

The Construction of Knowledge in Archaeology and Art History in Southeastern Europe: A Research Programme (2019-2023) hosted by the Centre for Advanced Study, Sofia (Bulgaria) and funded by the Getty Foundation as part of the Connecting Art Histories Initiative

OPENING CONFERENCE

Looking at Things in Southeastern Europe: Regional Archaeology in Search of Viable Futures

17-18 April 2021

PARTICIPANTS AND ABSTRACTS

**Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu /
"Vasile Pârvan" Institute of
Archaeology, Bucharest (Romania)**

**Trying to do what we are told: dominated
thinking in archaeology**

The current state of archaeological thinking in Romania is generated by a conjunction between subjection to the knowledge claims of the state and deference towards local images of scientific excellence produced in Western Europe. The evaluation of the results of our work favors conformity with the requirements imagined or cherished by local political and scientific authorities and does not encourage a confrontation of research goals with the empirical reality of the finds. Making what we do as good as the best international research is imagined only as an outcome of faithfully imitating our betters, being guided by local traditions of reception which do not include critical examinations of what might be worth imitating and do not distinguish between replicating procedures and mimicking results. The limitation of thinking to what is prescribed by authorities has damaging outcomes. Local cooperation is much less frequent than local competition for privileged access to the authority sources and

archaeologists rarely go beyond what they perceive to be prestigious understandings, the main way of adding something new to the discipline being the publication of recent and old finds.

Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu (alec.niculescu@yahoo.com) is a senior researcher at the Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology; educated at the University of Bucharest (1974-1978), Ph.D. in history (2000), archaeological training and research at the aforementioned institute (since 1985); teaches archaeological theory at the University of Bucharest; published research on ancient ethnic phenomena and on the impact of nationalism on archaeological research; published research on the politics of cultural heritage in Romania and its impact on the conservation and visibility of the artifacts; currently working on the global asymmetries of archaeological research and on the properties of typological thinking and its flattening consequences on the perception of the artifacts (preliminary findings presented at conferences held in 2016 and 2017).

Dimitris Plantzos (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens / Greece)

Artefacts to things: the anthropological shift in archaeological discourse and its repercussions for the study of material culture

Classical art has captured the attention of scholars and enthusiasts since the Renaissance. Based on art-historical tools devised independently of archaeology (such as connoisseurship), classical archaeologists, followed soon enough by their colleagues working on pre-classical and post-classical cultures, forged a research model based on aesthetics and their reception, also assuming that their breed of archaeology was value-free and their methodologies transparent. Connoisseurship still dominates vast areas of Mediterranean archaeology, from prehistoric frescoes to Late Roman jewellery. Over time, art-historical reasoning was increasingly used in combination with positivist tools (such as archaeometry); often enough, however, the former may be found to contaminate the results of the latter. In the last thirty years or so, the study of material culture has been influenced by new trends appearing elsewhere. The so-called 'pictorial turn' observed in cultural studies already in the late 1980s called for a renewed interest in the way images interact with their viewer, an interaction that dramatically supersedes the old creator/spectator axis. Inspired by parallel research in anthropology, cultural historians and archaeologists now accept that things (no more 'artefacts' or 'objets d'art') interact with us through their own materiality, irrespective of whether we use them as everyday items, admire them as remains of a glorified past, or study them as historical reference. In other words, the division of subject and object is less

straightforward than we once thought. This turn involves a reappraisal of culture's ties with the material world, the new concept of material agency, and a novel approach to interaction that relies on network thinking, and is bound to influence archaeological discourse in the years to come. In this paper, I revisit well-known objects from classical Greece to demonstrate that a new, anthropologically informed approach is possible in the study of Greek art. This approach is hitherto ignored by both theorists of agency and materiality and classical archaeologists. In my discussion I hope to show that such approaches may reverse the standard flow of disciplinary power in classical Greece (from artist to viewer), as well as in classics at large (from scholar to the general public).

Dimitris Plantzos, (dkplantzos@yahoo.gr), is a classical archaeologist, educated at Athens (BA, 1982-1987) and Oxford (MPhil, 1988-1990; DPhil, 1990-1993). He is the author of various papers and books on Greek art and archaeology, archaeological theory and classical reception. His Greek-language textbook on Greek Art and Archaeology, first published in 2011 by Kapon Editions, was published in 2016 in English by Lockwood Press in Atlanta, Georgia. He was also co-editor of the volume *A Singular Antiquity. Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in 20th century Greece* (published in Athens in 2008) and the *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Greek Art* (2012; paperback edition 2018). His latest books are *The Recent Future*, a study of archaeological biopolitics in contemporary Greece (2016, Nefeli Editions), and a study of ancient Greek painting in 2018, also published on both sides of the Atlantic. He is co-director of the Argos Orestikon Excavation Project; he teaches classical archaeology and reception at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

