

# Diachronic Perspective Regarding the Solemnity of the Justice Act over Time

Marilena Marin

*Ovidius University of Constanța, Romania*  
*marilena.marin@365.univ-ovidius.com*

**ABSTRACT:** The concept of solemnity in the act of justice has a long history, originating in antiquity and evolving with the development of society. Since the dawn of history, people have recognized the need to establish official procedures and ceremonies to reach fair and accepted decisions in various disputes and conflicts. Implementing incorrect or erroneous decisions would have deviated from the rules of justice and, at times, even undermined the act of justice. Our work is of practical interest by relating to professional ethics and deontology, as well as analyzing the efficiency of the judicial procedure and the correctness of the title subject to compulsory execution. From the perspective of scientific research methodology, this work addresses the concept of solemnity of the act of justice from the perspective of legal history, through an analysis of each historical era and in relation to certain peoples who have distinguished themselves over time through the rules established in the conduct of trials and the strictness with which they have imposed these rules.

**KEYWORDS:** solemnity, act, justice, judgment, legal procedure/judicial process

## Introduction

Each nation has established specific rules regarding the solemnity of the act of justice, even though these rules have experienced some shortcomings or peculiarities related to the era under analysis, the social category to which the accused or injured party belonged, and/or their criminological profile. The solemnity of the act of justice can be viewed from several perspectives, namely: on the one hand, diachronic and synchronic perspectives, and on the other hand, from the point of view of the form that the legal act presented to the court or the act subject to enforcement (compulsory), as well as from the perspective of the addressing formulas during the trial of a case. In this latter case, the solemnity of the act of justice considers the formulas through which parties and their representatives (lawyers, legal advisors, or agents) address the authorities entrusted by law with the enforcement of a title to be executed. It also considers the formulas and language limits used by the parties and their representatives towards each other and in their relationship with third parties participating in the trial (witnesses, interpreters, experts, etc.).

Among these perspectives, we have chosen to analyze in the context of this work the solemnity of the act of justice through the lens of the relationship between parties and the judiciary over time, especially the appropriate conduct that must be respected before the judge in a case.

## 1. The Origin of the Word “Solemnity” – Terminological Landmarks

The origin of the word “solemnity” can be traced in the history of the Romanian language as well as in its evolution in other European languages. The term “solemnity” comes from Latin, more precisely from the Latin word “sōlemnitas”. In ancient Rome, “sōlemnitas” was used to describe official and sacred ceremonies or rituals that regularly took place to mark various events or celebrations.

The Latin word “sōlemnitas” was a noun derived from “sollemnis”, meaning “festive” or “practiced routinely”. Thus, “solemnity” was associated with the sacred and official nature of certain events or ceremonies, viewed as special and significant moments. With the evolution of the Latin language and its influence on other European languages, the word “solemnity” was adopted in other languages, largely retaining its original meaning. Focusing specifically on French and English, we can understand the significance of this word for authorities applying solemnity in their activities.

In French, the word “solemnité” is defined, among other things, in Larousse Dictionary and Le Petit Robert Dictionary and is similar in meaning to how we use it in the Romanian language. Similarly, in English, the word “solemnity” is defined/associated with sobriety, a certain ceremony, gravity, an impressive attitude, a certain form of seriousness, formalism, sincerity, and the weighty effect that a particular procedure lends to the context. Thus, we observe that the meaning found in English is like that used in the Romanian language.

In Romanian, this word entered through the Latin language, which was a significant source of linguistic borrowings for Romance languages. Therefore, in Romanian, “solemnity” continued to express the idea of the sacred, official, and festive character of ceremonies or procedures (Rotaru 2014, 91-205), holidays, or important events. Over time, the word has been used to describe solemn moments, full of gravity and dignity, whether in a religious or secular context, such as official ceremonies, institutional gatherings, or solemn moments in an individual's personal life (Mitra-Niță 2020, 645). Thus, “solemnity” remains a word with strong connotations of seriousness, respect, and solemnity, evoking the idea of a special moment or event that should be treated with dignity (Rotaru 2016, 29-43) and importance.

