help that Greek culture enjoyed in all of its manifestations after the Fall of Byzantium.<sup>77</sup>

Although less important in the whole of her work, the studies of history proper are represented by such topics as the Phanariot tax system, the Greek revolt of 1768-1774 organized by Tsarina Catherine II, the pro-French trend among the Ionians and the presentation of some key Philiki Etaireia members. We notice here the correct interpretations, the coherence of exposition and the richness of information from primary sources, as well as a good knowledge of the specialized Greek, Russian or French literature.

The text editions on which she worked alone or together with her brother Nestor have in common an enormous toil and critical method. As a homage to their erudite uncle, the text of a chronicle discovered by Russo in the library of the Holy Sepulchre Metochion at Constantinople was published in 1965, in a bilingual Greek-Romanian edition, becoming an important and necessary instrument, especially for Romanian and Greek medievalists.<sup>78</sup> Two decades later another edition, gathering the "diplomatic" reports addressed to Prince Constantinos Mavrokordatos (a topic she had dealt with in a study from 1961 as well), was published by Ariadna Camariano, proving to be equally useful, despite a rather contestable title.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Among the reviews we mention: Paul Cernovodeanu, *Revue roumaine d'histoire*, 9, 1 (1972), pp. 150-153; V. Mihordea, *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* 90, 1-2 (1972), pp. 202-208; Gh. Cronț, *Studii. Revistă de istorie* 25, 3 (1972), pp. 613-617; Maria Marinescu-Himu, *Studii și cercetări de bibliologie* 13 (1974), pp. 271-273; Alkis Myrsinis-Manthos, *Ηπειρωτική Εστία* 22 (1973), pp. 421-425; P. K. Gheorgountzos, *Πλάτων* 24 (1972), pp. 338-342, etc.

<sup>76</sup> See the reviews of Eleni D. Belea, *Μνημοσύνη* 5 (1974-1975), pp. 421-426; Georgios Karas, *Ερανιστής* 14 (1976), pp. 247-248; Asterios Argyrou, *Balkan Studies* 20, 1 (1979), pp. 168-176, etc.

<sup>77</sup> "Aides pécuriaires fournies par les Pays Roumains aux écoles grecques", *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 17, 1 (1979), pp. 123-151, and 18, 1 (1980), pp. 63-83.

<sup>78</sup> *Cronica Ghiculeștilor. Istoria Moldovei între anii 1695-1754*, Bucharest: Academiei, 1965. See also note 96 below.

<sup>79</sup> *Reprezentanța diplomatică a Moldovei la Constantinopol (30 august 1741- decembrie 1742). Rapoartele inedite ale agenților lui Constantin Mavrocordat*, Bucharest: Academiei, 1985.

IV. *Nestor Camariano (1909-1982): From Comparative Literature to a Passion for Historical Documents*

Nestor Camariano distinguished himself as one of the most active researchers in the field of humanities, offering the specialized public over 90 works in such subjects as the history of Romanian literature, comparative literature, book history, and the history of the Philiki Etaireia and of Greek-Romanian relations. Most of the texts were published in Romania, but some of his perhaps most important contributions – if we think about his monograph on Athanasios Christopoulos – were printed in Greece.

He was born on 23 March 1909 and he attended, with interruptions because of the armed conflicts, the elementary school in his native town, Peristasi, in Eastern Thrace. After the loss of his father, a trader, and the population exchange between Greece and Turkey, his family moved to Constanța (1922) in Romania, and he was soon taken in, like his sister Ariadna, by his uncle Demosthene Russo in Bucharest.

Rather few things are known about the next period of his life, some of them from his or his sister Ariadna's or their uncle's correspondence. Nestor's secondary education was private and, passionate about books and their history, he enrolled in the 1930s in the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the University of Bucharest, where his uncle was already an influential professor and where he obtained his bachelor's degree within a few years (1936), directed by Professor D. Caracostea, with a thesis on the history of comparative literature.<sup>80</sup>

From the time of his secondary education, Nestor entered, gradually, the refined intellectual circles of the Wednesday and Saturday meetings at Russo's house, and he appropriated his uncle's method and inclination towards exact detail; he also started to become close to Russo's students and collaborators;<sup>81</sup> some of them, when they reached important positions, supported him in his career, as in the cases of C. C. Giurescu, D. Caracostea or N. Cartoian; with a few others the relations grew colder in the years that followed Russo's death, when survival became a difficult and individual issue.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>80</sup> Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, "Nestor Camariano", *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 21, 3 (1983), pp. 283-284.

