

Michał Pawleta*

**TOWARDS A NEW SYNTHESIS
OF THE PREHISTORY OF POLISH LANDS.
SOME REMARKS ON
“THE PAST SOCIETIES. POLISH LANDS
FROM THE FIRST EVIDENCE OF HUMAN PRESENCE
TO THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES”**

ABSTRACT

Pawleta M. 2018. Towards a new synthesis of the prehistory of Polish lands. Some remarks on “The Past Societies. Polish lands from the first evidence of human presence to the early Middle Ages”. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 70, 353-373.

The article discusses the recently published (2016) five-volume synthesis entitled “The Past Societies. Polish lands from the first evidence of human presence to the early Middle Ages”, edited by Przemysław Urbańczyk. It is a long-overdue publication, written by a group of sixty archaeologists, presenting in subsequent chapters the oldest history of Polish lands from the Palaeolithic Era to the Early Middle Ages (1000 AD). Instead of a systematic analysis of its scientific content – due to its extent and the abundance of issues it addresses, this is impossible for one author – this article takes under scrutiny the main initial goals and ideas of this compendium, its theoretical and methodological assumptions along with the proclaimed anthropological and less materialistic approach to the human past as well as its editorial layout. It also addresses the crucial aspect of the accessibility of this publication.

Keywords: synthesis, the prehistory of Polish lands, new discoveries, the social past, an anthropological approach, theory of archaeology, accessibility

Received: 10.09.2018; Revised: 16.09.2018; Accepted: 20.09.2018

* Institute of Archaeology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Umultowska st. 89d, 61-614 Poznań;
mpawleta@amu.edu.pl

INTRODUCTION

Nearly four decades have passed since the last comprehensive compendium about the oldest history of Polish lands was published. A previous, five-volume publication of a similar character and extent, namely “Prahistoria ziem polskich” (“The Prehistory of Polish Lands”, acronym “PZP”), was published in the period between 1975-1981 (Chmielewski and Hensel 1975; Machnik *et al.* 1978 Gardawski 1979; Hensel and Wiślański 1979; Hensel, Bukowski and Wielowiejski 1981). It was written by researchers from the Institute of Material Culture of Polish Academy of Sciences (now known as the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of Polish Academy of Sciences) where “The Past Societies” was also published. Apart from a few minor publications (e.g., Godłowski and Kozłowski 1976; Jażdżewski 1981; Blajer and Kmiecński 1989; Chmielewski and Kmiecński 1989; Ostoja Zagórski 1998; 2005; Kozłowski, Kaczanowski 1998) since then there has been no publication of a similar character, length and chronological scope in Polish archaeology.

“The Past Societies” (hereinafter referred to as “TPS”) – similarly to its antecedent, namely PZP – is also a five-volume set, aspiring to be a compendium of present knowledge about Polish lands up to the year 1000 AD. It is a synthesis of this territory from the first evidence of human presence to the Early Middle Ages. It encompasses the results of new discoveries and research undertaken mainly in connection with huge infrastructural investments in Poland over the last few decades. These have provided us with a huge amount of archaeological data which permitted the revision of existing arrangements on the oldest history of Polish lands. The main editor of the series is Przemysław Urbańczyk and the editors of subsequent volumes are as follows: Jacek Kabaciński (vol. 1), Piotr Włodarczak (vol. 2), Urszula Bugaj (vol. 3), Aleksandra Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz (vol. 4) and Maciej Trzeciecki and Przemysław Urbańczyk (vol. 5). All chapters take the form of scientific essays presenting the long history of the societies which have inhabited Polish lands in a chronological order.

“TPS” is the outcome of collaboration with dozens of authors from universities and archaeological museums from Warszawa, Kraków, Poznań, Olsztyn, Rzeszów and Wrocław. The work was financed by the National Program for Development of the Humanities (2012-2017). It was prepared and written by prominent experts in archaeology but also by young researchers. The preparation of this work lasted five years. It was published in 100 (*sic!*) printed copies, yet it is also available for purchase *via* the App Store as an iBook. The publisher is the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Polish Academy of Sciences. The language of the publication is English.

