

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

SPRING SCHOOL 2021

“The Impact of the Political on Archaeological Research”

Colloquium

23 April 2021

PARTICIPANTS AND ABSTRACTS

**Ivo Strahilov / Sofia University
(Bulgaria)**

**Shared and Contested: Cultural Heritage of
Southeastern Europe in National, Regional
and European Perspective. The case of
Trebenishte Necropolis**

The modern history of the ancient necropolis situated near the Macedonian village of Trebenishte by Ohrid lake represents a peculiar case, which provides us with important terrain that could reveal some significant dynamics in knowledge construction in archaeology and history in Southeastern Europe. It was in 1918, towards the end of World War I, when the Bulgarian army “discovered” ruins and precious objects, while repairing the road between Kichevo and Ohrid. Back then archaeologists from Bulgaria have been sent to further investigate the site, and many artefacts have consequently been transferred to the National archaeological museum in Sofia. Later, after the constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes

(1918), excavations have continued in the 1930s under the direction of prominent Serbian archaeologists. Nowadays, the objects found during this period belong to the collection of the National museum of Belgrade. The third part of the artefacts which have been discovered afterwards, mostly by Macedonian archaeologists, are related to the history of (North) Macedonia as an independent state and remain at its museums. Due to these complex and controversial historical developments and consecutive independent excavations, not only have the objects been dispersed in the three countries, but also their interpretations have been incoherent and competing. Following the premises of the culture-historical archaeology, national archaeological schools have attributed ethnic characteristics to the ancient graves according to respective nationalistic and scholarly agendas. Thus, the necropolis has been categorised and used as heritage that would testify the existence or the superiority of a relevant archaeological culture (e.g. Illyrian, Mycenaean, Thracian, Macedonian, etc.). On the other hand, this procedure legitimates the accuracy of the specific archaeological paradigm. In 2018, however, an agreement was signed between museums in North Macedonia, Bulgaria, and Serbia that led to a joint exhibition on the ancient site and the first assemblage of its finds. Firstly, the whole collection was exhibited in Skopje in 2019, whereas it is agreed that Belgrade and Sofia will host it in near future, too. Certainly, this initiative is also imbricated with political intentions in the context of the Europeanisation of the Balkans. Drawing upon ethnographic fieldwork among Macedonian archaeologists and experts in the sphere of cultural heritage, participant observation of the exhibition, study of media representations and review of existing interpretational theories, this paper aims at presenting some preliminary results of an ongoing project exploring the social life of the necropolis of Trebenishte. My research highlights past and current tendencies in both archaeological knowledge production and further instrumentalizations of archaeological heritage for national, regional and European goals.

Ivo Strahilov (strahilov.ivo@gmail.com) holds a PhD in Cultural Studies from Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski (2019) and specializes in the field of Critical Heritage Studies. His dissertation scrutinizes the social construction of the ancient Thracian heritage and its contemporary political, economic, academic and popular dimensions in Bulgaria. Drawing upon fieldwork in France and Bulgaria, it also explores how cultural heritage is rearticulated and renegotiated within the entanglements between Europe's "core" and "periphery". In his postdoctoral research project, Ivo Strahilov works on the debates and contestations visible in the making of international archaeological exhibitions in Southeastern Europe and beyond. Other aspects of his current research focus on popular narratives of the past, historical reenactments, and

new festivities. Ivo Strahilov's scholarly interests include also identity politics and performativity, modern uses of heritage, minorities' heritages (especially Romani and Ottoman), and intangible heritage with an emphasis on masquerades and carnivals. He has been a visiting fellow at the University of Guadalajara (2016), Paris Descartes University (2017 and 2018), University of Salento (2018), and the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2019).

