



Рис. 4. Таблиця з періодизацією трипільської культури до статті Т. Пассек та Б. Литиніна «Опыт классификации керамики «Трипольской культуры» Восточной Европы (предварительный очерк)», надісланої для публікації у II томі видання «Трипільська культура на Україні» [НА ІА НАНУ, фонд ВУАК, 586]

спорудами. У науковому плані Т. Мовчанівський найбільш актуальним вважав дослідження соціально-економічного характеру: вивчення осілості, хліборобства, скотарства, гончарного виробництва як окремих науково-дослідних проблем на основі міждисциплінарних дослід-

жень [Мовчанівський, 1935, с. 65—86; Беляєва, Калюк, 1989, с. 125—130].

Власне, все це з самого початку намагалися робити члени Комісії, однак їм не вдалося здійснити все у бажаному обсязі. Уявлення про те, як саме слід досліджувати трипільську

культуру, викладені у програмі Т. Мовчанівського, народилися, зрештою, не на порожньому місці, а мали за собою певний досвід організації досліджень вже у радянський час. Створену 1934 року Трипільську експедицію очолив С. Магура, у ній працювали В. Козловська, Є. Кричевський та інші члени Комісії, продовжуючи справу, розпочату у нелегкі 20-ті роки.

Нині можна стверджувати, що «Комісія ВУАК для вивчення і дослідів пам'яток Трипільської культури на Україні» — Трипільська комісія — дала сильний імпульс розвитку трипільської археології 30—40-х років, створивши для нього солідне підґрунтя. Міждисциплінарний підхід до археологічних досліджень, який вважається стандартом у трипільстві початку ХХІ ст. був не лише проголошений, але і започаткований на практиці саме завдяки діяльності Комісії. Координація зусиль фахівців з різних наукових центрів, видавничих діяльність, публічність роботи і сьогодні залишаються гідними високої оцінки та поваги до фахівців, які втілювали (або намагалися втілити) їх в життя. Можна також сказати, що у цьому відношенні Комісія лишається взірцем для нині діючих наукових установ, зокрема і Інституту археології НАН України.

Чи можливе (і доцільне) відтворення Трипільської комісії на початку ХХІ ст.? В рамках існуючих організаційних структур науки — напевно чи. Ті фахівці, які займаються вивченням трипільської культури, в межах України зосереджені у відділі археології доби енеоліту-бронзового віку Інституту археології НАН України, кількох музеях, заповідниках та університетах, їх число не перевищує 20 дослідників — до речі, це у кілька разів більше, ніж за часів Комісії. Кожна з цих установ має власну мету діяльності і плани наукових робіт. Крім того, впродовж останнього десятиліття у дослідницький процес залучено археологів з багатьох країн — США, Великої Британії, Німеччини, Швейцарії, Польщі та ін. Їх співпраця відбувається, як правило, в межах спільних дослідницьких проектів, фінансованих за рахунок міжнародних грантів, спонсорських коштів.

Крім цих обставин нині, як і у 20-ті роки ХХ ст. для діяльності подібної Комісії бракує коштів, навіть більше — бюджетне фінансування дослідницьких програм на ниві польових досліджень фактично припинилося у середині 90-х років і перспектив його відновлення на разі не існує. Реально продовжувати існувати така форма взаємодії наукового співтовариства, як конференції, семінари, які проводяться по трипільській проблематиці раз на кілька років. Якщо і можливе відродження «Трипільської комісії», то скоріше у формі громадської організації на зразок «Археологічного інституту Америки» та йому подібних, які власним коштом та добровольцями підтримують наукові дослідження, музейницьку і видавничу

діяльність. Рухаючись у подібному напрямку, завжди корисно буде пам'ятати як про досвід Трипільської комісії, так і про людей, які її створили і підтримували у складний період вітчизняної історії.

Біляшівський М.Т. Досліди на городищі біля с. Борисівки Линецького району (Липовецького повіту) на Київщині [тепер Вінниц. обл.] / М.Т. Біляшівський // Короткі згадки згадки ВУАК за 1925 рік. — 1926. — С. 67—71.

Беляєва С.О. Т.М. Мовчанівський. Сторінки наукової біографії (До 90-річчя з дня народження) / С.О. Беляєва, О.П. Калюк // Археологія. — 1989. — № 2. — С. 125—130.

Болтенко М.Ф. Раскопки Усатово-Большекуляничного поля культурных остатков [близ Одессы] / М.Ф. Болтенко // Вісник Одеської комісії краєзнавства. — 1925. — № 2/3. — С. 48—66;

Відейко М.Ю. Трипільська експедиція ВУАК / М.Ю. Відейко // Енциклопедія трипільської цивілізації. — К., 2004. — Т.ІІ. — С. 539—540

Козловська В.Є. Розкопи біля с. Сушківки на Гуманщині: (Жовт. р. 1926) / В.Є. Козловська // КЗ ВУАК за 1926 рік. — К., 1927. — С. 45—47.

