

DACIA

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LX

2016

EN SOUVENIR D'ALEXANDRU VULPE

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE « VASILE PÂRVAN »

D A C I A

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LX

2016



EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

RÉDACTION

Rédacteur en chef :

EUGEN NICOLAE

Rédacteur en chef adjoint :

CRISTINA-GEORGETA ALEXANDRESCU

Collège de rédaction :

MARIA ALEXANDRESCU VIANU (Bucarest), ALEXANDRU AVRAM (Le Mans), DOUGLASS W. BAILEY (San Francisco), MIHAI BĂRBULESCU (Cluj-Napoca), PIERRE DUPONT (Lyon), SVEND HANSEN (Berlin), ANTHONY HARDING (Exeter), RADU HARHOIU (Bucarest), ATTILA LÁSZLÓ (Iași), SILVIA MARINESCU-BÎLCU (Bucarest), MONICA MĂRGINEANU-CÂRSTOIU (Bucarest), VIRGIL MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA (Iași), JEAN-PAUL MOREL (Aix-en-Provence), CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU (Bucarest) IOAN PISO (Cluj-Napoca), CLAUDE RAPIN (Aix-en-Provence), WOLFRAM SCHIER (Berlin), VICTOR SPINEI (Iași)

Comité de rédaction :

IRINA ACHIM, IULIAN BÎRZESCU, ADINA BORONEANȚ, ANDREI MĂGUREANU, ALEXANDRU NICULESCU, LIANA OȚA, ADRIANA PANAITTE, ANCA DIANA POPESCU, DANIEL SPÂNU, AUREL VÎLCU

Secrétaire de rédaction : RALUCA KOGĂLNICEANU

Rédaction éditoriale : OLGA DUMITRU, ANA BOROȘ

Informatique éditoriale : OFELIA COȘMAN

Toute commande sera adressée à :

EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, 050711, București, România ;
Tél. 4021-318 8146, 4021-318 8106, Fax 4021-318 2444, E-mail : edacad@ear.ro

ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000 S.R.L., P. O. Box 77-19, sector 3, București, România ; Tél./Fax : 4021-610 6765,
4021-210 6787, Tél. 0311 044 668, E-mail : office@orionpress.ro

S.C. MANPRESS DISTRIBUTION S.R.L., Piața Presei Libere, nr. 1, Corp B, Etaj 3, Cam. 301-302, sector 1,
București, Tel.: 4021 314 63 39, fax: 4021 314 63 39, E-mail: abonamente@manpress.ro, office@manpress.ro,
www.manpress.ro

SORIRORI SOLUTIONS, Tel.: 0040765262077, 0040765166433; Internet: <http://www.sorirori.ro>; E-mail:
sorin.costreie@sorirori.ro, rosana.guta@sorirori.ro

Les manuscrits et les périodiques proposés en échange, ainsi que toute correspondance seront adressés à la Rédaction : Institut d'Archéologie « Vasile Pârvan », 11, rue H. Coandă, 010667 Bucarest, Roumanie, Tél./Fax 4021 212 88 62, E-mail : iab.redactie@gmail.com



© 2 0 1 7, E D I T U R A A C A D E M I E I R O M Â N E

www.ear.ro

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE «VASILE PÂRVAN»

DACIA LX, 2016

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE
JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANCIENT HISTORY
ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ARCHÄOLOGIE UND GESCHICHTE DES ALTERTUMS
ЖУРНАЛ АРХЕОЛОГИИ И ДРЕВНЕЙ ИСТОРИИ

SOMMAIRE
CONTENTS
I N H A L T

En souvenir d'Alexandru Vulpe (16 juin 1931 - 9 février 2016).....	7
<i>ÉTUDES</i>	
SVEND HANSEN, Kupferzeitliche Marmorobjekte aus Măgura Gorgana bei Pietrele an der Unteren Donau	17
CRISTIAN EDUARD ȘTEFAN, Playing with clay: anthropomorphic figurines from Șoimuș – <i>La Avicola (Ferma 2)</i> , Hunedoara County.....	31
GABRIEL BĂLAN, COLIN P. QUINN, GREGORY HODGINS, The Wietenberg culture: periodization and chronology.....	67
OLIVER DIETRICH, Tekirdağ und Troja. Zur Verbreitungsgrenze südosteuropäischer Tüllenbeile in der Türkei	93
ZOE PETRE, <i>Thucydides Mythistoricus</i>	103
JULIAN GALLEGO, La politique, une invention humaine ou divine ? La pensée de Protagoras et le regard platonicien.....	111
AUREL VÎLCU, EUGEN NICOLAE, Aspects de la diffusion des monnaies d'argent istriennes au nord du Danube à la lumière du trésor découvert à Ivancea.....	121
IULIAN BÎRZESCU, Das Perirrhanterion aus dem Tempel M von Histria	129
FLORINA PANAIT BÎRZESCU, The sons of Istros and the classical silver coins of Histria.....	137
STELUȚA MARIN, VIRGIL IONIȚĂ, Pseudo-autonomous coins minted at Callatis	147
ALEXANDRU AVRAM, OCTAVIAN MITROI, Un fragment de cadran solaire d'époque impériale découvert à Tomis	173
MIHAI BĂRBULESCU, Le mobilier et la vaisselle représentés sur les monuments funéraires de Dacie.....	183
ADRIANA PANAIT, CARMEN MIU (BEM), Roman roads identified on aerial and satellite images within the territory of the city of Tropaeum Traiani (Moesia Inferior).....	201
LUCREȚIU MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, Le témoignage épigraphique des <i>villae</i> en Mésie Inférieure : remarques sur les propriétaires et sur le personnel administratif.....	221
DANIEL SPÂNU, MIHAI DIMA, ALIN FRÎNCULEASA, The Mălăieștii de Jos (Prahova County) silver craftsman's hoard from the end of the 3rd century AD.....	237
STEFFEN KRAUS, ERNST PERNICKA, Chemical analyses on Roman coins and silver objects from the Mălăieștii de Jos hoard, Romania	275
<i>NOTES ET DISCUSSIONS</i>	
ATTILA LÁSZLÓ, Cui bono? Thoughts about a "reconsideration" of the Tărtăria tablets.....	281
JEREMY M. HUTTON, NATHANIEL E. GREENE, A note on the Aramaic text of the bilingual Guras inscription (PAT 0251 = CIL III 3.7999 = CIS 3906).....	293

CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU, MIHAI POPESCU, Une contribution à PIR ² , P 926 : <i>C. Prastina Messalinus</i>	301
GHEORGHE ALEXANDRU NICULESCU, On Florin Curta's attack.....	307
VIRGIL MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, Numismatics and other sciences.....	329

COMPTES RENDUS

<i>Inscriptions de Scythie Mineure</i> , volume IV, Tropaeum - Durostorum - <i>Axiopolis</i> , recueillies, traduites et accompagnées de commentaires et d'index par Emilian Popescu, Editura Academiei Române, București - Editura Basilica, București - Diffusion de Boccard, Paris 2015, 412 pages, 17 planches avec photos des inscriptions. (<i>Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba</i>).....	335
--	-----

IN MEMORIAM

Ion-Șerban Motzoi-Chicideanu (9. Dezember 1943 - 8. Oktober 2016) (<i>Nikolaus Boroffka</i>)	341
--	-----

<i>ABRÉVIATIONS</i>	349
---------------------------	-----

ON FLORIN CURTA'S ATTACK

GHEORGHE ALEXANDRU NICULESCU*

Keywords: archaeology, ethnic phenomena, methodological nationalism, dogmatism, ideology, epistemic vices

Abstract: Comments on Florin Curta's arrogant and defamatory article, which, instead of a fair examination of what I wrote about how culture-historical archaeologists understand social science research on ethnic phenomena, uses mockery, insults, data manipulation and statements presented without arguments or with ridiculous ones, in order to prove that he has nothing to do with to culture-historical archaeology and that the persistence of nationalist representations in his thinking about ethnic phenomena is just an outcome of my malicious interpretation.

Cuvinte-cheie: arheologie, fenomene etnice, naționalism metodologic, dogmatism, ideologie, vicii epistemice

Rezumat: Comentarii la articolul arogant și defăimător al lui Florin Curta, în care, în loc să examineze onest ce am scris despre felul în care arheologii cultural istorici înțeleg cercetarea din științele sociale cu privire la fenomenele etnice, folosește bătaia de joc, insultele, manipularea informației și afirmații prezentate fără argumente sau cu argumente ridicole pentru a dovedi că nu are nici o legătură cu arheologia cultural istorică și că persistența reprezentărilor naționaliste în felul în care concepe fenomenele etnice este doar un rezultat al interpretării mele rău-voitoare.

In an article about the archaeological research on ethnic phenomena¹, I tried to show, taking Florin Curta and Sebastian Brather as examples, that archaeologists educated as I was², in a culture-historical research tradition, tend to preserve key elements from nationalist representations of society, even when they reject nationalism and try to replace its representations with knowledge taken from the social sciences. Unwilling to discuss my views, Curta dismisses them and expects other people³ to do that, in a paper published in two versions, one in English and the other one in Romanian⁴. A radical refutation of my claims, supported by

* "Vasile Pârvan" Institute of Archaeology, Romanian Academy, Bucharest; alec_niculescu@yahoo.com.

¹ Niculescu 2011.

² Curta has noticed that: "In a sudden confession, he admits being 'also educated as a culture-historical archaeologist'" (2014a, p. 300), but he does not see the connection with my main argument, because for him the only imaginable reason to criticize culture-historical archaeology is to present yourself as superior to it, as he does. That is why what I said appears to him "sudden". It is not part of a scientific argument, it is an accidental and laughable admission of weakness.

³ He mentions two colleagues who have found some value in my article (Curta 2014a, p. 300, n. 9). This is a warning for those archaeologists who dare to refer to views unapproved by him.

⁴ Curta 2014a and 2014b. The version in Romanian is an obvious attempt to impose his views on readers who do not know English and therefore cannot check whether Curta has properly understood and presented what I wrote. My article from 2011 was published in English and it refers only to what Curta wrote in English. There are differences between the two versions of the attack. Mockery is more frequent here, starting with the title, which replaces the quotation from the English version – the quotation is not accurate, "an" is added by Curta (see Niculescu 2011, p. 6); probably an "a" would be appropriate – with a mocking interpretation of it. Other examples: "describing the water" (2014a, p. 300, n. 11) becomes "ne descrie cu savantlâc apa" ("savantlâc" designates in Romanian false scientific pretenses) (2014b, p. 911, n. 11); "says that he knows" (2014a, p. 300) becomes, in 2014b, p. 910, "ne mărturisește cu o sinceritate înduioșătoare (confesses with heart-breaking sincerity). In several instances, my claims are evaluated differently: an article published in 2005 is qualified as "a thorough critique of nationalism" in the English version (2014a, p. 300, n. 11), and as "a very acid critique of nationalism" (o foarte acidă critică a naționalismului) in the Romanian one (Curta 2014b, p. 911, n. 11; "[t]o be fair, Niculescu hints at precisely this matter..." (2014a, p. 302, n. 20) becomes "Niculescu se apropie întrucâtva de această idee" (Niculescu comes somewhat close to this idea) (2014b, p. 914, n. 20).

arguments, would be certainly useful, but the scientific content is for Curta just a pretext for constructing a defamatory attack. He pays little attention to what I wrote⁵ and uses his credibility, abusive rhetoric, derogatory remarks and many red herrings with the aim of convincing the readers⁶. He assembles words from my text into whatever he needs to prove that it contains a personal attack against him and that it is made of “dishonest citation practices”, “efforts to create a straw man” and “smearing tactics”, that my arguments are worthless, because they are coming from someone who has “weak credentials”⁷, is intellectually deficient⁸, has “a distorted understanding of what culture history actually is” and “wrong assumptions about such fundamental concepts as ethnicity or (material culture) style”⁹.

Curta is strongly displeased with the idea that nationalist representations are still active in his interpretations. He claims that this is not possible, simply because he was not educated as a cultural-historical archaeologist, and that I deliberately misrepresented the truth: “Niculescu chooses to ignore the fact that my archaeological education is from the United States, not Romania.... there is actually no basis for his claim that I was ‘educated as a culture-historical archaeologist who explores the social sciences’”¹⁰.

I know that Curta has a Ph.D. in history from Western Michigan University, not in archaeology (archaeology is not usually taught in US history departments). I did not know that he took a course on archaeological theory, but one course with an American archaeologist does not provide one with an archaeological education. In what I read from Florin Curta’s writings there is nothing that could indicate an US training: the interest for the social sciences was present in the history department of the Bucharest University, most significantly in the teaching of an archaeologist: Ligia Bârzu¹¹. Knowledge about the debate on styles from the 1980s was also present: while participating at an excavation in Norway, in 1990, I was able to spend time in the excellent little library of the Bergen Historisk Museum and I copied literature on the archaeological interpretation of ethnic phenomena. Coming back to Romania I have presented those views on style to my colleagues (Florin Curta and I worked in the same office) and offered the literature brought from Norway to anyone interested. Even Bruce Trigger’s well known *History of Archaeological Theory*, mentioned by Curta, as an important part of his US archaeological education, was present: in 1992 I brought several copies of that book from the United States. Seriation and cluster analysis were also known.

Curta claims that in Romania he “was trained as a Classicist, not as an archaeologist”, and supports this by invoking the theme of his B.A. thesis and two articles derived from it, published in 1995 and 1997. The reader is led to imagine that a Romanian classicist continued his education in the United States, where he developed an interest for archaeology. This is not true. He was trained as a historian, in the History department of the Bucharest University, where he was taught archaeology (all university archaeology teaching was done at that time in history departments), not in the Classics department. Trusting his CV, he even taught archaeology in the History-Philosophy Department of the Bucharest University in 1989. This might not be a strong argument because having no education in a discipline does not prevent Curta from teaching it: he mentions in his CV that he also taught sociology at the Bucharest Romanian-American University, in 1993¹².

⁵ See Curta 2014a, p. 300: “I will also not discuss his views of Bierbrauer or Brather. Instead, I shall focus on getting the record straight and pointing to key problems in his deeply flawed argument”. My views are not on persons. I am only discussing some of their writings.

⁶ Curta even resorts to slander when he describes me as someone who hides what he thinks in order to get advantages from those who have different opinions (2014a, p. 303, n. 22).

⁷ Curta 2014a, p. 299: “weak credentials for assuming any critical position in terms of the ‘production’ of archaeological literature in the culture-historical mode.” I’m not sure about what kind of credentials Curta has in mind here, but he provides (ibidem, p. 301) the reader with what seems to him relevant information, that I took my Ph.D. from the University of Bucharest, at the age of 46 (tacitly compared to his Ph.D. earned at 33, from an American university).

⁸ See, e.g., Curta 2014a, p. 299, n. 1: “‘knowledge’ appears as truly ‘foreign’ to the author”.

⁹ Curta 2014a, p. 299.

¹⁰ Curta 2014a, p. 301.

¹¹ In his preface to Curta 2009a, Victor Spinei mentions that Curta had several favorite professors, his main attachment being to Ligia Bârzu (p. v).