Anastasia Vergaki / National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (Greece)

Searching for the Power of the Multitude: political and ritual dimensions of Minoan neopalatial domestic architecture

The Neopalatial period- (c. 1700-1500 BC or Middle Minoan IIIB - Late Minoan IB in pottery terms), marked the heyday of the Minoan palatial society, and ended with the disastrous volcanic eruption of Santorini and its social reverberations. This period has been regarded as a time of affluence, owing to the many and elaborate court-centered buildings, frequently called palaces, and the villas, namely their smaller scale counterparts. These buildings are supposed to be a two-tier elite and feature special types of rooms often related to ritual. The best known are the so-called "Pillar Crypts", "Lustral Basins" and "Bench Sanctuaries", as well as the "Pier and Door Partitions" system. The above architectural features are found in average houses, albeit less frequently and in a less elaborate form. This architectural difference is usually interpreted as a domestic emulation of elite architecture. This is because we are influenced by modern forms of political and social organization. The political nature of the "traditional" or generally accepted views of the palace and architecture trace their origins to Evans' Edwardian aristocratic conceptions or to Diffusionism (ex oriente lux) as well as to newer political conservative top-down models of society, such as systemic models with their need for managers or system regulators. Apart from their deeply political character, the aforementioned approaches to architecture have problems regarding the manipulation of the excavation data as well, by giving a ritual and/or elite character to every uninterpretable find. However, a closer look demonstrates that the assumed elite features were widely adopted by both palaces and houses at the same period of time. Furthermore, their architectural predecessors are detected both in palatial and in non-palatial buildings of the Early and, mostly, the Middle Minoan period. A re-examination of the neopalatial settlements of Pseira, Mochlos and Gournia may allow the suggestion that the aforementioned architectural features may have hosted ritual and other types of action that reinforced low-level social and even political

organization. This argument reinforces what has already been widely accepted regarding the convivial character of feasting practices in Minoan Crete, which attained a key-role in social reproduction both before and after the establishment of the palaces. It also allows us to reconsider the social organization of Minoan Crete and the significance of the palaces. Instead of a hierarchical society topped by a leader or an elite group, Minoan society may be seen as a complex web entailing a dynamic interplay of different levels of social organization and hierarchy. Such a bottom up approach to Minoan Crete brings up the concept of the multitude, namely the ability of the basis of the social pyramid to be socially self-organised and to trigger responses by higher social echelons. As a result, a question emerges: Are we dealing with palatial or with the multitude's architecture? We should search for an answer free from established cultural and socio political stereotypes.

Anastasia M. Vergaki, (avergaki@arch.uoa.gr), National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (Greece), was born in Athens and she's an archaeologist specialised in Bronze Age Aegean. She graduated from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, where she also continued her postgraduate studies. She has participated in several interdisciplinary excavations and since 2016 she is a Ph.D. student of Prehistoric Archaeology in the University of Athens. She has been working on domestic ritual in small-scale societies, theory, political and social organization of the Late Bronze Age settlements of Minoan Crete.

**Zenta Broka-Lace /
University of Latvia (Latvia)**

**Archaeological ethics under the hammer and sickle in
Latvia (1940-1941; 1944-1991)**

During Soviet occupation Latvian archaeology, other sciences and entire aspects of life were reorganised according to the official ideology of the Soviet Union (USSR): Marxism–Leninism. The goal was to build the communism, and all preceding views about the past had to be revised and adjusted in order to fit the theory of evolution towards the “World communism”. Although in Latvian historiography it is widely agreed that history and prehistory were those spheres where ideology was just a formality, there is no doubt that archaeologists also had to contribute to the regime. The question is how much scientists had to bow to the regime and compromise with it? In this paper I try to find answer to the uncomfortable question of how exactly the unwritten code of archaeology ethics was violated during the regime of Soviet occupation in Latvia. The research question can be expanded in more general manner as a question – how far scientists can engage with any kind of politics to maintain the honour to be called a scientist.