Козловська В.Є. Розкопи у с. Веремі у жовтні р. 1925 / В.Є. Козловська // КЗ ВУАК за 1925 рік. — К., 1926. — С. 51—53.

Козловська В.Є. Розшуки та розкопи на правому березі Дніпра між м. Ржищевим та с. Балики: Лип. — верес. 1926 р. / В.Є. Козловська // КЗ ВУАК за 1926 рік. — К., 1927а. — С. 40—44.

Козловська В.Є. З науково-дослідчої роботи Комісії ВУАКу для вивчення трипільської культури / В.Є. Козловська // Хроніка археології та мистецтва. — 1931. — Ч. 3. — С. 82—83.

Курінний П.П. Розкопи біля с. Томашівки / П.П. Курінний // КЗ ВУАК за 1925 рік. — К., 1926. — С. 54—60.

Курінний П.П. Розкопи біля с. Томашівки на Гуманщині / П.П. Курінний // КЗ ВУАК за 1926 рік. — К., 1927. — С. 54—62.

Курінний П.П. Раєцька могила на Бердичівщині / П.П. Курінний // КЗ ВУАК за 1926 рік. — К., 1927б. — С. 71—78.

Ляшко С.М. Трипільська Комісія ВУАК / С.М. Ляшко, М.Ю. Відейко // Енциклопедія трипільської цивілізації. — К., 2004. — Т.ІІ. — С. 542—543.

Макаренко М.О. Халеп'я / М.О. Макаренко // КЗ ВУАК за 1925 рік. — 1926а. — С. 33—50.

Макаренко М.О. Досліди на Остерщині. Євминка. Стоянка в місцевості «Бугаївка» / М.О. Макаренко // КЗ ВУАК за 1925 рік. — К., 1926б. — С. 61—66.

Мовчанівський Т.М. Чергові методологічні питання трипільської проблеми / Т.М. Мовчанівський // НЗ ІМК. — 1935. — Кн. 5—6. — С. 65—86.

Науковий архів Інституту археології НАН України (далі НА ІА НАНУ) ф. ВУАК, № 89. Книга протоколів засідань Трипільської комісії ВУАКу.

НА ІА НАНУ ф. ВУАК, № 102. Дослідження Трипільської культури (листування в справі організації дослідів, протоколи засідань, кошториси).

НА ІА НАНУ ф. ВУАК, № 586. Пассек Т.С., Латынин Б. Опыт классификации керамики «Трипольской культуры» Восточной Европы (предварительный очерк).

НА ІА НАНУ ф. ВУАК, № 587. Пассек Т.С. Южная группа «трипольской» керамики.

Нестуля С. Становлення Всеукраїнського археологічного комітету ВУАН (сер. 1920-х років) / С. Нестуля. — Полтава, 1997. — С. 43—45.  
 Рудинський М.Я. Досліди на Кам'яниччині / М.Я. Рудинський // КЗ ВУАК за 1926 рік. — 1927. — С. 123—143.  
 Рудинський М.Я. Поповгородський вияв культури мальованої кераміки: З повідомл. про наслідки дослід. сезону р. 1929 / М.Я. Рудинський // Антропологія. — 1930. — № 3. — С. 235—259.  
 Чикаленко Л. Нарис розвитку української неолітичної мальованої кераміки (Більче Золоте) / Л. Чикаленко // Трипільська культура на Україні. — Т. 1. — К., 1926.  
 Passek T. La Ceramique Trypillienne / T. Passek. — М. — Л., 1935.

М. Ю. В і д е й к о

### ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННЫЙ ЭКСПЕРИМЕНТ: ТРИПОЛЬСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ

В последнее десятилетие в Украине вырос интерес к трипольской культуре. На этой волне прозвучали призывы к воссозданию Трипольской комиссии, которая должна была бы возглавить изучение данного историко-культурного феномена. Обращение к относительно короткой истории деятельности этого научного подразделения (1925—1930) имеет целью проанализировать его деятельность и выяснить практическую ценность предложения обратиться к опыту прошлого в сфере организации научных исследований.

Интересен тот факт, что Трипольская комиссия появилась в годы создания украинской государственности в советской ее форме в 20-е годы XX века, а лозунги о ее воссоздании — на втором десятилетии существования независимой Украины, в начале XXI века. Однако в первом случае эта организация была создана и просуществовала около шести лет, а во втором — даже призывы к ее реинкарнации не были восприняты всерьез.

Сегодня можно утверждать, что «Комиссия ВУАК для изучения памятников трипольской культуры на Украине» - Трипольская комиссия — способствовала сохранению традиций и развитию археологии Триполья в 20—40-е годы XX века. Междисциплинарный подход к археологическим исследованиям, который сегодня считается общепринятым стандартом, был не только декларирован, но и осуществлялся на практике благодаря деятельности Комиссии. Координация усилий специалистов из различных научных центров, издательская деятельность, публичность работы и сегодня остаются достойными высокой оценки и уважения к ученым, которые воплощали (или пытались воплотить) их в те непростые годы. В этом отношении Комиссия может рассматриваться в качестве образца для ныне действующих научных учреждений.