¹² F. Curta, *Curriculum vitae*, <http://users.clas.ufl.edu/fcurta/florin/cv.pdf> (accessed on February 27, 2015).

He was indeed interested in ancient history, but developed his archaeological knowledge by participating to several excavations, from 1990 to 1993 as a member of the Institute of Archaeology, where he started his work on the archaeology of the “Slavs” under the supervision of Radu Harhoiu¹³. Curta used that knowledge in eight archaeological articles conceived before his emigration to the USA¹⁴. The idea that he had a culture-historical archaeological education in Romania, qualified now as “bizarre” and “with no basis”, was certainly not so a few years ago, when Victor Spinei wrote an introduction to a volume containing some of Curta's writings. Here Curta's interest for archaeology is presented as starting in 1982, with the participation to an excavation at Vadu under the guidance of Sergiu Iosipescu, and continuing with other participations to excavations at Histria (1986-1987), Tîrgşorul Vechi (1987-1989) and Sighişoara (1987-1993). Spinei points out that Curta's archaeological education was guided by Radu Harhoiu, his “colleague and mentor”¹⁵. In the acknowledgements section of his Ph.D. dissertation from 1998, Curta gives more details: “My deepest academic debt is to Radu Harhoiu from the Archaeological Institute in Bucharest, **who guided my training as an archaeologist and encouraged me to think historically about artifacts**. It is he who gave me the idea of studying the Slavs in the context of the sixth-century Barbaricum...” (emphasis added)¹⁶.

All this is forgotten in Curta's attack. He even qualifies his professors at the University of Bucharest as “Niculescu's” professors, forgets the debt of gratitude towards those who helped him become an archaeologist, and opposes to them Allan Zagarell, who appears now as having “the greatest influence” on Curta's “mode of thinking”¹⁷. No US archaeological education is mentioned in the preface to Curta's book from 2001: “This book is in fact a combined product of archaeological experience, mostly gained during field work in Romania, Moldova, Hungary, and Germany, and work with written sources, particularly with those in Greek. ... I have conducted exhaustive research on most of the topics surveyed in those chapters which deal with the archaeological evidence. **Field work in Sighişoara (1985) and Tîrgşor (1986–8) greatly contributed to the stance taken in this book** (emphasis added)”¹⁸.

It is unlikely that Curta actually believes what he writes about his education, especially since his CV and Spinei's introduction can refresh his memory and it is astonishing that he invokes two publications and the theme of his M.A. in favor of his thesis and ignores eight publications and the theme of his Ph.D. dissertation, which do not support it. The way in which he argues in order to create the impression that he is an US educated archaeologist, who has nothing to do with culture-historical archaeology, makes me understand why my advice on not having our data behave according to our plans is dismissed by Florin Curta as “vague and emotional”

¹³ In Romania, he was an apprentice at the excavations he mentions (no other field experience is mentioned in his CV, except one in Constance, to which he participated, very probably, also as an apprentice or as a visitor). He was supposed to do what he was told and to learn. Following the custom active at that time, he was not entrusted with research responsibilities (he is not even mentioned among the authors of the excavation reports). These excavations and the considerable amount of time spent by senior colleagues from the Bucharest Institute of Archaeology on teaching him, especially by Radu Harhoiu, were his archaeological post-graduate education in Romania. See Curta 2014a, p. 301, n. 16: “My education at the University of Bucharest is irrelevant in this respect, since I was trained as a Classicist, not as an archaeologist. ... Following my B.A. from the University of Bucharest (1988), I have not received any other form of post-graduate education in Romania”.

¹⁴ Curta 1990 and 1992 were published in *Dacia N.S.*, the main archaeological journal in Romania at that time; the other six: Curta 1988; Curta 1994a; Curta 1994b; Curta 1994c; Curta, Dupoi 1994-1995 and Canache, Curta 1994.

¹⁵ Spinei, in Curta 2009, p. vi. Some details from this preface, for instance that Curta participated to an excavation under my supervision and that of Monica Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu, indicate that Spinei has used information coming from Curta.

¹⁶ Curta 1998, p. ii

¹⁷ Curta 2014a, p. 301. In order to indicate that his research belongs to a superior way of doing archaeology, he presents his education as post-processualist. If we think that social theory and sensitivity to the ways in which archaeologists are prone to ascribe to the distant past ways of thinking belonging to the recent one are important, post-processual archaeology is certainly better than culture historical archaeology. But that does not make any post-processual research product better than a culture-historical one. For instance, the contributions to archaeological knowledge made by Max Martin, with his catalogue and analysis of the Kaiseraugst necropolis (1976 and 1991) are much more important than many sterile post-processual theoretical musings, just as the theoretical work produced by Ian Hodder or John C. Barrett is much more important for archaeology than many worthless descriptive publications of culture-historical archaeologists.

¹⁸ Curta 2001, p. 2.

and gratulated with three exclamation marks¹⁹. His construction of the argument is made by choosing what can be presented as supporting it and by deliberately omitting what does not, something a lawyer or a tabloid journalist would do, not a scientist²⁰. Getting away with what can be presented as true is the goal, probably with a wish to see how far he can go, not the truth.

Curta's effort to falsify his biography is pointless. I did not infer his views from his education. I have examined some of his writings, which clearly indicate a culture-historical perspective and the influence of nationalism. One can safely assume they come from his education, no matter where that took place. One's beginnings in professional knowledge are important, but the extent to which they impose a set of outlooks for a long time is variable, especially under conditions which do not favor their survival. Then, of course, nationalist representations of the social were not cultivated only among archaeologists: the whole educational system was permeated by them. And not only in Romania. They are frequent now in the US, even among social scientists who study ethnic phenomena²¹. The resistance to them does not come from the immunity tacitly claimed by Curta. It can be a product of examining how what we know has come to our minds. Without such efforts, our ability to take research outside the frame that has been for so long imposed on us is limited.

For any archaeologist who has read culture history, processual and post-processual archaeology is obvious that Curta belongs to the first. This is indicated by central research practices which were frequent in his Romanian work environment and continue to be frequent in Curta's work: *e.g.*, analysis of drawings instead of artifacts (Curta has never seen most of the artifacts he is talking about) and hence a focus on shapes and decoration and little interest for materials, technology and formation processes, the use of typological classifications and mapping for ethnic identification²².

A serious investigation of ethnic phenomena starts by distancing itself from nationalist views. Just an example, from Fredrik Barth:

“Practically all anthropological reasoning rests on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous: that there are aggregates of people who essentially share a common culture, and interconnected differences that distinguish each such discrete culture from all others. Since culture is nothing but a way to describe human behaviour, it would follow that there are discrete groups of people, *i.e.* ethnic units, to correspond to each culture” (emphasis added)²³.

Curta can certainly claim that he knows that. Here are “his” words:

“Before Barth, Western anthropologists had limited their investigation to processes taking place within groups, rather than between groups. All anthropological reasoning has been based on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous and that there were aggregates of people who essentially shared a common culture, and interconnected differences that distinguish each such discrete culture from all others” (emphasis added)²⁴. Curta has appropriated Barth's words, but their meaning does not come to his mind when he is wondering what a nationalist representation of society might be²⁵.

¹⁹ Niculescu 2011, p. 15. Curta 2014a, p. 301.

²⁰ Interesting enough, Curta himself has harsh words for those who deliberately ignore evidence: when he suspects that an archaeologist “passes over in silence those facts which directly contradict her arguments” the verdict is clear: “she is simply dishonest” (Curta 2009b, p. 10).

²¹ See Wimmer 2014, p. 838, on the “straightforward Herderian essentialism [which] dominates much of ethnic studies in the USA (with very notable exceptions)”.

²² Despite the decades he has spent on inferring types of people from types of artifacts, as many culture-historical archaeologists do, Curta dismisses my interpretation that this has to do with a groupist social ontology and claims that the reason for using typology is “a stringent need of chronological control”. More about Curta's understanding of typology, here, *infra*. On mapping, see Curta 2001, p. 200-203, where he comments on the distribution of several types of brooches and concludes: “[t]he distribution of all these types speaks for itself.” No distribution map speaks for itself.

²³ Barth 1969, p. 9.

²⁴ Curta 2001, p. 18. Footnote 39, situated before the “paraphrased” text, sends the reader to Barth's “influential book” from 1969, not to the introduction, from which the emphasized words are taken. The next footnote, n. 40, placed at considerable distance from it, sends the reader to Barth 1994, p. 12, but the text is taken from Barth 1969, p. 9. The reader is not offered that information and is led to believe that the assessment belongs to Curta, who evaluates the state of the research before the work of F. Barth.

²⁵ See Curta 2014a, p. 302: “...Niculescu... never explains what exactly is a nationalist representation of any society”.

In my 2011 article I did not offer a definition for “nationalist representation of society”. The contexts in which I used this notion made it clear enough²⁶ and I thought that those interested in the archaeological interpretation of ethnic phenomena would not need one. It is what sociologists call “methodological nationalism”²⁷ and it designates beliefs about the relations between human beings imagined by nationalist ideologies and absorbed by common knowledge and scientific disciplines. Its main ingredient is the idea that the world is made of distinct groups, similar to modern nations, endowed with durable characteristics, which make them the main actors of history and politics, and should be studied as such.

In the article that has enraged Curta I argued that, despite his efforts to distance himself from nationalism, this representation is still present in some of his interpretations, namely in the view of ethnicity as a common mode of action, in that of style equated with the signaling of the distinctiveness of an ethnic entity and in the assumption that ethnicity was during Late Antiquity what it is today. All this amounts to the preservation of what is crucial in nationalist representations and was rejected by F. Barth and U. Beck: a world made now and in the distant past of groups of the same kind. And this representation makes for Curta valid definitions like that of Max Weber, on which I will have more to say. My views on these matters are not rejected by Curta as based on misrepresentations of his writings, so he tacitly agrees that I properly understood what he meant. They are dismissed, with no arguments worthy of a scientific paper, as indicating my ignorance.

For Curta, as for many historians and archaeologists from Eastern Europe, nationalism means mainly defending and promoting views that exalt their own nation and diminish others. Therefore, he defends his writings as being irrelevant for current nationalist interests²⁸. My claim was that both he and S. Brather make the past relevant to the ethnic present not by supporting particular nationalist political claims, but by imagining ethnicity as a uniform reality, extending from the past to the present, although what it does is to extend the nationalist present in an imagined ethnic past²⁹. This view is emphatically sustained even in Curta's recent attack, when he equates my reservations towards his idea that ethnicity was in distant past, as today, “a phenomenon of everyday life”³⁰, with the radical rejection of ethnicity as a phenomenon of Late Antiquity.

²⁶ See Niculescu 2011, p. 10, where such representations refer to ethnic phenomena as “continuously mobilized groups”, or p. 15, where the idea “of a world divided, in the present as in the past, into bounded ethnic entities” is presented as “central in the nationalist representation of social reality”.

²⁷ See the definition of methodological nationalism offered by Ulrich Beck (2007, p. 287): “Systematically, methodological nationalism takes the following ideal premises for granted: it equates society with nation-state societies, and sees states and their governments as the cornerstones of a social sciences analysis”. See also Wimmer, Glick Schiller 2002, p. 217: “Methodological nationalism is understood as the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world”. See also p. 222, where a reference to one of my papers is used to point out that methodological nationalism continues to be dominant in historiography, art history and archaeology, as practiced by many Eastern European researchers.

²⁸ It seems unlikely that Curta is so politically naïve that he does not understand the implications of knowing “who were those enigmatic Slavs” (Curta 2001, p. 2). He comments: “Be as it may, one is left wondering how is that relevant for the ethnic present?” and claims that the conclusions of his work are against current ethnic concerns (2014a, p. 302). However, they replace origins exalting long ancestry and autonomy, with a “truth” that makes them subaltern. This is devaluation, one of the tactical devices used in nationalist symbolic conflicts, described by Simon Harrison (1995, p. 256-258), and, as such, it is relevant for the present.

²⁹ Niculescu 2011, p. 15. A similar view can be found in an article written by an anthropologist: “[c]lassifying the most diverse historical forms of social identity as ‘ethnic’ creates the scientifically questionable but politically useful impression that all ethnicities are basically the same and that ethnic identity is a natural trait of persons and social groups. If, following Smith (1991, p. 52), we use the term *ethnies* to refer equally to Old Testament Canaanites, early medieval Normans and modern-day Basques and Sikhs, it is no great feat to claim ‘a greater continuity between pre-modern *ethnies* and ethnocentrism and more modern nations and nationalism than modernists of all kinds have been prepared to concede’. This is not an argument which bears up to historical scrutiny. Rather, it is a nominalist operation intended to provide scholarly legitimation for ethno-nationalist ideologies” (Lentz 1995, p. 305). After rightly seeing in A.D. Smith's understanding of *ethnie* “a tendency to reify ethnic groups and to treat ethnicity as an ‘it’, a ‘thing’ out there to be objectively measured and studied”, Curta uses *ethnie* as “a way to avoid confusion between the ethnic group and the phenomenon it supposedly instantiates (ethnicity)” (2001, p. 23), without noticing that “instantiation” used in this way is reification.

³⁰ Curta 2014a, p. 305. See *infra*.

The overtly political nationalism contained in archaeological writings relies on methodological nationalism, but there are archaeologists who still believe in the existence of ethnic archaeological cultures and resist nationalist interpretations of the past because the archaeological record, as they understand it, does not support them. One can even dedicate a very important and valuable body of work against the nationalist use of the past and still have a nationalist representation of society. Herminio Martins, who appears to have invented the notion of methodological nationalism, remarks that “macro-sociological work has largely submitted to national pre-definitions of social realities: a kind of methodological nationalism – **which does not necessarily go together with political nationalism on the part of the researcher** – imposes itself in practice with national community as the terminal unit and boundary condition for the demarcation of problems and phenomena for social science” (emphasis added)³¹.

Avoiding a direct confrontation with most of my claims, Curta focuses on proving dishonesty and ignorance, a common tactic for those who want to avoid a scientific discussion. I will discuss only some of his arguments, selected according to the importance he gave to them. I have ignored statements that are formal games on what I wrote or just silly³².

Curta invokes “dishonest citation practices”³³, starting with the accusation that I selected the information supporting my claims. I paid attention to arguments in his writings that could prove my interpretations wrong, but I did not read everything Curta has written. My purpose was to illustrate a common problem, shared even by culture-historical archaeologists who use the social sciences, not to offer a comprehensive study of Curta’s work.

Then he claims that I have invented things he never wrote: “if one goes to the page indicated, one immediately notes that there is no mention of ethnicity being a recent phenomenon. Those words are not mine; they have only been attributed to me by Niculescu”³⁴. Here is what one can read by going to that page:

“Others argue that ethnicity is **a relatively recent phenomenon**, resulting from dramatic historical experiences, notably escape from or resistance to slavery,” (emphasis added)³⁵.

Curta also claims that I have wrongly attributed to him the characterization of Fredrik Barth’s work as a “subjective approach to ethnicity” and that what he wrote -- “[t]o be sure, the subjective approach to ethnicity, which is so often and almost exclusively attributed to Barth, long precedes him” is something completely different. It is not. Here is another statement, on the same page: “Barth shed a new light on subjective criteria (ethnic boundaries)...”³⁶.