Zenta Broka-Lāce (zentabroka@inbox.lv) is currently a PhD student at Faculty of History and Philosophy at the University of Latvia, who works as a Scientific Assistant at the Department of Archaeology, Institute of Latvian History at the University of Latvia as well as a Chief Specialist at the Ģederts Eliass History and Art Museum of Jelgava. Her scientific interests and PhD Project are related to theory and history of archaeology specifically in Latvia („The Development of Archaeological Thought in Latvia from 19th - 21st Century"). The PhD project investigates how archaeology has developed, changed and been used by different political narratives during various political regimes such as independence, Nazi and soviet occupations. Besides ideological aspects, the project studies communication of archaeology and questions related to subject of public archaeology from the beginnings of discipline until this day.

**Cătălin Ion Nicolae / Nicolae Iorga
Institute of History, Institute of
History (Romania)**

**Archaeology and politics in the programs of
public Romanian radio (1930-1944)**

Almost from the beginning of radio broadcasting in Romania archaeology was a constant presence in radio programs between 1930 and 1944. Most of the prominent Romanian archaeologists took the opportunity to share with the audience their work and achievements and to raise public awareness for the cause of archaeology. As most of the intellectuals of the period, archaeologists were also politically involved, thus many of the conferences are biased by propaganda discourse. Between 1930 and 1944 about 200 conferences with archaeological subjects were broadcast, the authors being mostly archaeologists (22 out of 35), with Radu Vulpe (archaeologist at the National Museum of Antiquities then) having the largest number of conferences (55). The recurrent themes of archaeological discourse at the national radio, as the war approached, and then, during the war, were related to backing the military actions of Romania and the Third Reich, trying to legitimize all military campaigns in the East. Bringing into discussion archaeology and ancient sources was common practice. Another theme was the constant battle with the Hungarian archaeologists, and during the war with the Hungarian authorities and political actors, related to the history of Transylvania. In the war years most conferences were infused with nationalism. Some archaeologists also took part as active military officers to the campaigns in the East, and made radio conferences from there, mixing archaeological research with political arguments. In our contribution we will briefly present and analyze the documents from the Romanian National Broadcasting Company archive.

Cătălin Ion Nicolae (fotoiavp@gmail.com) is currently archaeologist, photographer and curator of the photographic archive at the "Vasile Pârvan" Institute of Archaeology in Bucharest. His main interests as field archaeologist are related to the Neolithic of Southern Romania and Dobrogea but also to the much more recent traces, those belonging to the Second World War and to the Communist built industrial and agricultural heritage in the same areas. His recent projects relate to the photographic documentation of Communist heritage from Dobrogea and the research of former Communist forced labour and extermination camps along the Black Sea-Danube Channel.

**Natalija Cosic / University of Belgrade
(Serbia)**

Making-of Lepenski Vir

Due to its multidimensional nature archaeological heritage, often involves different concepts, interpretations, reuses, interests, and strategies. This includes heritage usage as a cultural, political or economic source. Thus, this presentation will pursue to address following question: How and to what extent (re)shaping the final heritage product- the archeological site, for presentation and use, affects the scientific and historical values. Archeological sites are first and foremost research arenas, which through the process of preservation and presentation may gain or lose value within cultural and touristic offer of a city, state, region or even in global spheres. This being said the aim of this presentation is twofold. Firstly, relying on the methodology of preventive conservation, paper will set the scene by demonstrating the common problems of archeological sites in general. This includes identification of various agents of heritage devastation that arise or are present in the process of site research, presentation and use, and may affect the loss of its values. Then, the study will seek to understand and problematize the role of authority in producing the final product in pursuing the authentic representations of the past. Particularly, presentation will analyze how disciplinary explanatory models influence the design, use, and presentation of archeological sites and landscapes. The paper aims to show how site and landscape elements become articulated spatially and interpretively while going through several different approaches to understanding the past. Which of these elements is included, what is omitted, and what are the values that remain constants? Having said that, through the prism of the authorized heritage discourse (sensu Smith 2006), the paper critically examines research and conservation practices that tends to create, certain views of the past which will be problematized. Particularly,

process will be investigated through the example of the history of transformations and the "biography" of the Lepenski Vir site and its immediate environment.