## **2. The Concept of "Solemnity" - Legal Landmarks**

The concept of “solemnity” holds a special place in the legal domain. The solemnity of judicial acts represents an essential aspect of the legal system, ensuring a serious and respectful image of the courts and their decisions. In this study, we will explore the legal and procedural aspects related to the solemnity of judicial processes, specifically the legal regulations concerning this aspect, the role of ceremonial forms in legal acts, and the effects of solemnization on the validity of court decisions, including their enforceability.

From a legal standpoint, we encounter the notion of “solemnity” when discussing the form or substance of a legal act. Concerning the form of the act, the legal field typically considers the legal act, while in the same domain, the substance pertains to the act of justice.

Regarding the form, the legal act generally involves the written expression of the respective act to be considered valid and to produce legal effects. From a substantive perspective, solemnity usually refers to verbal expression, the externalization of that act within the limits imposed by the context in which it is used, the quality of the person formulating the request, and the authority to whom that person is addressing.

As for legal regulations regarding the solemnity of judicial processes, it is observed that in most legal systems, there are legal provisions that mandate solemnity in the conduct of judicial processes. These regulations aim to confer authority and respect to acts of justice. Thus, judicial procedures are established by law and must be strictly adhered to ensure a fair and equitable process. This often involves an imperative legal norm. Only in certain cases has the legislator allowed parties the latitude to express a legal issue outside solemn limits.

Among the regulated aspects, we note the ceremonial proceedings before the courts, as found since ancient times and subsequently in each of the following epochs: the Middle Ages, the

modern era, and the contemporary era. The conduct of court sessions and the behavior of participants during the judicial process are defined by law. This includes how judges and parties are to address each other, as well as other conduct rules to maintain a respectful and solemn atmosphere before authority, both in the courtroom and the place where a case is being heard.

Respecting legal procedures implied that each stage of the judicial process be adhered to in accordance with the law, from filing the case and summoning the parties before the presiding authority, to the proposal and administration of evidence, as well as the rendering of the judgment. Any deviation from established procedures could impact the validity of the forthcoming decision.

Simultaneously, ceremonial forms play a crucial role in legal proceedings, contributing to the creation of a solemn and respectful atmosphere in the courtroom. These aspects also serve a symbolic and psychological function, marking the significance of the judicial process and the decisions made. An example of a ceremonial form in modern times is the utterance of the opening statement in a court session, where the judge announces the commencement of the session and presents its purpose. Additionally, addressing formulas such as “Honorable Court”, “Your Honor”, or “Mr./Mrs. President” contribute to upholding the dignity of the court and the participants in the process. Since the dawn of history, the effects of imposing specific patterns related to the concept of “solemnity” have been aimed at ensuring the validity of judicial decisions and their enforcement. When a decision is pronounced with a certain solemnity, it carries greater authority in the eyes of the parties involved in the dispute and the public. The validity of a judicial decision is also linked to the adherence to legal procedures during the process. If the trial procedure is not followed, there is and continues to be the risk of the decision being contested and ultimately annulled by a higher court, depending on the strictness with which the procedure is applied and the solemnity of the act of justice.

Furthermore, the solemnization of the decision contributes to its enforcement. Litigating parties are more inclined to respect and implement a judicial decision if it is pronounced solemnly, emphasizing the importance and seriousness of the decision. In contemporary times, a component of solemnity is the legalization of judicial decisions by the court that rendered the decision, a procedural moment from which, usually, the decision can be enforced coercively.

Considering the foregoing, we can derive the following conclusion: the solemnity of the act of justice is an essential element of the legal system, ensuring the adherence to legal procedures and conferring greater authority to judicial decisions. Ceremonial forms play a significant role in creating a solemn atmosphere in the courtroom and underscore the importance of the judicial process. By solemnizing the act of justice, the integrity and efficiency of the judicial system are maintained.

“Solemnity” remains a word with strong connotations of seriousness, respect, (sometimes) condescension, and deference, evoking the idea of special moments or events that must be treated with dignity and importance.

### **3. The Solemnity of Adjudication in Ancient Rome**

In Ancient Rome, the adjudication of disputes was a solemn and sacred event, reflecting the significance placed on justice and social stability within Roman society. Judicial processes were an essential part of Roman life, providing a means to resolve disputes and ensure adherence to the law. This solemnity in jurisdiction contributed to the efficient functioning of the Roman judicial system and the maintenance of social order.

