



**TÜBINGER ARCHÄOLOGISCHE
TASCHENBÜCHER**

3

**Peter F. Biehl,
Alexander Gramsch, Arkadiusz Marciniak (Hrsg.)**

Archäologien Europas/ Archaeologies of Europe

**Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien/
History, Methods and Theories**

WAXMANN

Archäologien Europas /
Archaeologies of Europe

Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher

herausgegeben von
Manfred K. H. Eggert
und Ulrich Veit

Band 3



Waxmann Münster / New York
München / Berlin

Archäologien Europas / Archaeologies of Europe

Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien /
History, Methods and Theories

Herausgegeben von Peter F. Biehl,
Alexander Gramsch und Arkadiusz Marciniak



Waxmann Münster / New York
München / Berlin

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Archäologien Europas : Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien

= Archaeologies of Europe / hrsg. von Peter F. Biehl

– Münster ; New York ; München ; Berlin: Waxmann, 2002

(Tübinger archäologische Taschenbücher ; 3)

ISBN 3-8309-1067-3

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung
der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung

Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher, Band 3

ISSN 1430-0931

ISBN 3-8309-1067-3

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2002

Postfach 8603, D-48046 Münster, F. R. G.

<http://www.waxmann.com>

E-Mail: info@waxmann.com

Umschlaggestaltung: Pleßmann Kommunikationsdesign, Ascheberg

Umschlagzeichnung: Holger Singowitz (nach einem Motiv vom
unteren Tor von Schloss Hohentübingen aus dem frühen 17. Jh.)

Druck: Runge GmbH, Cloppenburg

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier, DIN 6738

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Printed in Germany

DRAGOȘ GHEORGHIU & CHRISTIAN F. SCHUSTER

The avatars of a paradigm: A short history of Romanian archaeology¹

Introduction

The present paper will for the first time present the Western public with a brief panorama of the historical context of the different phases of archaeology in Romania and the consequences they have had on past and current archaeological research.

Romanian archaeology from its origins up to 1989 was based on culture-history method that became a paradigm for approaching the past. This is an attitude specific to small nations, where the idea of national unity was used to legitimize territorial claims (Urbańczyk 2000, 49) and counteracted internal divisions (Trigger 1989, 174).

In small nations recently emerged from peasant cultures, as was the case of Romania at the end of the 19th century, where the ancestors' cult (and more recently heroes) was fundamental, and where history identifies itself with a descendent identity to the past, it was natural that archaeology (as a science issued from history), be used precisely to legitimize a kinship continuity between present and the past.

The national paradigm I

The emergence of a national state

The 19th century coincided with three important phenomena: the increasing attention of Western Europe to Oriental markets that manifested in the Crimean War, attempts to establish a link of East to West by means of the Danube River, and the emergence of pro-Western national elites in the Romanian provinces.

A brief description of the Romanian states, Wallachia and Moldavia, is that of peasant societies, with small urban areas. Consequently, the national idea was shared both by high culture and folk culture.

Wallachia and Moldavia united in 1859, although they were still under Turkish tutelage, while Transylvania was annexed to Austria and later to Austria-Hungary.

In the provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia, the urban culture was restricted to a few towns and market towns, and was influenced both by the East and the West, the latter particularly by French culture. Although the influence of medieval chroniclers is

¹ Many thanks to Dr. Peter F. Biehl for the kind invitation to publish the present paper although it was not presented at the conference, as well as to Professor Radu Florescu for the oral history data generously offered. Last, but not least, thanks to Dr. Alex Gibson for improving the English of the text.

still present in the historical production of the modern epoch (e. g., in the works of Dimitrie Cantemir [1673-1723], prince of Moldavia and humanist scholar), the intellectual ideas from France were particularly influential in Moldavia. In the search for common origins, the intellectual appeal of the elite from the three states, all of whom shared the same neo-Latin origins, was materialized in the penchant to “trace ethnic identities in the archaeological record” (Trigger 1989, 162-163) of Roman Antiquity. This quest issued from political grounds (see Urbańczyk 2000, 51). They wanted to free themselves from the domination of Turkey and Austrian-Hungary. In the 19th century, archaeology in all Romanian states represented an instrument for the awakening of a collective consciousness of a common origin, and, as in other European countries, it developed as soon as the modern ‘nation-state’ (Giddens 1990, 13) emerged and defined its territoriality.

The “idea of Rome” (Pârvan 1920) became the paradigm of the national culture that would last, with some interruptions, until the end of the 20th century.