Natalija Cosic (natalija.cosic@gmail.com) holds a BA in archaeology from the University of Belgrade and a master degree in preventive conservation from the same University. Currently, she is a PhD candidate at the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Philosophy. Her main research fields are critical studies of archaeological heritage and knowledge production of archaeological knowledge.

Hüseyin Burak Soy / Middle East Technical University (Turkey)

Peace and Conflict on Heritage: A Comparison of Greece and Turkey World Heritage Lists for the Study of the Concept of Heritage as a Tool for Peace

The antiquated turbulent character of the relationship between Greece and Turkey only newly articulated once again by the signature of an agreement between Libya and Turkey unveiled in December 2019, resultant of Greece's objection to United Nations regarding her sea boundaries. The United Nations remained neutral and urged Turkey and Greece to maintain a dialogue. In a world of nation-states, the material remains of the past often receive an important role in the editing of both idealised national discourses, and counter-discourses. In terms of understanding the value of "Heritage" both as a concept and tool for peace, this paper concentrates on the heritage in Greece and Turkey, which are distinguished as the "same" and the "other" respectively, in the Western ideology. Through a study of the emergence and development of the heritage concept in both countries via the World Heritage Lists, I aim to define the trends of the use of heritage as a tool against the "other". In so doing, I ask the questions: How have the attitudes towards heritage in Turkey and Greece change through time and are these changes reflected in the World Heritage Lists of both countries? How have the Turkish and Greek World Heritage Lists developed through time? How have the Turkish attitudes towards the Greek past in Turkey changed through time? How have the Greek attitudes towards the Turkish past in Greece changed through time? Are there trends in Turkey and Greece regarding the selection or neglect of certain monuments of certain periods? If so, are these trends reflected in the World Heritage Lists of both countries? Answers to these questions regarding the heritage as a tool will help us to develop our understanding of heritage as a concept and presumably lead us to other questions: How has UNESCO changed in its ideology, methodology, and goals in terms of an

evaluation of these two countries World Heritage Lists? What potential have the heritage listed in both countries as a tool to create a platform for a more harmonious existence and communication in both micro and macro scales? Or will there a need to do some (other) lists once the concept of heritage has transformed into another tool, a tool for dialogue, understanding, and peace?

Hüseyin Burak Soy (hbsoy@yahoo.com) has graduated from the Archaeology Department at Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts (MSUFA), İstanbul in 2004. During his studies there, he has worked with various Turkish and foreign archaeological projects as a student. After his graduation, he participated in the Byzantine Harbour Excavations under the auspices of the Istanbul Archaeological Museum, and then worked for Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. He has completed his master's studies in Architectural History at İstanbul Technical University in 2015, and in 2016 he has graduated from MSUFA in a master's degree program in Classical Archaeology. In 2017, he started his studies in Settlement Archaeology Ph.D programme at Middle East Technical University, Ankara. The topic of his thesis is "The Appreciation of Classical Heritage in West Turkey: Understanding Greek Immigrant and Turkish Attitudes - A Holistic Approach".

Miglena Stamberova / Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Bulgaria)

Archaeology during the Communism in Bulgaria

My research presents the impact of the political on the archaeology during the communist period in Bulgaria. It is innovative one as there is no detailed study on the relationship between archaeology and politics and the impact of politics on archaeology so far. The first significant discoveries were related to the large-scale construction undertaken by the communist regime in the late 1940s. The initial few years of the interaction between the archaeology and the politics were very problematic as marked by the belief that the old should not stand on the way of the new. Bulgarian archaeologists were forced to declare a course of integration with the Soviet science and the contact with Western science was completely cut off. After the difficult years of adaptation, the regime realized that the rich cultural heritage of the country could be advantage. Archaeology very often was used to reinforce the political regime, with emphasis on its nationalism and populism. Examples of this can be seen in the organized traveling exhibitions with the Thracian treasures abroad, the events for the 1,300th anniversary of the founding of the Bulgarian state

in 1981 etc. The collapse of the communist regime has changed the direction of development of archaeology. However, many of the ideological trends from the recent past could be seen even today. One of the significant is the reconstruction of historical sites, fortress and buildings.