“THE PAST SOCIETIES” – INITIAL AIMS, ASSUMPTIONS AND IDEAS

The foremost aim of “TPS” was a presentation in a synthetic and up-to-date publication an outline of the current state of knowledge about past societies in Poland. As its main editor, P. Urbańczyk, states in the introduction: “the present project offers an attempt to redirect archaeological discourse about the past towards a more social and less material approach”. The main stress then was put on an anthropological approach in describing past people and past social processes; it is also reflected in the very title of the publication, namely “The Past Societies”. Approached from such a perspective, past artifacts were not analyzed in detail as such but rather they were considered as a prime source of information about the people of the past. Thus, the publication tries to go beyond the material-oriented approach that has dominated culture-historical archaeology. On the contrary, the main focus is placed on broader approaches that address “the social aspects of processes described in specific temporal and spatial contexts”. In Polish archaeology, this has to be seen as a significant and a long overdue shift in approach. Thus, the volumes in question certainly should be considered a very valuable publication, meeting the high standards of scientific research and being up-to-date compendium of the oldest history of Polish lands.

The editors and authors of “TPS” were quite aware of a fact that – using words of P. Urbańczyk, expressed in a “Preface” – “this was no easy task, as the physical nature of archaeological evidence forces our attention on the reality of material culture, whereas the social and symbolic side of history is more difficult to study”. Yet most of them see the urgent necessity of leaving behind the naïve belief in the cumulative growth of knowledge about the past and the need to re-evaluate with considerable frequency even well-established views. Consequently, they make attempts to shift the stress in interpreting the past from a material approach towards a more social one. Yet, they also notice that “this shift does not, however, change the fact that archaeology is very well suited to combining the humanities with the exact sciences”. This means that contemporary archaeology has to be open to the interdisciplinarity of research as a key element of any archaeological endeavour since it can shed new light on discoveries and existing interpretations.

Seen from such a perspective, “TPS” is a very ambitious enterprise and worthy of the highest appreciation. It presents ongoing progress in Polish archaeology on several levels that allow the re-evaluation of current knowledge about the past and researching it in more complex and nuanced ways. This is possible thanks to the fact that it is based on: (a) new archaeological data and discoveries made over the last decades, mainly during works at large investments in Poland; (b) the application of new research methods (e.g., non-invasive methods, analysis of ancient DNA, X-ray or chemical analyses, etc.); (c) new ways of interpreting and writing about the prehistory from the anthropological perspective.

LAYOUT, CONTENT AND STYLE OF THE VOLUMES

It is virtually impossible to provide even briefly a substantive and comprehensive evaluation of a work of almost 1,800 pages of print in a short article. Bearing in mind the chronological scope of this work and number of issues and problems it addresses, only a few people would be able to competently assess a narrative related to a period in Poland beginning with the Palaeolithic and ending with the Early Middle Ages. Thus, it is also not my intention even to try to make an attempt to assess the scientific content of particular volumes or their subsequent chapters. Instead, I will rather conduct a short critical analysis of how the initial presumptions of the whole publication have been completed and how it fits the concept of a synthesis. Consequently, I will focus my attention on some interconnected issues, mainly: methods of archaeological research (e.g., new research techniques, interdisciplinarity); methodology and theory of archaeology (new and existing theories, interpretations, underlying assumptions); editorial layout as well as an aspect of dissemination of the knowledge about the past among the general public by “TPS”. Taking the abovementioned issues under scrutiny, I will try to answer whether this synthesis has achieved its stated goals or not.