The antiquarians: from collections to national consciousness

The generation of the 1848 revolutionaries, educated in French, Austrian or German universities, shaped scientific research, both in theory and practice. History and, implicitly, archaeology were perceived as the instruments of the national unity and independence, so antiquarianism also became an instrument to help build national identity, parallel with the building of the national state.

In Moldavia and Wallachia real antiquarianism emerged at the beginning of the 19th century, when some collectors began to start archaeological excavations and to publish results. A prominent personality in the epoch was the nobleman Mihalache Ghica (1792-1850) who established the Museum of Natural History and Antiquities in Bucharest in 1834, and who created the first laws concerning archaeological excavations in Wallachia (Babeş 1994, 95).

In 1864, a decree of the prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza set up the National Museum of Antiquities that gathered the big local collections, such as those belonging to Nicolae Mavros, Dimitrie Papazoglu, Nicolae Creţulescu, Cezar Bolliac.

“The idea of Rome” and the first scientific epoch: from 1859 to 1914

In the interval between the union of Wallachia with Moldavia under the name of the Romanian Principalities, and their union with Transylvania in 1918 as the Romanian Kingdom, three personalities shaped the study of archaeology: Cezar Bolliac (1813-1881), Alexandru Odobescu (1834-1895), Grigore Tocilescu (1850-1909).

Cezar Bolliac, a classicist working on Roman antiquities, initiated the first protohistoric and prehistoric diggings in Romania (Babeş 1994, 95).

In a more scientific manner, Alexandru Odobescu continued the study of pre- and protohistory and in 1874 he published *The Arts in Romania in the Prehistoric Epoch* along with his studies of classical monuments such as the *Notices sur les antiquités de Roumanie* (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1940, 39).

Odobescu was also the founder of archaeological education and his course on the history of archaeology delivered between 1874-1875 is the first Western-style course in archaeology. He became chair of the department of archaeology, established in 1877, the same year as when the Principalities became independent. This demonstrated the institutionalization of archaeology within the national culture.

Grigore Tocilescu ("the last representative [in Romania] of the Romantic Western school, in the moment when it tried to emphasize German criticism") succeeded Odobescu in promoting classical as well as prehistoric archaeology. His PhD. thesis *Dacia before the Romans* was awarded by the Romanian Academy in the same year as the Principalities' independence. His activity fixed the place of archaeology into the frame of the national historical science (Babeş 1994, 95). Between 1882 and 1890, Tocilescu studied the Tropaeum Trajani monument from Dobroudja and published it later in Vienna together with O. Benndorf and G. Niemann in 1895.

As a rule, Romanian intellectuals, educated in Western Europe (for the influence of the German school of historiography, see Popovici 1999-2000, 19) in the spirit of culture-history, returned to their native country to create a national culture. This is because in Europe archaeology was "undeniably social and historical" (Hodder 1991, 4), and could not be dissociated from national contexts (Hodder 1991, 4). Therefore Romanian archaeologists, as well as other contemporary European archaeologists (Hodder 1991, 2), were driven by the national paradigm in their attempt to explain ethnogenesis.

A particular example of that epoch is the discovery of the antiquities in Dobroudja, a region retrieved from the Ottoman Empire in 1878, one year after the independence of the Principalities.

The discovery in Dobroudja of the Tropaeum Trajani, "a birth certificate of the Romanian people [that produced] enthusiasm in the intellectual milieu" (Vulpe 1928, 6), led to a spate of archaeological excavations (1882-1890) conducted by Tocilescu. But, after the initial *ebullience* the rhythm of the research slowed down (Vulpe 1928, 8).

Teohari Antonescu (1866-1910), a student of Odobescu, continued Tocilescu's work at Tropaeum Trajani in 1905.

In spite of the fact that the public attention was focused on classical archaeology, parallel to the search for Latin roots, the study of proto- and prehistoric material culture developed. Archaeologists discovered the importance of the remote past for the national paradigm, as put by Camille Jullian (Andrieşescu 1940, 22): "Neolithic probably means the real beginning of our national history".

The national paradigm: from 1918 to 1927

In 1919, as part of the European cult of the heroes (ancestors), in Romania, in high and folk cultures the "solemn memory of Emperor Trajan" was celebrated "1800 years from his death" (Analele Academiei 1921), thereby stressing the Latin roots of the nation.