Miglena Stamberova (miglena_vas@abv.bg) has a PhD in Archaeology since 2012. In the period 2012-2015 she worked as an independent researcher. Currently she works for the Department "Exhibitions" in the National Archaeological Institute with Museum in Sofia. Miglena is interested in Archaeology, Cultural heritage and Tourism. She speaks English and Italian.

Klairi Gianniri / National & Kapodistrian University of Athens(Greece)

Politics on a small scale: Archaeological ethnography as a lens of understanding community politics

Politics in archaeology is usually associated with grand narratives, rather than relationship networks within local or community context. Although, it may seem to be a neutral act to study how a small community is being affected by archaeological research, such activity carries profound political effects and implications. The aim of this paper is to shed light on these implications through the process of archaeological ethnography and the role of the researcher as a mediator of the collective past. Over the last two decades, the role of archaeology in politics, and politics in archaeology has been under extended research. It is now increasingly realised that archaeology, as it is known and being practiced in the West, often played a significant role in promoting colonial and nationalistic agendas. Greece, in particular, provides such an example, offering a complex case where colonialism and nationalism have worked in unison to shape the contours of Greek archaeology (Hamilakis 2016, Hamilakis 2008:274). Despite the fact that the colonial heritage of the discipline and its neocolonial present have been exposed and critiqued, the vast majority of archaeologists does not seem to be fully conscious that it acts politically in various scales. Furthermore, it often goes unnoticed that politics and archaeology go beyond grand narratives of nationhood, and extend into everyday matters, such as relatively small but vital functions of a local community (Lennox & Richardson 2016). The above issues will be discussed in my presentation, which is based on my doctoral research in a small and remote community, at the mountain village of Anatoli. Since 2012, the archaeological excavations of the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens in several neighbouring sites, and the “invasion” of a large group of

archaeologists to the village's life provided an excellent opportunity for an archaeological ethnography project on the complex relationships between archaeologists, antiquities and the local community. The main objective of the project was to gather the community's opinion, by conducting semi-structured face-to-face interviews, and to design a public archaeology action model based on it. The tracing of the politics within the community, where not initially included within the research's objectives. However, the strong political issues lying behind the relationships of the groups involved, appeared during the investigation. Through our field research, it became clear that the practice of archaeological ethnography itself is a two-way political act. By sharing its stories, the community becomes a social agent of its own history and its own archaeology in the present, and at the same time the researcher elaborates further in his/her understanding of the past, by reconstructing the complex network of community's relationships. Acknowledging the entanglement of politics at any aspect of archaeological practice, this paper intends to show that the political agendas of the various stakeholders involved may affect both the archaeological research work and the perception of the local communities about their cultural heritage, and consequently their identity in the present. Finally, examples of the stakeholder's subgroups and their power dynamics will be discussed and analysed.

Klairi Gianniri (claire_gian@hotmail.com) has a background in Cultural Communication and Technology (University of Aegean, Lesvos) and in Social and Cultural Anthropology (Freie Universität, Berlin). She holds an MA in Museum Studies (Department of History and Archaeology, University of Athens) and her on going PhD, in the same department, focuses on the public archaeology of mountain and remote communities. She has participated in national and international research projects and archaeological excavations. In recent years, she is leading the archaeological ethnography project in Anatoli region of East Crete.

**Paulina Florjanowicz / Polish
Academy of Sciences
(Poland)**

**Polish archaeologists' approach towards Nazism
and Stalinism (1939 – 1956)**

Links between archaeology and politics have always been very strong. It is claimed that the rapid development of archaeology in the 19th century was possible as European states needed the fuel to support the unifying idea of their national