**Deniz Burcu Erciyas (Middle East
Technical University / Turkey)**

**Archaeology Education, Practice and Theory
in Turkey**

Archaeology in Turkey emerged as a discipline only in the 1930s following the arrival of German scholars fleeing from the Nazi regime who were appointed to Turkish universities. Until around that time, archaeology was done by foreign expeditions on Ottoman lands and for the Ottoman administration it essentially meant museology although the first legislation on antiquities had passed as early as 1869. In the early years of the new Republic, archaeology had become an agent in nation-state formation concentrating its efforts on the pre-Ottoman past in search of an identity detached from the recently collapsed sultanate. Such nationalism in research objectives did not continue for very long however, archaeology in Turkey assumed a rather conservative position in education, fieldwork and publications. Object-based archaeology

dominated, championing culture-historical approach. Studies remained site-based for the most part and excavation projects lacked multi-disciplinarity. Introduction of scientific methods came late in 1980s with the establishment of the first Archaeometry program at METU. In 1999, the Graduate Program in Settlement Archaeology at METU was founded with a complete multi-disciplinary syllabus and has since served as the sole graduate program including processual and post-processual approaches into its education program. While education in most archaeology schools in Turkey continue to follow the limited definition of “archaeological cultures”, there is a growing number of scholars questioning how we do archaeology. Likewise, projects with interdisciplinary teams and regional perspectives emerged in the last few decades. The beginnings of archaeology as a discipline in Turkey has been widely discussed by several scholars thus it will only be briefly introduced here for colleagues who are not familiar however, the main objective of this presentation will be to discuss archaeological education, practice and theory in Turkey today with a special emphasis on the relationship between culture-historical paradigm and nationalistic agendas in archaeology and the resultant conservatism in practice.

Deniz Burcu Erciyas (berciyas@metu.edu.tr) is the Chair of the Settlement Archaeology programme of the Graduate School of Social Sciences in the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. She has B.S. from Bilkent University (1994), M.A. from the University of Cincinnati (1997) and Ph.D. from the University of Cincinnati (2001). Her research interests include: Hellenistic period in Anatolia, Archaeology of the Black Sea, Archaeological Method and Theory, Byzantine Archaeology, Seljukid Archaeology, Community Archaeology and Public Involvement.

Aleksandar Palavestra
(University of Belgrade / Serbia)

**The Lost Step. Serbian Culture-Historical
Archaeology and the Problem of Continuity**

Culture-historical archaeology – the leading paradigm in Europe and Northern America during the first half of the 20th century, became dominant in the Serbian archaeology only after the Second World War. In the development of interpretive styles and archaeological practices in Serbia, locally specific characteristics are apparent, as well as the importance of the dominant individuals and their authority. Its foundation, development and specific traits move along an irregular trajectory, pointing to the shortcomings of the simplified and schematized pattern of linear sequence of paradigms (culture-historical, processual, postprocessual). The Serbian archaeology was in the position to establish some kind of culture-historical interpretive framework comparatively early, by the beginning of the 20th century, thanks to the anthropogeographical school of Jovan Cvijić, itself compatible to the German and Austrian anthropological theory of Kulturkreislehre. However, the small archaeological community at the time did not accept the ideas of Cvijić concerning cultural

belts/circles, and remained equally uninterested for his justified critique of the idea of deep cultural continuity in the Balkans, running from praehistory to the modern times. This idea of continuity of „the Balkan substrate“ was very attractive to archaeologists, ethnologists, linguists, “characterologists” and “ethno-psychologists” in Serbia of the time. The leading Serbian archaeologist of the first half of the 20th century, Miloje Vasić, completely circumvented the concept of culture-historical archaeology, since it did not contribute to his life’s project – the erroneous interpretation of the Neolithic site Vinča as an Aegean Bronze Age settlement or, later in his life, as an Archaic Greek colony. The authority of Vasić suppressed the introduction of culture-historical paradigm, argued for by a small number of Serbian archaeologists (e.g. Miodrag Grbić), as well as some foreign researchers working in Serbia. Due to these circumstances, prior to the World War II, the European and Serbian archaeologies were in the state of polite mutual ignoring. The culture-historical paradigm was finally established only after the war, thanks to the next generation of archaeologists such as Josip Korošec in Slovenia, Alojz Benac in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Milutin Garašanin in Serbia, and was subsequently accepted by many researchers in the Yugoslav and Serbian archaeology. It is characteristic, however, that this local variety remained imbued by the ideas of continuity and the influence of the primordial Balkan deep “substrate”, as the consequence of the legacy of Vasić’s ideas and his years-long mesmerizing influence in Serbian archaeology. An illustrative example of this hybrid form of culture-historical interpretation may be found in the works of Dragoslav Srejšević, whose equally imposing authority shaped the new generations of archaeologists in the country. Although not predominant any more, this locally specific form of culture-historical approach is still persistently present in the Serbian archaeology. On the other hand, precisely because of this “lost step” during the first half of the 20th century, during the early 1980s the new paradigms of processual and postprocessual archaeology appeared in Serbia almost simultaneously. Their trajectory, marginal at first, has also been irregular and with varying degree of influence in the discipline. With time, and with the introduction of more recent interpretive approaches, a welcome multivocality and a rich ideational pluralism developed in the Serbian archaeology, avoiding the paradigmatic narrow-mindedness of any theoretical provenance.