One of the main locations where trials took place in Ancient Rome was the Roman Forum, the central hub of political and legal life in the city, which also served as a courtroom. In this sacred

place, where Roman gods guarded justice, Roman citizens brought their complaints and disputes to be resolved. Trials were public, and participants and spectators gathered to witness their proceedings, observing how disputes were unraveled and justice was served.

An important aspect of the solemnity of the trial proceedings was the attire worn by the judges. Magistrates, elected from among the citizens to exercise authority in the realm of justice, wore the “*toga pretexta*”, a white toga with purple borders. This toga symbolized their dignity and judicial power, reflecting the sacred nature of their function. Furthermore, religious ceremonies and sacrifices accompanying these rituals before the commencement of trials added solemnity to the act of justice. It was believed that in this way, the gods were consulted and guided the magistrates and judges in making correct decisions. The presence of priests and the offering of sacrifices to the gods emphasized the sacred character of justice and the connection between divinity and Roman law.

During the trials, the involved parties had the right to present their cases and arguments before the judges, following specific procedures of the era in which the trial took place, based on the type of applicable judicial procedure (*legis-actionis* procedure, *formulary* procedure, *extraordinary* procedure, or *special* procedures). Lawyers were often hired to represent the interests of the litigating parties. Their speeches were elaborate and well-prepared, as persuasion and rhetoric played a crucial role in convincing the judges. However, the judicial procedure imposed certain rules and solemnities that, if not strictly adhered to, resulted in the loss of the case by the party failing to comply with the established procedure.

Magistrates and judges played an active role in the process, having the ability to question the involved parties for clarification or to delve deeper into the presented arguments. They placed great importance on customary law and precedents established earlier in similar cases, respecting the solemnity of the act of justice characterizing the applicable judicial procedure at that historical moment. A clarification needs to be made regarding the difference between the two public functions, namely, that of a “magistrate” and that of a “judge”. In the case of *legis-actionis* and *formulary* procedures, Roman law had two stages of judgment: the “*in iure*” phase (before the magistrate) and the “*in iudicio*” phase (before the judge). These two phases could be applied successively, in the situation where the litigating parties failed to resolve the issue amicably, or the dispute could be resolved in the first phase before the magistrate (Sâmbrian 1994, 112, 126).

During the application period of the extraordinary procedure, the two procedural phases coexisted, in the sense that the roles of the two public officials (magistrate and judge) were fulfilled/exercised by a single person, because of the existence of a single trial phase. As for the solemn atmosphere of the trial, it was intended to assure the litigants that each case was treated seriously, and that justice was obtained. Part of this solemnity was reflected in the public nature of the proceedings, where knowledge of the judgments pronounced by the judge’s instilled confidence in the judicial system among the people. Decisions resulting from the trials were respected and strictly enforced. Violating a court decision could lead to accusations of defiance of authority and attract severe sanctions. This desire to maintain order and enforce compliance with the law contributed to the stability and longevity of the Roman Empire.

In the territory of Dacia, which became a Roman province, the applicable judicial procedure was generally that specific to the Roman state, just like in the case of other territories conquered by the Romans and transformed into Roman provinces (Marcu 1997, 52-53). During this period, regulations regarding the inclusion of criminal law in the category/family of private law were encountered (Vasiu 2009, 71).

In the light of the above, we note that the solemnity of the trial process in Ancient Rome was an expression of the importance placed on justice and respect for judicial authority. Religious

ceremonies, the “*toga pretexta*”, and the rigor of procedures contributed to maintaining social order and upholding the law within Roman society. This solemn approach to justice influenced how the Romans understood the concept of justice and contributed to the consolidation of their empire over the centuries. Some of the rules that governed the adjudication of cases were so rigorously regulated that they were adopted by other peoples and transmitted through the ages, even to the nowadays.

#### **4. The solemnity of adjudicating disputes in the Middle Ages**

In the Middle Ages, justice was considered a matter of great importance for maintaining order and justice in society. We can even speak of a moment in the formation of legal consciousness (Negoiță 2013, 157). Adjudicating disputes was a solemn activity, conducted in a ceremonial framework, with specific rules and traditions that reflected the significance of this process. Both in European kingdoms and in other states/formations on different continents, the solemnity and ritual of judicature were deemed necessary to demonstrate the authority and power of the courts, as well as to ensure the enforcement of the pronounced judgments.