identity. This theory, whether true or not for some parts of the world, cannot stand for countries of Central and Eastern Europe, where most modern national states emerged after World War I, usually multiethnic and of diverse religions. Archeology has existed there long before the statehoods, uncovering fascinating remains of the past civilizations, regardless of national policy priorities. Nevertheless, one cannot say that archaeology and politics were not interlinked, whether it was archaeologists trying to use the political opportunities to support their research, or politicians trying to exploit the results of the archaeological findings to aid their ideological program. It becomes an essential question today, where the entire concept of heritage is becoming more political than scientific. Is there a way in-between? Where does it lead? The aim of my research is to examine how (and if) these relations existed in times most extreme, when the two totalitarian regimes occupied Poland: Nazism (1939-1945) and Stalinism (1944-1956). The analysis of the attitude of Polish archaeologists (especially Józef Kostrzewski, Włodzimierz Antoniewicz and Leon Kozłowski) towards the two occupants sheds light not only on the scientific quality of their research, but also on the mechanism of a totalitarian regime taking over (or not!) the society, or at least its elites. It is especially interesting in case of Poland, not only because both totalitarian regimes invaded and occupied the country for several years in the most horrific way, but also as it allows to provide answers on how researchers on prehistory have dealt with the extreme political pressure and, given the time passed, what are the consequences for the discipline, quality of research and the place of archaeology in today's Poland. Archaeology of the prewar time focused mainly on the question of the origin and arrival of Slavonic peoples to the basins of Vistula and Oder rivers. Before World War II, there was an intense "debate" with German scholars on whether the land was "originally" Slavonic or Germanic. Nazi regime turned it into a most pervert battle, where the toll for disobedience meant death. After the War, during the times of Stalinism, archeology was once again used by the new regime to provide for evidence of Slavonic occupation of the territories assigned to Poland in Jalta, as a compensation for the eastern lands seized by the Soviet Union in 1939. It is therefore possible to trace the links in the past as well as the consequences for the present. It is also interesting to discover different attitudes of most distinguished Polish archeologists of those times: to what extent they complied with, exploited, or avoided the politics, and what were the results of their choices.

Paulina Florjanowicz (paulina.florjanowicz@gmail.com) is an archaeologist, she graduated from Warsaw University in 2000 (M.A. in mediaeval and modern times archaeology) and completed PhD studies at the Institute of Archaeology and

Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences in 2018 (currently preparing the doctoral thesis). Since 2016, Director of the Department for Cultural Heritage at the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, supervising the museum sector, remembrance policy and memorial sites. General Coordinator of the national "Niepodległa" program for the centenary of Poland regaining its independence. For the past twenty years, she worked for several national and international NGOs and public institutions of the culture sector, including Stefan Batory Foundation, National Center for Culture, Center for the Protection of Archaeological Heritage. Director General of the National Heritage Board of Poland (2010-2013), then responsible for international relations at the National Institute for Museums and Public Collections (until 2016), as well as research coordinator for the European Archaeological Council (2014-2016). Member of various national and international expert and advisory panels (including EU & Cultural Heritage Reflection Group, member of the Board for ICOM's International Committee for Museum Security, currently member of the jury for European Capital of Culture). Project evaluator in different EU culture and education programs, university lecturer and expert on heritage management, cultural policy, museums, remembrance, memorial sites, and social and economic impact of heritage.

**Oana Dichel / "Babeş-Bolyai"
University in Cluj-Napoca
(Romania)**

**Involvement of the political factor in the research
and promotion of archeology in Romania post '89**

It is well known that during the communist period, especially the last two decades, nationalism reached its maximum levels in Romania. During this period, history was one of the most important manipulation tools of the communist regime. Archeology and archaeological discoveries were no exception; they were put at the service of communist propaganda that led to the creation of a forged image on prehistory. An edifying example is the historiography of the second Iron Age that served the interests of President Nicolae Ceausescu by creating and identifying his image with the "hero" Burebista and the Communist Party in the subsidiary. The phenomenon has been analyzed in recent works by several archaeologists and historians, of which we mention the studies of M. Babeş, F. Constantiniu, A. Dragoman, S. Oanţă-Marghitu, L. Boia and A. Henţ, etc. After the collapse of the communist regime and the establishment of the democratic one in Romania, culture, heritage and archeology have undergone a process of transit, adaptation or reconfiguration like many other