The editors and authors of “TPS” were guided by the idea of a publication in a form of the up-to-date synthesis of the oldest history of Polish lands, written in an essayistic convention. Such a form (an essay) is conceived by them as one that suits best the needs of professional archaeologists and students of archaeology but also a wider, non-professional audience interested in the subject. In order to assess the abovementioned issues, one should consider what a scientific synthesis is and what constitutes its inseparable elements. The synthesis of the past is both a reconstruction of bygone processes and at the same a particular vision of the past. Its content arises as a result of the selection by scientists (archaeologists, historians, etc.) of some facts from the past and the creation on this basis of a certain narration about bygone times. However, a closer reflection on the character of such a synthesis is associated with the most complex dilemmas of philosophy, referring to the solution of a problem to what extent the reconstruction of the past “wie es eigentlich gewesen war” (referring to Leopold von Ranke’s famous assertion) is possible. On the one hand, it is obvious that such a reconstruction (or perhaps better: interpretation, narration or construction) cannot be placed within the past as in the ontic sense it does not exist anymore. On the other, it cannot be assumed that consequences of past events are unknown to us as they were to their participants. Every description of the past is thus a presently made selection of past facts from the point of view of their consequences already known to us. However, the impossibility of ever knowing of “how it really was” in the past does not mean that we should not try to get as close to this elusive goal as possible.

While preparing a synthesis of the prehistory of Polish lands in light of new discoveries, an abundance of new archaeological data and the new research methods applied, the

editors of "TPS" point out that: "the variety of approaches, newly emerging aspects, emphasis on a new range of issues – all of this makes it hard to even imagine such a synthesis" (vol. 2, 19). This means that "the volumes are hardly the same, the differences being due to the uniqueness of the given periods, the distinctness of the methods applied, the state of investigation into human communities from the given time, and the approach that particular researchers adopt toward the issues in question" (vol. 1, 10).

The five-volume set is the outcome of the work of sixty authors who were divided into five teams. The editors employed a strictly chronological criterion in presenting the oldest history of Polish lands (into the Palaeolithic Era, the Mesolithic Era, the Neolithic Era, the Bronze Age, the Iron Age, and the Early Middle Ages) in order to reduce "the effects of the traditional systematization of prehistory and protohistory". Consequently, the subsequent chapters of individual volumes also follow a chronological path.

Volume one embraces the period between 500,000-5,500 BC, that is from the appearance of the first humans until the Mesolithic Era. It was edited by Jacek Kabaciński. It was a period when a lifestyle of hunting, fishing and gathering societies gradually transformed – against the backdrop in the natural environmental changes – into agrarian societies which had dramatic consequences for their lives. Volume one consists of fourteen chapters: "Preface" (J. Kabaciński), "Changes in the natural environment in Polish territory in the Pleistocene and Early Holocene" (P. Socha, D. Nalepka and A. Nadachowski), "Fauna and humans in the changing climate and environment of the Pleistocene and Early Holocene" (A. Nadachowski), "The first humans. Societies of the Lower and Middle Palaeolithic" (A. Wiśniewski), "The Early Upper Palaeolithic in Poland" (A. Wiśniewski and J. Wilczyński), "A new beginning: modern humans in Poland" (J. Wilczyński), "On the peripheries of the Magdalenian world. Magdalenian hunters north of the Carpathian and Sudety Mountains" (M. Połtowicz-Bobak), "The first hunters of the Lowland" (J. Kabaciński), "Hunter-gatherers in the Allerod forests" (I. Sobkowiak-Tabaka), "The last Late Glacial hunter-gatherers" (I. Sobkowiak-Tabaka), "The mutual influence and intergroup contacts of hunting and gathering communities in Polish territory between 14,000 and 6,000 cal BP" (Z. Sulgustowska), "After the Ice Age" (J. Kabaciński), "Mesolithic hunter-gatherers of the Atlantic forests" (M. Masojć), "Burial rituals in the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic in Polish territories" (Z. Sulgustowska), "The symbolic world of foragers" (T. Płonka).

The second volume was edited by Piotr Włodarczak and encompasses a period between 5500-2000 BC – the Neolithic. It envisioned the expansion and depending establishment of agrarian societies. It was a time of the stabilization of settlement that enabled the population to increase. It was characterized by stone tools shaped by polishing or grinding, a dependence on domesticated plants or animals, settlement in permanent villages, novel types of cemeteries and monumental graves, and the appearance of such crafts as pottery and weaving. This volume consists of eleven chapters, including "Preface" by P. Włodarczak. As he states: "is thus by no means such a synthesis, as it depicts the societies of the Neolithic in diverse ways, ones dependent on the intentions of individual authors" (vol. 2, 19).