<sup>81</sup> Very useful, from the point of view of his social connections, was the mission he received from his uncle, to take care of his correspondence when he was not in the country or when he was seriously ill/hospitalized for surgical interventions, as we can see from the family correspondence.

<sup>82</sup> In spite of the numerous articles dedicated to the image of their dead uncle, a difficult period started for Nestor and Ariadna, whom Russo wanted to be the continuers of his work. Gradually, some former students started contesting some of the scholar's opinions on controversial themes, as was the case of Vasile Grecu with the "Homeric question" of

Indeed, the scholar's death (1938) was hard to endure for his nephew and niece, in spite of the complicated medical interventions that Russo had been submitted to over the last decade of his life and which should have prepared them for the end. In July 1937 the professor had appointed Ariadna his legatee, leaving her the house and an appreciable bank account, from which she was supposed to pay fixed sums to her mother or brother until he completed his doctoral studies. On the other hand, his library, probably the private library with the highest number of rare books in the country at that time, was left to both of them, in equal parts.<sup>83</sup>

Nestor worked for two years, starting in 1937, as a palaeographer at the Library of the Academy (a position that Russo himself had wanted and could not obtain at the beginning of the century). After a period of instability and searching (1939-1943), and with the support of the influential C. C. Giurescu, who remained faithful to Russo, Nestor was hired as assistant at the History Institute in Bucharest.<sup>84</sup>

Nestor first published in 1935, the same year as Ariadna, as a student; his paper, *Primele încercări literare ale lui C. Negruzzi și prototipurile lor grecești*, appeared in the collection of monographs of the Institute of Literary History and Folklore in Bucharest, directed by Caracostea, a close collaborator of Russo. The contribution has a fine internal logic and, in spite of some gaucheries of expression, it brought new elements and useful corrections to the early literary activity of Constantin Negruzzi, a classic of Romanian literature of the transitional epoch, by identifying the originals or the intermediary editions of the works he had translated.<sup>85</sup> The following year he published two studies in

---

Romanian literature, the paternity of *Învățăturile lui Neagoe Basarab*. It seems that the break followed a banal event, the brother and sister's refusal to rent a room to Grecu, arguing that they were forced, by necessities, to rent the whole lower floor. Cf. letters of 14-12-1938 and 18-12-1938 in the family archives. On the other hand, six months before, Nestor had sent Grecu one of his booklets and offered to proofread his preface in Greek to his work *Erminiile de pictură bizantine*.

<sup>83</sup> We can see how well-equipped this library was from the additions Nestor made to the two volumes of D. Ghinis' *Bibliografia grecească* (1939-1943) and published in 1940 and 1943 in magazines in Athens and Bucharest.

<sup>84</sup> In a letter of March 1943 G. T. Kirileanu thanked C. C. Giurescu for the support he gave to the nephew and niece of the "late lamented scholar" and for the chance they were given to continue their uncle's work, in accordance to his will. News about their desperate situation and about their efforts to find a job can also be found in one of Ariadna's letters to Kirileanu, from April of the same year. Kirileanu, *Corespondență*, p. 85, p. 412.