Возможно (и целесообразно) ли возрождение Трипольской комиссии в начале XXI века? В рамках

ныне действующих организационных структур науки — едва ли. Если и возможно возрождение «Трипольской комиссии» то скорее в форме общественной организации, которая за счет своих фондов и добровольцев поддерживала бы научные исследования, музейную и издательскую деятельность. Продвигаясь в этом направлении, всегда полезно будет вспомнить как об опыте Трипольской комиссии, так и тех, кто создал ее и работал в ней в сложный период отечественной истории.

M. Yu. V i d e i k o

### TRYPILLIA COMMISSION: AN ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIMENT

In the last decade in Ukraine interest to the Trypillia Culture has increased. It was proposed to reconstruct Trypillia Commission, which was supposed to lead the study of this important historical and cultural phenomenon. Appeal to the relatively short history of this scientific division (1925—1930), this article aims to analyze its activities and determine the practical value of the proposal refer to the past experience in the field of research. An interesting fact is that the Trypillia Commission appeared at times of the creation of the Ukrainian state in the Soviet form (20-ths of the XX<sup>th</sup> century), and the slogans of its re-creation - at the second decade of the existence of an independent Ukraine. However, in the first case, the organization was created and existed for about six years, while the second — even calls for its reincarnation were not taken seriously. Today we can say that «The Commission to study the monuments of the Trypillia culture in Ukraine of the Whole-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee» - Trypillia Commission — contributed to the preservation of traditions of Trypillia Culture studies and development of Trypillia of archeology in the 20—40<sup>th</sup> of the twentieth century. An interdisciplinary approach to archaeological research, which is now considered as the standard was not only declared, but implemented in practice by the Commission. Coordination of efforts of specialists from various research centers, publishing, publicity at work even today remains worthy of appreciation and respect for the scientists who embody (or tried to implement) them in those difficult years. In this regard, the Commission may be considered to as a model for the existing academic institutions.

Is it possible (and appropriate) to rebuild the Trypillia Commission at the beginning of the XXI<sup>th</sup> century? In the framework of the existing institutional structures of science - barely. If possible revival of the «Trypillia commission» is probably in the form of public organization, which through its funds and volunteers fo supporting of the field research, museums and editions. Moving in this direction is always useful remember the experience of Trypillia Commission and people, who created it and worked it in at the difficult period of national History.

S.-C. Enea

## ROMANIAN PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY, BETWEEN TRADITION AND INNOVATION \*

---

With this text, the author intends to present a short history of the evolution of Romanian prehistoric archaeology, from the moment of its appearance in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the present day. Thus, several distinct stages that mark this evolution have been detected, stages influenced by the charisma and activity of certain personalities. It can be noticed that the scientific foundations of this discipline were laid after World War I by Vasile Pârvan, the founder of Romanian archaeology, whose followers have dominated the scientific discourse to this day. Romanian prehistoric archaeology, just like other areas of historical research, mirrored the political discourse, and, unfortunately, was under its sway during certain periods of time.

**K e y w o r d s:** prehistoric archaeology, Antiquarianism school of archaeology, Positivism, Marxism, New Archaeology.

Prehistoric archaeology appears in Western Europe as the result of a long series of intellectual acquisitions, specific to the environment of Western European society, and which materializes in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century through the emergence of a research domain, a corpus of methods, and a small cohort of specialists [Anghelina, 2003, p. 72].

Archaeology has its first beginnings in Romania in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries through the concerns of collectors of coins, inscriptions and antiquities, but a manifest interest is fostered only with the beginning the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In the evolution of Romanian archaeology we can distinguish several phases, each with different characteristics and points of contention.

### THE ANTIQUARIAN PHASE

The 19<sup>th</sup> century generally represented a period of theoretical refinements and crystallization of the institutional framework.

This first stage is characterized by the activity of identification and investigation of sites conducted by some enthusiast collectors. A noteworthy example is Al. Popovici, land surveyor, who discovered the first Neolithic settlements from the Romanian Plain in the 1830s; the National Museum, where the discoveries were collected, was founded in 1834.

The treasure of Pietroasa is discovered by two locals — who unfortunately destroyed a number of pieces — in 1837, and in 1842 the hoard enters into the patrimony of the National Museum. A notable collector of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was Nicolae Mavros, one of the founders of the National Museum, its first and biggest donor, the same who, in 1864, pleaded to Prince Al.I. Cuza in favour of establishing the National Museum of Antiquities. During the first years of the museum, the collection consisted of donations from public figures such as C. Bolliac, D. Sturdza, N. Kretzulescu [Dumitrescu, 1993, p. 7—8].