Subsequent chapters are as follows: “The first farmers from the south – Linear Pottery Culture” (A. Czekaj-Zastawny), “The Danubian world and the dawn of the metal ages” (S. Kadrow), “Hunter-gatherers and the first farmers” (A. Czekaj-Zastawny and J. Kabaćniński), “Ubiquitous settlers, consequent farmers, and monument builders” (M. Nowak), “From south to north. Baden culture people and their Neighbours” (A. Przybył), “Collective graves, flint axes, and cows. The people of Globular Amphora culture on the Vistula and Odra” (M. Szmyt), “Battle-axes and beakers. The Final Eneolithic societies” (P. Włodarczak), “Beyond the world of farmers: the Subneolithic, 4000-2000 BC” (J. Sobieraj), “Dagger means power: Western Poland, 2300-2000 BC” (U. Bugaj), “Towards the Bronze Age in south-eastern Poland (2300-2000 BC)” (P. Włodarczak).

Volume three, which was edited by Urszula Bugaj, covers the period between 2000-500 BC. It describes the Bronze Age – the time of spreading use of metals, accelerating differentiation of social structures and intensifying long-distance contacts trading and progressive specialization in many areas of life. It also witnessed the emergence of new categories of everyday goods as ceramics and weapons, changes in burial practice, the development of metallurgy and the expanding symbolism of material culture. This volume consists of ten chapters, including a “Preface” by S. Kadrow. The subsequent chapters are as follows: “Únětice metal finds from western Poland: an archaeometallurgical perspective” (U. Bugaj, K. Nejnert, S. Ilnicki, P. Wiciński, T. Onyszczyk and H. Garbacz), “Małopolska at the beginning of the Bronze Age (2000-1600 BC)” (P. Włodarczak), “The Trzciniec culture. On the periphery of Bronze Age civilization (1800-1100 BC)” (J. Górski), “The birth of a new world. Barrows, warriors, and metallurgists (1600-1200/1100 BC)” (P. Markarowicz), “The formation and breakdown of the Carpathian social networks – a discussion on the archaeological record from the Bronze Age Upper Vistula river” (M. Przybyła), “The Snares of Ostensible Homogeneity. Lusatian Culture or Lusatian Urnfields?” (M. Kaczmarek), “Late Bronze and Early Iron Age communities in the northern part of the Polish Lowland (1000-500 BC)” (K. Dziągiewski), “The rise and fall of Biskupin and its counterparts” (K. Dziągiewski), “The Hallstatt Period in Śląsk” (J. Baron).

Volume four refers to the period between 500 BC and 500 AD and was edited by Aleksandra Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz. It addresses the time when Europe was undergoing rapid transformations together with the migration of large societies. Contact with the great civilizations of the period – the Celts, Romans or Germanics – gave social and cultural processes an extraordinary dynamism, what was partially reflected in rich material culture of that time. Volume four consists of nine chapters, forwarded by a short “Preface” by A. Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz. The following chapters include: “Societies of the younger segment of the early Iron Age in Poland (500–250 BC)” (K. Dziągiewski), “The societies of West Balt Barrow culture, 500 BC–1 AD” (M. Hoffmann and A. Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz), “It’s a Man’s World... Germanic societies of the Jastorf and the Przeworsk cultures in southern and central Poland (300 BC–10 AD)” (A. Maciałowicz), “Pomorze in the final centuries BC” (A. Strobini), “With gold and sword. Contacts of Celts and early Germanics

in central Europe. The historical background: 3rd–1st c. BC” (A. Maciałowicz, M. Rudnicki and A. Strobin), “Przeworsk culture society and its long-distance contacts, AD 1–350” (B. Kontny), “The society of Wielbark culture, AD 1–300” (A. Cieśliński), “The Balt societies in Poland, 1–500 AD” (A. Bitner-Wróblewska and A. Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz), “Societies in the lands of Poland, from 350 AD until 500 AD” (J. Rodzińska-Nowak).