Another accusation of misrepresentation concerns my claim that Curta believes F. Barth favored a “we vs. them” perspective³⁷. He says that in his book he attributed this not to Barth, but to his followers. That is true. I assumed that Barth’s followers very simply followed his opinions. Curta did not mention them and did not indicate that they were dissenters. How was I to know? That this is another instance in which Curta plays

³¹ Martins 1974, p. 276.

³² *E.g.*, Curta 2014a, p. 302, claims that I do not understand that “the Slavs are not a desirable ingredient of the Romanian ethnogenesis, and definitely not an element of the past that could be effectively used by Romanian nationalists”. This is something in Romania even high-school pupils understand. Or: “[m]ine is not a text-aided approach. Nor do I think of historical sources as additional or some kind of crutches helping the archaeologist make sense of the archaeological record” (2014a, p. 306). Curta does not know what he is doing. The simple existence of ethnic units is taken from the written sources. Without them he would have no knowledge about “who were” those Slavs. On this, see Halsall 2011, p. 18: “Indeed assigning any ethnic name to archaeological evidence is quite impossible on archaeological grounds alone. No specific ethnic identity of any sort can ever simply emerge from the archaeological record on its own, whether that record be studied through artefact design, or from distribution maps or charts of percentage frequencies...Such an interpretation can only – ever – arise through the application to the archaeological data of a series of assumptions derived from written sources”.

³³ Curta 2014a, p. 299.

³⁴ Curta 2014a, p. 303.

³⁵ Curta 2001, p. 15. I did not write that Curta believes ethnicity to be a recent phenomenon, only that he mentioned this as an opinion: “After mentioning the opinion that ethnicity is a relatively recent phenomenon...” (Niculescu 2011, p. 10).

³⁶ Niculescu 2011, p. 10; Curta 2001, p. 18.

³⁷ Curta 2014a, p. 303-304. See Niculescu 2011, p. 10 and Curta 2001, p. 18.

on the appearances against the truth is proved by what he wrote in a book review "Barth and his students built on concepts of the self and social role behavior typified by the 'we vs. them perspective'"³⁸.

Curta also indicates that my remark on the absence of the required quotations marks for a phrase he borrowed from Siân Jones is inappropriate. He has the audacity of presenting his use of her words as a paraphrase³⁹.

This is the "paraphrase":

"This seems to come very close to Bentley's point that **the cultural practices and representations which become objectified as symbols of ethnicity are derived from, and resonate with, the habitual practices and experiences of the agents involved, as well as reflect the instrumental contingencies of a particular situation**" (emphasis added).

And this is Siân Jones' text:

"The cultural practices and representations that become objectified as symbols of ethnicity are derived from, and resonate with, the habitual practices and experiences of the people involved, as well as reflecting the instrumental contingencies and meaningful cultural idioms of a particular situation" (emphases added)⁴⁰.

In the footnote following the paragraph which includes the text quoted above, the unpublished Ph.D. dissertation of Siân Jones is mentioned, after a reference to a work by Ian Hodder. But without quotation marks the reader cannot know what was taken from her dissertation and how. The rules about this are straightforward. This is how they are presented on the site of well-known academic publisher: "Authors are reminded that, where they draw upon material from another source, they must EITHER put that material in the form of a quote, OR write it entirely in their own words (*i.e.* there is no 'middle way')"⁴¹.

The "paraphrase" from S. Jones is immediately followed by another one from Ian Hodder:

"Thus, **the ethnic differences are constituted in the mundane as well as in the decorative, for the 'tribal' distinctions and negative reciprocity become acceptable and are 'naturalized' by their continual repetition in both public and private**"⁴².

This is Ian Hodder's text:

"The ethnic differences are constituted in the mundane as well as in the decorative. The tribal distinctions and negative reciprocity become acceptable and are 'naturalised' by their continual repetition in both public and private"⁴³.

The aforementioned footnote 68 starts with a reference to Hodder, but, again, the reader is not informed that Hodder's text was copied almost *ad litteram*. With time, the paragraph made of phrases written by S. Jones and I. Hodder has become so dear to Curta that it has become his knowledge. In a review and two articles he uses it, with small variations, without indicating the sources:

"But the evidence suggests precisely the opposite. **Cultural practices and representations that become objectified as symbols of group identity are derived from, and resonate with, the habitual practices and experiences of the agents involved, but they also reflect the instrumental contingencies of a particular situation. Ethnic differences are constituted simultaneously in the mundane as well as in the decorative, and become "naturalized" by continual repetition in both public and private**"⁴⁴.

When I first encountered the "paraphrase" from S. Jones, I did not see it as more than an accident, eventually to be mentioned in a footnote. I do not know how frequently Curta uses such "paraphrases", but they suggest the special relation with other traditions of research than his own, also indicated by his mocking of the difficulties encountered by me during my journey through the foreign knowledge produced by social scientists. Endowed with the miraculous gift of instant comprehension, Curta imagines that by reading and by

³⁸ Curta 2006, p. 92.

³⁹ Curta 2014a, p. 304, n. 31. See Niculescu 2011, p. 11, n. 56, on Curta 2001, p. 30.

⁴⁰ Jones 1997, p. 90

⁴¹ <http://www.elsevier.com/journals/research-policy/0048-7333/guide-for-authors> (accessed on April 12, 2015).

⁴² Curta 2001, p. 30.

⁴³ Hodder 1982, p. 55-56.

⁴⁴ Curta 2006, p. 92; the text is almost identically reproduced in Curta 2007, p. 180 (here the two parts coming from Jones and Hodder are separated) and Curta 2011, p. 539 (in footnote 26, placed before the "paraphrase", Curta sends the reader to p. 187 and 205 of Hodder's book, but not to p. 55-56, where the text he copied can be found).

appropriating ideas he cannot express with his own words, let alone produce, he has direct access to current research in other traditions of research and that there is no difference between identical words uttered by different persons, in different contexts⁴⁵. That this is an illusion is shown by the evolution of I. Hodder, who has repeatedly changed his views in order to get closer to the advance of current research or to produce it. Confronted with my statement that the idea of material culture as text Curta still presents as current post-processual thinking was abandoned by Hodder, he is blocked in the sterile rage of the clueless and, instead of calmly examining the facts (I have provided a citation from one of Hodder's writings, in which he declares that "[r]eading text is not an appropriate analogy for reading material culture")⁴⁶, he explains my position by claiming that I hate post-processual archaeology (sic!)⁴⁷. Knowledge is as good as its conditions of production and printed words do not include the reality that has produced them. That is why their meaning is different. What for Curta is eternal truth, for a post-processualist is a tentative formulation, to be replaced with something better. But the main difference is that while a post-processualist knows the reasons for embracing and discarding such a notion, for Curta the choice of a representation is a matter of personal excellence, and therefore a good choice can never become a bad one, because someone highly intelligent cannot become stupid. Illusions of instant comprehension are a serious problem in the relations between disciplines and traditions of research. They are based on mistaken codes⁴⁸ and plague numerous interdisciplinary projects in which researchers are imagined by bureaucrats as Curta imagines himself and therefore no recognition is given to the fact that understanding of a different scientific world takes a lot of time⁴⁹.

The only coherence detectable in Curta's theoretical writings about ethnic phenomena is given by the underlying methodological nationalism. Otherwise the texts taken from different social scientists, archaeologists or not, who have different and sometimes contrasting views, and assembled by Curta, are incompatible. The reliance on borrowings and the incapacity to produce good original thinking explains the gap between the "paraphrased" quality of Curta's theoretical writings and the intellectual poverty of his attack, for which Curta had to produce his own arguments, usually nothing more than dogmatic statements dressed in mockery.

Instead of discussing arguments I have offered about the persistence of a groupist social ontology in his work⁵⁰, Curta wants to prove my "distorted understanding of what culture history actually is". The line of thought is that only someone who does not understand culture-historical archaeology could place him in this tradition of research. I did not attempt to prove his belonging to culture historical archaeology, simply because that is obvious, just as obvious as the fact that there are differences between him and other archaeologists belonging to the same tradition.

Curta claims that he has nothing to do with culture-historical archaeology, because he has never defended the use of "archaeological culture" notion⁵¹. He does not pay attention to what I wrote: "Emblemic style **replaces** for F. Curta archaeological culture as a tool for archaeological ethnic identification (emphasis added)"⁵².

Then, Curta claims that I ignore the problem of agency, which he considers important for what I wanted to say. He states that culture-historical archaeology uses a normative view of culture, "*i.e.*, [that] people

⁴⁵ On similar illusions, see the remarks of Thomas Kuhn (1996, p. 204): "...he finds himself fully persuaded of the new view but nevertheless unable to internalize it and be at home in the world it helps to shape. ...He may use the new theory nonetheless, but he will do so as a foreigner in a foreign environment, **an alternative available to him only because there are natives already there. His work is parasitic on theirs, for he lacks the constellation of mental sets which future members of the community will acquire through education**" (emphasis added).

⁴⁶ Niculescu 2011, p. 15 and Hodder, Hutson 2003, p. 204. For a presentation of the "material culture as text" position, see Preucel 2006, p. 138-142.

⁴⁷ Curta 2014a, p. 301, n. 17.

⁴⁸ Bourdieu 1968, p. 590.

⁴⁹ On the misrecognition of the amount of time needed in interdisciplinary projects, see Gosselain 2011.

⁵⁰ I am not sure he understands properly what the notion means. In the Romanian version of the attack, he translates it with "ontologie socială de grup" (2014b, p. 909), an appropriate translation for "group social ontology", not for "groupist social ontology", which should be translated in Romanian with "ontologie socială bazată pe existența grupurilor".

⁵¹ Curta 2014a, p. 301, n. 19. In Romania, more often than not, culture-historical archaeologists do not rely on complex wholes of interrelated artifacts for their ethnic identifications, but on few "expressive artifacts", just as Curta does.

⁵² Niculescu 2011, p. 12.

'behave' in certain culturally characteristic ways without necessarily being aware of what they are doing"⁵³ and opposes to it agency. It seems to me that normativity refers to behavior being guided by norms⁵⁴, whether the agents are aware of what they are doing or not, and that human agency is, to a significant extent, normatively constituted⁵⁵. Culture-historical archaeologists assume that behind the typological regularities they study there are ancient norms, and Curta does the same, when he uses the notion of emblematic style, which implies the existence of rules linking styles to ethnic entities⁵⁶. The restriction of agency to intentional action is unusual for a post-processual archaeologist – Curta claims to have a post-processual education and training⁵⁷ –, especially now, when many of them are supporting ideas of material agency, which by definition is not intentional and excludes awareness⁵⁸. Among the social scientists, some have serious reservations against the utility of the notion of agency and more include habitual action in it⁵⁹. Without any references in Curta's writings (again, I have not read all of them), the sources can only be guessed. Possibly the source is neoliberal thinking, in which humans are imagined as actors who make rational choices with the aim of improving their chances of success and are free from structural constraints, reflexively managing their selves as if they were businesses⁶⁰.

Embracing some theory of agency and leaving everything else in place does not take one out of culture-historical archaeology. Curta's agency enables ancient actors to do exactly what culture-historical archaeologists imagined they did (of course, now they are fully aware of they are doing): they use the types of artifacts determined by archaeologists – their agency does not allow them to choose anything else – in order to show their identity, and archaeologists continue to do what they were doing before: they identify them using those types. The only benefit seems to be that by using "agency" Curta is able to show that he knows more to those who don't⁶¹.

For Curta, someone who embraces his notion of agency cannot be a culture-historical archaeologist, because this tradition does not use it. The definition of culture I had to learn in 1975, as a first-year student in the history department of the Bucharest University, was that it is "the extra-somatic means of adaptation", *i.e.* Lewis R. Binford's well-known definition adopted from Leslie White⁶². That did not make any of the archaeologists working in Romania processual, not even the professor who taught us the definition. A tradition of research can use a variety of borrowed ideas, usually under the pressure of their prestige, as legitimating devices, which do not change the research procedures and their outcomes. These are the core of the paradigm and the theory empowering them is largely tacit. The adoption of some foreign ideas does not necessarily change what archaeologists do and how they do it⁶³.

⁵³ Curta 2014a, p. 302. He indicates in n. 20 that he knows I reject cultural determinism ("[t]o be fair, Niculescu hints at precisely this matter when writing that Bierbrauer's view...". For a different assessment of my position, see the version in Romanian (here, *supra*, n. 4).

⁵⁴ See, *e.g.*, Hodder, Hutson 2003, p. 9, where normative refers to the existence of shared beliefs and rules of behavior.

⁵⁵ Korsgaard 2014.

⁵⁶ See, again, Hodder, Hutson 2003, p. 31, on processual archaeology: "the systemic covering law approach is itself normative, in the sense that the beliefs and rituals, the meaning of style, are all rules shared by members of social communities" and p. 207: "...most current archaeological theory, of whatever hue, retains a normative component, in that explanation assumes ideas held in common and rules of behavior".

⁵⁷ Curta 2014a, p. 301.

⁵⁸ For this understanding of agency, which is crucial for current archaeological theory, see, *e.g.*, Hodder 2012, p. 68: "Things do have a primary agency, not because they have intentionality but because they are vibrant and have lives and interactions of their own".

⁵⁹ Bourdieu does not use it, because his whole work was an attempt to go beyond the opposition of structure and agency, which is also that between determination and conscious action. See also Loy, Barnes 2001 (especially p. 507-508), for whom the concept of agency is useless for sociological theory because no evidence can separate the chosen from the determined. For an inclusion of the habitual, using Bourdieu's notion of the "intentionless intentional" (p. 980) in a mainstream sociological understanding of agency, see Emirbayer, Mische 1998.

⁶⁰ Gershon 2011, p. 537 and 539. See also Patterson 2005, especially p. 376-377.

⁶¹ Curta also scolds S. Brather for not using the notion and for not mentioning "the now abundant literature on agency and performativity in archaeology" (Curta 2013, p. 168), but he does not offer any references.

⁶² Binford 1962, p. 218. *Cf.* White 1959, p. 8.

⁶³ On the unequal contest between recent social theory and the conceptual apparatus embedded in archaeology, which includes types, see Johnson 2006, p. 123-124.

Against my claim that, as a group making methodology, typology has something to do with nationalism, Curta states that typology is important for culture-historical archaeologists mainly because they need chronological control⁶⁴. It is hard to believe that Curta does not remember those many instances in which, like other culture-historical archaeologists, he used archaeological types to “identify” ancient peoples. He does here what he has done with his education: he presents only arguments that support his thesis and ignores the rest. The link with nationalism seems to me obvious: just as the political ideology creates groups around human types (see Curta’s “prototypic manner” of identification, ascribed by him to ethnic groups, a way of thinking he continues to support in his attack), archaeological typologies make groups around artifact types, with two similar related consequences: the severe reduction of internal variability and the neglect of other traits than those used for making the groups⁶⁵.