<sup>85</sup> His contribution was mentioned by G. Călinescu in his *Istoria literaturii române*, Bucharest: Fundația regală pentru literatură și artă, 1941, in the bibliography column, and

a scientific magazine: a more extended one, dedicated to Italian-Neohellenic literary confluences,<sup>86</sup> and a smaller one, about the Greek influences in Ienăchiță Văcărescu's *Grammar*.<sup>87</sup>

Nestor started his scientific activity under the careful guidance of his uncle, who followed his evolution, sending his nephew's texts to his friends as well. Basil Munteanu wrote to Nestor from Paris in March 1936, letting him know that both his and his sister's studies were included in the bibliographic column of the *Revue de littérature comparée*, due to the fact that both papers, "constructed like clocks", included "conclusions worthy to enter the general circulation of ideas regarding our literary beginnings".<sup>88</sup>

The difficulties did not end after 1943, when Nestor officially entered the group of researchers. The war had affected all destinies, and a totalitarian regime was about to take possession of Eastern Europe; Romania was fully experiencing the new realities, at both the institutional and the individual levels. The institutes were closed or "fused", in a process of "reformation" of education and research (more intensely after 1947), a process by which the "uncomfortable" people were excluded from the system. Nestor himself was in real danger, as he himself admitted in a letter to the academic of Jassy, Petru Caraman, in the autumn of that fateful year of 1947: "It seems that the scientific institutes will be strongly affected, and many people, among whom I seem to be myself, will be fired."<sup>89</sup> However, he survived the purges and could focus on his passions: research, offering the academic environment many studies, papers and notes, and discovering and publishing new manuscripts.

Retired in 1968, Nestor Camariano continued to work in the same rhythm, preparing different writings, among which are two monographs for the publishing house of the famous Institute for Balkan Studies in Thessaloniki

---

years later in another useful scientific instrument, *Scriitori români*, Bucharest: Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1978, p. 339.

<sup>86</sup> "Torquato Tasso în literatura greacă", *Studii italiene* 3 (1936), pp. 95-135.

<sup>87</sup> "Modelele gramaticii lui Văcărescu", *Studii italiene* 3 (1936), pp. 185-191. This one was also mentioned by Călinescu in *Istoria literaturii*, as were Ariadna's first publications.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the letter in the family archives.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. the letter of 2-10-1947, preserved in the family archives. Caraman was excluded from the chair in October 1947. The correspondence between the two started by a request to Nestor to borrow in Jassy a few Greek books, though Dan Simonescu had made him aware of Russo's anecdotic golden rule not to lend books from home, after he had lost many precious items from his library. Nestor eventually accepted and he took the volumes to an intermediary destination and consulted the libraries in Bucharest to offer the philologist of Jassy other citations he needed; thus Caraman declared himself to be "unusually impressed" by Nestor's rare kindness (letter of 12-9-1947).

(see notes 103 and 104). One of them, dedicated to Christopoulos, in fact his *magnum opus*, was published in 1981, but he passed away only a few months after, on 3 June 1982, at the age of 73, unfortunately in full creative élan.<sup>90</sup>

During a period of almost half a century, dedicated to Romanian-Greek influences, Nestor Camariano collaborated with scientific journals (*Revista istorică română, Balcania, Studii. Revista de istorie, Balkan Studies, Revue des études sud-est européennes*), but also with newspapers and cultural magazines (*Έθνος, Νέα Ελλάς, Ελεύθερον Βήμα, Μακεδονική Ζωή, Μακεδονικά, Ο Εραυιστής*) in Bucharest, Athens and Thessaloniki. Like other colleagues, he sometimes published his scientific studies in a simplified form in the dailies or in the cultural press, for a wider popularization. He channelled his energy into two main levels: the discovery and publication of historical documents; and the reconstruction of historical moments of the previous centuries, or the analysis of cultural events and personalities in South-East Europe.

As an editor of documents and bibliographer, Nestor fulfilled his duties with verve, publishing with accuracy and critical spirit, especially in collaboration but also alone, indispensable tools for modern research. While he was employed at the Romanian Academy, he took over the second volume of the *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești*, with the titles that had entered the Library of the Academy after 1909.<sup>91</sup> This was published in 1940 and comprised the description of over 230 manuscripts (nos 831-1066),<sup>92</sup> the material being organized, in a useful way, in eight sections: theology, history, law, medicine, translation into Modern Greek, school books, miscellanea and various.<sup>93</sup>

Afterwards, as a researcher at the History Institute, Nestor contributed, with other colleagues, to the editing of the five volumes of documents on

---

<sup>90</sup> See Konstantinos K. Hatzopoulos, “Μνήμη Νέστορα Καμαριανού” [In memoriam Nestor Camarianou], *Βαλκανική Βιβλιογραφία* (1983), pp. 325-326, briefly summarized in “Πέθανε στο Βουκουρέστι ο Νέστορας Καμαριανός” [The death of Nestor Camariano in Bucharest], *Μακεδονική Ζωή* 196 (1982), p. 18.