After the union of 1918, archaeological research began to be more systematic in Dobroudja, along the Danube, up to the Tisza river, in the north of Bessarabia, in Banat (i. e., in the outlying, or in the recently enclosed regions), and an archaeological map of Romania was produced in association with the International Association of Academies in Brussels.

The most outstanding personality of the epoch was Vasile Pârvan (1882–1927), educated in the classical German school, as well as in France and Italy. According to a contemporary scholar, Pârvan “introduced the methods of prehistoric archaeology to the research of the origins [of the Romanian nation], thus giving rise to a national protohistory” (Vulpe 1928, 14). In Dobroudja, Pârvan (helped by Tocilescu) organized systematic excavations of Graeco-Roman cities and set up local museums in Constanţa, Mangalia, and Histria. The cities were later devastated by German and Bulgarian armies.

In 1912 he established a department of prehistory at the National Museum of Antiquities in Bucharest, and in 1920 he created a readership in prehistoric archaeology (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1940, 40). This was the moment when the study of “the north-west spreading of Thracian population” (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1940, 40) began in Romania.

Starting in 1922, Pârvan organized the Romanian School in Rome (Babeş 1994, 96) to present the Dobroudja discoveries in Italy. A compendium of his research in Dobroudja (*The beginnings of Roman life at Danube's mouths*) was published in 1923, and his protohistorical studies in 1927 (*Getica – A protohistory of Dacia*). Pârvan's work had an international echo, confirmed by the conferences at St. John's College in Cambridge, and the publishing of his work in England (Pârvan 1928).

In 1927 two archaeological journals were edited under Pârvan's patronage: *Ephemeris Dacoromana* and *Dacia*, “the journal of research and discoveries from Romania”, the latter being one of “the best and efficient achievements of [Romanian] culture to international science” (Vulpe 1928, 26).

Pârvan's commitment to prehistory led after 1918 to the drawing up of the “archaeological map of Dacia” (Mateescu and Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1940, 57), and to the investigation of the most important prehistoric settlements: Gumelniţa (by V. Dumitrescu 1925), Boian and Vădastra (by V. Christescu 1925–1926), Căscioarele (by G. Ştefan 1925), and other sites. (Andrieşescu 1929, 147).

The activity of museums increased, including work at the Museum Teohari Antonescu from Giurgiu, who published a bulletin on prehistoric research. In this climate of emulation created by the master, a new generation of archaeologists came forth, including Grigore Florescu (1892–1960), Theofil Sauciuc-Săveanu (1884–1971) and Orest Tafrali (1876–1937).

In Bucharest, and later in Iaşi and Cluj, a Chair of Prehistoric Archaeology was set up, as well as a Seminar that promoted diverse studies, from prehistory up to modern history.

Palaeolithic studies, which until 1912 were “a problem of the future” (Andrieşescu 1912, 16–17), after only a decade became a subject of study for many scholars and were endorsed by Abbot du Breuil's visit (Anghelinu 1998–2000, 272) to the collections in Braşov (du Breuil 1924). Romanian Palaeolithic studies were deeply influ-

enced by the chronologies and typologies of the French school, being in consonance with the Western ones for a long time.

Generally, for prehistory and protohistory, the German school was a methodological model for Romanian archaeology and stipended students, such as Ion Nestor (1905-1974) to study in Germany. As soon as 1909, Hubert Schmidt applied successfully the stratigraphic method at the eponymous site of the Cucuteni culture (Monah and Monah 1997, 23), and during World War I Carl Schuchhardt and the archbishop R. Netzhammer dug Roman earthwalls and Neolithic kurgans (round barrows) or studied Roman-Christian antiquities at Constanța.

The national paradigm II: 1927–1945

This period can be described as being that of Pârvan's school of archaeology.

The Seminar in Bucharest became an active factor in promoting archaeology, particularly prehistoric, and a new journal, the *Journal of Prehistory and National Antiquities*, was founded.

Andrieșescu (1888-1944) characterized the activity of the Seminar as a way for “future professors of history, geography and classic languages, to identify our antiquities, collaborating to the great future work of organizing the material that we miss now” (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmbovița 1940, 52). Compared with the history department, the Seminar doubled the number of students within the next decade (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmbovița 1940, 53).

As part of the readership *The Prehistoric archaeology of Dacia*, in 1931 Vladimir Dumitrescu presented the first theoretical studies on the Chalcolithic Gumelnița and Cucuteni cultures (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmbovița 1940, 50). At the same time, at the Berlin Museum der Völkerkunde, Ion Nestor delivered lectures on stratigraphy, chronology and typology (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmbovița 1940, 50).