Historical and legal sources reveal the existence of three legal systems in the medieval period: royal justice, ecclesiastical justice, and feudal justice, each having peculiarities, including the solemnity of adjudicating cases/disputes. In addition to the judgment faced by individuals, the medieval world also engaged in the judgment of animals, following the same rules regarding the solemnity of trial proceedings.

The venue of the trial was one of the most crucial elements of solemnity in adjudicating disputes in the Middle Ages. It is noteworthy that during this era, no distinction was made between civil and criminal justice (Marcu 1997, 134). Typically, the trial took place in the royal court or in the presence of an important noble, while in other forms of state organization, the trial occurred in a location that heightened the importance of the act of justice. Participants in the process, including judges, lawyers, and the involved parties, were seated in predetermined places, observing a specific protocol in their hierarchical positioning. This spatial organization emphasized the authority of the court and the subordination of all to the royal or sovereign power with judicial responsibilities.

Another important aspect of solemnity was the attire of the trial participants. Judges and lawyers involved in the process generally wore special robes with symbols and ornaments indicating their status and authority within the judicial system. The parties involved in the dispute were also expected to wear appropriate clothing, and they were required to adhere to a specific dress code to reflect the importance and gravity of the moment in which they participated.

Rituals and symbols played a central role in the solemnity of adjudication in the Middle Ages. Often, proceedings began with an opening ritual, in which the judge or a trusted person invoked divine blessings upon the forthcoming act of justice. In certain cases, symbolic objects such as the sword or scepter were used to emphasize the authority and power of the judge. These elements aimed to impress the participants and encourage them to approach the process with seriousness and respect, urging them to uphold the solemnity of the act of justice. Additionally, we speak about the concept of law and justice in relation to the specific social values of the medieval world (Negoiță 2013, 63).

At the same time, the solemnity of adjudicating disputes in the Middle Ages was often accompanied by a series of specific ceremonies and traditions. For example, significant legal proceedings could be preceded by a large assembly of nobles or representatives of local communities, where various issues were addressed, and important decisions were made. These assemblies also had a social character, contributing to the strengthening of ties between different social classes and maintaining social order.

Another noteworthy aspect is that, in many cases, the adjudication of disputes in the Middle Ages was associated with trials by combat or other means of determining guilt or innocence. Although these methods may seem archaic and unfair today, they were seen as ways in which Divinity would reveal the truth and influence the outcome of the process.

The judicial system of the medieval era was characterized by several aspects, both public and occult/secret, strongly influenced by the church and, at times, compromised due to abuses committed in the name of justice and/or divinity. Notably, the Inquisition and secret tribunals played a significant role in adjudicating certain categories of disputes during the medieval period, including the Vehmic Tribunal (or the “tribunal of terror”) in Germany or the Council of Ten in the Republic of Venice.

In comparison to the aforementioned, it is noted that the solemnity of adjudicating disputes in the Middle Ages reflected the importance society attributed to the act of justice. The rituals, symbols, and ceremonies associated with legal proceedings emphasized the authority and power of the courts and ensured that participants understood the solemnity of the judicial process. Although many of the traditions and practices of that time have long been forgotten in modern justice systems, the solemn legacy of the Middle Ages has left a certain imprint on the evolution of the current judicial system.

## **5. The solemnity of litigation in the modern era**

The role and importance of the judicial system have significantly evolved. In the modern era, it no longer merely represents a tool for conflict resolution but also serves as a bastion of the rule of law and democracy. In the essence of the normative act, we find the foundation of punishment and even the right of the state to impose a penalty (Mitra-Niță 2021, 162-164). Therefore, the solemnity of case adjudication adapts to the respect for individual rights, the protection of citizens against abuses, and the maintenance of a balance between state powers.

Litigation in the modern era aimed to ensure the functioning of a fair and efficient judicial system, in line with the specific social values of this era (Poirier 1968). Historical and legal sources provide evidence of the legal systems applicable in this era (feudal law or bourgeois law), as well as how the modern legal system was expressed. It is during this period that the concept of the “family of law” (system of law) emerges, distinguishing between the Roman-Germanic legal family (starting from the 13th century) and the Anglo-Saxon legal family (David 1978).