<sup>91</sup> In March 1939 the work should have been handed over, as evidenced by two letters (in the family archives) in which Al. Elian asked Nestor to go to his superior, Al. Rosetti, with the manuscript of the catalogue.

<sup>92</sup> We should mention that Nestor took from C. Litzica, so criticized by his uncle, 100 descriptions of manuscripts (nos 831-930) that he had published after the release of Volume I of the catalogue; Nestor introduced them in the beginning of his edition, with some small changes and mentioning the source.

<sup>93</sup> He was prepared for this kind of toil since the spring of 1935, when his uncle sent him to Transylvania to catalogue the Greek manuscripts and prints from the Astra Library of Braşov, with the intention to buy the items on sale. Nestor solved the task quite quickly, sending Russo, on 15 April, two lists with 122 Greek titles. Cf. unpublished correspondence in the family archives.

the year 1821 in the Romanian Principalities,<sup>94</sup> counting over 2000 pages; the fourth volume included sources referring to the Philiki Etaireia. In the same collegial spirit, he collaborated on the publication of a fundamental source for the investigation of nineteenth-century Romanian society, which included the bibliographic description of all articles and news that appeared in old Romanian periodicals.<sup>95</sup> In the same years, together with his learned sister, he edited the parallel text *Cronica Ghiculeștilor* (1965),<sup>96</sup> as well as a parallel text on the Romanian Principalities (*Ephemerides*) by C. Dapontes, and participated in another major project started by the Romanian Academy, in which he dealt with historical literature.<sup>97</sup>

Nestor’s historical reconstructions, usually undertaken individually, are not less important. In 1938, in the first issue of the Bucharest *Balcania* journal, he published a well-documented and inciteful study on Rhigas’ work, a popular topic that would attract the attention of Greek scholars.<sup>98</sup> He would return many times to the life and work of this disputed scholar, capitalizing on materials gathered over a long period spent in libraries and archives.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>94</sup> *Documente privind istoria României. Răscoala din 1821*, 5 vols, Bucharest: Academiei, 1959-1962.

<sup>95</sup> *Bibliografia analitică a periodicelor românești*, 2 vols, Bucharest: Academiei, 1966-1972. The work was enthusiastically received in the academic environment, followed by numerous favourable reviews in the scientific and cultural press.

<sup>96</sup> The Romanian public (and historians in particular) also received this work enthusiastically, as shown by the 1966 reviews signed by M. Rachieru, I. Caproșu and Gh. Cronț in the magazines *Ateneu*, *Cronica* and *Revue roumaine d’histoire*.

<sup>97</sup> *Istoria literaturii române*, Bucharest: Academiei Române, 1964.

<sup>98</sup> “Contributions à la bibliographie des œuvres de Rigas Velestinlis”, *Balcania* I (1938), pp. 211-229. Nestor Camariano’s study immediately found echoes among the Neohellenists, who intervened in the debate: C. Kerofilas, in *Le Messager d’Athènes* (29/30-6-1938); Ap. Daskalakis, in *Néa Eστία* 24, 279 (1938), pp. 1075-1078; N. Svoronos, in *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbucher* 15 (1939), p. 324.