Aleksandar Palavestra (aleksandar.palavestra@gmail.com) (born in 1956) is professor in the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade. His research focusses on theory and history of archaeology, praehistoric archaeology and heraldry. Published books: "Kneževski grobovi starijeg gvozdenog doba na Centralnom Balkanu" (Princely Graves of the Early Iron Age Central Balkans, 1984), "Rodoslovne tablice i grbovi srpskih dinastija i vlastele" (Genealogy and Heraldry of the Serbian Dynasties and Nobility; co-authors D. Spasić and D. Mrđenović, 1987), "Praistorijski ćilibar na centralnom i zapadnom Balkanu" (Prehistoric Amber in the Central and Western Balkans, 1993), "The Magic of Amber" (co-author V. Krstić, 2006), "Ilirski grbovnici i drugi heraldički radovi" (Illyrian Armorial and other Heraldic essays, 2010), "Kulturni konteksti arheologije" (Cultural Contexts of Archaeology, 2011).

The archaeological research and the associated interest to the antiquities in Bulgarian lands started to grow immediately after the end of the Russian-Ottoman war (1877-78) and the Congress of Berlin that set the beginning of the modern Bulgarian state. The Bulgarian enthusiasts being inspired by the works on Balkan antiquities of European historians, archaeologists, ethnographers, etc. from the second half of 19th c soon founded archaeological societies and organizations that gradually grew into official state institutions. Russian, West- and Central European universities have provided the academic background of the first Bulgarian professionals who immediately began to organize field surveys and excavations and to present the Old Bulgarian heritage at international forums. Along with these enterprises the uses of the past also started with the funding of the first large scale excavations in Plisca by the Russian Imperial Archaeological Institute in Constantinople. The Imperial Institute intended to present the site as very representative and important part of the common Slavonic and Orthodox culture and commonwealth in favor of the Russian political interests on the East Balkans. The intentional demonstration of these interests and especially the Serb-Bulgarian War (1885) have caused the deep division of Bulgarian society between Russophiles and Russophobes – a process that went on with the beginning and ignition of WWI. The young Bulgarian archaeology had to face up to the intentions of nation-state political authorities to use the past for nationalistic ideological and sometimes chauvinistic purposes as well as the legitimization of territorial pretensions being based on historical ground. During the Interwar period Bulgarian archaeologists participated in most of the inner sociopolitical discussions. Most of them however being involved with Prehistory and Classical studies refused to contribute the creation of “deep Bulgarian Antiquity” or processes similar to the ones that ran in Interwar Germany where the idea about “Germanentum” has been constructed. Other scholars who served some ideas about the originality of Medieval Bulgarian culture have contributed to the general political ideological framework concerning the emancipation from Byzantium, but in the late 30’s even the most radical ones admitted its affiliation to the Byzantine Commonwealth. Most notably the archaeologists being armed with best facts and arguments refused to participate in the hot issue about the purity of “Bulgarian race” thus leaving the actual racial discussions in the field of biology and philosophy. Actually the Interwar Bulgaria provides an instance in which archaeology was rarely officially used for nationalistic purposes, however sometimes been manipulated and interpreted for such purposes. Prior the end of the WWII and the establishment of Communist regime archaeology was a well-developed discipline in Bulgaria aided in part by scholars from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Poland and Czechoslovakia. In turn Bulgarian archaeologists were regarded as credible investigators at the international forums. Since 1948 and especially 1950 the

archaeology in Bulgaria has been stimulated by the Communist governmental policy to make a radical effort to include archaeology as important part of the political education of the people and to transform itself from "science for the people into People's science". Initially the organization of the archaeological research in Postwar Bulgaria reflects the tendencies concerning the reformation of all humanities. Under the disguise of the dialectic terms of Marxism the archaeological research reflected the beginning of new nationalistic policy. The old and still influential scholars were forced to change their minds towards the new tendencies and their main goal became the quest for the Bulgarian autochthonous ancestry and the forge of the "Trinity" theory.