The Roman-Germanic legal system or family brings attention to the work of glossators, who interpreted Justinian's Digest through notes (called “glosses”). An important influence on this legal system was exerted by Catholic canon law, composed of a set of fundamental Catholic normative acts. In turn, this legal system (also known as the civil law system) is divided into subsystems where we find peculiarities of the solemnity of legal acts, such as the French influence (French private law - written law) or the German influence (based on unwritten law, considered to be “sacred law”).

The Anglo-Saxon legal system or family, known under the generic term “common law”, represents the law created by judges and applied in similar cases based on the application of judicial precedent. This legal system is based on common law in a narrow sense, equity resulting from legal norms before the unification of English jurisdictions, and written law (which has the character of a special law). We observe that reforms in Europe between the 18th and 19th centuries had a significant impact on economic, political, and social development in Europe (Apetrei 2009, 24). These reforms were largely inspired by Enlightenment principles and aimed at increasing efficiency, social progress, and the evolution of the legal system.

In the modern period, Romanian law refers to several normative acts (written law) that have shaped the normative system underlying the modern legal order. Among these normative acts, we mention the Calimach Code and the Legislation/Caragea Code - collections of laws (Firoiu 1976, 143); the Organic Regulations (1831 in Wallachia and 1832 in Moldavia), which had the character of fundamental laws. The latter limited the prerogatives/duties of the head of state in the issuance of laws. Additionally, the Organic Regulations regulated the professional status of certain officials as career magistrates and recognized the right of certain officials to adjudicate various disputes in the first instance (judicial officials), who were remunerated by the state. Also, during the period of the Organic Regulations, Romanian legal terminology used the term “law” for normative acts issued by the public assemblies, while the term “domestic office” was used for acts issued by the head of state. Written legislation, i.e., collections of laws, became normative acts of a general nature, gaining greater importance compared to customary law.

The legal procedure in Romanian countries experienced some peculiarities, including the solemnity of the judicial act. Thus, in the modern era, in Wallachia and Moldavia, there were modifications to the normative acts governing the adjudication of processes through legislation imposed by the ruler Constantin Mavrocordat. In Transylvania, the judicial procedure began to be applied differentially regarding civil and criminal cases, maintaining the solemnity of the trial.

Another aspect of the solemnity of the judicial act is the regulation of the fundamental rights of the parties involved in the dispute. This involved access to relevant information and resources, the right to legal assistance, as well as the right to an impartial and independent trial. In this regard, the modernization of the judicial system brought about a series of reforms aimed at ensuring the respect for these rights, such as the emergence of collections of laws considering both substantive and procedural law. In Romanian law, an important place is occupied by the reforming work of Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza (Giurescu 2000, 98). The legislative codification project promoted by Prince Cuza was initiated after the Union of the Romanian Principalities. The aim of this project was to create a unified legislative system across the entire country.

Among the normative acts that paid particular attention to the solemnity of the judicial act are the procedural codes (1865). The judicial procedure was based on the concept that the “objective truth” could not be known by the court, and the decision pronounced by this authority could express only the legal truth. The Civil Procedure Code was inspired by the following European normative acts: the procedural law of the Canton of Geneva, the French Civil Procedure Code, the Belgian Law on Forced Execution, as well as a series of previous Romanian normative acts. This collection of laws was composed of seven books, namely: the procedure before the county judge, county courts, courts of appeal, arbitrators, forced execution, special procedures, and general provisions. Regarding these books, historical and legal sources attest that the first of them was never applied. The reason is that there was not enough personnel, so the competence of these courts was entrusted to deputy prefects until 1879 when it was later repealed by the Law for Communal and District Courts.

The Code of Criminal Procedure that influenced the elaboration of this code was the French Code of Criminal Instruction (1808). Also, this Romanian collection of laws regulated the conduct of participants in the legal process and, implicitly, the solemnity of the act of justice. In addition, compared to the old regulations in criminal matters, the written, secret, and non-contradictory procedure was replaced with oral, public, and contradictory judgment.

In terms of structure, the criminal procedure code comprised two books corresponding to the two phases of the criminal process, namely: the book regulating the actions performed in the phase preceding the trial (identification, pursuit, and investigation/instruction of offenses) and the

book regulating the procedure to be followed in the trial phase, which was the second phase of the criminal process.