fields. The present paper aims to analyze the position of archeology in the new social, economic and political context of the last three decades, trying to identify the perpetuation of old patterns as well as the interference of the political factor in archaeological research. Has the Romanian researcher managed to distance himself from the political sphere? Can we talk about exerting some pressure on archaeological research in post-communist Romania? Does it affect populist political discourse archeology and cultural heritage? We can say that the chosen topic is taboo in Romania. Although there is an increasing number of works on archeology in the post-World War II period, otherwise, archaeologists and / or historians are avoiding addressing the topic in the current context. Do we fear or perpetuate the idea of reprisals in the minds of researchers or are we talking about their commodity in approaching this topic?

Oana Alina Dichel (dichel.oana@gmail.com) is a PhD student at the "Babeş-Bolyai" University in Cluj-Napoca, field History, Civilization and Culture. Her PhD thesis addresses the problem of Public Archeology, concepts and methods, case study Romania, being coordinated by Professor Gelu Florea ("Babeş-Bolyai" University). From 2018 she a beginner archaeologist and at the moment she participates in the archaeological research of the historical monument of the Evangelical Church in Cisnădie (Sibiu county). Over the years she has participated in several archaeological excavations, of which, the archaeological site Grădiştea de Munte (Hunedoara County), being part of UNESCO heritage, from 2009 until now. Besides public archeology (current field of study) she is interested in promoting and protecting the cultural heritage, implicitly the archaeological one, as well as the relation between archeologist / archeology and education, economy, politics and the media.

Cosmin Minea / University of Birmingham (Romania)

The Promotion and Use of Roman Antiquities in 19th Century Romania

My proposed paper describes the international archeological missions and study of the Roman antiquities in 19th century Romania. If medieval monuments connected Romania with the idea of Byzantine culture, the Roman remains played a special symbolic role as proofs of the Latin origin of Romanians. Nevertheless, what was an endeavour of great significance for the national identity of Romanians (unearthing and study of archeological remains) was also essentially a transnational, collaborative discipline. Since Wallachia and Moldavia united to form Romania in

1859, foreign specialists were actively involved in shaping the material heritage of the country. The very first archeological mission in the state of Romania, in 1865, was a French one, while the most active 19th century Romanian archaeologist, Grigore Tocilescu (1850-1909), conducted his studies of Roman monuments together with German and Austrian archaeologists. At the same time, Italy and Rome in particular were taken as reference points for the excavation and study of antiquities. My paper will therefore describe the entangled transnational networks of intellectuals who, through archeological missions and the study and display of artefacts, contributed at building a Romanian national identity. Drawing from the main argument of my entire PhD Thesis, the paper will state that the discovery, restoration and promotion of archeological sites, albeit seen as a work of national significance, was done across nation-states and nationalities, involving the input of artists and intellectuals from many European countries. At the same time, my analysis of the entanglements between Western and Romanian artists and intellectuals offers new arguments for the broader relevance of Eastern Europe and can contribute to de-peripheralize the region within wider studies of European heritage.

Cosmin Minea (CTM570@student.bham.ac.uk) recently defended his PhD thesis in the Department of Art History at the University of Birmingham (December 2019), titled 'Old Buildings for Modern Times: The Rise of Architectural Monuments as Symbols of The State in Late 19th Century Romania'. His research considers the European-wide networks of architects and intellectuals involved in creating, restoring and promoting historical monuments, heritage sites and a sense of national cultural identity in late 19th century Romania. He has been a teaching assistant and he is currently a visiting lecturer at the University of Birmingham, convening in 2020 the module 'Political Art', where he considers some of the many ways in which art played a visible political role from the nineteenth century to the present. He has been a research fellow at a number of institutions, including Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology, Institut national d'histoire de l'art, Paris, Leibniz Institute for European History in Mainz, New Europe College, Bucharest. His MA thesis, defended in 2014, at Central European University in Budapest received the 'Hanák Prize' for the best dissertation in the History Department.