

## Summary

The period between the year 1878 and the beginning of First World War is a time of progress, prosperity and exultation. In this time frame, named subsequently *La Belle Époque*, Romania registered outstanding achievements in its efforts towards international recognition of its independence and kingdom, consolidating its state institutions, economic and cultural growth. At the same time, the authorities from Bucharest didn't forget the Romanians outside its borders, keeping alive the hope that, one day, the dream of all land inhabited by Romanians united in the same borders will become reality. The establishment of Universities from Iași and Bucharest, of the Academy and the scholar and museum network are part of the state modernisation programme, initiated by the political authorities and cultural elite of that time. In the meanwhile, in Romania appeared and developed, as a reflection of older concerns in the Western Europe, the interest for archaeological investigation and cultural salvaging of archaeological vestiges.

At the same time, the authorities adopted laws and regulations in order to protect archaeological monuments and sites besieged by treasure hunters and collectors. The interest for the past vestiges hidden in the ground lead, inevitably, to incurrence of archaeology as curriculum and the first site museums. The first archaeological investigations incited more the interest of history lovers and provoked animated controversies between the historians of the time on grounds of research methods. The previously mentioned aspects and cultural valuation of vestiges represent the interest domain of our doctoral research.

The methods and concepts in archaeological research and museum salvaging of vestiges are of interest since the years of bachelor's studies. The histories of archaeology and museums, researched together, moreover for the period hereby mentioned, leads us to extremely interesting conclusions. Furthermore, the history of archaeology is tightly related to the history of museums. The museum is the place where archaeological vestiges are showed to the public and, in the same time, the one which sustains the archaeological research. Moreover, in the period, the archaeology and museums are attended by the same people, that try to define their research methods and exhibition and cultural valuation concepts.

Although a history of archaeology in Romania seems more urgent, the lack of it being poignant felt by historians, or of museology, the complexity of these topics inquires common effort of an interdisciplinary research team. The doctoral dissertation is designed as a synthesis research of research methods and concepts in archaeology, as research area of the

past and museum capitalization of vestiges, the museum being the penchant exhibition place of vestiges discovered by archaeologists.

The chronological boundaries of our research, end of XIX century and beginning of XX<sup>th</sup> century, approximately include the period between years 1874 and 1916. Both dates have been chosen because they represent important chronological milestones in the history of archaeology and museum phenomenon in Romania. In the 70's years of XIX century took place two important historical events. In 1874 "Regulation for antiques research and purchase", which offered the juridical framework in beginning to protect the vestiges discovered through archaeological excavations. The newly founded National Museum of Antiquities from Bucharest had the mission to apply the regulatory principles of this Regulation. Year 1878 marks the international recognition of Romania's independence, as a result of Independence War (from 1877-1878) and of Peace Conference from Berlin (1878). Under the reign of Carol I de Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen (1867-1914), Romania obtained its independence and new territories. It took over the administration of Dobrogea and Delta Dunării. The new territory was administratively divided in two counties: Constanța and Tulcea. Dobrogea's annexation brought along a large unresearched heritage. We will refer especially to the Romanian territory after 1878; however, in terms of concepts, it will exceed the territorial borders, trying to identify the models used by Romanian archaeologists in everything that meant archaeological research and museum valuation in Europe.

After Romanian's decision of entering the war beside Antanta in August 1916, the level of actions dedicated to archaeology and museology experienced important changes. The military defeats suffered by Romanian army in autumn of year 1916 and the Romanian authorities' refuge in Moldova caused the disruption of many cultural activities, almost all financial resources being put towards the war efforts. General mobilisation interrupted the archaeological research activities also in Moldova, the only territory left unoccupied. The German military authorities allowed German archaeologists to carry on archaeological research in Dobrogea, Southern Muntenia and Sărata Monteoru. The archaeological materials found by them have been taken to Germany and deposited in the Prehistory Museum in Berlin, where Ion Nestor identified and studied them between 1928-1931. According to his narration, at the Museum were "artefacts discovered in the archaeological diggings between 1909-1910, with the Romanian government authorisation, at Cucuteni, county of Iași, by Hubert Schimdt, conservator of the Prehistory Museum in Berlin, artefacts discovered in the archaeological diggings between 1917-1918 at prehistorical Cetățuia at Sărata-Monteoru, county of Buzău. Also in Berlin is the collection donated by the architect

Ed. Honzik with artefacts from Sărata Monteoru, objects discovered during the archaeological excavations made in 1917 by C. Schuchhardt, director of the Museum in Berlin, in the aeneolithic resort at Cernavodă and in 1918, in Oltenia, in aeneolithic settlements and Bronze Age or dacians period, from Coțofeni, county of Dolj. In 1917, German Leo Frobenius (specialist in African ethnology) made researches in two prehistorical aeneolithic settlements from Danube Valey (Crângu and Cunești)”.