The last, fifth volume encapsulates a period between 500 AD and 1000 AD and was edited by Maciej Trzeciecki and Przemysław Urbańczyk. It sums up the five hundred years during which early Slavonic communities passed from dispersed agricultural groups to a centralized early Piast state. The chapters are as follows: “Preface” (P. Urbańczyk), “Early-Slavic culture” (B. Szmoniewski), “Baltic communities present between 500 and 700 AD in today’s Poland” (A. Bitner-Wróblewska and A. Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz), “From a tribe to a state” (S. Moździoch), “Baltic communities present in today’s Polish territory between 700 and 1000 AD” (T. Nowakiewicz), “Intercultural relations of the inhabitants of Polish territory in the 9th and 10th centuries” (M. Bogucki), “The emergence of the territorial state” (M. Trzeciecki).

As can be seen by the very titles of subsequent chapters, the diversity of issues and problems raised in five volumes of “TPS” is abundant. The authors, representing different archaeological schools, present new archaeological data, change or “alter the existing theories” and describe the social aspects of past processes. Thus, the monograph comes as a much-needed contribution to available knowledge concerning the oldest history of Polish lands.

However, the general outline and scope of the volumes, as well as their division, raises some questions and thus needs some comments. In contrast to “PZP”, which took the form of a rather unified synthesis of the oldest times of Polish lands, the individual volumes as well as chapters were very similar in terms of their structure and content (which generally included such aspects as chronology, cultural division, analysis and typology of material culture, presentation of burial rites, social and economic aspects, etc.), “TPS” is completely different. It consists of essays written by archaeologists from various archaeological centres in Poland who specialize in particular periods of prehistory. What is of a great value is that they were collected in one publication. As it has been already mentioned above, an initial aim of editors of “TPS” was to employ an essayistic convention of chapters that not only suits the needs of professional archaeologists but also appeals to a non-professional audience. Consequently, the essays were not written in the form of conventional academic lectures, overloaded with scientific jargon, but they are rather more scientific-popular. Such a strategy was also aimed at reaching out to the general public— either through the content or the easy-to-read texts. Hence, particular essays are centred around selected issues and pivotal points in the development of past human societies. Yet, they differ as some are more concerned with facts, making them more descriptive, while others are more interpretative in nature and debatable.

What is worth stressing is that most of the chapters presented in this five-volume compendium are not so much concerned with presenting only factual material, chronology,

typology of artefacts, etc., but they also strive for their broader contextualization and presentation in a wide network of social and cultural issues. Thus, they leave once-established schemata and rather narrow culture-historical approach and depart from traditional description of the past through the prism of archaeological cultures and abstract processes (Tabaczyński 2000) in favour of a more humanistic approach, something which the very title “The Past Societies” clearly illustrates. Such an approach was virtually absent in “PZP”.

Separate boxes that constitute an integral part of some essays are also worth mentioning here. Apart from the main body text, several chapters include separate boxes in which important archaeological sites, finds and cultural phenomena of broader significance are discussed (e.g., ochre, cultivated and wild plants, animal husbandry, salt production by the Funnel Beaker culture communities, the sepulchral complex at the Koszyce 3 site of the Globular Amphora Culture populations). They are attractive from the point of view of readers as they make the narrations less hierarchized and more understandable.

Although I find the essayistic convention a laudable idea, sometimes it does not exactly work and this means that “TPS” is inconsistent in this regard, unclear as to what the main key was to the organization and structure of particular essays. It includes some more traditional and scientific essays addressed mainly to the archaeological milieu but also chapters where the authors have made successful attempts to reach the general public while at the same time respecting scientific standards of publication. In effect, some of essays meet the standards of non-professional recipients and educated part of society interested in a distant past, however some of them are deprived of popularizing elements and style. This does not mean that they are not good in terms of archaeology, but only that they would not easy understandable for non-professionals. Considering that there are sixty different authors, it is hard to expect that the essays would be unified, yet in my opinion this discrepancy in a style might impede the reception of “TPS” seeing as a whole.