The enthusiastic collecting of the antiquarians compromised the archaeological contexts or led to the estrangement of artefacts, but also contributed to saving the numerous heritage objects that, via donation or purchase, entered the collections of museums.

### THE ROMANTIC PHASE

The first theoretical horizons (19<sup>th</sup> century) was the stage of the intellectuals of 1848 Revolution. They collected particularly the artefacts that were beautiful and not broken,

---

\* У статті збережено авторську редакцію.

without attempting a cultural or chronological classification.

With respect to the theoretical field, we bring attention to M. Kogălniceanu and N. Bălcescu, who stressed the importance of the archaeological, epigraphic, and numismatic evidence for writing the national history.

Cezar Bolliac (1813—1881) is the most prominent figure of the Forty-Eighters' generation in archaeology, also being an active collector; he has the merit of having noted and even surveyed some pre- and protohistoric sites. He was the first to carry out excavations at the Neolithic settlement of Vădastra, between 1871 and 1873. He created and supported the magazine *Răcnetul Carpaților* («Howl of the Carpathians»), and also joined the Archaeological Committee that managed the National Museum of Antiquities. From 1865, Bolliac focused his excavations on the Getae-Dacian sites of Tinosu, Piscul Crăsani, and Zimnicea, while continuing the excavations of the Neolithic settlement from Vădastra.

Al. Odobescu (1834—1895) remained in the memory of the archaeologists as a cabinet archaeologist, mainly because of his conceptual and theoretical assessments, being the one that truly entrenched Romanian archaeology as a scientific discipline; he is arguably the first great Romanian archaeologist, and the founder of Romanian scientific archaeology.

Odobescu introduced the critical spirit into archaeology, calling into question any discovery; he had a rich field activity that resulted in the identification of several archaeological sites. In 1874 he taught the first course in Archaeology at the University of Bucharest. He was constantly concerned with the introduction of a rigorous system for prehistoric research, being basically the first one to introduce scientific methods into the archaeological approach. Thus, he employed the three-age system, divided into the Stone, Bronze, and Iron ages, and insisted on both the need for a chronological classification of the archaeological findings (based on stratigraphic and typological principles), and on their ethnic attribution.

He publishes in Paris *Le Trésor de Pétroussa. Étude sur l'orfèvrerie antique* (I—III, 1889, 1896, 1900) [László, 2006, p. 58], a seminal work to this day.

In the Department of Archaeology from the University of Bucharest, and in Romanian archaeology, he is followed by Grigore Tocilescu (1850—1909); it is the age in which archaeology becomes a separate field of study. Tocilescu dug extensively, even if not always with an adequate methodology, as his excavations were conducted using approximated techniques. Unfortunately, there are very few reports left of his excavations. He is the one who introduced in Romanian archaeology the idea of co-joint work with foreign archaeologists [Dumitrescu, 1993, p. 10; László, 2006, p. 59]. He is also the author of a monumental work, *Dacia onainte de romani*

(«Dacia before the Romans», 1880), well-received by his contemporaries.

In Romania, as almost everywhere in the world, archaeology became a science only in the early 20th century, through the «union of typology with stratigraphy», marking thus the separation from the antiquarian approach.

Tocilescu was followed by Vasile Pârvan both in the management of the museum, and in the research endeavour.

Prehistory research was inaugurated in Moldova by N. Beldiceanu and Gr. Buțureanu, the first archaeologist to dig at Cucuteni [Ursulescu, Văleanu, 2006, p. 21]. The results achieved attracted the interest of foreign archaeologists, including Hubert Schmidt, who digs at Cucuteni in 1909—1910, and publishes the monograph of the excavation in 1932. He established the three stages of the Cucuteni culture (A, A—B, B). For the research methodology, the monograph of the German archaeologist played an important role in the development of the Romanian archaeology [Ursulescu, Văleanu, 2006, p. 26].

Archaeological research in southwest Transylvania stood at the beginnings of the 20<sup>th</sup> century under the sign of the powerful personality of Fr. Laszlo. Starting with 1904, he directed his attention to the site of Ariușd, after seeing the private collection of J. Teutsch.

Between 1907 and 1913 he will carry systematic excavations on the site of Dealul Tyisz. The excavation was restarted in 1925, contributing substantially to defining the area and characteristics of the painted pottery civilization from Transylvania. The research in Ariușd was the first systematic excavation on Romanian territory, preceding by three years those of H. Schmidt at Cucuteni. In 1908, after two excavation campaigns, and then again in 1909, the site from Ariușd was visited by H. Schmidt himself, who took part in the digging activity for two days, expressing his favourable opinion on the excavation techniques used (the impressive discoveries from Ariușd also piqued the interest of G. Childe).

## EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY, UNTIL WORLD WAR I

During this time span, the confusions and fables of the antiquarians' period were finally eliminated through the use of more systematic methods; prehistory detached itself from history and geology, achieving full methodological autonomy [Anghelescu, 2003, p. 101].