Boyan Dumanov (bdumanov@nbu.bg), New Bulgarian University (Bulgaria), has been the acting Chair of the Department of Archeology at the New Bulgarian University since 2012. His research career started at Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski" (1999-2003) where he defended his doctoral thesis in 2003. In 2004 Dr. Dumanov became a full time lecturer at the Department of Archeology at the New Bulgarian University, setting the Department policy of attracting young and promising researchers. Dr. Dumanov's research interests are mainly in the field of Late Antique Archeology, the Great Migration, Medieval Bulgaria and Byzantium and focus mainly on issues of applied arts, ruler ideology, ethnic identity, settlement patterns and migration. In recent years, Dr. Dumanov has been particularly focusing on the interaction between politics and archeology, the influence of the political status quo in archeology and science as an object of political action.

Giorgos Vavouranakis (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens / Greece)

Old dogs and new tricks: paradigmatic continuity and change in Aegean prehistoric archaeology

Aegean Prehistory was established a distinct field of archaeological research in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century, when a series of important sites were excavated, such as Knossos, Mycenae, Phylakopi, Tiryns and others. Ever since it has been quick to receive the latest paradigmatic developments of the archaeological discipline. Thus, the early researchers attempted to break away from the tyranny of the ancient texts, adopted cultural evolutionism and produced ethnocentric culture-historical interpretative narratives. The shift from culture history to new or processual archaeology was immediately felt in the study of Aegean Prehistory, especially through the work of Colin Renfrew, one of the very founders of the new paradigm. Post-processualism was introduced relatively late, but related research contributions became more numerous in the 1990s. The latest post-humanist tendencies have been spearheaded by Aegeanists. At the same time, Aegean prehistoric archaeology features a long-standing tradition of paradigmatic conservatism. The connection to "Altertumswissenschaft" and to 19th century practices was maintained at least until the 1970s. Nationalist narratives were retained for a long period of time after World War

II. The culture-historical paradigm has remained relatively popular until today. The merits of processual archaeology started to become widely accepted only in the 1980s and afterwards. The contribution of post-processual and post-humanist approaches has remained tangential. As a result, the current state of Aegean research may be understood as “traditional plus”. This characterisation denotes an empiricist version of processualism with occasional overtones from other paradigms. The present paper argues that the above epistemological tendencies are related to several parameters. One of them is the complex nature of the archaeological record, especially when it comes to extensively excavated urban settlements, citadels and palaces with stratigraphic sequences spanning over millennia. Another reason is the sensitive place of archaeology within Greek national identity and the strengthening of the latter through the instrumental employment of antiquities from the establishment of the Greek state in the 1830s until today. A third parameter is the academic orientation and institutional infrastructure of many of the so-called “foreign schools of archaeology”. These are research institutes or -more rarely- cultural branches of embassies, responsible for the archaeological research traffic coming from their respective home academic departments in Greece.

Giorgos Vavouranakis (gvavour@arch.uoa.gr), National & Kapodistrian University of Athens (Greece), was born in Athens in 1972. He holds a 4-year BA in Archaeology and History of Art from the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens (1994), an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Prehistoric Archaeology from the University of Sheffield (1998, 2002). He has worked as a post-doctoral researcher at the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens (2003- 2005); as adjunct faculty at the Universities of Crete (2004-2005) and the Peloponnese (2007- 2009) and at the Hellenic Open University (2007-today); and as a contract archaeologist at the Hellenic Ministry of Culture (2007-2008, 2011). He was appointed Lecturer in «Prehistoric Aegean: Theoretical Archaeology» at the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens in 2012 and was promoted to Associate Professor in 2019. His research interests include Minoan Crete, Cypriot Prehistory, archaeological theory and the history of archaeological research.

Monika Milosavljević (University of Belgrade / Serbia)

The Development and Change of Archaeological Knowledge in the Former Yugoslavia: a Fleckian Perspective