Curta then states that, “[a]s a method, typology is not ‘contaminated’ by culture history. Only its use (which is dictated by theoretical choices) could be incriminated as ‘culture-historical’. In and for itself, typology is neutral”⁶⁶. According to him the same typology can receive a culture-historical interpretation or a post-processual one, and so, whatever the results of analysis are, they cannot influence an archaeologist’s view of the past he wants to recover, because that view is not produced by archaeologists, it is adopted before the analysis is made and its adoption has nothing to do with archaeological analytical procedures. In other words, social theory becomes an ideology, not a tool which needs appropriate methodological choices. The informed archaeologist is supposed to know, before doing anything with the archaeological record, what view of the world is currently accepted as valid and his research has to confirm it⁶⁷. That view is presented in the conclusions, even if it is incompatible with the methods used for the analysis of the archaeological record, as it happens with Curta’s emblematic style, which, imagined as a result of the deliberate choices of the actors, should make him abandon objectivistic and empiricist typologies.

As a way of looking at the world of objects and people typology is not neutral, it shapes the world according to what it can do, just as in the well-known saying that someone who has a hammer will tend to see only nails around him. That is why sociologists have repeatedly warned about the limitations imposed by the constitution of traditions of research around one or several methods⁶⁸. One of the most instructive facts about typological thinking is the importance attached by biologists to its repudiation: “For the typologist, the type (eidos) is real and the variation an illusion, while for the populationist the type (average) is an abstraction and only the variation is real. No two ways of looking at nature could be more different”⁶⁹.

As he tries to demonstrate that he has no connections with culture historical archaeology, Curta makes them clearly visible. His insistence on the neutrality of typologies, with the consequence that theoretical choices, good or bad, manifest themselves only in their interpretation and do not participate in the construction of the methodology, is what processual archaeologists have repeatedly rejected, as culture-historical archaeology, during the 1960s: the idea that “archaeology can be conducted as an autonomous (technical) fact-gathering and systematizing enterprise that is neutral with respect to (and that can be expected to support) the diverse

⁶⁴ Curta 2014a, p. 302.

⁶⁵ Curta 2001, p. 21 and Curta 2014a, p. 305. See Barth 1995, on nationalism operating by impoverishment. See also Barth’s introduction to the 1969 volume, where the general viewpoint of the essays published in it is described as the exploration of the processes “involved in generating and maintaining ethnic groups”, rather than “than working through a typology of forms of ethnic groups and relations” (p. 10). For the limitations of archaeological typology see, e.g., Bisson 2000, Van Oyen 2015 and Boozer 2015.

⁶⁶ Curta 2014a, p. 302.

⁶⁷ See Bauman 1992, p. 686, on the knowledge cultivated by nationalist intellectuals: “The truth they preach must rely on something stronger than mere power of argument; it must be guaranteed before the argument has started, and independently of the course the future argument may take - that is, by forces reason can only discover and acknowledge, not conjure up or modify”.

⁶⁸ On this, see, e.g., Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992, p. 225-226. For a whole chapter on the alleged neutrality of methods, see Bourdieu, Chamboredon, Passeron 1991, p. 40-48.

⁶⁹ Mayr 2006 [1959], p. 327. For the transition in biology, in the wake of World War II, from typological thought to clinal differences, see Abu El-Haj 2007, p. 286. On the giving up of typology as tool for group making in physical anthropology, “was von den Nachbardisziplinen gelegentlich noch nicht ausreichend zur Kenntnis genommen wird”, see Brather 2008, p. 449.

explanatory objectives of archaeologists qua anthropologists and historians”⁷⁰ and the practice of making interpretations as *post hoc* conclusions, fitted to the results of the analysis because, as L.R. Binford thought, such interpretations can be evaluated, as Raymond Thompson suggested, only “by evaluating the competence of the person who is proposing the reconstruction [, which] is scarcely sound scientific procedure”⁷¹. Thus, Curta’s insistence on credibility and his interest in displaying theoretical excellence opposed to the ignorance of others seems to be more than a personal disposition. He wants to show in this way that his interpretations are right and should be accepted, because he cannot do this through the analysis of the archaeological record.

In an attempt to show how ignorant I am and to warn about the dangers to which are exposed those who do not know about Max Weber as much as he does, Curta gives a lot of attention to my rejection of his statement that “very few would now disagree with Max Weber that ethnic groups are ‘human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration; conversely, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists’”⁷².

I commented on this in a footnote, where I tried to show that it is not largely accepted, as Curta continues to claim. For that purpose, I quoted from an article by Michael Banton, where Weber’s review of ethnic communities is described as “antiquated”⁷³.

Here is what Curta writes about this:

“In reality, Banton’s article is specifically about an untitled draft found among Weber’s posthumous papers, which was later published under the title ‘Ethnic Communities’. At the beginning of his article, Banton explicitly writes that his critique of that manuscript of Weber ‘does not extend to any passages in Weber’s other works which bear on questions of ethnic community’. That Niculescu ignored this particular caveat is not an accident: Banton’s quote, so hastily brought as ammunition against my statement, does not have any bearing on the passage I have taken from the English translation of Weber’s *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*”⁷⁴.

Curta does not know what he is talking about. He believes the “untitled draft” and the chapter on ‘Ethnic Groups’, where he has found the definition, are two unrelated writings. They are not just related, the chapter on ‘Ethnic Groups’ is a translation of the “untitled draft”, as it was published by the editors of *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, and this information is available in Banton’s article, at page 20, just below the limiting statement Curta is using against me⁷⁵. Indeed, Banton’s critique does not apply to everything Weber has written about ethnic communities, only to the chapter from which comes what Curta has taken.

I did not write about why the definition is not useful, but Curta knows why. Because I have misunderstood it, a misunderstanding that should at least – I wonder what would be at most – make me lose my “reputation as a serious scholar”⁷⁶. I quoted in full Weber’s definition from the translation quoted by Curta and then, instead of writing again about the “subjective belief” contained in it, I used only “belief”. This is a ridiculous argument. Using only “belief” does not mean that I did not understand what Weber said in the definition. I omitted “subjective” because it was not necessary to state my point, which was to reject Curta’s claim that the definition

⁷⁰ Wylie 2002, p. 57 and p. 59 with n. 7, where she discusses the opinions expressed by J. Hill and R. Evans (1972) on the uselessness of all-purpose typologies and against the idea that archaeological data, conceived as “basic data”, with “inherent or primary meanings to be discovered”, can be analyzed before making interpretations.

⁷¹ Binford 1968, p. 270.

⁷² Curta 2011, p. 537; *cf.* Weber 1968, p. 389.

⁷³ Niculescu 2011, p. 7, n. 30; *cf.* Banton 2007, p. 19-20.

⁷⁴ Curta 2014a, p. 304.

⁷⁵ “Among the papers found after Weber’s death in 1920 was an untitled draft that has since been published in the Max Weber *Gesamtausgabe* and given the title *Ethnische Gemeinschaften* (Weber 2001, p. 168-190). In English, this is better translated as ‘Ethnic relations of communities’ (an expression Weber used elsewhere) than as ‘Ethnic Groups’, the title it was given by Roth and Wittich” [the editors of the translation used by Curta] (Banton 2007, p. 20). See also p. 23: “In *Economy and Society* (Weber 1968, p. 385-398) the text was divided into four sections...”. In the following pages Banton analyzes the text, section by section, and discusses the definition quoted by Curta (Banton 2007, p. 26).

⁷⁶ Curta 2014a, p. 304-305.

is currently widely accepted as valid, not an analysis of the definition, and probably because “subjective” seems redundant (I do not know what an “objective” belief might be).

I did not present the reasons for my reservation against Weber’s definition. I will do that now. Beyond being uneasy with Curta’s view that current research has brought nothing to significantly alter the views expressed in Weber’s definition, the mention of “similarities of physical type” seemed to indicate that Weber saw race as a fact⁷⁷, something certainly absent from most recent sociological literature. I was also unable to figure out what those similarities might be in most cases of ethnic difference. At that time, I did not know that the translation used by Curta, which takes Weber’s “Ähnlichkeiten des äußeren Habitus” to mean “similarities of physical type”, is an unfortunate one⁷⁸.

Curta did not adequately present Weber’s thoughts on ethnicity by using that definition. More important is what Weber has written immediately after it:

“Ethnic membership (*Gemeinsamkeit*) differs from the kinship group precisely by being a presumed identity, not a group (*Gemeinschaft*) with concrete social action, like the latter. In our sense, ethnic membership does not constitute a group; it only facilitates group formation of any kind, particularly in the political sphere. On the other hand, it is primarily the political community (*Gemeinschaft*), no matter how artificially organized, that inspires the belief in common ethnicity (*ethnische Gemeinsamkeitsglaube*)”⁷⁹.

Weber also thought that the term “ethnic” will be abandoned, because “it is unsuitable for a really rigorous analysis” and that “[t]he concept of the ‘ethnic’ group, dissolves if we define our terms exactly”⁸⁰. I take these statements to be a step away from methodological nationalism and much closer to the current state of the research than the definition quoted by Curta⁸¹.

⁷⁷ Weber’s mention of “objective blood relationship (*Blutgemeinschaft*)” (Weber 1968, p. 389; Weber 1922, p. 219) could also be interpreted in this sense. Of course, I am aware that Weber did not think race generates ethnic realities, which are in his view articulated by subjective belief.

⁷⁸ At the beginning of the chapter on ‘Ethnic Groups’, Weber indicates he is not thinking only about inherited, physical traits: “diese Art von ‘Abstoßung’... knüpft sie auch und vor allem keineswegs nur an ererbte, sondern ganz ebenso an andere auffällige Unterschiede des äußeren Habitus an (Weber 1922, p. 216). See also Raum 1995, p. 77-78: “a completely incorrect and especially irritating translation of a word can be discussed that results in an inexcusable distortion of what Weber was trying to say. The term ‘Habitus’ means ‘bearing’ or ‘deportment’ or ‘outward appearance’ in German, but not ‘physical type’ as the translation reads. Moreover, it should be emphasized that Max Weber expressly speaks of ‘äußere(r) Habitus’, not just of ‘Habitus’.... Anybody relying only on the translation quoted or even on the one contained in the English version of *Economy of Society* by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (Weber 1978 [this a reprint of the 1968 edition, my comment]: 389), but unacquainted with the German original might all too easily be tempted to stigmatize Max Weber as a racist”. Among those who believe that Weber’s definition was badly translated in Weber 1968, p. 389: Scaff 2014, p. 128: “the standard translation mistakenly refers to ‘physical type’” and Jenkins 2008, p. 10.

⁷⁹ Weber 1968, p. 389.

⁸⁰ Weber 1968, p. 395. Cf. Weber 1922, p. 224: “Dabei würde der Sammelbegriff „ethnisch“ sicherlich ganz über Bord geworfen werden. Denn er ist ein für jede wirklich exakte Untersuchung ganz unbrauchbarer Sammelname... Der bei exakter Begriffsbildung sich verflüchtigende Begriff der „ethnischen“ Gemeinschaft... entspricht nun in dieser Hinsicht bis zu einem gewissen Grade einem der mit pathetischen Empfindungen für uns am meisten beschwerten Begriffe: demjenigen der „N a t i o n“, sobald wir ihn soziologisch zu fassen suchen.”

⁸¹ However, it seems that Weber was not always able to escape racist thinking (he writes about objective race kinship – Weber 1922, p. 217) and nationalism. He lived at a time when these were common in the sociological imagination. See, e.g., Ulrich Beck, for whom Weber was worse than a methodological nationalist (2007, p. 286): “the political inspiration for his sociology was nationalistic”. See also Joe Feagin: “like other social scientists of his era, he held to the tenets of blatant biological racism, a view that infected his historical and geopolitical arguments, yet one that almost never gets critically discussed in the social science textbooks and empirical analyses that to this day use his important concepts. Weber wrote unreflectively of the “hereditary hysteria” of Asian Indians, of Africans as genetically incapable of factory work, and of the Chinese as slow in intelligence and docile, with these latter traits viewed as shaped by biology” (2009, p. 6). The strongest statement about this I found in an article by Andrew Zimmerman: “Max Weber was an imperialist, a racist, and a Social Darwinistic nationalist, and these political positions fundamentally shaped his social scientific work.” (2006, p. 53). *Contra*: Kalberg 2005, p. 293, who thinks that for Weber “the concept ‘race’ possesses ‘a completely mystical character’ and implies ‘subjective evaluations’” and that ““innate and inherited qualities’ fail to explain a ‘single fact relevant for sociology’”. See also Raum 1995, p. 77-78.

Unfortunately, instead of taking my remarks as an incentive to look again at what Weber wrote about ethnic phenomena, eventually to discover that the first who would not agree with the translated definition would be Weber himself, Curta is more interested in presenting his knowledge of Max Weber's works as excellent and in associating with the great scholar, while misunderstanding his contribution and using as an argument a manuscript which exists only in Curta's imagination, as a consequence of a hasty reading.

With his statement that I have "wrong assumptions about such fundamental concepts as ethnicity or (material culture) style"⁸², Curta steps outside scientific practice into the world of authoritarian politics. Science is a world of "organized skepticism"⁸³, not one inhabited by uncontested truths and by people authorized to punish those who think differently. Scientific concepts are not true, they are only more or less useful for getting closer to realities that are external to them. Researchers employ Curta's "fundamental concepts" as they please, they can make jokes about them or discard them as useless, if not dangerous. Whatever meanings one attaches to ethnicity and style, new ones or chosen from the hundreds one can find in scientific literature, what matters is not what you choose, but the arguments that convinced you to make the choice. In Curta's article, just as it happens in authoritarian politics, what matters is what you choose, it has to be the right choice, guided by a capacity to see what is authoritative. Whatever common people might think is irrelevant, because what is right is not decided by their arguments.

Curta objects to my statement that ethnicity was not a phenomenon of everyday life during Late Antiquity and offers another instance of careless reading by accusing me of not offering arguments while quoting them: "He strongly believes, for reasons known only to him, that 'ethnicity as <a phenomenon of everyday life>' is what we live in our world of massive transmission of ways of thinking and of acting through the mass media and state supported educational systems, not of Late Antiquity"⁸⁴. Obviously, the lack of modern mass media and educational systems are here the arguments. Then he distorts my views, ascribing to me "the idea that there was no ethnicity in Late Antiquity", thus equating ethnicity with ethnicity as phenomenon of everyday life. He offers only a ridiculous argument for defending his views: the presumed raised eyebrows of Michel Maas, Patrick Geary and Walter Pohl (Curta does not support this with references) and an insult (my opinion is presented as "regurgitated").

Let's imagine for a moment that Curta is right and that what I think about ethnicity is indeed something that the scholars he mentions would reject. I could only be happy about that. I do not construct my arguments with the purpose of agreeing with what great scholars have already said. Curta's attitude, which subordinates research to authority, explains why so many Eastern European scholars, for such a long time, have been only rarely able to create more than decent stances of conformity. What strikes an Eastern European in an American University is the number of students engaged in ways of thinking openly disapproved by their professors and the encouragement they get from the same professors.

Unfortunately, my views on ethnicity are anything but discordant. I do not think that any of the scholars mentioned by Curta would reject the existence of significant differences between current ethnic phenomena and the ancient ones, starting with the differences in the communication means. See, for instance, W. Pohl on their importance:

"Ethnic identities in a world as complex as Late Antiquity only existed through efforts to make them meaningful. Face-to-face groups, local and regional communities could share a sense of belonging without much effort; they only needed to distinguish between 'us' and 'them'. Goths or Franks lived in a world where this was not enough. They were gentes among many others, distributed over wide areas; to give them a sense of community required more sophisticated forms of communication. This is an idea that I have repeatedly proposed, ..." ⁸⁵.