The emergence of archaeology in Romania is linked to the search, development and affirmation of the national identity. As an auxiliary science, archaeology followed history in its aim to establish the origins of the Romanian people; in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Romanian prehistoric archaeology tried to reduce the distance that still



Cezar Bolliac  
1813—1881



Alexandru Odobescu  
1834—1895



Grigore Tocilescu  
1850—1909



Vasile Pârvan  
1882—1927



Ion Andrieșescu  
1888—1944



Hubert Schmidt  
1864—1933



Ferenc Laszlo  
1873—1925

First romanian archaeologists

separated it from the norms of European prehistoric research.

After the excavations from Cucuteni in 1909—1910, there followed an interruption in the investigation of prehistoric civilizations on Moldavian territory; the period came to an end after the conclusion of World War I, though the efforts of the disciples of V. Pârvan (1882—1927). Using a systematic approach, they will investigate new prehistoric sites, at the same time developing and diversifying the prehistoric field, by approaching objectives other than Cucutenian ones.

In the field of Palaeolithic research, the personality of N.N. Moroşan stands apart. A prominent archaeologist, palaeontologist, and geologist, Moroşan investigated the sites of Ripiceni — Izvor and Stâncu — Ripiceni, arguing, on scientific grounds, for the existence of the Palaeolithic in Moldavia. Through a laborious fieldwork which lead to the identification of new Palaeolithic sites, through the use of the stratigraphical-paleontological method in the research of archaeological sites, through his studies and syntheses (*Le Pleistocene et le Paleolithique de la Roumanie du Nord—Est*, 1938), Moroşan is considered the founder of the advanced, modern research of the Romanian Palaeolithic, and the forerunner of interdisciplinary studies in the field of Romanian prehistory.

#### THE INTERWAR PERIOD: THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY IN ROMANIA

After WWI, Romanian archaeology benefited from a series of specialists trained in French and German universities, who laid the foundations of archaeology as a science by adopting the principles of stratigraphy. The excavation campaigns coordinated by Ion Nestor (especially in the field of prehistory) and by Vasile Pârvan (Greek and Roman archaeology) became true «archaeological schools» for the new generations of archaeologists [Anghelinu, 2007, p. 4].

Prehistoric archaeology will not detach itself from antiquarianism gradually, but suddenly, through the decisive initiatives coming from the new critical historiography.

After WWI, Vasile Pârvan, assisted by I. Andrieşescu (1888—1944) —appointed by him in 1915 as responsible for organizing the department of Prehistory from the National Museum of Antiquities — and later by the disciples from the University of Bucharest, started the systematic organization of archaeological activity throughout Romania.<sup>1</sup>

1. The archaeology of the Paleolithic is, during this period, the domain of a small number of enthusiasts, particularly with geological training.

V. Pârvan founded modern Romanian archaeology. He continued his research in Classical Antiquity, but he did not neglect the study of prehistory, and allotted a significant portion of his work to the pre- and protohistory of the Carpathian-Danubian area. The fruit of this research direction was his monumental *Getica* (1927), in which, on archaeological grounds, he reconstructs the Dacian world from the Late Bronze Age until the Roman conquest [László, 2006, p. 62].

On his initiative, his colleagues investigated a large number of sites throughout Romania, such as the Neolithic settlements from Sultana, Gumelniţa, Boian, and Vădastra, concurrently with the Bronze Age sites of Sărata Monteoru and Lechinţa de Mureş.

Through the large number of archaeologists trained by him, we can now speak of the «Pârvan School», whose members include Vl. Dumitrescu, I. Nestor, R. Vulpe, D. Popescu, V. Christescu, Hortensia Dumitrescu, Ecaterina Vulpe, Gh. Ştefan, M. Petrescu-Dimboviţa, D. Berciu; nonetheless, Andrieşescu also brought a decisive contribution to the formation of this generation of prehistorians. She dominated the education and the research in the interwar period, and constituted the scientific nucleus which kept the Romanian school of archaeology free of total decay during the communist era. Pârvan transformed the National Museum of Antiquities into a training centre for young researchers, but also for the development of a modern scientific conceptual framework, as well as a centre of activity that attempted to polarize the whole archaeological research in Romania after 1918.

Through the activity of Pârvan and Andrieşescu, the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought a detachment of Romanian archaeology from romantic and antiquarian ideals, and ensured the conditions for the crystallization of the Romanian school of prehistory.

After 1918, they mounted a sustained effort to help local museums and to establish new units of this kind all over Romania, and even indented to transform the National Museum of Antiquities into the general coordinator of these units in Romania. This concept formed the basis of the development, on a various grounds, of the museums after World War II.

Simultaneously, the institutional foundations of prehistoric archaeology as a distinct discipline taught in the institutes of higher education were laid down.