<sup>99</sup> “Traducătorii anonimi ai cântecelor lui Rigas Velestinlis în limba rusă”, *Revista istorică română* IX (1939), pp. 322-325, also published in Greek in *Néa Eστία* 27, 320 (1940), pp. 503-505; “Câteva considerații cu privire la revoluționarul Rigas Velestinlis”, *Studii. Revistă de istorie* 17 (1964), pp. 1097-1116; “Quelques précisions au sujet de la traduction du drame *L’Olympiade* de Metastasio faite par Rigas Velestinlis”, *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 3, 1-2 (1965), pp. 291-296; “Η διαμονή και η δράση του Ρήγα του Βελεστινλή στη Βλαχία” [The stay and activity of Rhigas Velestinlis in Wallachia], *Μακεδονική Ζωή* 123 (1976), pp. 8-9; “Το τελευταίο ταξίδι του Ρήγα Βελεστινλή στη Θεσσαλία λίγο πριν τον θάνατό του” [The last trip of Rhigas Velestinlis to Thessaly shortly before his death], *Μακεδονική Ζωή* 184 (1981), pp. 12-13; “Rhigas Velestinlis. Compléments et corrections concernant sa vie et son activité”, *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 18, 4 (1980), pp. 687-719, and 19, 1 (1981), pp. 41-69 (republished in Greek, ed. A. Karathanasis, Athens 1999).

The Philiki Etaireia and the events of the year 1821 also represented favoured topics in Camariano's work, to which he dedicated years of research. Except for two notes published in the Bucharest Greek newspaper, *Néa Ellás*, his first scientific contribution on the subject appeared in 1947,<sup>100</sup> while the next ones appeared over a decade after.<sup>101</sup> In all of them one can notice the respect for the historical document, the thoroughness of the arguments and a central concern for clarity.

Nestor Camariano wrote interesting studies, extremely useful for researchers interested in the field and in issues of philological finesse, especially the subject of the contact of Neohellenic culture (often an intermediary culture in relations with the developed Western culture) with the Romanian one. Continuing the line of his debut texts, he patiently pondered the presence of masterpieces of Occidental spirit, re-establishing literary filiations and paternities, and investigating the cultural activity of Greek companies or the beginnings of the Greek-language press in Romania.<sup>102</sup> However, his most

<sup>100</sup> "Un manuscris al unui eterist despre evenimentele dela 1821 din Moldova", *Revista istorică română* 17 (1947), pp. 80-97.

<sup>101</sup> "Despre organizarea și activitatea Eteriei în Rusia înainte de răscoala din 1821", *Studii și materiale de istorie modernă* 2 (1960), pp. 73-103; "L'activité de Georges Olympios dans les Principautés Roumaines avant la révolution de 1821", *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 2, 3-4 (1964), pp. 433-446; "Μιά άγνωστη προκήρυξη των Φιλικών προς τους βαλκανικούς λαούς" [An unknown proclamation of the Philiki Etaireia to the Balkan peoples], *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης* 118 (1964), pp. 260-273 (published in 1967 in Romanian as well); "Η συμβολή του ηγεμόνα της Μολδαβίας Μιχαήλ Σούτσου στη Φιλική Εταιρεία" [The contribution of the ruler of Moldavia Michael Soutzos to the Philiki Etaireia], *Néa Eotía* 76, 898 (1964), pp. 1696-1701; "Les relations de Tudor Vladimirescu avec l'Hétairie avant la révolution de 1821", *Balkan Studies* 6 (1965), pp. 139-164; "Planurile revoluționare ale eteriștilor din București și colaborarea lor cu Tudor Vladimirescu", *Studii. Revistă de istorie* 20 (1967), pp. 1163-1175 "Un eterist fruntaș din București. Nicolae Scufos", *Studii. Revistă de istorie* 26 (1973), pp. 803-815. Furthermore, he reedited a collection of patriotic songs published at Jassy by the Greek revolutionaries preparing the events of 1821. The new edition (*Chansons et opuscules patriotiques publiés à Jassy en 1821 par un hétairiste*, Bucharest 1966) faithfully reproduced the texts of 1821, as Nestor himself mentioned, and benefitted from a thorough introductory study, meant to clarify different aspects related to the paternity of these songs and the context of their emergence.