The majority of current histories on the social aspects of scientific work rely theoretically on Thomas Kuhn's “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” (1962). Changes in science and technology studies have since led to a rethinking of Kuhn's approach and use of the term paradigm has become unsatisfactory. Accordingly, Ludwik Fleck's ideas have now come to be considered better capable of observing of past and present science practices and, consequently, archaeology. The aim of the presentation is to introduce Ludwik Fleck's conceptual toolbox to reexamine changes

in Southeastern Europe's archaeologies through the history of its development. What was once purely considered through a Kuhnian lens may now be reinterpreted through a Fleckian perspective. Fleck still remains in the shadow of Kuhn and is only now emerging from it. Fleck's most significant epistemological papers were published in the 1930s, but became known only with the development of constructivistic programmes of philosophy and sociology of science from the 1980s. Side by side with Karl Popper, Robert Merton or Thomas Kuhn, Fleck is today regarded as a classic author in the field of the historiography of science, more applicable to the scientific traditions in non-first-world countries that underwent different experiences in their respective development. Fleck's suitability stems from his main epistemological work, "The Genesis and Development of Scientific Fact" (1935), in which he elaborated on concepts such as thought-collectives, thought-style, proto-ideas, incommensurability. These all allow for better micro-historiographies to come to the surface, as opposed to paradigm shifts that discount minor exceptions to a presupposed rule. The introduction of a Fleckian approach should be done in the context of the contemporary science of science and specific attention paid towards Southeastern-European issues. As a case study, there was a monumental shift recorded in archaeology as a field within the former Yugoslavia. Prior to WWII, it consisted of lone individuals; following it, perceived as an emancipatory force in the service of ideology, institutions arose across the country. Despite its nondemocratic nature, considerable growth occurred in archaeology, known as the introduction of a culture-historical approach. How did such a paradigm shift affect knowledge production and how can we study the history of archaeology today? Through a Fleckian perspective, an examination of the archeology of the former Yugoslavia will allow for a broader picture on the mechanisms of scientific development in the region as a whole.

Monika Milosavljevic (monika.milosavljevic@gmail.com) obtained her PhD (2015), MA (2010) and BA (2009) from the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, under the supervision of Professor Aleksandar Palavestra. Her dissertation, "Concepts of Barbarism and Barbarization as Otherness in Serbian Archaeology" (2015), utilizes a self-developed methodology for the analysis of the history of ideas in archaeology according to Ludwik Fleck's sociology of knowledge, resulting in a novel understanding of the barbaric heritage of Europe as according to the example of Serbian Archaeology. Since 2016, she holds the position of Assistant Professor of Archaeology at the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, where she was an Assistant Lecturer of Archaeology from 2013 to 2016. She was a guest editor for a thematic issue on archaeology of the journal *Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology* Vol.11, No. 3, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade.

Predrag Novaković (University of Ljubljana / Slovenia)

Cohabitation, hybridisation and eclecticism of archaeological paradigms: Modern

As all national archaeological schools in former Yugoslavia, also the Slovene archaeology underwent a major process of modernization in the period between 1945 and 1965. Prior that period one could speak of rather limited level of archaeological discipline which also extremely varied from one to another region in former Yugoslavia. A radical change occurred with 1945 when the intensive process of infrastructural and conceptual renovation of archaeological discipline in whole Yugoslavia was initiated. Only 20 years later, the situation was almost incomparable, several dozens of new museums and heritage protection institutes were established across the country, a number of professional archaeologists radically increased, as well as grew the supporting infrastructure (publications, exhibitions, legislative changes...). In conceptual terms, the basis of this renovation was culture history archaeology as reformed, in post-war Germany by Merhart and his students (e.g. Mueller-Karpe, Kossack, Miložič, Werner, Dehn...). The development of modern prehistoric archaeology in Slovenia is directly linked with the influence of this 'school', and by late 1960s Slovenian archaeology achieved a high level of excellence in SE European region which continued in future decades as well. However, with the beginning of the 1980s new ideas influenced by the processual archaeology in the USA and UK started to circulate. The crucial role played some younger scholars (e.g. Slapšak, Djurić) from the University of Ljubljana which argued for stronger reflexion and critique of the dominant practice and concepts. In 1981 they have established a journal *Arheo* which started to publish articles and translations focused on critique of the state of archaeology, epistemology and theory. The peak of the endeavours of this group was an invitation to Lewis Binford who became a guest professor at the University of Ljubljana in 1985. Though the impact of his teaching was not immediate nor there were any radical paradigmatic shifts in the Slovene archaeology, the whole »program« of another modernization proved very resilient. In the 1980s, besides a number of articles in *Arheo*, also translations of several key texts were published: Lev Klejn's *Archaeological sources* (1987) and *Archaeological typology* (1988), Jean-Claude Gardin's *Archeologie theoretique* (1988), and there was also a plan to translate Davide Clarke's *Analytical Archaeology*, but this did not happen. In addition to this, another group of younger scholars in Slovenia, mostly sociologists, philosophers, anthropologists and linguists, also quite unhappy with the state of discourse in social sciences and humanities in Slovenia, launched in the 1980s a monograph series where translations of mostly French theorists of history, art history and antiquity were published in the first years (J. P. Vernant, G. Dumezil, J. Le Goff, P. Vidal-Nacquet..., but also M. Finley, P. Anderson, A. Momigliano, R. Bianchi Bandinelli) bringing additional perspectives in historical sciences. The 'opening' of the archaeology in Slovenia (to a certain degree also in some other places in Yugoslavia, e.g. Belgrade) to ideas of processual archaeology gave boost to younger generation of archaeologists to participate in a different kind of