The destructions caused by war in Dobrogea slowed down the archaeological and museum activities, and, as a result, they needed huge funds in order to replace the sites materials, the reopening of the excavations, museums reconstruction and its reorganization with new collections. In 1916, in Dobrogea, there were seven regional archaeological museums, some of them working with the aid of the National Antiquities Museum, respectively from Constanța, Mangalia, Adamclisi, Ulmetum and Histria, others with the support of local authorities, as is the case of the ones from Hârșova and Silistra. None of them was left unharmed by the events of October 1916. Moreover, their patrimony suffered important destructions from Bulgarian and German armies.

The territorial alterations which occurred at the end of First World War, when Romania received between her borders Transylvania, Bucovina and Basarabia, constrain us to choose as limit year 1916. In the interwar period, archaeology and museums in Romania developed a new stage in their evolvement, highlighted even before the war. Furthermore, the year 1916 is also a temporal mark for our research because the museum activity has been stopped in this period through the decision of sending the national patrimony to Moscow, in order to be protected from possible thefts or destructions. This action needed extensive effort from the owners of cultural patrimony, persons with notoriety or state institutions. The chronological boundaries are variable, that is why the references to the events occurred in the proxime years for establishing historical context will be made, as a definition is necessary.

About the beginnings of archaeology and museology in Romania many have written and with great results. Historians researched the two topics separately and without their contextualisation in the Romanian culture of that time or how they have been influenced by the cultural debate of that era. The existing contributions are the result of incidental research: historical event celebrations, commemoration of some personalities, editing work instruments, biographic studies dedicated to certain personalities. Sometimes, to study certain events occurred in the history of archaeology and to understand the historical context and the subjective realities of the studied topic, archaeologist used new resources, learning

archivist techniques. Monographies have been the object of private research of archaeological sites or monuments discovered between XIX and XX centuries. More recent interests approach legislative-institutional aspects or analyse how museums development reflects the progression of historical speech in Romania in the second half of XIX century and beginning of XXth century.

The establishment of the first museums, the discovery of national treasures, like the one from Pietroasa, or the method of restauration and museum valuation of some monuments are the proneness topics in the research regarding museology. The first archaeological surveys and how the recovered pieces have been subsequently conserved and brought into the history amateur public attention of history are tangent approached topics, though the archivist, memorialist and journalist sources offer generous information. Newest writings with monographic character contain considerable analysis regarding the evolution of archaeological researches, the evolvment of museum concept and cultural patrimony along the XIX century and the beginning of XX century. Andi Mihalache's contributions at this topic were the main references for the structure of our thesis. In same category we can enrol research published in the last years, like the ones of Alexandru Istrate and Ioan Oprea. The progress of models and concepts in studying prehistory represents, moreover, an important contribution for the history of archaeology, as well as the historiographic analysis after the Second World War.

Our inquiry uses in great deal unpublished archivist sources kept by certain fonds held in the Central National Historical Archives (Minister of Cult and Public Instruction), „Vasile Pârvan” Institute of Romanian Academy (National Antiquities Museum archive) or the Romanian Academy Library (Pamfil Polonic archive and Romanian Manuscripts collection, in which is included Grigore G. Tocilescu's archive). The sources from this fonds and also from other upon which I will not detail here, lead me to conclusions that were many times different than the ones already published or, maybe, the ones that I was expecting. The study of normative documents extracted from the Official Monitor contributed to the understanding of the legislative context, on which depended the protection of archaeological patrimony and the museums status in Romania.

Through archaeological patrimony is today understood the sum of all human activity vestiges, represented by ruins and artefacts discovered in earth or visible at its surface. Obviously, the study of this topic implies the research of personalities that made possible the existence of archaeological and museological activities. An important contribution had Alexandru Odobescu, Grigore G. Tocilescu and Vasile Pârvan, for their addition brought in

the fields of archaeological and museological research. A pioneer in studying museums in Romania can be considered Alexandru Tzigara-Samurcaș, which, through his works, combine historical research with field observations. In another category we can mention the journalistic and memorial contributions of N. Iorga, T. Antonescu, Titu Maiorescu and Alexandru Tzigara-Samurcaș.

The study of the proposed topic involves the use of methodological and conceptual support specific to the cultural history. In order to write a project dedicated to the methods and concepts of archaeology and museology, understanding the sources is necessary and research will be done through comparative analysis of information offered by unpublished and published sources. Scanning through Romanian and foreign historical literature dedicated to these aspects we observe how concepts, archaeological research methods and the museums status in Occident represented models to be followed by archaeologist and initiators of the first museums in Romania.