In 1937 the International Congress of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology was organized in Bucharest, an occasion for Romanian archaeologists to present the current research at Sărata-Monteoru, Poiana Coșofenești and Oinac (Revista 1937, Pl. I-XXXVI).

The Palaeolithic studies of the epoch were influenced by diffusionism, and the sequence of cultures was modeled on the French system, insisting upon vertical stratigraphy (Anghelinu 1998-2000, 273). Neolithic studies made use of diffusion theory too, to explain some analogies between cultures. Vladimir Dumitrescu identified a possible source for Cucuteni painted ceramics in the “pre-Elamite centre of Souse II” (Dumitrescu 1931, 19).

Compared with the Bucharest school, the Cluj school led by Pârvan's student Dimitrie Mihail Theodorescu (1881–1947) focused mostly on classical studies, and published between 1928 and 1948 the Roman monuments from Transylvania in the *Institute of Classical Studies Yearbook*.

The same attitude characterized the Iași school that published *Art and Archaeology* directed by Orest Tafrali (1876–1937) and then by Paul Nicorescu (1890-1946) (Babeș 1994, 97).

In Bessarabia, archaeological research was conducted by Nicolae Moroşan (1902-1944), a scholar educated at the French school, who tried to start a center of scientific research in archaeology (Dergacev 1994, 8). Special attention was given to the study of the medieval antiquities, such as the White Citadel (Nicorescu 1931; Avakian 1931).

The Romanian School in Rome founded by Pârvan in 1922 (Babeş 1994, 97) supported classical archaeology for two decades. Its last director was Scarlat Lambrino (1891-1964), epigraphist and historian of Graeco-Roman antiquity.

A conclusion of the pre- World War II period is that archaeology became “an integral part of the Romanian scientific heritage” (Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1940, 62). Western theories and methodologies of different schools were synthesized into a coherent system that became functional. As Tallgren remarked in 1938, “due to its great museums and its talented and very energetic prehistorians, Romania acquired a secure place in the international archaeological prehistory. Such a rapid development means a victory for the Eurasian archaeology too [...], archaeological activity in Romania in the last decade is one of the greatest conquests of our science” (Tallgren 1938, 237).

The beneficiary of the archaeological research in the pre-war period was popular culture that used the construct of origins to express national identity. Such an attitude could be found in school textbooks that stressed “we are among the oldest people of Europe, and the oldest of south-east Europe [this producing] a feeling of national pride and of absolute confidence in the future of our people and state” (Giurescu 1941, 4).

The first terror: from 1948 to 1955

After World War II, Europe was divided both politically and culturally into two zones, or “camps” (Tismăneanu 1998, 159), a separation that tried to change human nature (Communism and Socialism attempted to create a “new man”) as well as scientific methods in the East of Europe.

For Romania, the year 1948 represented the year of the beginning of the terror (Tănase 1998, 59) and of the “class struggle”, i. e., the setting against each other of the professional and ethnic subcultures. A priority was the “annihilation of the elites”, particularly in science and education (Tănase 1998, 63).

The imposition of the Soviet conceptual apparatus meant the imposition of value judgements, i. e., the “primitive commune”; the idea of the absence of a state form when there were no written documents. This referred to the epoch of the ethnogenesis of the Romanian people (Florescu pers.comm.) and the imposition of a new team, by appointing minor personalities as promoters of Panslavism (Rădulescu 1994), and the imprisonment of the recognized experts (Dumitrescu 1993).

The Thracian background was promoted by Russians to demonstrate a unity of the East in the past, and therefore to legitimize the newly created geopolitical situation (Urbańczyk 2000, 52). A transfer thus occurred from Latin to Thracian studies that culminated at the end of the 1950s with the cessation of almost all Roman excavations.

In 1948 the Romanian Academy was reorganized (Tănase 1998, 63), and until 1955 the research in the various institutions was centralized. As in Russia at the beginning of the 1930s (Tănase 1998, 69), the archaeological institutes were transformed into “cooperatives for digging” (Florescu pers. comm.). In 1949 the Academy received the monopoly for organizing scientific research (“The Peoples Republic of Romania’s Academy *took into its hands* [our emphasis] the control of all the activity of Romanian archaeologists and historians”, *Dacia NS* 1957, 7), and “archaeological excavations are [conducted] on the basis of the general plan of work issued by the Bucharest Institute of Archaeology [...] and approved by the Subsection of Historical Sciences of the Academy of PRR (*Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice* 1959, 9).