archaeology as they have experienced at home; they started to participate at TAG conferences in England, to work in international teams, to follow guest teachers from the UK and USA, and gradually many new topics became included in the archaeological curriculum (archaeological theory included) in the early 1990s. However, here one important aspect should be pointed out. The changes brought by 'new archaeological thinking' were not highly successful in Slovene archaeology because of their theoretical or conceptual strength, but because of their success in practice, as methods and techniques which demonstrated very successful in a series of important projects in Slovenia. Here, in the first place should be mentioned spatial archaeology which stands out for at least two major successes which left considerable consequences on further development of archaeology in Slovenia and wider: the application of GIS (one of the pioneering GIS projects in archaeology in general, was done by combined Slovene-British team in 1992) and project of preventive research on motorways, where methods, based on experiences from the Slovene-British landscape reconnaissance in Dalmatia, were developed in the early 1990s, and, in the future two decades, led to a multi-million national program of preventive archaeology. The two 'successes' are just the most illustrative for the legacy of the 1980s, the list of projects with new techniques and methods coming from the domain and practice of processual (and later also postprocessual) archaeology is much more extensive. However, what is important to note here is that 'new' archaeologies in Slovenia did not replace the traditional culture-history approach. A rather peculiar situation emerged, that of co-habitation or hybridisation of traditional archaeology with concepts, ideas and methods originating in the processual and postprocessual archaeology. Already a brief survey of publications in the last 30 years demonstrates this interesting and eclectic mixture. The paper discusses the reasons for such an eclectic nature of the Slovene archaeology since the 1980s, and potentials of eclectic approach in the development of modern archaeology in SE Europe.

Predrag Novakovic, (predrag.novakovic@ff.uni-lj.si), University of Ljubljana (Slovenia), graduated in Archaeology (1989), PhD in Archaeology (2001) at the University of Ljubljana. In 1991: a research grant (1 semester) at the University of Durham, UK. Since 1992: employed at the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. He was a guest professor at the University of Pisa, Italy (1998-2000), University of Graz, Austria (2007-2008), and University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina (2013 - 2015); member of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) since 1994; secretary of the EAA (2005 - 2008). Currently teaching archaeological theory, history of archaeology, landscape archaeology, archaeological field methods; author and co-author of several studies in history of archaeological discipline, development of spatial studies in archaeology, preventive archaeology; also co-author of the standards in field archaeology in Slovenia; director and co-director of several field projects in Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia.

Radu-Alexandru Dragoman
(“Vasile Pârvan” Institute of
Archaeology, Bucharest / Romania)

**Forgetting our own lives: self-colonization,
anticommunism and capitalist ideology in the
Romanian archaeology of today**

The socio-political changes of 1989 were welcomed by the Romanian archaeologists with high hopes in the revival of their discipline, marked under the communist regime by isolation, political control and modest material conditions or even poverty. One of the new and positive research directions that emerged after 1990 was that of the archaeology of the recent past, the central topic so far being the research of the communist political repression. Over the years, a whole series of archaeological excavations were carried out across the country in the places where victims were believed to have been buried. Importantly, this research has given rise not only to debates on Romania’s recent history, but also to critical evaluations of the epistemological foundations of the discipline. Two main opposing epistemological zones in the study of the human remains and the associated materiality can be noted: a positivistic one (non-theoretical and non-reflexive), with a long tradition and still dominant in Romanian archaeology; and a much younger, post-processual one (interpretative and reflexive), adopted by very few. However, both zones are not homogenous: within each it is possible to identify different research agendas producing different narratives. Based on an analysis of the discourses promoted in the archaeologies of the recent past, in this talk I argue that, in contrast to the optimism of the 1990s, but also in opposition to both positivistic and some of the post-processual perspectives, the present day Romanian archaeology is a discipline colonized epistemologically and ideologically by the “West”, with no place for the local historical experience. The archaeologies of the recent past in Romania are at best a peripheral / local application of Western research philosophies and agendas, and at worst, a tool for legitimizing capitalist ideology. Therefore, I make a plea for the decolonisation of the Romanian archaeological practice and for the thinking of new archaeological approaches forged by our own existential and historical experiences.