<sup>102</sup> Many of the texts from the first years were published in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*: "Primul număr al *României literare* din 1852 a lui Vasile Alecsandri", 7, 10 (1940), pp. 132-147; "Erast a lui Salomon Gessner în literatura greacă și română", 8, 7 (1941), pp. 64-81; "Influența franceză în Principatele Române prin filiera neogreacă", 9, 2 (1942), pp. 397-408; "Primele traduceri din B. de Saint-Pierre în literatura neogreacă", 9, 6 (1942), pp. 643-652. Others appeared in contemporary magazines: "Un izvor necunoscut al Istoriei

important works concern Alexandros Mavrokordatos’ diplomatic activity in the late seventeenth century and the early eighteenth<sup>103</sup> and the life and work of the scholar Athanasios Christopoulos, who lived most of his life in the Romanian Principalities;<sup>104</sup> both of them were published in successful editions, in French, in Greece. On the latter, he worked for at least one decade, but he did not survive to enjoy the positive echoes and the admiration that this model monograph – his most relevant writing – stirred up.<sup>105</sup>

\*

It is quite obvious that the “dynasty” that Demosthene Russo founded and which was successfully represented by Ariadna and Nestor Camariano played a defining role in South-East European historiography. Russo’s preoccupations in the fields of the history of Hellenism and of Greek-Romanian relations were continued by his niece and nephew, whose studies were inspired by the unfinished work of their uncle; the contributions of the

---

lui Dionisie Fotino”, *Revista istorică română* 10 (1940), pp. 227-236; “L’organisation et l’activité culturelle de la Compagnie des marchands grecs de Sibiu”, *Balcania* 6 (1943), pp. 202-241; “Despre un manual de patriotism publicat la Iași în 1829”, *Revista istorică română* 13 (1943), pp. 116-126; “Le premier journal grec de Bucarest”, *Balcania* 8 (1945), pp. 221-227; “Un pretins istoric. Emanuil Băleanu”, *Revista istorică română* 16 (1946), pp. 142-156; “Nouvelles informations sur la création et l’activité de la typographie de Yassy (1812-1821)”, *Balkan Studies* 7 (1966), pp. 61-76; “Sur l’activité de la Société Littéraire Gréco-Dacique de Bucarest (1810-1812)”, *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 6, 1 (1968), pp. 39-54; “Les Principautés Roumaines à la lumière de l’autobiographie de Jean Capodistria”, *Revue roumaine d’histoire* 8, 2 (1969), pp. 263-270; “Constantin Dapontès et les Principautés Roumaines”, *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 8, 3 (1970), pp. 481-494; “Nouvelles données sur Alexandre Calfoglou de Byzance et ses *Vers moraux*”, *L’Époque phanariote*, Symposium (Thessaloniki, 21-25 October 1970), Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1974, pp. 93-125, etc.

<sup>103</sup> *Alexandre Mavrocordato, le Grand Drogman. Son activité diplomatique, 1673-1709*, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1970. The detailed reconstruction, based on archival documents and a carefully selected bibliography, received favourable reviews and presentations, such as those of N. Grigoraș, V. Mihordea, N. Danova, P. Cernovodeanu, Dan A. Lăzărescu, etc., in important publications in Romania, Bulgaria and Greece.

<sup>104</sup> *Athanasios Christopoulos. Sa vie, son œuvre littéraire et ses rapports avec la culture roumaine*, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1981.

<sup>105</sup> Probably the most touching review was the one signed by Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, in *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 21, 3 (1983), pp. 293-294. The new study was regarded as a great service to the history of Romanian-Greek literary relations and a “precious guide for the Romanian and Greek historians and comparatists, a complete monograph, rich in novel elements”.



three scholars are highly qualitative, competent and objective constructions, representing, in fact, deeper and deeper diggings in the same soil. Many of the works of this triad are now classics (*Critica textelor și tehnica edițiilor; Les Académies princières de Bucarest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs; Athanasios Christopoulos*, etc.), representing models to be followed and offering many suggestions and directions of investigation for the interested audience. Yet, out of subjective reasons, their posterity tends to remain below the level of their work or the influence they exerted in their time, a fact that obliges a future reassessment.

*A. D. Xenopol Institute of History, Romanian Academy*