Looking from a reader’s perspective what is particularly missing is a glossary of terms. There are a lot of specialist and abstract terms which are unknown to non-professionals, such as badenization, eneolithization, anthropomorphization, etc. It would be recommended that every volume was thus provided with even a short glossary of essential archaeological terms that need explanation. This would certainly be a great advantage and a helpful device enabling potential readers, both professionals and non-professionals, to become more easily acquainted with the content presented in this publication. In my opinion, this aspect requires complementation if the publication is aimed at going beyond professional archaeologists and to reach a wider non-archaeological audience as was the initial intention of the authors of “TPS”.

As I mentioned earlier, “TPS” consists of either texts with distinctly scientific contents and those that additionally include good dissemination elements and textual strategies. The former style slightly prevails. Yet, none of essays can be said to be purely scientific or only popularizing: this is always a question of a degree. The question of to what extent the authors use stylistic features specific for a scientific or popularizing style is a question

about their individual writing preferences and/or abilities. It is also an issue of how they perceive the process of reconstructing / interpreting / giving meaning to the past as well as giving voices to people hidden behind past material culture. In my opinion, the chapters that link the scientific content with “popularizing” style more successfully meet initial requirements and aims of “TPS”. For that reason, a proposal should be made that the authors of any synthesis of prehistory – which undoubtedly “TPS” is – on the one hand construct their style of writing in order to maintain the scientific authority and preserve the element of science, and on the other try to reduce the distance to potential recipients in order to be persuasive and clearly understandable (c.f. Fagan 2005).

TOWARDS A GROWING COMPLEXITY AND INTERDISCIPLINARITY: METHODS, METHODOLOGY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY

Having in mind the number of the authors of “TPS”, as well as a range of archaeological periods and different topics it covers, a diversity of approaches, methodologies and research methods should be expected; this is also the case here. Generally, the main and shared organisational schemata of the whole-volume set, as well as of particular chapters, is a chronological division. It was caused by the significant growth of archaeological sources that has shifted the focus from taxonomic divisions (e.g., archaeological cultures) to chronological ones as well as to the characterization of the differences between small microregions. Such an approach enables changes taking place at different scales, both macro- and microregional to be captured and to present regional diversities and differences instead of a more traditional schemata of portraying the past through the prism of the appearance and decline of archaeological cultures over the course of time. It should thus be seen as a more nuanced and diverse attitude enabling a more adequate explanation of the broader processes that took place in the past and goes beyond cultural categorization. It allows to show the past not as a mosaic of archaeological cultures identified by archaeologists, but through broader processes and social connection networks taking place on both regional and pan-European scales. Yet, not all of authors manage this and a few remain at a more traditional, material description of archaeological remains and patterns (e.g., vol. 1, chapter 6; vol. 4, chapter 1).

“TPS” delivers new information about the past’s technology, production methods, agriculture, animal husbandry, mining, pottery production, economy, burial rites, social organization and many other aspects of bygone life during a long-time span of prehistoric societies of the Polish lands. It is very important in this regard as it introduces numerous very important archaeological discoveries that have been made recently. As an example, the *temenos* (a burial ground combined with a separated sacred space) of the Funnel Beaker culture in Słonowice in western Małopolska (vol. 2, 144-145) could be presented.

This particularly spectacular feature not only confirms the long-lasting tradition of the sepulchral space of the elite of the local Funnel Beaker culture community, but also delivers valuable information that enlarge our knowledge on the social, intellectual, and technological state of development of the population that inhabited the upper Vistula river basin in the 4th millennium BC.

It is a somewhat common situation in archaeology (as in any other science) that the accumulation of knowledge often invalidates some of the interpretations made on the basis of smaller and different sets of data. This dependency is also quite evident in a case of “TPS” which frequently shows how interpretations in archaeology have been dynamically changing and that even well-established views need to be re-evaluated. An excellent example of this is the so called “the Hallstatt Period in Śląsk” (vol. 3, chapter 10) re-interpreted from the perspective of spectacular discoveries made recently in Domasław near Wrocław, where a cemetery with ca. 300 richly furnished chamber graves was excavated. It has led to the revision of earlier views on this area’s links with Hallstatt culture and changes our knowledge of the scale of the cultural transformations that occurred in this part of Poland at the threshold of the Iron Age.