During this period, excavations were conducted at Sultana (I. Andrieşescu), Boian and Vădastra (V. Christescu), Gumelniţa (Vl. Dumitrescu), Căscioarele (Gh. Ştefan), Glina (I. Nestor), Sărata Monteoru (I. Andrieşescu and I. Nestor), Vidra and Jilava (Dinu V. Rosetti), and Lechinţa de Mureş (D. Popescu).

Through the excavations at Izvoarele (Neamţ county), R. Vulpe discovered and delimited

a layer belonging to the Precucuteni culture, while VI. Dumitrescu, through the excavations at Traian — Dealul Fântânilor, collected many materials that allowed him to define the painting styles of the Cucuteni A—B stage.

In 1932—1933 appeared the first synthesis work on Romanian prehistory, under the pen of I. Nestor (*Der Stand der Vorgeschichtsforschung in Rumänien*), published in Berlin, only one year after the publication of another famous synthesis, the Cucuteni monograph of H. Schmidt (1932). We should mention here that the excavation technique employed by the German archaeologist at Cucuteni, despite its serious shortcomings, became the authoritative methodology for prehistoric research in Romania, explained by the fact that the German school of prehistory was held in high regard at that moment.

During the war some museums continued their work despite the material and financial difficulties. Thus, the Museum in Alba Iulia made a series of excavations at Limba — Vărar, Petrești — Groapa Galbenă, and Alba Iulia — Lumea Nouă. In 1945 a new synthesis on the Neolithic of Muntenia appeared, signed by M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița.

During this period the myths of Romanian historiography were born and developed, which entered into the collective mind through history textbooks since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. At the Universal Exhibition in Paris (1867, 1889, 1900, 1937) or Vienna (1873), the Romanian pavilions affirmed the national identity also through the exhibition of archaeological artefacts. The buzzwords of the national discourse were the terms «Romanization», «ethnogenesis», «continuity», «unity», the dichotomies «native — allogeneic», «sedentary — nomad», «farmers — shepherds», or the phrase «of national importance» [Dragoman, Oanță-Marghitu, 2003].

#### ROMANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY DURING COMMUNISM: NATIONAL IDEOLOGY, DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM, POSITIVISM

The communist regime inherited a coagulated structure: Romanian archaeology already had a capital city (Bucharest), a research activity with scientific standards imposed by the National Museum of Antiquities (the future Institute of Archaeology), and the former students of Pârvan were now specialists who possessed a significant symbolic capital that they will transfer to the new ideological context [Anghelinu, 200p. 153].

Overall, the post-war decades brought major innovations (radiocarbon dating), which affected all theoretical and methodological framework of European prehistoric archaeology. If, from a theoretical point of view, the bibliographic siege of New Archaeology represented the major event of the era, with important consequences on the

research of prehistory, purely instrumental innovations were also considerable. Along with the invention of absolute dating methods (physical, chemical, biological), the widespread integration of auxiliary naturalist subjects played a fundamental role in shaping the current profile of prehistoric research (archaeozoology, palynology, sedimentology, etc.).

Marxism did not arouse much sympathy from the intellectual environment of the interwar period, but after 1945 the new ideology launched an aggressive cultural offensive that was proportional to the demands of its historical theoretical schema.

History and archaeology were considered by the new political system as «political-ideological sciences», being subjected to strict control by the state and the Communist Party, few being those who dared to disobey the arbitrary authority. During the '50s, many historical personalities who had not fled Romania experienced the communist prison hell. On the other hand, we must acknowledge the fact that the official policy of the Communist Party emphasized, especially in the '60s, the nationalist component, which favoured — in terms of the research resources allotted to it — Romanian archaeology. By the early '70s there was a sustained period of extensive field research, but the situation gradually began to change and socialist ideology began to be reflected in archaeological writing. In was especially during the years that proceeded 1989 when the situation deteriorated to a great extent.

The national discourse was apparently suspended in the period between 1945 and 1964, when archaeology based on the «Marxist-Leninist concept based on the principles of dialectical and historical materialism» was being promoted. The echoes of this peculiar episode were felt increasingly weaker until the early '70s, and extremely sporadically thereafter; history, as part of the «new culture», should have been «national in form, socialist in content». The main achievements of archaeology in the «years of popular democracy» are considered to be, together with the new archaeological finds (the research also having been galvanised by the founding of the Bucharest Institute of Archaeology in 1956 and the Commission of Historical Monuments in 1959), the development of the archaeology of the migrations period and of the medieval age, the organization of a national network of museums, and the documentation of the favourite topics of the national discourse: the continuity of the Dacians in the Roman age, their Romanization, the relationships of the «natives» with «allogeneous» populations, the «free Dacians». The Romanian school of archaeology withstand the vicissitudes of the Stalinist and then of the national communism periods, becoming one of the most acclaimed schools of European archaeology [Anghelinu, 2007, p. 1—36].