All the above-mentioned issues, supported by an intensive program of indoctrination by means of education and mass media (Tănase 1998, 86) led to the decimation of the elite (Tănase 1998, 86) and the demobilization of the survivors by moving them away from the Western sources of documentation (see Tănase 1998, 85). Paradoxically, large funds were allocated to fieldwork, but not for the infrastructure, because archaeology was believed to be an empirical science that did not need theory (Florescu, pers. comm.).

In Bessarabia (today the Republic of Moldavia), the communist regime “monopolized” the ethno-cultural and historical development of the ancient and medieval communities [presented] generally through a Slavic perspective, and ignored the research on Thracians, Daco-Romans and Old Romanian issues” (Dergacev 1994, 120). Such inappropriate studies “influenced in a negative way the writing of the history of Romanians from Moldavia” (Dergacev 1994, 120) and the research being conducted by Russian archaeologists (see the chapter “The Development of Archaeology in the Republic of Moldavia between the 40s and 60s”, Dergacev 1994, 8ff).

The second epoch of terror: from 1956 to 1958

After 1956, the “national way to communism” (Tănase 1998, 226) had direct repercussions on the archaeological research.

The retreat of the Soviet troops (Falls 1993) in 1956 was compensated by the political elite with a second wave of “preventive” repression (Tănase 1998, 126) on the intellectual elite between 1958 and 1961, therefore a moderation in the scientific research may be noticed only after 1964.

Nationalism was one of the reactions of the Romanian society to Soviet occupation (Tănase 1998, 214) that offered support to the ruling communist elite after the retreat of the Russian troops.

For archaeology, the prohibition of theoretical information in the following decades led to autarchic fanciful theories regarding the Dacian state (Florescu, pers. comm.). But generally, prehistoric archaeology was favored due to the political neutrality (see Urbańczyk 2000, 52) of “the primitive commune”, as prehistory was labeled, and funds were assigned to perform exhaustive diggings (Vulpe 1991, 230).

After the retreat of the Soviet army, the research at Grădiştea Muncelului, Tropaeum Trajani (Adamclisi), or Capidava was resumed and new sites were discovered all over the country.

In 1957 *Dacia-Nouvelle Serie*, was published, the first issue being dedicated to Vasile Pârvan, as a gesture of recovering the scientific elite. At the same time, Pârvan's *Dacia* was published in a "revised and annotated" version.

The neo-national paradigm I and the emergence of national communism: the sixties

Beginning with 1964, the leaders from Bucharest attempted to outdistance themselves from the Soviet Union in order to preserve power. This movement was perceived as a gesture of independence that filled some intellectuals with enthusiasm. Ceauşescu exploited this false independence, insisting upon the national idea (Tismăneanu 1998, 108).

The Roman excavations were resumed as, for example, in Grădiştea Muncelului or in Capidava, as well as in Greek cities (Callatis, Tomis, Argamum) (Florescu, pers. comm.).

A process of recovery of some inter-war personalities that escaped the gulag allowed the conservation of a certain scientific rigor and the formation of fresh quality scholars. For example, Vladimir Dumitrescu, the former director of the National Museum of Antiquities in 1935, and former politician, who worked between 1950 and 1951 without the right of signature, and was later arrested, was appointed head of department at the National Museum of Archaeology (Vulpe 1991, 229-230).

Starting from this point, a network of museums of history and archaeology was developed, which promoted the countryside.

From all the archaeological subdisciplines, Palaeolithic archaeology was the last to be indirectly subordinated to politics (Anghelinu 1998-2000, 273), "the contradictions and crisis between the relationships and means of production [being] absent in the work of Romanian scholars" (Anghelinu 1998-2000, 275). This was largely because the pre-war tradition was well preserved, by means of "the stratigraphic and typological methods" and the "dogmatic use of Bordes method" (Anghelinu 1998-2000, 275). Pre- and protohistoric sites were dug all over the country, continuing the pre-war or new settlements excavations.

The wall between East and West was visible in the case of international collaboration. A similar separation existed in the case of the collaboration between the countries of the "Socialist camp", causing the absence of any modern synthesis on ancient cultures, whose study remained fragmentary and reduced to the boundaries of national cultures. This 'Balkanisation' of the research left syntheses on Eastern Europe to be made by the West.

The neo-national paradigm II: the seventies and eighties

An incipient interest of the West to the East-European zone from the other side of the Wall is observable now in prehistory and antiquity, because there is an opening for museum collections and for publishing local research (see, for instance, in the *British Archaeological Reports*) for the first time since the war.