And P. Geary on the idea of a universal definition of ethnicity:

"Within this extended definition of ethnic group, I would point out a number of assumptions critical for the contemporary study of ethnicity, but that present serious problems for historians when they attempt to make sense of the distant past and probably for anthropologists who attempt to make sense of the distant present. First is the assumption that this definition is universal. This may seem a self-evident assumption, but frankly

⁸² Curta 2014a, p. 299.

⁸³ Merton 1973 [1942], p. 277-278.

⁸⁴ Curta 2014a, p. 305.

⁸⁵ Pohl 2002, p. 238; see also Pohl 1999, p. 75.

it demands demonstration. If we assume that *ethnies* exist and have always existed in the terms that Smith defines them, then we will inevitably look for evidence of them and, as we all know, if one looks hard enough for something one will find it, even if it is not there”⁸⁶. The last phrase resumes very well what Curta is doing with his interpretations.

Another instance supposed to show my ignorance is the assertion that in Curta’s work “style... is just a new name for what culture-historical archaeologists usually do”. He disdainfully remarks: “Even more embarrassing is his equation of style with culture history”⁸⁷.

In his view, “in order for style to work, it needs to be deliberate”, it is an intentional form of communication, and that makes his position radically different from that of culture-historical archaeologists. Curta does not address the arguments presented in my article⁸⁸. Not even those which link styles with nationalism. He provides no arguments supporting his views on agency and style, not even a reference to literature that might contain such arguments. Just a mention of Polly Wiessner, who is presented as believing that style is a matter of choice, and thus cannot be imagined to “work “behind the backs” of producers and consumers”⁸⁹, although she accepts the existence of style that is not a matter of choice⁹⁰. But he takes time to reject my reference to an article of Andrew Gillett, in which I saw “an understanding of what F. Curta does with his concept of style as a return to culture-historical archaeology”⁹¹, and claims that “[t]here is no mention of culture-historical archaeology, and Gillett’s remark is positive, not critical”⁹².

My interpretation is supported by what Gillett wrote: “Twentieth-century ‘**culture history**’ approaches, concerned with ascribing different **styles of material items to particular ethnic groups** and so tracking the historical movement of those groups through **the distribution patterns of styles, have received serious criticism**. ... For critique of the ‘culture history’ ethnic ascription approach: B. Effros, *Merovingian Mortuary Archaeology and The Making of the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); cf. **the reassertion of the association of style and ethnicity** in F. Curta, *The Making of the Slavs* (emphases added)”⁹³.

In my remarks on how Curta uses style, I was not comparing his worldview with those of other culture-history archaeologists. I was just noticing that, Curta does exactly what culture-historical archaeologists do: selects some types, proclaims them ethnically relevant and so he becomes able to “identify” peoples from the past. I do not see what substantive change for research is brought by Curta’s emblematic style. Without using this notion, culture-historical archaeologists relied on brooches to identify Gepids or Longobards, believing that they were in some way determined to wear them, now Curta relies on brooches to identify Gepids or Longobards, claiming that they were deliberately choosing the types invented by archaeologists. In the end, we have the same thing: ethnic identities are indicated by the brooches. Culture-historical archaeologists care more about their methodology of type mapping and about the results than about what kind of social action can be imagined. Curta himself supports the lack of importance of theoretical constructs when, after commenting on the distribution of several types of brooches, he concludes: “[t]he distribution of all these types speaks for itself”⁹⁴. The main difference the use of emblematic style does is to separate Curta from other archaeologists who do not use it. It allows him to continue doing typology and mapping while claiming that he is doing something completely different. It also deserves attention that archaeologists using the old archaeological culture concept have much

⁸⁶ Geary 2015, p. 11.

⁸⁷ Niculescu 2011, p. 14 and Curta 2014a, p. 305.

⁸⁸ Niculescu 2011, p. 16-18.

⁸⁹ Curta 2014a, p. 306.

⁹⁰ See Wiessner 1983, p. 257, on emblematic style: it “transmits a clear message to a defined target population (Wobst 1977) about **conscious** affiliation or identity” and on assertive style (p. 258): “may be employed either consciously or **unconsciously**” (emphases added). See also Wiessner 1990, p. 107, on passive style: “Sackett’s argument for a passive style also has some validity. Everything has to be done in some way and not every action is executed or interpreted with great significance attached to it. Many ways of doing are acquired gradually by enculturation are not subject to regular stylistic and social comparison and thus play a background role in communication. In everyday life many ways of doing are ignored and only when somebody departs from standard procedure are questions of what, why, and who raised”.

⁹¹ Niculescu 2011, p. 14, n. 76.

⁹² Curta 2014a, p. 305, n. 43.

⁹³ Gillett 2006, p. 253, n. 3.

⁹⁴ Curta 2001, p. 203, already quoted by me in 2011, p. 13.

work to do, because they have to assemble a complex whole out of the remains from the past, while Curta has only do declare that one type of artifact is emblematic – there are no ways to prove that – and the analysis is done. The use of the archaeological culture concept is scientific because it can fail, because it may lead in particular studies to the conclusion that no ethnic entities are detectable, because nothing resembling an archaeological culture can be seen in the archaeological record, a situation which can also be explained by the inadequacy of concept itself. No failure is possible with Curta's emblematic style. All you need is two similar artifacts.

Curta's emphatic assertion "in order for style to work, it needs to be deliberate", put in a context suggesting that everybody who knows about style agrees with it, is supported only by mentioning Polly Wiessner, without any reference. I do not think that deliberate action is more effective than genuine style, despite the great number of crooks successful at appearing to be what they claim. Pierre Bourdieu seems to be closer to social reality with his remark on people who manipulate on television: "[t]hey manipulate even more effectively the more they are themselves manipulated and the more they are unconscious of this"⁹⁵. Many people know that impersonating someone is possible and look for clues in the realm of what is difficult to fake, of what is not deliberate.

Curta's article is a good example. He wants to present himself as a distinguished, elegant (as indicated by the pompous platitudes with which the article begins), supremely knowledgeable scholar, an excellent polemist, with a fine sense of humor, who wants "to set the record straight". That is quite deliberate and also effective, at least with the two journals that have published the paper. But his true style, passively exposed, is breaking through the appearances and shows what Curta does not want the readers to see: arrogance, ruthless manipulation, bad taste and empty claims. This is not deliberate, but he cannot help displaying what is contrary to what he wants, partly because it is habitual and therefore enjoyable, partly because there are no arguments to support his claims.

Finally, Curta decides to say something about one of the main problems discussed in my article, in order to show how inconsistent are my views and to end his article with one more insult (in the Romanian version):

"...his suggestion that archaeologists adopt the point of view of the social scientists, who presumably see the whole humanity with different eyes, seems like an invitation to disregard the questions he himself raises about 'the relevance of the social sciences for the past' or 'the problems concepts designed for the understanding of contemporary phenomena and certainly influenced by them, like ethnicity, might create when used for Late Antiquity'. One cannot eat the cake and have it too"⁹⁶.

Curta is unable to figure out how can one use the social sciences and worry about the consequences of their use. Actually, the more you know about the social sciences, the more you learn about those consequences, mostly from social scientists and philosophers. The situation confronting archaeologists when using social sciences is not different from a myriad of other situations when something useful can also produce unwanted or even harmful effects. We all use fire or electric power, although fire can produce burns and improper use of electric power can be lethal. Curta would make people choose: if it is dangerous, do not use it, if you use it, it is not dangerous. He invents a false alternative between the use of the social sciences and the acknowledgement of their problematic relevance for the past, chooses the use and dismisses the problems. We cannot simply ignore that social science knowledge is built by research on the recent past, because some of that knowledge might be irrelevant for the distant one.

Throughout his article, Curta displays an arrogant and dogmatic understanding of knowledge that is unusual for a scholar. What he knows appears to be the only thing worth knowing. Other views, especially when directly opposed to his, are crimes perpetrated by the dishonest and the ignorant. Knowledge is for him what it is for some prestigious colleagues from Romania: a source of legitimate authority and disdain for the ignorant, who should know their place and refrain from criticizing their superiors if they do not want to be crushed. The main tool used by such splendid human beings is verbal violence, meant to humiliate the inferior, reduce them to silence, and confirm their dominant position, which can be preserved only when unopposed. The truth they have, unlike scientific truth and closely related to political truth, is undebatable. It is not something achieved during a process, it is an entitlement, something they own by right of intellectual

⁹⁵ Bourdieu 1998, p. 17

⁹⁶ Curta 2014a, p. 306.

superiority. It is personal, an unavoidable consequence of who they are, not a result of collective endeavors. That is why any uncompliant discussion becomes a personal attack that has to be countered with a more efficient personal attack. When such encounters take place in hierarchically structured environments, those who are entitled to knowledge have the right (one might say even the duty) to insult the unworthy and the inferiors who have to expect punishment when they are disobedient.

Arrogance, “an attitude of superiority manifested in an overbearing manner or in presumptuous claims or assumptions”⁹⁷, described by philosophers as an epistemic vice, is usually avoided by researchers because it restricts the field of vision to what the arrogant person knows and makes invisible not only colleagues, whose work, which might be helpful, is made useless by dismissal, but also research issues.

What Curta sees in what I wrote about my contact with the social sciences illustrates how arrogance reduces the capacity to understand. He cannot imagine other attitudes towards scientific knowledge than his and sees in my arguments a claim for leadership and domination, a ridiculous one when compared with his legitimate claim⁹⁸. For him, presenting personal difficulties in understanding what social scientists write, beyond being stupid, because it generates lack of confidence, can have only one meaning that makes sense: it is a claim to superior understanding supported by a description of a difficult road to it. In the paragraph in question, I tried to argue for the utility of reflexivity, wondering why Curta and Brather “are not in the least surprised by the different styles of thinking they have encountered and show no sign of the slow and vacillating progress one could expect from someone educated as a culture-historical archaeologist who explores the social sciences”⁹⁹. I used my own experience, which I described as a “tortuous and hesitating journey through foreign knowledge”, because it suggests that an examination of how we understand the social sciences might be useful by making us more sensitive to the origins and implications of what we think. This kind of reflexivity¹⁰⁰ is the opposite of what Curta does, who falsifies his intellectual biography in order to claim better sources for his knowledge and is not willing to disclose anything about what makes him able to evaluate social science research.

For a closer look at Curta’s hermeneutic abilities, here is his interpretation of what I wrote:

“In the course of that journey, Niculescu was apparently ‘blinded’ by what he believed he knew, but only partially. Like Saul on the road to Damascus, he eventually recovered his sight, only to be puzzled by ‘lasting misunderstandings’ surrounding him, while benefiting ‘from being recognized as an archaeologist’ by his colleagues. He appears to have arrived at conclusions ‘of such importance that you try to convince them to abandon what they were accustomed to believe’. Leaving aside for the moment the paramount concern with obtaining recognition (and, one presumes, validation) from his peers, the confession in the middle of his article shows Niculescu to be a man with a mission... He has after all concluded his little confession with the idea that “the description of such journeys [as his] might help us put into perspective what we know and what we have to do in order to achieve our scientific goals. The message is clear: Niculescu has gone alone on this difficult journey of recuperating good archaeology from the claws of culture history, but he is willing to share with all of us the boon of his conversion”¹⁰¹.

And this is what I wrote:

“Reflexivity does not come naturally and, because I was also educated as a culture-historical archaeologist, I know how difficult it is to engage in describing what has been for me a tortuous and hesitating journey through foreign knowledge, partially blinded by what I believed I knew, puzzled by lasting misunderstandings and, benefiting from being recognized as an archaeologist by your colleagues, to arrive at conclusions of such importance that you try to convince them to abandon what they were accustomed to

⁹⁷ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/arrogance> (accessed on June 22, 2012).

⁹⁸ “One would simply love to see where a man with a mission like Niculescu would lead all those roaming through the uncharted territories of culture history, and what is his plan for a brighter future of the discipline.... However, when one seeks some guidance from the man with a mission, one is quickly disappointed. All that Niculescu has to offer is some vague and emotional advice” (Curta 2014a, 300-301).

⁹⁹ Niculescu 2011, p. 6.

¹⁰⁰ For reflexivity as a tool for improving research, see Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992 and Pels 2000; *contra*: Lynch 2000.

¹⁰¹ Curta 2014a, p. 300-301.

believe. However difficult to transform in a routine scientific practice, the description of such journeys might help us put into perspective what we know and what we have to do in order to achieve our scientific goals"¹⁰².

Curta completely misrepresents this passage. There is nothing in it about the glorious outcome of an exceptional journey, the "lasting misunderstandings" belong to me, not to other archaeologists and it is quite clear that the description of common difficulties, not the proclamation of superior understanding, is in my view useful for archaeology. I wrote about reflexivity and about how difficult it is to convince of its utility or of that of other ideas coming from the social sciences colleagues like Curta, who, accustomed with authoritative claims of knowledge and confronted with reflexive accounts which record misunderstandings and errors, would be inclined to dismiss them. Curta does not mention reflexivity¹⁰³, although it was important in the article he discusses, particularly in the paragraph quoted above, but describes repeatedly what I wrote as a confession (even as a "little confession", in order to emphasize how ridiculous it is) and this shows that my worries about how reflexivity would be perceived were justified. The "conclusions of such importance..." do not describe what I know, just what archaeologists who use social sciences usually present to their colleagues: *e.g.*, perspectives on ethnic phenomena, agency, style and so on. These are not details that could be easily integrated in what archaeologists who do not use them believe about social reality. Therefore, the resistance to be expected is greater than it would be in the case of some minor additions to things already known. "Being recognized as an archaeologist" is a reference to a discussion at my institute, during which a senior colleague expressed his opinion that whatever comes from non-archaeologists is irrelevant for us. Obviously, there is no claim for recognition here. With this discussion about reflexivity, I wanted something opposite to the intention of presenting myself as knowledgeable, ascribed to me by Curta. The collective examination of what and of how we think as archaeologists about the social sciences seems to me a better interdisciplinary practice than the current one, the authoritative presentation of knowledge from the social sciences, tacitly assumed to be perfectly understood by exceptional individuals like him.

Curta is far away from the current reality of the scientific world, made of competing claims and increasingly inclined towards epistemic pluralism¹⁰⁴, and close to the world of bad schoolteachers who have no control on the knowledge they are presenting, but believe that knowledge is what they think they know and have the institutional authority necessary to impose it as true. Scientific opinions opposed to what he believes are embarrassing mistakes. Not once is he able to recognize that some of them might simply be different from what he thinks, that constructing arguments against them might be more useful than dogmatic dismissal.