Radu-Alexandru Dragoman, (al_dragoman@yahoo.com), is an archaeologist based in the Department of Prehistoric Archaeology, Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania, working on the biography of Neolithic pottery, ritual and religion in the Neolithic, the archaeology of mountains, the archaeology of the recent past (with a focus on political repression and communist modernity), and the political dimensions of Romanian archaeology. He is currently exploring the value of Christian theological perspectives in relation to the study of material culture. His publications include *Arheologie și politică în România* (2013; with Sorin Oanță-Marghitu) and *Materiality of the Pitești Experiment: An Archaeological Essay on the Memory of Repression and Resistance in Communist Romania* (2015).

From the last decades of the 20th century, it has become customary to systematize modes of archaeological knowledge into three distinct approaches: culture-historical, processual and postprocessual. The incommensurability of these strands of research has occasionally been emphasized by labelling them as distinct paradigms, evoking the work of Thomas Kuhn and implying that the turning points (1960s and again in 1980s) induced profound changes in the ways archaeologists gain knowledge of the past, so that the entire epistemological base of the discipline has been fundamentally altered (cf. Lucas 2016). In this way, a pattern is created presupposing some law-like force driving the development of the discipline on general level, resembling the mechanisms of unilinear evolutionary ladder of stages. The units not corresponding to this universal pattern are perceived as anomalies, resulting from some inherent deficiency and/or inability of certain archaeological communities to comply to the overall laws of progress. The archaeological communities of South-eastern Europe have long been considered as one such example of a scholarly environment in the state of “arrested development”, remaining prevalently devoted to the culture-historical approach and largely hesitant to engage in current theoretical debate. There is certainly merit to this assessment, as for various reasons this part of the world does not neatly follow the established pattern of the three archaeological approaches identified as clear-cut “paradigms”. However, it may safely be argued that in this respect South-eastern Europe is not an isolated example, but rather matches the majority of global archaeological experiences, from Japan to Latin America (cf. e.g. Chapman 2003). The conventional sequence: culture-historical, processual, post-processual, in fact reflects primarily the situation in one part of the European and, to some extent, North American archaeological community. Consequently, the current state of the discipline may better be described as a fragmented and multi-vocal landscape, rather than a single prescribed approach to be attained through rapid synchronization under the same banner. Furthermore, the scrutiny of some basic archaeological concepts (e.g. the very nature of the material we work with – the archaeological record, sensu Lucas 2012) indicates that the two turning points in the history of the discipline did not radically disrupt fundamental epistemological principles. This contribution therefore seeks to explore some of the ways in which archaeological knowledge is transferred and transformed in various interactions inside the discipline and beyond, and the reasons underlying the wide acceptance/rejection of certain approaches and theoretical propositions. These reasons include current institutional and socio-political circumstances of archaeological research, but also varying intellectual traditions on which diverse archaeological communities were formed. Discussing these issues may bring us closer to advancing the archaeological theory and practice in SE Europe, corresponding to the (past and present) particularities of the region, and at the same time resonating with the global disciplinary context.

Staša Babić, (sbabic@f.bg.ac.rs), is a full Professor of the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade. Prof. Babić served as Head of Department from 2009 to 2018. Currently she is the project leader of the ERASMUS+ project STEM in Heritage Sciences, exploring incorporation of new technologies in archaeological training, theory and practice. Her research focuses on theory in archaeology, Iron Age and Classical Archaeology of Greece. Her 2018 monograph *Metaarheologija* discusses the nature of archaeological knowledge, with an emphasis on the importance of collective knowledge versus paradigm shifts. She is one of the authors of the European Association of Archaeologists Statement Archaeology and the Future of Democracy (<https://www.e-a-a.org/BernStatement>).

Rajna Sosic Klindzic (University of Zagreb / Croatia)

The tradition of tradition in Croatian Archaeology

In this presentation, several topics proposed by the organizers meet. I will address them from the perspective of institutional archaeology in the Republic of Croatia. For decades now, disciplinary problems have been recognized and addressed by numerous authors, since David Clarke described archaeology as undisciplined empirical discipline. As recognized, culture-historical paradigm is still dominant in the Southeastern Europe. Traditional culture-historical thinking is still present in Croatian archaeology, as an invisible paradigm, or the "sense" of using common-sense approach. Many factors led to this situation. First of them is individuality of archaeological work in Croatian institutions. From 19th century onwards, there was strong division on personnel working on certain time period. This division pertained, so our study programs and museum departments are still organized in prehistoric, antique and medieval sections. Archaeological interpretation relied heavy on the authorities and old periodizations were rarely challenged, rather filled in with new data. Concept of cultural circles is still very much alive and active participant in the archaeological debates. Real archaeologist is still often considered one with fieldwork experience, who can get his hands dirty, proper archaeologist, with developed "feeling" for detection of important finds and finding the truth. On a more global scale, archaeological cultures are still most dominant "units of measurement" in archaeological research and interpretation. From the very beginning the archaeological research is formed around the "culture" it investigates. To broaden the problem, some prehistoric borders in SE Europe are still perceived as they were the subject of Badinter Arbitration Commission in 1991. This is the results of national archaeologies and politics and policies of archaeology in each country. The common environment in which archaeological research is funded is often in the "sphere" of the national interests, and therefore formed accordingly. More and more joint projects and international collaborations begin to rattle this traditional environment, but the process is slow. The problem which is particular for the SE Europe more intensely than in the rest of the Europe is the concept of archaeological research