A reconsideration of the Romans (no longer perceived as “conquerors”) (Florescu pers.comm.; see also Condurachi / Dumitrescu / Matei 1972, 38 ff.) developed the study of the Roman and Late Roman epochs and was seen in many articles and books that analyzed ethnogenesis. The same attention was given to medieval studies, which were reduced to the new geographic frontiers.

In the late seventies, the Thracian issue had a new political revival, due to the “Romanian protochronism”, a concept launched by ideologists of the party. As a consequence of this viewpoint, the 2nd International Congress of Thracology was organized in 1976 in Bucharest and the Institute of Thracology was created.

In the same protochronist spirit, a parallel was drawn between “the first centralized and independent Dacian state” (Popișteanu 1980, 10) and Ceaușescu’s Romania (for a link between past and present see Berciu 1980, 9), the Dacian king Burebista being a historical duplicate of the communist leader.

“The decision of the Plenary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party from 26-27 October 1977 referring to the anniversary of 2050 years from the creation of the first independent Dacian state [tried to demonstrate, beside the] deterministic role of the masses in making history and material civilization of peoples, the historical role in forming the nation and of the national state. Cultural-educational activities would be organized in order to know the glorious past and the epochal accomplishments achieved by the people in all the areas of the construction of the Socialism” (*Scântea* 16 November 1977; *Magazin istoric* 1978, cited in Popișteanu 1980, 5 ff.). One can notice in the text a social control through the use of national ideology, in the care Romanian leaders took to use pre-war clichés of the national state to legitimize power and to create the illusion of independence for people and the Western world.

Another ideological artifice was the addition of a Latin name to Transylvanian towns.

In the eighties, a paradoxical attitude existed toward national history: while the archaeology of early Christianity in Dobroudja was tacitly accepted (Zugravu 1994, 351), the medieval churches from Bucharest were demolished or moved on wheels behind the newly built blocks.

A conclusion of the post-war epoch is that, except for the interruption between 1949 and 1955, the Communist regime used national archaeology to control the national problem, the ethnical origins being reoriented to the East while the “national Dacian state” replaced “the idea of Rome”. The history-culture method will be continued, with political support, to link the present to the past (and in this way to legitimize power).

Theory was banished because culture-history “required little theoretical discussion” (Hodder 1991, 9), and the anthropological discourse was practically nonexistent. A total absence of documentation on theory, associated with the European perception of processual archaeology as being “ahistorical” (Hodder 1991, 12), that contradicted the Party’s will to control the teleology culture-history, made postprocessual archaeology

completely unknown in totalitarian Romania. The traditional cultural model, France, also had problems with culture-history, promoting at that time a “retro-archaeology” (Cleuziou / Coudart / Demoule / Schnapp 1991, 97).

The timid multivocality after 1989

After the fall of the totalitarian regime, the national paradigm was restricted to medieval archaeology (Rusu 1996, 5) and ethnoarchaeology (see the 1991 Symposium “From the Thracian Knight to the Romanian Căluş”, Ghinoiu 1992, 205), since the state was no longer implicated in directing archaeological research.

A heteroglossy, still timid and still in the positivist domain, evidenced in the many emerging “subdisciplines” began replacing the discourse of the previous epoch. Consequently, a myriad of studies on ethnoarchaeology (Iclod), archaeometry (Cluj), multidisciplinary (Hârşova), funerary archaeology (Tulcea), medieval archaeology (Bucharest, Iaşi, Cluj, Reşita), archaeozoology (Bucharest, Iaşi, Caraş-Severin) erupted. This occurred despite a still-noticeable lack of many basic courses, such as anthropology or industrial archaeology, as well as that of a theoretical support is still noticeable.

New legislation, adapted from other European countries, was passed a decade after the fall of the former regime. A national Commission of Archaeology is now linking archaeologists working in museums, universities and institutions under the patronage of the Romanian Academy. New scholars have been elected to lead the institutes and museums, and even if collections still suffer from inadequate space of storage and display, national and international exhibitions present to the large public past and current discoveries.

The education in archaeology has been stimulated, new private universities are supporting the discipline, including the departments of history-archaeology from Cluj and Sibiu. Archaeological teaching has improved by allowing access to many scholars from outside the Academy. Access to PhD. research is no longer restricted by political constraints and much international fieldwork has been organized (Irimia 1994, 261). European Union and American fellowships are introducing archaeology students to current methods of research and recent trends in theory.