What I have seen at the University of Arizona in 1991-1992 is very different from Curta's world of knowledge. Arrogant claims of truth were completely missing and many prestigious professors declared their ignorance and were willing to learn from anyone who might have something to say. Such claims are frequent in Romania, where the main problem is too often, unfortunately, who has the right to speak and truth is imagined as a property of the authorized. Curta's unusual display of arrogance and dogmatism confirms his scientific education in Romania, where such attitudes are tolerated and even believed to be adequate, in part because they were encouraged by an undemocratic political environment. That is why two journals from Romania, probably impressed with Curta's international reputation and taking his derogatory remarks as the privilege of a great scholar, have published his *ad hominem* attack, something no US scientific journal would. The difference between the two academic environments is one of the reasons for which Curta published a version in Romanian: he wanted access to those who really can appreciate the arrogant display of his greatness, people he rarely finds in the United States. Usually, those who study epistemic arrogance detect it in the colonializing centres, but my experience tells me that it is more frequent at the periphery, where it can be described as "parochial self-absorption"¹⁰⁵.

Ignoring my arguments or opposing to them dogmatic statements, Curta concentrates on asserting his credibility and destroying mine by mockery and insults, something that brings nothing to scientific debate. That

¹⁰² Niculescu 2011, p. 6.

¹⁰³ Reflexivity is embraced especially by post-processualists (see, *e.g.*, Berggren 2001 and Hodder 2005), but I doubt Curta knows what it means, despite his claimed post-processualist education and training. Otherwise, he would have engaged in a discussion of this epistemic principle.

¹⁰⁴ See, *e.g.*, Harrison-Buck 2014.

¹⁰⁵ Nagel 1986, p. 222.

is why scientific journals do not tolerate mockery and defamation: they are simply useless noise which obscures the value of the arguments¹⁰⁶. Reliance on personal credibility makes sense in circumstances when what someone knows cannot be directly evaluated by competent people. So CV's, lists of publications and various forms of scientific recognition are used as a proxy for quality. For instance in interdisciplinary evaluation teams. But direct evaluations focused on what one knows, not on what who one is, are preferred in scientific practice. This is one of the reasons why so many scientific journals conceal the identities of the author and of the reviewer in their evaluation of the papers submitted for publication. They make criteria such as the reputation, intelligence, and publication record of the author unusable. In the words of Heike Langenberg, chief editor of Nature Geoscience, this procedure "just takes away anything but the science in the paper"¹⁰⁷.

The frequent reliance on personal credibility in peripheral traditions of research, like that in which Curta was educated, is overdetermined. It is a consequence of subordination to politics (this is where the most important signs of scientific recognition come from) and one of subordination to the knowledge created in the scientific cores, knowledge which is credible just for that reason. And so, claiming to be close, understanding, educated in one such core or a member of it is a valuable device in establishing credibility. Arguments like "as the great (German, American and so on) professor said..." are frequent – that is why Curta's argument consisting in the raised eyebrows of Michael Maas, Walter Pohl and Patrick Geary did not appear ridiculous to the Romanian editors of his attack – and the idea that any statement should be judged on its merits is much less frequent than in Western academic life. This encourages arrogance and dogmatism and also appropriative attitudes toward knowledge. The value of scientific statements is not determined by how well it has resisted critical examination, but by assessing the value of its author.

Therefore, it is not surprising that, relying on this local understanding of scientific value, Curta expects the readers to believe what he writes about agency and style – which are crucial for his claim that only an ignorant can link him to culture-history archaeology, because for him agency and style are deliberate – although he is not the source of the thinking about them. His interpretation is validated by belief in his knowledge and that is one of the main reasons of the attack against me: he does not want anyone to examine how accurately he presents what he has read.

To sum up, Curta misrepresents the article he is supposed to discuss: it is about **what** reduces the receptivity of culture historical archaeologists to knowledge produced by the social sciences and about nationalist representations of society, not about **who** is a culture historical archaeologist and a nationalist. Instead of examining the arguments supporting my conclusions, a common practice among scholars, he picks from what I wrote whatever he thinks can be used against me, manipulates what I wrote and presents his views as authoritative, practices common among politicians. My article was not a personal attack, there are no personal remarks in it, no defamation attempt, no mockery, no malicious comments meant to reduce Curta's credibility, just arguments based on what he wrote. There are no willing or accidental misrepresentations of his ideas in order to maliciously link him to culture historical archaeology and to present his thinking on ethnic phenomena as influenced by methodological nationalism. He reasserts some of them – typology is neutral, ethnicity is ubiquitous – in his attack and shows how bad is his understanding of current work on ethnic phenomena by insisting on the validity of Max Weber's definition of ethnic groups.

My views on culture history archaeology, ethnicity and style are not "distorted" or based on "wrong assumptions". They are just different from his, supported by arguments and, of course, debatable. Curta's article is focused on defamation and has no scientific value, only a self-assertive one. There is nothing to be learned from it except that Curta is right, that he is not a culture history archaeologist and certainly not a nationalist. He offers mostly dogmatic statements, no arguments worthy of attention and no discussion and references for the concepts taken from the social sciences whose importance he emphatically claims.

¹⁰⁶ See International Committee of Medical Journal Editors: "editors must make an effort to screen out discourteous, inaccurate, or libelous statements, and should not allow *ad hominem* arguments intended to discredit opinions or findings" (<http://www.neurology.org/site/misc/auth2.xhtml>; accessed on May 10, 2016).

¹⁰⁷ *Apud* Palus 2015. See also Elsevier's peer review guidelines: "[a]rticles written by prestigious or renowned authors are considered on the basis of the content of their papers, rather than their reputation." <http://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/what-is-peer-review>" (accessed on June 23, 2015). See also Merton's first institutional imperative: "The acceptance or rejection of claims entering the lists of science is not to depend on the personal or social attributes of their protagonist...personal qualities are as such irrelevant" (1973 [1942], p. 270).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu El-Haj 2007 – N. Abu El-Haj, *The Genetic Reinscription of Race*, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36, 2007, p. 283-300.
- Banton 2007 – M. Banton, *Max Weber on 'Ethnic Communities': a Critique*, *Nations and Nationalism* 13, 2007, p. 19-35.
- Barth 1969 – F. Barth, *Introduction*, in F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organisation of Culture Difference*, Bergen, 1969, p. 9-38.
- Barth 1994 – F. Barth, *Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis of Ethnicity*, in H. Vermeulen and C. Govers (eds.), *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries'*, Amsterdam, 1994, p. 11-32.
- Barth 1995 – F. Barth, *Ethnicity and the Concept of Culture*. Available at <http://data.fas.harvard.edu/cfia/pnscs/DOCS/s95barth.htm> (accessed on April 18, 2001).
- Bauman 1992 – Z. Bauman, *Soil, Blood and Identity*, *Sociological Review* 40, 1992, p. 675-701.
- Beck 2007 – U. Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Condition: Why Methodological Nationalism Fails*, *Theory, Culture and Society* 24, 2007, p. 286-290.
- Berggren 2001 – A. Berggren, *Swedish Archaeology in Perspective and the Possibility of Reflexivity*, *CSA* 9, 2001, p. 9-23.
- Binford 1962 – L.R. Binford, *Archaeology as Anthropology*, *American Antiquity* 28, 1962, p. 217-225.
- Binford 1968 – L.R. Binford, *Some Comments on Historical versus Processual Archeology*, *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 24, 1968, p. 267-275.
- Bisson 2000 – M.S. Bisson, *Nineteenth Century Tools for Twenty-First Century Archaeology? Why the Middle Paleolithic Typology of François Bordes Must Be Replaced*, *JAMT* 7, 2000, p. 1-48.
- Boozer 2015 – A.L. Boozer, *The Tyranny of Typologies: Evidential Reasoning in Romano-Egyptian Domestic Archaeology*, in R. Chapman, A. Wylie (eds.), *Material Evidence. Learning from Archaeological Practice*, London, 2015, p. 92-109.
- Bourdieu 1968 – P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Sociological Theory of Art Perception*, *ISSJ* 22, 1968, p. 589-612.
- Bourdieu 1998 – P. Bourdieu, *On Television*, translated from French by P. Parkhurst Ferguson, New York, 1998.
- Bourdieu, Chamboredon, Passeron 1991 – P. Bourdieu, J.-C. Chamboredon, J.-C. Passeron, *The Craft of Sociology: Epistemological Primaries*, translated by R. Nice, Berlin, 1991.
- Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992 – P. Bourdieu, L. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge, 1992.
- Brather 2008 – S. Brather, *Zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter. Zusammenfassung*, in S. Brather (ed.), *Zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter: Archäologie des 4. bis 7. Jahrhunderts im Westen*, Berlin, 2008, p. 425-465.
- Canache, Curta 1994 – A. Canache, F. Curta, *Depozite de unelte și arme medievale timpurii de pe teritoriul României*, *Musaioi* 4, 1994, p. 179-221.
- Curta 1988 – F. Curta, *Programul iconografic al paterei din tezaurul de la Pietroasa*, *Buletinul Științific Studentesc* 3, 1988, p. 38-46.
- Curta 1990 – F. Curta, *Zu den chronologischen Problemen der römischen Goldbarrenschätze aus Crasna (Kr. Covasna) und Feldioara (Kr. Brașov)*, *Dacia N.S.* 34, 1990, p. 269-284.
- Curta 1992 – F. Curta, *Die Fibeln der Sammlung V. Culică*, *Dacia N.S.* 36, 1992, p. 37-97.
- Curta 1994a – F. Curta, *On the Dating of the 'Vețel-Coșoveni' Group of Curved Fibulae*, *EphemNap* 4, 1994, p. 233-265.
- Curta 1994b – F. Curta, *The Changing Image of the Early Slavs in the Romanian Historiography and Archaeological Literature. A Critical Survey*, *Südost-Forschungen* 53, 1994, p. 235-276.
- Curta 1994c – F. Curta, *Asupra problemelor de cronologie a tezaurilor de lingouri de la Crasna (jud. Covasna) și Feldioara (jud. Brașov)*, *Musaioi* 4, 1994, p. 133-148.
- Curta 1998 – F. Curta, *Making an Early Medieval Ethnie: The Case of the Early Slavs (sixth to seventh century A.D.)*. Ph.D. Diss. Western Michigan University, Ann Arbor, 1998.
- Curta 20001 - F. Curta, *The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, ca. 500-700*, Cambridge, 2001.
- Curta 2006 – F. Curta, review of *Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie. Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen*, by Sebastian Brather (Berlin/New York, 2004), *ArchBulg* 10, 2006, p. 91-94.
- Curta 2007 – F. Curta, *Some Remarks on Ethnicity in Medieval Archaeology*, *Early Medieval Europe* 15, 2007, p. 159-182.
- Curta 2009a – F. Curta, *Text, Context, History, and Archaeology. Studies in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Bucharest – Brăila, 2009.
- Curta 2009b – F. Curta, *The Early Slavs in Bohemia and Moravia: A Response to My Critics*, *ArchRozhledy* 61, 2009, p. 1-30.
- Curta 2011 – F. Curta, *Medieval Archaeology and Ethnicity: Where Are We?*, *History Compass* 9, 2011, p. 537-548.
- Curta 2013 – F. Curta, *The Elephant in the Room. A Reply to Sebastian Brather*, *EphemNap* 33, 2013, p. 163-174.

- Curta 2014a – F. Curta, “*A Hesitating Journey through Foreign Knowledge*”: Niculescu, the Ostrich, and Culture History”, *ArhMold* 37, 2014, p. 299-306.
- Curta 2014b – *Un haġialăc șovăielnic prin tărâmul unor cunoștințe străine: d-l Niculescu, struțul și arheologia cultural istorică*, *Istros* 20, 2014, p. 907-925.
- Curta, Dupoi 1994-1995 – F. Curta, V. Dupoi, *Über die Bügelfibel aus Pietroasele und ihre Verwandten*, *Dacia N.S.* 38-39, 1994-1995, p. 217-238.
- Emirbayer, Mische – M. Emirbayer, A. Mische, *What is Agency?*, *AJS* 103, 1998, p. 962-1023.
- Feagin 2009 – J.R. Feagin, *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*, London, 2009.
- Geary 2015 – P. Geary, *Power and Ethnicity, History and Anthropology*, *History and Anthropology* 26, 2015, p. 8-17.
- Gershon 2011 – I. Gershon, *Neoliberal Agency*, *Current Anthropology* 52, 2011, p. 537-555.
- Gillett 2006 – A. Gillett, *Ethnogenesis: A Contested Model of Early Medieval Europe*, *History Compass* 4, 2006, p. 241-260.
- Gosselain 2011 – O. Gosselain, *Slow Science - La désexcellence*, *Uzance* 1, 2011, p. 128-140.
- Halsall 2011 – G. Halsall, *Ethnicity and Early Medieval Cemeteries*, *Arqueologia y territorio medieval* 18, 2011, p. 15-27.
- Harrison 1995 – S. Harrison, *Four Types of Symbolic Conflict*, *JRAI (N.S.)* 1, 1995, p. 255-272.
- Harrison-Buck 2014 – E. Harrison-Buck, *Anthropological Archaeology in 2013: The Search for Truth(s)*, *American Anthropologist* 116, 2014, p. 338-351.
- Hodder 1982 – I. Hodder, *Symbols in Action*, Cambridge, 1982.
- Hodder 2005 – I. Hodder, *Reflexive Methods*, in H.D.G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds.), *Handbook of Archaeological Methods*, Lanham, 2005, p. 643-672.
- Hodder 2012 – I. Hodder, *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships Between Humans and Things*, Malden, 2012.
- Hodder, Hutson 2003 – I. Hodder, S. Hutson, *Reading the Past : Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology*, third edition, Cambridge, 2003.
- Jenkins 2008 – R. Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*, second edition, Los Angeles, 2008.
- Jones 1997 – S. Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity : Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*, London, 1997.
- Johnson 2006 – M.H. Johnson, *On the Nature of Theoretical Archaeology and Archaeological Theory*, *Archaeological Dialogues* 13, 2006, p. 117-132.
- Kalberg 2005 – S. Kalberg, *On “Race” Membership, Common Ethnicity, the “Ethnic Group”, and Heredity*, in S. Kalberg (ed.), *Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity*, Malden, 2005.
- Korsgaard 2014 – C. Korsgaard, *The Normative Constitution of Agency*, in M. Vargas, G. Yaffe (eds.), *Rational and Social Agency: The Philosophy of Michael Bratman*, Oxford, 2014, p. 190-214.
- Kuhn 1996 – T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, third edition, Chicago, 1996.
- Lentz 1995 – C. Lentz, *Tribalism and Ethnicity in Africa. A Review of Four Decades of Anglophone Research*, *Cahiers des Sciences Humaines* 31, 1995, p. 303-328.
- Loyal, Barnes 2001 – S. Loyal, B. Barnes, “Agency” as a Red Herring in Social Theory, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 31, 2001, p. 507-524.
- Lynch 2000 – M. Lynch, *Against Reflexivity as an Academic Virtue and Source of Privileged Knowledge*, *Theory, Culture and Society* 17, 2000, p. 26-54.
- Martin 1976 – M. Martin, *Das spätrömisch-frühmittelalterliche Gräberfeld von Kaiseraugst, Kanton Aargau, Teil B, Kataloge und Tafeln*, Derendingen, 1976.
- Martin 1991 – M. Martin, *Das spätrömisch-frühmittelalterliche Gräberfeld von Kaiseraugst, Kanton Aargau, Derendingen – Solothurn*, 1991.
- Martins 1974 – H. Martins, *Time and Theory in Sociology*, in J. Rex (ed.), *Approaches to Sociology*, London, 1974, p. 246-294.
- Mayr 2006 [1959] – E. Mayr, *Typological versus Population Thinking*, in E. Sober (ed.), *Conceptual Issues in Evolutionary Biology*, third edition, Cambridge Mass., 2006, p. 325-328.
- Merton 1973 [1942] – R.K. Merton, *The Normative Structure of Science*, in R.K. Merton, *The Sociology of Science. Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* (edited and with an introduction by N.W. Storer), Chicago, 1973, p. 267-278.
- Nagel 1986 – T. Nagel, *The View from Nowhere*, Oxford, 1986.
- Niculescu 2011 – G.A. Niculescu, *Culture-Historical Archaeology and the Production of Knowledge on Ethnic Phenomena*, *Dacia N.S.* 55, 2011, p. 5-24.
- Palus 2015 – S. Palus, *Is Double-Blind Review Better?*, *APS News* 24, 2015, 7, p. 4, 6.
- Patterson 2005 – T.C. Patterson, *The Turn to Agency: Neoliberalism, Individuality, and Subjectivity in Late-Twentieth-Century Anglophone Archaeology*, *Rethinking Marxism* 17, 2005, p. 373-384.
- Pels 2000 – D. Pels, *Reflexivity: One Step Up*, *Theory, Culture and Society* 17, 2000, p. 1-15.
- Pohl 1999 – W. Pohl, *Ethnizität des Frühmittelalters als interdisziplinäres Problem*, *Das Mittelalter* 4, 1999, p. 69-75.