Exhibitions held annually during 1949—1952 sought to illustrate the achievements of Romanian archaeology by exposing the materials found in chronological order, from the «wilderness period» and «barbarism» to the «formation of feudal relations of production» (e.g., the 1949 Exhibition) [Dragoman, Oanță-Marghitu, 2003].

The post-war period did not bring an immediate and general replacement of the archaeology specialists, although the academic restructuring was important and there have been several waves of political persecution. As such, despite their political past, the Communist system was forced to inherit fully-professionalised practitioners before preparing its own; however, throughout the communist period, post-war archaeology professionals still held important academic and administrative positions [Anghelinu, 2003, p. 177].

The increase in research promoted by the state was accompanied by its centralization; the organizational initiative, especially beneficial in terms of funding, will have the disadvantage of a radical homogenisation of the archaeological discourse.

The theses of July 1971 put an end to this period of ideological laxity. The theses stated that history is «not a specialized profession», but a pure ideological activity practiced «only by people recruited by the Party, only by people who will become party activists». «No other mindset can exist in history teaching» [Georgescu, 1991, p. 69—70]. Archaeology, as an «auxiliary science» of history, is also affected. The 1974 Romanian Communist Party's programme of building the multilaterally developed socialist society and Romania's advancing toward communism opens with a history of the Romanians starting from the Thracians, continues with references to the old national themes of Romanization, continuity, unity, with a lot of xenophobic accents (migratory peoples, the Ottomans, foreign empires responsible for the historical lag of the Romanian nation). Controversial issues related to past events are solved through official decrees: the Central Committee of the Communist Party sets Burebista's enthronement year, adjusting it so that they can celebrate 2050 years from the event in 1980, at the International Congress of Historical Sciences held in Bucharest [Georgescu, 1991, p. 99]; history becomes the main element of official propaganda, «it invades the press, radio and TV programs, theatres, studios, libraries, popular music, art galleries [...]». Every moment of the present relates to the past, it is rooted deep in the ages, each achievement is presented as the conclusion of a long historical development» [Georgescu, 1991, p. 117].

Archaeological finds taken out of context are also manipulated (sometimes even by archaeologists) for developing this type of discourse. Archaeology continues to discuss, but on an exalted tone, the themes of the national ideology.

History plays an important role for the development «of the revolutionary consciousness» and

the «affirmation of the new man, builder of socialism», the latter having to realize, for instance, that «the defining feature, the righteousness, inherited from the Getae-Dacian ancestors and kept as such, is found profusely in the Romanian Communist Party's policy, in the domestic and foreign policy of our country» [Crișan, 1977, p. 81].

In fact, at least in the formal intention, the archaeologist merges two statutes: the scholar and the ideologist. «Along with its research work, the archaeology collective (of the Institute of Archaeology in Bucharest, subordinated to the Academy of Social and Political Sciences, then to the Ministry of Education) is fully committed to its propaganda, the spreading of scientific knowledge and education in the patriotic spirit of the young generation [...]. Thus, archaeology answers a second major goal of scientific inquiry, that of contributing on multiple levels to the building of the socialist society in our country» [Preda, 1984, p. 233].

Museums take part and faithfully comply with the official doctrine, as reflected by some magazine articles in *Revista muzeelor* («the Journal of the Museums») across the '70s and the '80s. The museum, considered to be a political institution, was required to contribute to the «transformation of the consciousness of the masses», the «forming of socialist consciousness», and «the shaping of the new man», through «museum propaganda» (action taken on directives from the party): organization of symposiums, presentations of propaganda films, patriotic poetry and music, competitions [Dragoman, Oanță-Marghitu, 2003; Anghelinu, 2003, p. 179].

Prehistoric archaeology departments are established at the Universities of Bucharest, Cluj, and Iași. The method of full (exhaustive) investigation of sites (the first one was Hăbășești) is implemented.

After 1950, at the National Museum of Antiquities there are issued a number of publications: *Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie* (SCIVA), *Materiale și cercetări arheologice, Dacia* (1957), *Studii și cercetări de numismatică* (1957), the *Biblioteca de arheologie* series (40 volumes — excavation monographs of different sites).

In Iași, archaeology developed tremendously under the leadership of academician M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița. In Cluj, the Institute of Archaeology and Art History was founded. In Sibiu and Tg. Mureș, institutes of socio-human sciences were established under the auspices of the Romanian Academy. In Bucharest, the National Military Museum was likewise founded during this period.

County-level museums of history, based on the concept of Pârvan, managed to convert themselves into institutions of scientific research and preservation of heritage. The research of the museum in Cluj-Napoca follows the same line, becoming the Museum of History of Transylvania.



Vladimir Dumitrescu  
1902—1991



Gheorghe Ștefan  
1899—1980



Ion Nestor  
1905—1974



Dan Monah  
born 1943



Mircea Petrescu-Dîmbovița  
born 1915



Alexandru Vulpe  
born 1931



Gheorghe Lazarovici  
born 1941



Nicolae Ursulescu  
born 1943



Mircea Cârciumaru  
born 1941

Romanian archaeologists

Archaeological research is placed under the aegis of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy, and a very intense research activity is performed, which contracts with the intention of the political fora to subordinate archaeological research.