The collaboration between museums and institutes developed (Roman 1994, 258) and Graeco-Roman and medieval excavations continued (Irimia 1994, 261).

Interregional collaboration developed as the “Terra Antiqua Balkanica project”, or the projects with Chişinău, Sofia and St. Petersburg Institutes.

The collaboration with the West has begun to be a custom, and many institutes and museums are now working with German, French, British, and American institutions.

The Institute of Thracology, for example, started collaborations with Eastern, Central and Western European institutions as well.

A new style of museum management has materialized and allowed museums to display local material culture (during the communist regime every museum had to display the history of the country). New permanent exhibitions and temporary national and international exhibitions have also emerged, including “Goldhelm, Schwert und Sil-

berschätze. Reichtümer aus 6000 Jahren rumänischer Vergangenheit” or “Cucuteni – The Last great Chalcolithic civilisation of Europe”.

In the last decade, Romanian archaeologists were challenged by the encounter with various schools of archaeology, a phenomenon that more or less transformed their mentality and their methods of work. One can see this in the changes occurring in the profession.

Conclusion

The analysis in a European context of the avatars of the national paradigm along more than a century leads to the conclusion that the epochs of genesis of the modern state generated and developed a “national” archaeology, made of the synthesis of the French and German methodologies, melted in an autochthonous synthesis. During the formation of the modern national state, archaeology served to identify the Latin origins of the Romanian people, a process that from a political point of view presupposed a common origin with Western Europe.

National ideology was later used by the totalitarian communist regime to maintain control over the population. After the Soviet colonization, origins were transferred completely to the Thracian-Dacian population. This stressed the Slavic element, indicating that it was the sole factor of the Romanian ethnogenesis, and thus inferring a link in the past only with the East.

At present one can notice an incipient multivocality in what concerns the diversity of the fields of scientific research. Only a small part of subdisciplines, such as ethnoarchaeology and medieval studies, are still within the national paradigm.

For Romanian archaeologists the last decade was the beginning of an emerging collaboration between West and East. It has required a functional adaptation to a different mode of thinking. In spite of a correlation to the Western legislation and education, the indigenous to form a new synthesis between the Western theory and the Eastern theoretical support is still immature and needs time realities.

Bibliography

- Andrieşescu 1912: I. Andrieşescu, Contribuție la Dacia înainte de Romani. Iași 1912.
- Andrieşescu 1929: I. Andrieşescu, Vasile Pârvan. Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice 22 (62), 1929, 147.
- Andrieşescu 1940: I. Andrieşescu, Un reprezentant tipic al studiilor de preistorie și antichități naționale: Camille Jullian. Revista de preistorie și antichități naționale. Buletin al Seminarului de Arheologie și Preistorie 2-4, 1940, 9-37.
- Anghelincu 1998-2000: M. Anghelincu, Un decupaj analitic al arheologiei paleoliticului din România. Cercetări arheologice 11, 1998-2000, 271-282.
- Analele Academiei 1921: Analele Academiei Române. Bucharest 1921.