Establishing the legal frame and how it influenced the archaeological research methods, artefacts valuation discovered in archaeological sites (exhibition, marketing etc.) and the status of museum institutions is the action that show us how the law has been a consequence of the incurrence of a new concern for society and state. In order to fulfil these objectives, we identified novelty elements introduced by the regulations and laws regarding these area, how they have been abided, breached, the frequency and the severity of these breaches. The comparative analysis of information from polemical sources appeared in mass-media, the reports forwarded to the resort Ministry and the memoires of personalities involved will reveal how archaeological concepts and research methods from that time were following some scientific regulations known by archaeologists or if they were casual archaeological excavations. All these aspects will be revealed through analysis of sources indicated in the bibliography, using a scientific approach specifically to the level of the research study. Introduction in scientific circulation of new archivist material, doubled by actualisation of events occurred in the reference period, through addition of new information is one of the main objectives. Furthermore, through the manner of organising the material we will try to situate amongst the conventional writing standards through chronology valuation of sources.

Considering that the published information regarding the history of the main institutions which were needed in archaeological and museological activity, like National Museum of Antiquities, Archaeological Committee, Cult and Public Instruction Ministry, Historical Monuments Commission, through this research being highlighted the role of the

institutions mentioned above for applying the existing legal requirements. In the first chapter, “Protection and valuation of archaeological vestiges: institutions, laws, regulations” is shown how the protection of cultural patrimony activity was perceived by different generations of experts, but also by the citizens of this country. Because the laws adopted in a certain year needed to be followed few decades and, inevitably, all representatives of a thinking ideology, common or not, they had to make this mechanism work. On this occasion I highlighted the European reality and how the Romanian specialists understood to follow the model for the Romanian reality and to apply them. Their concepts have improved gradually, so, in a few decades, an evidence of monuments and areas with archaeological potential was built, in this way important vestiges for national patrimony could be retrieved from the antiquities merchants, also many treasure hunters were stopped, ancient fortresses destruction was forbidden and many counties, which were presenting marks of antique settlements, were saved, all this being possible on account of efficient communication between ministries and their representatives, with the help of local authorities, prefects, subprefects, inspectors, priests, teachers etc. I highlighted the rhetoric strategies as well, used by the authors of these discovered vestiges or collectors, which were used more to convince their opponents of the importance of their actions.

The second chapter, “The beginnings of Romanian archaeology: archaeologists, sites and archaeological research methods” is dedicated to research and concepts presentation of the archaeological activity results of personalities which dedicated their career for the discovery of historical fragments from the prehistory and antiquity of this territories. The archaeological activities from Moldova, Muntenia, Oltenia or Dobrogea have been done constantly by many passionate people and later by the vestige’s collectors and archaeological researchers. The activity of Cezar Bolliac, Dimitrie C. Butculescu, Neculai Beldiceanu, Grigore C. Buțureanu, Alexandru Odobescu, Teohari Antonescu, Gr. G. Tocilescu, George Murnu, Vasile Pârvan, Oreste Tafrali was analysed and highlighted through particular elements, bringing new interpretation of aspects that were distrusted, lacked documentation, justified addition for an objective presentation of reality of facts.

The third chapter, “The first museums in Romania and their archaeological collections” is highlighting the accent of museological activities in Romania. The methods used to establish the main criteria of museum valuation of archaeological patrimony and inventory, classification, conservation of some collections of National Antiquities Museum were important aspects of my research. To those mentioned above will be added the presentation of the museological institutions in Romania, which values the archaeological

patrimony at central level through National Antiquities Museum, in the same way local or specific (like the site museums in Dobrogea), together with their collections. A single vision is not to be found until today in the historiography and offering this projection, thoroughly built, make us consider that our research has a necessary function. Because of the main role played by the National Antiquities Museum in organising both activities, through archaeological research coordination by the members of Archaeological Committee, the approval for archaeological excavations or for objects purchasing and for operation supervision of local or sit museums as well, we chose to present it at the beginning of the research study.

In order to be updated with the latest contributions on the subject, we analysed the importance of the generations and of professional background of the personalities presented throughout the research study. Through the last chapter, "Education and European influence in methods and concepts application" we are trying to highlight as precisely as possible the models that were decisive factors for the renewal and improvement of thinking and practice of Romanian specialists. A presentation of the main debates was offered through these pages, under the name of controversial, with the purpose of bringing into attention and the scenery of the great achievements from archaeology and museum areas. Without the analysis of these controversial subjects we would not be able to understand the reasons why archaeological research methods and archaeological identification, like museum valuation of this patrimony, was behind other European nations, in terms of professionalism and standards. The delays were not necessary the result of a slow evolution of the Romanian academic institutions, but they were provoked in a conscious way by the ambitions and unsatisfied personal egos or fundamental generation differences of its representatives, that build this mechanism. In this direction we have a romantic generation, in which was barely put the consolidation of these activities with the patience and monopolization ambition of everything new that had to be fulfilled, but also a critique generation, at the beginning of XX century, anxious to fulfil the great projects that could make the cultural level of the country equal with the ones found in the European training centres. Two generations that are momentary overlapping and do not tolerate each other because of these concept and method dispute regarding activities that must be fulfilled, through the nature of their chosen occupation and born vocation.