In criminal matters, the procedural code also established the competent hierarchical authorities to resolve cases, namely: county courts (which had exclusive written regulation without practical applicability due to the lack of specialized personnel), county courts, courts with a jury, and the Court of Cassation and Justice.

The emergence of collections of laws/codes, which included, among other things, rules based on which the trial process should unfold, rigorously regulated the conduct of legal proceedings. These demonstrated an evolution in the legal field and prepared society for the changes that were to take place in the contemporary era.

## **6. The solemnity of litigation in the contemporary era**

Litigating in the contemporary era is an essential aspect of the judicial system, practically serving as a pillar of justice that maintains order and stability in a modern society. The concept of “solemnity” in the act of justice is related to the adherence to principles and norms that ensure a fair, transparent, and impartial process. In this study, we consider the importance of the solemnity of litigation in the contemporary era and how it is guaranteed.

We do not overlook the influence of totalitarian regimes or the ideology promoted by communist states on the solemnity of the act of justice (Firoiu 1976, 315, 335, 366). However, we do not intend to analyze these specificities within the scope of this work.

Before delving into the concept of “solemnity” in this era, we recall that the contemporary era faced two world wars and the shift of political power centers globally, influencing peoples, including legally. The legal aspect itself characterized the relationships between states, between states and individuals, as well as between individuals viewed as citizens of states or stateless individuals. Against the backdrop of politico-historical developments, starting from the premises of the modern era, the legal issue, swinging between the breadth of negotiations and the strictness of the solemnity of the act of justice, has been grafted, as we explore in this study.

First and foremost, the solemnity of litigation ensures respect for the fundamental rights of the parties involved in the process. In contemporary society, equality before the law and the right to a fair trial are fundamental principles. By ensuring solemnity, justice could fulfill its role objectively and, at the same time, to apply the law fairly, regardless of the social status or economic power of the individuals involved. Another aspect of the solemnity of litigation in the contemporary era is the transparency of the judicial process (Turcu, Stan, and Laszlo 2007, 56-59). Judicial institutions and legal procedures must be accessible to the public, respecting confidentiality where necessary. Transparency ensures trust in the judicial system and allows citizens to understand how justice operates and how laws are applied.

Furthermore, the solemnity of litigation plays a significant role in maintaining the independence of the judicial system. In contemporary society, the rule of law implies that the powers of the state are separated, and none can arbitrarily influence or control the power of the other. By guaranteeing the solemnity of the process, judges can make objective and impartial decisions without external pressures or political influences.

It is also worth noting that the solemnity of the act of justice does not necessarily involve a dispute or the defense of an injured right. A procedural act may require a solemn form to have full legal effects, according to its nature (Turcu and Stan 2006, 10).

In the contemporary era, specifically in the period we can call “recent history”, technological advancement and digitization have brought significant changes to the judicial



system. Although these innovations have brought efficiency and increased accessibility to information, there are challenges in maintaining solemnity in the virtual environment. Protecting personal data, preventing fraud, and ensuring security online are particularly important aspects of maintaining trust in the contemporary judicial process.

Moreover, in the contemporary era, the expectation for expeditious resolution of disputes is common. However, it is essential not to compromise the solemnity of the process in favor of speed or so-called “celerity”. Rapid but unfair resolution of a dispute can cause significant harm to the parties involved and erode trust in the justice system.

To maintain the solemnity of adjudication in the contemporary era, it is crucial for legal professionals to be well-prepared and adhere to a strict ethical code. Continuous training for judges, prosecutors, and court personnel, as well as for lawyers, legal counselors, notaries public, bailiffs, and auxiliary staff serving legal professions, along with transparent and responsible management of judicial resources, are essential elements to ensure the quality and integrity of the judicial system, as well as the solemnity of the administration of justice (Mitra-Niță and Drăghici 2019, 132). At this point in our study, we can assert that the solemnity of adjudicating disputes and enforcing court decisions in the contemporary era is crucial for the functioning of a society based on the rule of law. Respecting fundamental human rights, transparency, independence, and professional ethics are key elements to maintain citizens' trust in the justice system. With appropriate adaptation to technological and social changes, while respecting the solemnity of the administration of justice, the contemporary judicial system can continue to ensure a fair and impartial process for all participants in a legal dispute and the enforcement of court decisions.