- Pohl 2002 – W. Pohl, *Ethnicity, Theory and Tradition: a Response*, in Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity - Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory*, Turnhout, 2002, p. 221-240.
- Preucel 2006 – R. Preucel, *Archaeological Semiotics*, Malden, 2006.
- Raum 1995 – J.W. Raum, *Reflections on M. Weber's Thoughts Concerning Ethnic Groups*, ZfE 120, 1995, p. 73-87.
- Scaff 2014 – L. Scaff, *Weber and the Weberians*, Basingstoke, 2014.
- Smith 1991 – A.D. Smith, *National Identity*, London, 1991
- Van Oyen 2015 – A. Van Oyen, *Actor-Network Theory's Take on Archaeological Types: Becoming, Material Agency and Historical Explanation*, CAJ 25, 2015, p. 63-78.
- Weber 1922 – M. Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tübingen, 1922.
- Weber 1968 – M. Weber, *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich, translated by E. Fischhoff *et alii*), Berkeley, 1968.
- Weber 2001 – M. Weber, *Gesamtausgabe I/22, I. Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Die Wirtschaft und die gesellschaftlichen Ordnungen und Mächte. Gemeinschaften. Nachlaß*, (edited by W.J. Mommsen, in cooperation with M. Meyer), Tübingen, 2001.
- White 1959 – L. White, *The Evolution of Culture: The Development of Civilization to the Fall of Rome*, New York, 1959.
- Wimmer 2014 – A. Wimmer, *Symposium Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks by Andreas Wimmer (O.U.P. 2013). Ethnic Boundary Making as Strategic Action: reply to my Critics*, Ethnic and Racial Studies 37, 2014, p. 834-842.
- Wimmer, Glick Schiller 2002 – A. Wimmer, N. Glick Schiller, *Methodological Nationalism and the Study of Migration*, EJS 43, 2002, p. 217-240.
- Wiessner 1983 – P. Wiessner, *Style and Social Information in Kalahari San Projectile Points*, American Antiquity 48, 1983, p. 253-276.
- Wiessner 1990 – P. Wiessner, *Is There a Unity to Style?*, in M.W. Conkey, Chr.A. Hastorf (eds.), *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*, Cambridge, 1990, p. 105-112.
- Wobst 1977 – M. Wobst, *Stylistic Behaviour and Information Exchange*, in C.E. Cleland (ed.), *Papers for the Director: Research Essays in Honor of James B. Griffin*, Ann Arbor, 1977, p. 317-342.
- Wylie 2002 – A. Wylie, *Thinking from Things: Essays in the Philosophy of Archaeology*, Berkeley, 2002
- Zimmerman 2006 – A. Zimmerman, *Decolonizing Weber*, Postcolonial Studies 9, 2006, p. 53-79.

ABRÉVIATIONS

- AA – Archäologischer Anzeiger. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Darmstadt, München, Tübingen – Berlin
AAIN – Annali dell’Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, Roma
AARMSI – Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice, București
Academica – Academica. Revistă editată de Academia Română, București
ACSS – Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia, Bordeaux – Moscow
ActaArchCop – Acta Archaeologica, Copenhagen
ActaArchHung – Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
ActaMM – Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis, Vaslui
ActaMN – Acta Musei Napocensis. Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei, Cluj-Napoca
ActaMP – Acta Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă, Zalău
ActaMV – Acta Musei Varnaensis, Varna
ActaMT – Acta Musei Tutovens, Muzeul „Vasile Pârvan”, Bârlad
ActaPraehArch – Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica, Berlin
ActaTS – Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis. Institutul pentru Cercetarea Patrimoniului Cultural Transilvănean în Context European, Sibiu
AÉ – L’Année Épigraphique, Paris
AEM – Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn, Wien
AISC – Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice, Cluj-Napoca
AJA – American Journal of Archaeology, Boston
AJS – The American Journal of Sociology, Chicago
Alba Regia – Alba Regia. Annales Musei Stephani regis, Székesfehérvár
Aluta – Muzeul Național Secuiesc, Sfântu Gheorghe
Alt-Hildesheim – Alt-Hildesheim. Jahrbuch für Stadt und Stift Hildesheim, Hildesheim
AM – Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung, Athen
American Anthropologist – American Anthropologist. Journal of the American Anthropological Association, ([http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1548-1433](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1548-1433))
American Antiquity – American Antiquity. Society for American Archaeology, Washington
Anatolia Antiqua – Anatolia Antiqua, Istanbul
AnB – Analele Banatului, Muzeul Banatului, Timișoara
Ancient Philosophy – Ancient Philosophy, Duquesne University, Pittsburg
AncWestEast – Ancient West & East, Leiden
AnnalesESC – Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, Paris
AnnalesHSS – Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales, Paris
Annals of Science – Annals of Science, Taylor and Francis Online (<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tasc20>)
ANSNS – American Numismatic Society. Numismatic Studies, New York
AnUA-SH – Annales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Historica, Alba Iulia
AnUBucurești – Analele Universității București, București
Angustia – Angustia. Arheologie, Etnografie, Sfântu Gheorghe
ANSMN – American Numismatic Society; Museum Notes, New York
AntCl – L’antiquité Classique, Revue interuniversitaire d’études classiques
Antik Tanulmányok – Antik Tanulmányok. Studia Antiqua, Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest
Antiquitas – Antiquitas, Museo Historico Municipal de Priego, Cordoba
Antiquités Nationales – Antiquités Nationales, Musée des Antiquités Nationales, Saint-Germain-en-Laye
Antiquity – Antiquity. A Review of World Archaeology, Durham
AO – Arhivele Olteniei, Craiova
APS News – The American Physical Society News
Apulum – Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii, Alba Iulia
Archaeological Dialogues – Archaeological Dialogues, Cambridge

- Archaeometry – Archaeometry, The Society for Archaeological Science, Gesellschaft für Naturwissenschaftliche, Associazione Italiana di Archeometria, University of Oxford, Wiley
- ArchBulg – Archaeologia Bulgarica, Sofia
- ArchÉrt – Archeológiai Értesítő, Budapest
- ArchHung – Archaeologia Hungarica, Acta Archaeologica Musei Nationalis Hungarici, Budapest
- ArchKorr – Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt, Mainz
- ArchRozhledy – Archeologické Rozhledy, Praha
- ArheologijaSSSR – Arheologija Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik, Moskova
- ArhMold – Arheologia Moldovei. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie, Iași
- ArhSofia – Arheologija. Organ na Arheologičeskija i Muzej, Sofia
- Arqueologia y Territorio Medieval – Arqueologia y Territorio Medieval, Universidad de Jaén, Jaén
- Ausgrabungen und Funde – Ausgrabungen und Funde, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Sektion für Vor- und Frühgeschichte; Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Zentralinstitut für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie
- BARIntSer – British Archaeological Reports, International Series, Oxford
- BerRGK – Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
- BCH – Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Athènes – Paris
- BHAUT – Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis, Timișoara Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis, Timișoara
- Bibliotheca Ephemeris Napocensis – Bibliotheca Ephemeris Napocensis, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei al Academiei Române, Cluj-Napoca
- Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae. Monographies – Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae. Monographies, Academia Republicii Socialiste România, Secția Științe Istorice, București
- Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis – Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei al Academiei Române, Cluj-Napoca
- BJb – Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn, Bonn
- BMC, I – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, I, Augustus to Vittelius*, London, 1923.
- BMC, II – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, II, Vespasian to Domitian*, London, 1930.
- BMC, III – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, III, Nerva to Hadrian*, London, 1936
- BMC, IV – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, IV, Antoninus Pius to Commodus*, London, 1940.
- BMC, V – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, V, Pertinax to Elagabalus*, London, 1950.
- BMC, VI – R. A. G. Carson, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, VI, Severus Alexander to Balbinus and Pupienus*, London, 1962.
- BMI – Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice, București
- BMJT – Buletinul Muzeului Județean Teleorman, Alexandria
- BMTAGiurgiu – Buletinul Muzeului „Teohari Antonescu”, Giurgiu
- Bosporskie issledovanija – Bosporskie Issledovanija (Études bosporaines), Académie nationale ukrainienne des sciences, Simferopol
- BSFN – Bulletin de la Société Française de Numismatique, Paris
- BSNR – Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române, București
- BTM Mühely – BTM Mühely, Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, Budapest
- Budapest Régiségei – Budapest Régiségei, Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, Budapest
- BulBOR – Buletinul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București
- Buridava – Buridava. Muzeul Județean Vâlcea, Râmnicu Vâlcea
- CA – Cercetări Arheologice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
- CAB – Cercetări Arheologice în București, Muzeul Municipiului București, București
- Caiete ARA – Caiete ARA. Arhitectură, Restaurare, Arheologie. Asociația ARA, București
- Cahiers des Sciences Humaines – Cahiers des Sciences Humaines, O.R.S.T.O.M. (Agency: France)

- CAJ – Cambridge Archaeological Journal
 CANT – Cercetări arheologice în aria nord-tracă, București (I – 1995, II – 1997, III - 1999)
 Carpica – Carpica, Carpica. Complexul Muzeal „Julian Antonescu” Bacău, Bacău
 CCA, campania – Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice din România, București
 CCDJ – Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos, Muzeul “Dunării de Jos”, Călărași
 CCGG – Cahiers du Centre Gustav-Glotz, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris
 Centaurus – Centaurus, European Society for the History of Science, John Wiley & Sons Ltd
 CercIst – Cercetări Istorice, Iași
 Chiron – Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, München
 Chronica Valachica – Chronica Valachica. Studii și materiale de istorie și istorie a culturii, Târgoviște
 Chronométriphilia – Chronométriphilia, La Chaux-de-Fonds
 CICSA – Centrul de Istorie Comparată a Societăților Antice, Universitatea București, București
 CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1862-.
 CIS – *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881-.
 Classica et Christiana – Classica et Christiana, Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine al Facultății de Istorie a Universității „Al.I. Cuza”, Iași
 CIQ – The Classical Quaterly, The Classical Association, Cambridge
 CN – Cercetări Numismatice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
 CNM – Corpus Nummorum Moldaviae
 Collection de la Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen. Série Épigraphique – Collection de la Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen. Série Épigraphique, Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, Fédération de recherche sur les sociétés anciennes, Université Lumière Lyon 2 - CNRS
 Communications – Communications. EHESS/CNRS-Centre Edgar Morin, Paris
 Comparative Criticism – Comparative Criticism, Cambridge University Press
 Corviniana – Corviniana. Acta Musei Corviniensis, Hunedoara
 CRAI – Comptes Rendus des Séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris
 Crisia – Crisia. Muzeului Țării Crișurilor, Oradea
 Critica Storica – Critica Storica, Associazione degli storici europei, Firenze
 CSA – Current Swedish Archaeology, Swedish Archaeological Society
 Current Anthropology – Current Anthropology. University of California, Merced
 Dacia N.S. – Dacia (Nouvelle Série). Revue d’archéologie et d’histoire ancienne. Académie Roumaine. Institut d’archéologie « V. Pârvan », București
 Danubius – Danubius, Revista Muzeului de Istorie Galați, Galați
 Das Altertum – Das Altertum, Berlin – Amsterdam – Oldenburg
 Das Mittelalter – Das Mittelalter, UTB GmbH, Stuttgart
 Der Anschnitt – Der Anschnitt, Vereinigung der Freunde von Kunst und Kultur im Bergbau, Bochum
 DHA – Dialogues d’Histoire ancienne, Université de Franche-Comté, Paris
 Die Kunde – Die Kunde. Zeitschrift für niedersächsische Archäologie, Hannover
 DissArch – Dissertationes Archaeologicae ex Instituto Archaeologico Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae, Budapest
 DissPann – Disertationes Pannonicae. Ex Instituto Numismatico et Archaeologico Universitatis de Petro Pázmány nominatae Budapestensis provenientes, Budapest
 DIVR – D.M. Pippidi (ed.), *Dicționar de istorie veche a României (Paleolitic – sec. X)*, București, 1976.
 Documenta Praehistorica – Documenta Praehistorica, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Archaeology
 Documenta Valachica – Documenta Valachica. Studii și materiale de istorie și istorie a culturii, Târgoviște
 Drobeta – Drobeta. Muzeul Regiunii Porțile de Fier, Drobeta-Turnu Severin
 EAIVR – Enciclopedia Arheologiei și Istoriei Vechi a României (ed. C. Preda), București, 1994
 EJS – European Journal of Sociology
 Epigraphische Studien – Epigraphische Studien, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Bonn, Köln
 EphemDAC – Ephemeris Dacoromana. Annuario della Scuola Romana di Roma
 EphemNap – Ephemeris Napocensis. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei, Cluj-Napoca
 Ethnic and Racial Studies – Ethnic and Racial Studies, London : Routledge & Kegan Paul