Several new cultures were identified and defined: Starčevo-Criș, Linear pottery culture, Hamangia, Dudești, Cîrcea, Gura Baciului — Ocna Sibiului. In Banat and Crișana, settlements of the Tisa, Ciumești, Tiszapolgar, and Bodrogkeresztur cultures were discovered. The periodization of most of the Neolithic cultures was achieved, together with the indication of the specific elements for each stage. Co-joint work with experts from related fields of study (geology, anthropology, pedology, paleo-fauna) was commenced.

Substantial monographs of the settlements of Stoiceni, Hăbășești, Izvoare, Cârna, Sălcuța, Tangiru, Petru Rareș, Gornea, Rast, and Tîrpești are published.

The *Dacia* (new series) and *SCIV* (*Studii și comunicări de Istorie Veche* — which became *SCIVA* in the '70s) magazines focused largely on publishing materials and studies of prehistoric archaeology. At the same time, the magazines and journals edited by the Institutes of Archaeology and the museums from other parts of the country include works that largely deal with problems of prehistory.

Two significant synthesis works are published: *Istoria României* (vol. I, 1960) in which the prehistoric cultures are presented briefly by D. Berciu and Vl. Dumitrescu, and *Contribuții la problemele neoliticului în România în lumina noilor cercetări* (1961) by D. Berciu. Likewise, monographs of the cultures and extensive studies appeared: *Hamangia* (D. Berciu — 1966), *Boian* (E. Comșa — 1974), *Precucuteni* (Silvia Marinescu-Bolcu — 1974), *Dudești* (E. Comșa — 1971), *Petrești* (I. Paul — 1970—1992), as well as synthesis papers focused on certain geographical regions: *N. Vlăsa, Neoliticul Transilvaniei* (1976) and *Gh. Lazarovici Neoliticul Banatului* (1979). Vl. Dumitrescu published *Arta neolitică în România* (1968), *Arta preistorică în România* (1974), *Arta culturii Cucuteni* (1979). *Harta arheologică a României* («the Archaeological map of Romania») appears in 1972, edited by Emil Condurachi, Vl. Dumitrescu and M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița. In 1982, Eugen Comșa publishes a popularization work on the Neolithic, *Neoliticul din România*, and in 1987 *Neoliticul pe teritoriul României. Considerații* [Niculescu, 2002].

To conclude, the communist decades, although responsible for a tremendous advance of prehistoric archaeology through the direct financial investment made and the extensive research performed, are also characterized by limitations, internal and external, in the assimilation of these advances into the theoretical corpus of the discipline, which keeps the mission, concepts,

and methods of research of the interwar period; Marxism, as well as all the innovations that affect the theoretical, methodological and cultural-historical essence, failed to impose themselves in the minds of the prehistorians [Anghelinu, 2003, p. 245].

## ROMANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE POST-TOTALITARIAN AGE

The collapse of the Eastern political bloc released from the tutelage of ideological Marxism several national archaeologies, each with its own ambitions and limited resources, willing to align, but uncertain about the direction of this alignment, while the competition did not stimulate an uniformity [Anghelinu, 2003, p. 11].

Prehistoric archaeology witnessed after 1990 a relatively large administrative and academic restructuring, ranging from the establishment of a specialized service in the Ministry of Culture and the establishment of a National Register of Archaeologists to the onset of regional universities, including some with degrees of specialization in archaeology; however, Romanian prehistoric archaeology of Romania does not seem very keen on re-evaluating its past or present theoretical canon.

Following 1989, the «Marxist-Leninist» discourse, adopted in its entirety by the Romanian archaeology only during the Stalinist period, is now present only vaguely, as an emphasis on economic determinism. Furthermore, the discourse of the political power structures, which gradually shifts towards a full European integration, marginalizes the nationalist facet, at least in its dialogue with the rest of Europe. The reliance of national ideology on archaeology is minimal; this state of facts is reflected by the financial issues facing archaeological research, by the publishing difficulties encountered even by «prestigious» journals (e.g., *SCIVA*, *Dacia*, *Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice*) [Babeș, 1999, p. 9], by the isolation felt by researchers unable to consult foreign literature, and last but not least, by the wages received by the archaeologists and museum curators.

The national discourse, which prevailed in the last decades of the old regime, episodically used in certain contexts after 1989, is now employed by those who now promote a far-right nationalism but before 1989 were closely linked to the communist structures, namely by those who promote an exaggerated and embellished historiography of the Romanians' Thracian heritage (e.g., I.C. Dragan and N. Săvescu). Similarly, the national discourse is sometimes used when organizing exhibitions «at order», during significant political events, when Romania must display its «glorious past». Even after 1989, some works, particularly those concerning the period