- Avakian 1931: G. Avakian, Săpăturile de la Cetatea Albă. Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice – Basarabia 3, 1931, 47-104.
- Babeș 1994: M. Babeș, Arheologia. In: C. Preda (ed.), Enciclopedia arheologiei și istoriei vechi a României. Vol. 1, Bucharest 1994.
- Berciu 1980: D. Berciu, Cuvânt Înainte. Istros, 1980, 9.
- du Breuil 1924: H. du Breuil, Stations paleolithiques en Transylvanie, Buletinul Societății de Științe din Cluj 2, 1924, 197-208.
- Cleuziou / Coudart / Demoule / Schnapp 1991: S. Cleuziou / A. Coudart / J.-P. Demoule / A. Schnapp, The use of theory in French archaeology. In: I. Hodder (ed.), Archaeological theory in Europe. The last three decades. London / New York 1991, 91-127.
- Condurachi / Dumitrescu / Matei 1972: E. Condurachi / V. Dumitrescu / M. D. Matei, Harta arheologică a României. Bucharest 1972.
- Dergacev 1994: V. Dergacev, Arheologia Republicii Moldova, Tharaco-Dacica 15/1-2, 1994, 7-18.
- Dumitrescu 1931: Vl. Dumitrescu, Notes concernant l'ornementation peinte zoomorphe et humaine dans les civilisations a ceramique peinte de Roumanie et de la Susiane. Bucharest 1931.
- Dumitrescu 1993: Vl. Dumitrescu, Oameni și cioburi. Cultură și civilizație la Dunărea de Jos 11, 1993.
- Falls 1993: D. R. Falls, Soviet Decision Taking and Withdrawal of Soviet Troops form Romania. Eastern European Quarterly 4, 1993.
- Ghinoiu 1992: I. Ghinoiu, Participări la reuniuni științifice interne si internaționale, Thraco-Dacia 13/1-2, 1992, 205.
- Giddens 1990: A. Giddens, The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford 1990.
- Giurescu 1941: C. Giurescu, Istoria românilor. Bucharest 1941.
- Hodder 1991: I. Hodder (ed.), Archaeological theory in Europe. The last three decades. London / New York 1991.
- Irimia 1994: M. Irimia, Informare privind activitatea filialei Constanța a IRT în anul 1993. Thraco-Getica 15/1-2, 1994, 260-261.
- Magazin istoric 12/1 (130), January 1978, Bucharest.
- Mateescu / Petrescu-Dîmbovița 1940: C. Mateescu / M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița, Seminarul de Arheologie preistorică – zece ani de activitate, Revista de preistorie și antichități naționale, 2-4, 1940, 39-61.
- Materiale și Cercetări arheologice, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, Bucharest 1959.
- Monah / Monah 1997: D. Monah / F. Monah, The Last Great Chalcolithic Civilisation of Old Europe. In: Cucuteni, The Last great Civilisation of Europe. Catalogue, Bucharest 1997, 17-95.
- Netzhammer 1918: R. Netzhammer, Die christlichen Altertuermer der Dobrudscha. Bukarest 1918.
- Nicorescu 1931: P. Nicorescu, Lucrări de consolidare și restaurare la Cetatea Albă, Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice – Basarabia 3, 1931, 115-128.

- Parentalia. Pentru pomenirea împăratului Traian. *Analele Academiei Române*, debateri 41, Bucharest 1921.
- Pârvan 1920: V. Pârvan, Datoria vieții noastre. Aninoasa 1920.
- Pârvan 1928: V. Pârvan, *An Outline of the early civilisations of the Carpatho-Danubian countries*. Cambridge 1928.
- Popișteanu 1980: C. Popișteanu (ed.), *Strămoșii poporului român. Geto-dacii și epoca lor*. Bucharest 1980.
- Popovici 1999-2000: D. Popovici, Note pentru o viitoare și necesară istorieografie a arheologiei Românești. *Buletinul Muzeului Teohari Antonescu* 5-6, 1999-2000, 17-22.
- Rădulescu 1994: B. Rădulescu, Manualul de istorie sovieto-română al lui Roller. *Memoria* 11, September 1994, 97-105.
- Revista 1937 : *Revista de Preistorie și Antichități Naționale*, Extrait Hommagial aux membres du XVII^e Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie préhistorique 1, September 1937. Bucharest 1937.
- Roman 1993 : P. Roman, Activitatea Institutului Român de Tracologie în anul 1993. *Thraco-Getica* 15/1-2, 257-258.
- Rusu 1996: A. A. Rusu, Pledoarie pentru arheologia medievală. *Arheologie Medievală* 1, 1996, 5-8.
- Schuchhardt 1924: C. Schuchhardt, Cernavoda, eine Steinzeitsiedlung in Thrakien. In: *Prähist. Zeitschrift* 15, 1924.
- Tallgren 1938 : A. M. Tallgren, Mouvement scientifique. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* 12, 1938.
- Tănase 1998: S. Tănase, *Elite și Societate. Guvernarea Gheorghiu-Dej 1948-1965*. Bucharest 1998.
- Tismăneanu 1998: V. Tismăneanu, *Arheologia terorii*. Bucharest 1998.
- Trigger 1989: B. Trigger, *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge / New York / Port Chester / Melbourne / Sydney 1989.
- Urbańczyk 2000: P. Urbańczyk, Political circumstances reflected in post-war Polish archaeology. *Public Archaeology* 1, 2000, 49-56.
- Vulpe 1928: R. Vulpe, Activitatea arheologică în Dobrogea în cei 50 de ani de stăpânire românească. Bucharest 1928.
- Vulpe 1991: Al. Vulpe, Necrologie Vladimir Dumitrescu (1902-1991). *Dacia* 35, 1991, 229-234.
- Zugravu 1994: I. Zugravu, Profesorul Ion Barnea la 80 de ani. *Arheologia Moldovei* 17, 1994, 349-352.