- EurAnt – Eurasia Antiqua. Deutsche Archäologisches Institut, Berlin
- FI – File de Istorie. Muzeul Județean Bistrița-Năsăud, Bistrița
- FolArch – Folia Archaeologica, Budapest
- Fontes I – V. Iliescu, V. C. Popescu, Gh. Ștefan (ed.), Izvoare privind Istoria României, vol. I, București, 1964.
- Fontes II – H. Mihăescu, Gh. Ștefan, R. Hîncu, V. Iliescu, V. C. Popescu (ed.), Izvoare privind Istoria României, vol. I, București, 1970.
- FrühMitAltSt – Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster, Münster
- Gerión – Gerión. Revista de Historia Antigua
- Germania – Germania. Anzeiger der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
- GlasnikSarajevo – Glasnik Zemlinskog Muzeja u Sarajevu, Sarajevo
- Greece & Rome – Greece & Rome, Classical Association, Cambridge University Press
- HispAnt – Hispania Antiqua. Revista de Historia Antigua (digital journal: <https://revistas.uva.es/index.php/hispaanti>)
- Hesperia – Hesperia. The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens
- Historia – Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart
- History and Anthropology – History and Anthropology, Taylor & Francis (Routledge)
- History and Theory – History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History, Middletown
- History Compass – History Compass, Wiley-Blackwell
- Histria Antiqua – Histria Antiqua, Institut društvenih znanosti IVO PILAR, Zagreb
- HNE – M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898.
- HPQ – History of Philosophy Quarterly, University of Illinois Press
- IDR II – G. Florescu, C.C. Petolescu, *Inscripțiile Daciei Romane*, vol. II: *Oltenia și Muntenia*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1977.
- IDR III/1 – I.I. Russu, N. Gudea, V. Wollmann, M. Dușanic, *Inscripțiile Daciei Romane*, vol. III/1: *Dacia Superior. Zona de sud-vest*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1977.
- IDRE – C.C. Petolescu, *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae. Inscriptions externes concernant l'histoire de la Dacie*, I-II, București, 1996-2000.
- IG XII 6.2 – K. Hallof, A.P. Matthaiou, *Inscriptiones Graecae XII 6. Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icariaque. Pars 2. Inscriptiones Sami insulae. Dedicaciones. Tituli sepulcrales. Tituli Christiani, Byzantini, Iudaei. Varia. Tituli graphio incisi. Incerta. Tituli alieni. Inscriptiones Corassiarum. Inscriptiones Icariae insulae*, Berlin – New York, 2003.
- IGB – G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*, 5 vol., Sofia, 1958–2001.
- IGLN – V. Božilova, J. Kolendo (eds.), *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Novae (Mésie inférieure)*, Ausonius, Bordeaux, 1997.
- IGLR – E. Popescu, *Inscripțiile grecești și latinești descoperite pe teritoriul României*, București, 1976.
- IGLS VI – J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie. VI. Baalbek et Beqa'.* Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 78, Paris, 1967.
- IGLS XVII.1 – J.-B. Yon, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. XVII/1. Palmyre* Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 195; Beirut, 2012.
- ILB – B. Gerov, *Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria Repertae*, Sofia, 1989.
- Il Mar Nero – Il mar nero: annali di archeologia e storia, Roma
- ILS – H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin, I (1892), II (1902), III (1916).
- ISSJ – International Social Science Journal
- Interpretation – Interpretation. A Journal of Political Philosophy, Waco
- ISM I – D.M. Pippidi, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor*, vol. I. *Histria și împrejurimile*, București, 1983.
- ISM II – I. Stoian, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor grecești și latine*, vol. II. *Tomis și teritoriul său*, Bucarest, 1987.
- ISM III – A. Avram, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Scythie Mineure*, vol. III. *Callatis et son territoire*, Bucharest–Paris, 1999.
- ISM IV – E. Popescu, *Inscriptions de Scythie Mineure*, vol. IV. *Tropaeum – Durostorum – Axiopolis*, Bucharest–Paris, 2015.

- ISM V – E. Doruțiu Boilă, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor*, vol. V. *Capidava – Troesmis – Noviodunum*, București, 1980.
- IstMitt – Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Istanbul
- Istros – Istros, Muzeul Brăilei „Carol I”, Brăila
- IzvestijaSofia – Izvestija na Nacionalnija Arheologičeski Institut, Sofia
- JAMT – Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, Springer
- JHS – Journal of Hellenic Studies, London
- JIES – Journal of Indo-European Studies, Washington
- JFA – Journal of Field Archaeology, Boston University, Taylor & Francis
- JMC – Journal of Material Culture, SAGE Publications Ltd.
- JNG – Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte, Bayerische Numismatische Gesellschaft, München
- JÖAI – Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien
- Journal of Value Inquiry – The Journal of Value Inquiry, Springer
- JRA – Journal of Roman Archaeology, Portsmouth, Rhode Island
- JRAI – Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute, London
- JRAI (N.S.) – The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, London
- JRAI-GBI – Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, London
- JRGZM – Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz, Mainz
- JRS – Journal of Roman Studies, London
- Kadmos – Kadmos. Zeitschrift für vor- und frühgriechische Epigraphik, Berlin
- Klio – Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Berlin
- La Cultura – La Cultura. Rivista de Filosofia, Letteratura e Storia
- LIMC – Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae, Zürich, 1981-1999
- Lucerna – Lucerna. The Roman Finds Group Newsletter, Stevenage, UK
- Marmația – Marmația, Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Arheologie Baia Mare, Baia Mare
- MASP – Materiali po Arheologii Severnogo Pričernomorja, Odesa
- MCA – Materiale și cercetări arheologice. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- MemAnt – Memoria Antiquitatis, Acta Musei Petrodavensis, Complexul Muzeal Județean Neamț, Piatra-Neamț
- MFME – A Móra Ferenc Múzeum évkönyve. Móra Ferenc Múzeum, Szeged
- MIA – Materialy i issledovanija po arheologii SSSR, Moskva – Sk. Petersburg
- MitteilungenBerlin – Mitteilungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, Berlin
- Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft – Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig
- MN – Muzeul Național, București
- MonographRGZM – Monographies des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, Mainz
- Montana II – V. Velkov, G. Aleksandrov, *Epigrafski pametnitsi ot Montana i raiona*, Montana, 1994.
- Mousaios – Mousaios. Buletinul Științific al Muzeului Județean Buzău, Bacău
- MSȘIA – Academia Română. Memoriile Secției de Științe Istorice și Arheologie, București
- MusHelv – Museum Helveticum: schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica, Schwabe-Verlag
- NAC – Numismatica et Antichità Classiche. Quaderni Ticinesi, Lugano
- Nestor – Nestor, University of Cincinnati, Department of Classics, Cincinnati
- NC – Numismatic Chronicle, London
- NNM – Numismatic Notes and Monographs, New York
- Novensia – Novensia, Antiquity of Southeastern Europe Research Centre, University of Warsaw, Warsaw
- NZ – Numismatische Zeitschrift. Österreichische Numismatische Gesellschaft, Wien
- Oltenia – Oltenia. Studii și comunicări, Craiova
- Orientalia – Orientalia, Pontificio Istituto biblico, Roma
- Pact – Pact. Journal of the European Study Group on Physical, Chemical, Biological & Mathematical Techniques Applied to Archaeology, Strasbourg
- PAS – Praehistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa, Berlin

- PAT – Patrimonium Archaeologicum Transylvanicum
 PAT – D.R. Hillers, E. Cussini, *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts*, The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project, Baltimore, 1996.
- PBF – Prähistorische Bronzefunde. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Seminar für Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M, Abteilung für Ur- und Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie des Historischen Seminars der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, Münster
- PCPhS – Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge
- Peuce – Peuce. Studii și Note de Istorie Veche și Arheologie. Muzeul Delta Dunării / Institutul de Cercetări Eco-Muzeale „Simion Gavrilă”, Tulcea
- Peuce S.N. – Peuce, serie nouă. Studii și Cercetări de Istorie și Arheologie. Institutul de Cercetări Eco-Muzeale „Simion Gavrilă”, Tulcea
- Philosophie – Philosophie, Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris
- Phronesis – Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy, Leiden
- PIR² – *Prosopographia Imperii Romani, saec. I-III*, ed. II, Berlin–Leipzig
- PNAS – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Washington DC
- Poetics Today – Poetics Today, Duke University, Columbus, USA
- Polis – Polis. The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought, Exeter
- Pontica / Pontice – Pontica. Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie, Constanța
- PPS – Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society, Cambridge
- PZ – Praehistorische Zeitschrift. Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin
- QS – Quaderni di storia, Roma
- RAN – Repertoriul Arheologic Național (<http://ran.cimec.ro/>)
- RE – *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, Stuttgart, 1893-
- REA – Revue des Études Anciennes. Maison de l'Archéologie, Université Bordeaux Montaigne, Pessac
- RES – *Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique*, Paris, 1900-1968.
- RÉSEE – Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes. Academia Română, Institutul de Studii Sud-Est Europeene, București
- RevBistr – Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Bistrița-Năsăud, Bistrița
- Review of Metaphysics – The Review of Metaphysics. A Philosophical Quarterly, Washington DC
- Revista Arheologică – Revista Arheologică, Academia de Științe a Moldovei, Institutul Patrimoniului Cultural, Centrul de Arheologie, Chișinău
- Revista d'arqueologia de Ponent – Revista d'arqueologia de Ponent, Unitat d'Arqueologia, Prehistòria i Història Antiga del Departament d'Història de la Universitat de Lleida, Lleida
- RevMuz – Revista Muzeelor, București
- Révue d'Alsace – Révue d'Alsace, Fédération des Sociétés d'Histoire et d'Archéologie d'Alsace, Colmar
- Revue d'Archéométrie - ArchéoSciences, revue d'Archéométrie, Presses universitaires de Rennes
- Revue du Louvre – La Revue du Louvre et des musées de France, Conseil des musées nationaux (France), Paris
- Revue du Nord – Revue du Nord. Archéologie de la Picardie et du Nord de la France, Université de Lille, Villeneuve D'Asco
- RGA – *Reallexicon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, Berlin
- RGZM – Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz, Bonn
- Rhetorica – Rhetorica. A Journal of the History of Rhetoric, Berkley
- RI – Revista Istorică. Academia Română, Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga”, București
- RIB – Roman Inscriptions of Britain, London
- RIC, II – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, II, Vespasian to Hadrian*, London, 1926.
- RIC, III – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, III, Antoninus Pius to Commodus*, London, 1930.
- RIC, IV/1 – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C.H.V. Shutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, IV/1, Pertinax to Geta*, London, 1936.
- RIC, IV/2 – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C. H. V. Shutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, IV/2, Macrinus to Papienus*, London, 1938.

- RIC, IV/3 – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C. H. V. Shutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, IV/3, Gordian III-Uranus Antoninus*, London, 1949.
- RIC, V/1 – P. H. Webb, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, V/1*, London, 1927.
- RIS – E. Weber (ed.), *Die römischen Inschriften der Steiermark*, Graz, 1969.
- RIU III – L. Barkóczi, S. Soproni, *Die römische Inschriften Ungarns, 3. Liefereng: Brigetio (Fortsetzung) und die Limesstrecke am Donauknie*, Budapest–Bonn, 1981.
- RMD – *Roman Military Diplomas*, London, I (M.M. Roxan, 1978), II (M.M. Roxan, 1985), III (M.M. Roxan, 1993), IV (M.M. Roxan, P.A. Holder, 2003), V (P.A. Holder, 2006)
- RMM-MIA – Revista muzeelor și monumentelor. Monumente istorice și de artă, București
- RPC I – A. Burnett, M. Amandry, P.P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage, I. From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC-AD 69)*, London – Paris, 1992.
- RPC II – A. Burnett, M. Amandry, I. Carradice, *Roman Provincial Coinage, II. From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69-96)*, London – Paris, 1999.
- SAA – *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica*. Universitatea „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași
- SAI – *Studii și Articole de Istorie*, București
- Sargetia – *Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane*, Deva
- SchwNumRu – *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*, Bern
- Science – *Science*, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington DC
- SCIV(A) – *Studii și cercetări de istorie veche (și arheologie)*. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- SCN – *Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică*. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- Scripta Valachica – *Scripta Valachica, Studii și materiale de istorie și istorie a culturii*, Târgoviște
- SEG – *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden 1923-1971, Alphen aan den Rijn 1979-1980, Amsterdam 1979-2005, Boston 2006-
- Semitica et Classica – *Semitica et Classica. Revue internationale d'études orientales et méditerranéennes. International Journal of Oriental and Mediterranean Studies*, Paris – Turnhout
- SlovArch – *Slovenská Archeológia*, Nitra
- SMA – *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Series*
- SNG Copenhagen 2 – *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Copenhagen. The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals. Danish National Museum, Volume 2. Macedonia and Thrace*, reprint of original edition, New Jersey, 1981.
- SNG BM Black Sea – *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Great Britain, Volume IX, British Museum, Part 1: The Black Sea*, London, 1993.
- SNG Stancomb – *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Great Britain, Volume XI, The William Stancomb Collection of Coins of the Black Sea Region*, Oxford, 2000.
- Southwestern Journal of Anthropology – *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, University of Chicago, Chicago
- SP – *Studii de Preistorie*, București
- Starinar – *Starinar, Arheologskog Instituta*, Belgrade
- StCl – *Studii Clasice*, București
- StComPitești – *Studii și Comunicări, Pitești*
- StComBrukenthal – *Studii și Comunicări, Muzeul Național Brukenthal*, Sibiu
- StComSatuMare – *Studii și Comunicări. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare, Satu Mare*
- Stratum plus – *Stratum, Vysshaya Antropologicheskaya Shkola*, Chișinău
- Studia Palmyrenskie – *Studia Palmyrenskie, Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology*, University of Warsaw, Warsaw
- Studia Troica – *Studia Troica, Universität Tübingen, University of Cincinnati, Mainz am Rhein*
- Südost-Forschungen – *Südost-Institut München, Deutsches Auslandswissenschaftliches Institut (Berlin, Germany), Leipzig*
- Symbolae Osloenses – *Symbolae Osloenses. Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies*, Oslo
- SympThrac 1 – *Symposia Thracologica, I, Institutul de Tracologie, Craiova*, 1983
- SympThrac 2 – *Symposia Thracologica, II, Institutul de Tracologie, Drobeta-Turnu Severin*, 1984
- SympThrac 5 – *Symposia Thracologica, V, Institutul de Tracologie, Miercurea Ciuc*, 1987

- SympThrac 7 – Symposia Thracologica, VII, Institutul de Tracologie, Tulcea, 1989
- Terra Sebus – Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis, Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeş
- The Antiquaries Journal – The Antiquaries Journal, Society of Antiquaries of London
- Theory, Culture and Society – Theory, Culture and Society, Universitz of London, London
- ThesCRA* – *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum*, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum: I-II (2004), III-V (2005), VI (2011), VII-VIII (2012), Index (2014)
- The Numismatist – The Numismatist, The American Numismatic association
- Thracia – Thracia, Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite, Institut po trakologia, Serdica
- Thracia Pontica 4 – M. Lazarov *et alii* (eds.), *Thracia Pontica. Quatrieme Symposium International, Sozopol 6-12 Octobre 1988*, Sofia, 1991.
- Thraco-Dacica – Thraco-Dacica. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, Bucureşti
- TIR – Tabula Imperii Romani, Romula-Durostorum-Tomis, Bucarest, 1969.
- TPAPhS – Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Society. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore
- TÜBA-AR – Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi
- Tyche – Tyche. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Wien
- Tyragetia – Tyragetia. Anuarul Muzeului Naţional de Istorie a Moldovei, Chişinău
- Tyragetia International – Tyragetia International, Muzeul Naţional de Istorie a Moldovei, Chişinău
- UPA – Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie, Bonn
- Valachica – Studii şi cercetări de istorie şi istoria culturii, Târgovişte
- VDI – Vestnik Drevnej Istorii, Moskva
- World Archaeology – World Archaeology, Taylor & Francis
- ZfE – Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, Berlin
- ZfN – Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Berlin
- ZPE – Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Bonn
- ZSav – Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung, Wien