not as team work, but as the right, responsibility and property of single esteemed scholar, which is often inherited. On the other hand, young scholars were guided to narrow specialization since the early stages of their career so they became expert for specific topics and have no time or interest subsequently to deal with theoretical and epistemological questions. That way the grand narratives of our prehistory remain as solid as when they were formed during the 19th century. Ever since, much has been developed in archaeology, but also new epistemological issues arose. The long tradition of culture-history archaeology, production of archaeological knowledge reserved for the single great mind, and keeping dominant positions and strong hierarchy in the frames of national archaeologies is possible explanations for the dominant production of archaeological knowledge in some parts of the SE Europe. As part of the national funding and building block of national identity archaeology is in the feedback loop with every political structure and has never left archaeology. Maybe it is time to try to guide this relationship in another direction.

Rajna Sosic Klindzic (rsosic@ffzg.hr) is associate professor at the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Her research interests are prehistoric archaeology, archaeological theory, archaeology and politics, and archaeology in the digital world. Her current project is Modelling prehistoric settlement network in Slavonia (MOPRENS) funded by Croatian Science Foundation. As management committee member and representative of Croatia she participates in COST action ARKWORK. She teaches courses in prehistoric archaeology, history of archaeology and archaeological theory in undergraduate, master and PhD archaeology study program at the University of Zagreb.

Yiannis Papadatos (National & Kapodistrian University of Athens / Greece)

Regional surface surveys as a step forward: some thoughts on the basis of the Greek case study

Due to sharp differences in their political and cultural history, the countries of Southwestern Europe cannot be regarded as a single entity concerning the development of archaeological theory and practice. However, it is possible to pinpoint some interesting similarities, especially in comparison with the situation in other western countries. These similarities include (a) the lack of a local tradition of archaeological theory among archaeologists working both in state and academic institutions, (b) the appropriation of specific periods of their past by western academic discourse, (c) the colonial character of their interaction with the western academia, particularly in the earlier years, and (d) the strong influence by nationalist political agendas, especially in the first decades after national liberation from imperial or colonial powers. The above similarities may explain not only the resilience of the culture-historical paradigm but also the fact that archaeology in Southeastern Europe did not follow the western path of theoretical developments. This applies not only to

the new countries that emerged in the 20th century, but also to countries with longer history of existence, like Greece. In that sense, Greece as a case study is particularly indicative of regional archaeological developments not only because it is the first national state founded in the area, but also because, due to the appropriation of Greek classical antiquity by the west, it became a real archaeological laboratory for the application of all recent trends in archaeological theory and practice by western archaeologists. The above is best evidenced and exemplified in the application of systematic regional surface surveys, an archaeological method that developed in the 1960s in parallel with the emergence of New Archaeology and the weakening of the culture-historical thinking in western academia. In this paper we present a retrospective review of regional surface surveys in Greece in an effort to (a) study the impact of these research projects on national archaeology, (b) examine the diffusion of the relevant theoretical trends and (c) assess the degree to which they turned the theoretical agenda of Greek archaeology away from the culture-historical thinking. Furthermore, recent advances in regional surface survey over the last two decades, such as the abandonment of the concept of "site", the use of GIS applications, the development of phenomenological approaches and the reconstruction of mindscapes, constitute important steps towards post-modern thinking, but their impact on Greek archaeology remains to be seen and evaluated.

Yiannis Papadatos (gpapadat@arch.uoa.gr) is Associate Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology at the Department of History and Archaeology, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens (NKUA, Greece). He received his degree on Archaeology and History of Art from NKUA (1994), and his PhD on Prehistoric Archaeology from the University of Sheffield (1999). He worked as Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Sheffield (2001-2002) and as contract archaeologist for the Greek Archaeological Service (2002-2007). He is also teaching at the Hellenic Open University, since 2002. He has directed several field work projects, carrying out excavations and survey surveys in Siteia and Ierapetra (East Crete) and Marathon (Attica). His main research interests comprise Bronze Age Aegean, Funerary Archaeology and Ancient Technology.