## Conclusions

The concept of “solemnity in acts of justice” has a long history and, as we have seen, it has its roots in ancient civilizations and has evolved with the development of human societies. From the beginning, people recognized the need to establish official and ceremonial procedures to reach correct and accepted decisions in various disputes and conflicts, as well as to enforce them. When enforcement was not possible through mutual understanding, resorting to the coercive force of authority (whatever that authority may be) and forced execution were unanimously agreed upon and applied. In medieval Europe, the solemnization of justice acquired a strong religious connotation. Judges and judicial officials were often considered representatives of God on earth, and their acts had a divine significance. Religious ceremonies associated with judicial processes emphasized their importance and sacredness. With the emergence of modern national states and the principle of separation of powers, the solemnization of acts of justice began to detach from the religious sphere and acquire a more secular dimension. However, ceremonial elements and formalities remained present to underline the importance of justice and ensure strict adherence to procedural rules.

The solemnization of acts of justice plays an essential role in maintaining the authority and legitimacy of the judicial system and the enforcement of court decisions by competent authorities. Currently, judicial ceremonies contribute to highlighting the importance and seriousness of legal processes, conveying respect for law and order, encouraging public trust in authorities, and ensuring social stability. Therefore, based on the foregoing, we can conclude that the administration of justice, from the moment a court is seized until the enforcement of a court decision, must be circumscribed by the law, thereby emphasizing the importance and seriousness of justice applicable in a society founded on legal order and the necessary balance for social evolution.

## References

- David, René. 1978. *Grands systèmes de droit contemporains*. Paris: Dalloz Publishing House.
- Firoiu, Dumitru V. 1976. *History of the Romanian state and law*. Bucharest: Didactic and Pedagogical Publishing House.
- Giurescu, Constantin. C. 2000. *The life and work of Cuza Vodă*. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing House.
- Marcu, Liviu P. 1997. *History of the Romanian Law*. Bucharest: Lumina Lex Publishing House.
- Mitra-Niță, Mariana and Vasile Drăghici. 2019. "The evolution of the criminal sanctioning system in the last 100 years in Romania I." *A century since the establishment of Greater Romania. 140 years since the return of Dobrogea to Romania*. Bucharest: Universul Juridic Publishing House.
- Mitra-Niță, Mariana. 2020. "Contributions of the current Penal Code regarding the protection of religious freedom." In *Journal of Freedom of Conscience* 8(1): 2020.
- Mitra-Niță, Mariana. 2021. "The Basis of Punishment. The State's Right to Punish." In *Proceedings of the 21st International RAIS Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities*. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4640878.
- Negoită, Florin, 2013. *History of the Romanian state and law*. Bucharest: Universul Juridic Publishing House.
- Poirier, Jean. 1968. *Introduction a l'appareil juridique – Typologie des systèmes juridiques*. Ethologie générale. Paris: Encyclopédie de la Pléiade.
- Rotaru, Ioan-Gheorghe. 2016. "Plea for Human Dignity." *Scientia Moralitas. Human Dignity - A Contemporary Perspectives* 1 (1): 29-43.
- Rotaru, Ioan-Gheorghe. 2014. *Drept bisericesc [Church Law]*. Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint Publishing.
- Sâmbrian, Teodor. 1994. *Roman law. Principles, Institutions and Famous Texts*. Bucharest: Publishing House and Press "Chance".
- Topor, Roxana Elena. 2021. "Judicial prohibition between social perception and protection of the law." *Romanian Journal of Jurisprudence*. no. 3/2021. Bucharest: Universul Juridic Publishing House.
- Turcu, Ion, Mădălina Stan, and Traian Laszlo. 2007. "Lights and shadows in the twilight zone. Considerations based on the legal diagnosis of disqualifying the debtor's act in the twilight zone." *Revue Acta Universitatis Lucian Blaga. Iurisprudentia* No. 1-2/2007.
- Turcu, Ion, and Mădălina Stan. 2006. "The eternal French model - a reflection theme for the new insolvency procedure." In *Commercial Law Review*. No. 1/2006.
- Vasiu, Ioana. 2009. *History of old Romanian law*. Cluj-Napoca: Alabastră Publishing House.