What should be found of a great importance is the interdisciplinarity of archaeological research evidenced either in its growing specialization and collaboration with the exact and natural sciences. New technological and methodological discoveries in natural and hard sciences enabled archaeology to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations and this has resulted in the introduction of new branches and specialisations that need to be accommodated and integrated within its previous status-quo. Consequently, the authors in individual chapters refer to the results of many specialist analyses used in contemporary archaeological research. Among them, the growing use of a wide range of bioarchaeological analyses of human skeletal remains (but also of animal bones and plants), including genetic and isotopic research, is clearly observable. Thus, there is no doubt that in coming years they will be at the centre of attention for researchers. Numerous examples of the analysis undertaken of ancient DNA human remains can be recalled here. For example, genetics confirmed close relations of indigenous hunter-gatherers and Brześć Kujawski group and a difference of European foragers (having U haplogroup) and Danubian farmers with N1a and H haplogroups (vol. II, 119). DNA analyses were also conducted in case of materials derived from younger periods of prehistory. For instance, paleogenetic techniques (the analysis of modern DNA) have shown that Slavic mtDNA displays a high level of homogeneity and does not differ significantly from that of other European populations (vol. 5, 28-29). Also mentioned was how X-ray images of bones can reveal the presence of stress fractures (vol. 2, 323) or analyses of strontium, calcium, and barium isotope levels in human teeth reveal the quality of diet of human populations. This kind of research proves to be useful in the reconstruction of the biological state and living conditions of past populations, including the elements of palaeo-diet (vol. 2, 223; vol. 4, 204).

Authors also refer to specialist analyses of artefacts. Among them are: chemical analyses of inner surfaces of ceramics showing traces of processed milk preserved in the form of lipids on the walls of clay vessels of Neolithic communities (vol. 2, 44, 225); analyses of crucibles using optical, confocal and scanning microscopy, defectoscopy, x-ray spectroscopy in macro-scale (XRF) and micro-scale (SEM/EDS) that confirmed that the middle and late Bronze Age ceramic mass had contact with molten metal (vol. 3, 176); archaeometallurgical analyses of artefacts, for example of Ūnětice metal finds from western Poland (vol. 3, chapter 2), or the bronze objects that were studied macroscopically and chemically (XRF analysis) or with an electron microscope and energy-dispersive spectrometer (SEM/EDS) to determine their composition and structure (vol. 3, 174); use-wear analyses of flint, stone, and bone tools, including microscopic traces of wear that demonstrated traces of activities connected with them, for example meat or animal hide processing (vol. 1, 207; vol. 2, 51, 224).

Also, especially in the case of older periods of prehistory, the authors refer to palynological, mineralogical, and chemical research (vol. 1, 203) that can provide insights into climate and environment; they not only demonstrate changes of the past natural environment but also how this affected human behaviour. Such analyses also confirmed their usefulness in the case of younger periods of prehistory, such as for example pollen grains (along with the remains of domesticated animals) that proved the benefit of an agricultural economy that appeared at the beginning of the 4th millennium BC. (vol. 2, 120).

There are also a lot of references to non-invasive research in archaeology – aerial photography, LiDAR or geophysics – which have allowed the identification of many previously unknown prehistoric structures. It suffices to mention rondels, an ambiguous structure type which have recently been detected. One was discovered in Wenecja near Biskupin in Kujawy, while another Neolithic circular enclosure (roundel) of the Stroke-Ornamented Pottery culture was identified and then excavated in Bodzów in western Poland (vol. 2, 77). Most commonly they are considered to be astronomical observatories and places for performing cult rituals combined with the periodic meetings of the people from a given area. Alternatively, they could have been fortifications, refugia, kraals, etc.

It goes without saying that interdisciplinary projects undertaken by archaeologists, as well as the new technologies successfully employed by them, can partially lead to overcoming the practical limitations of the discipline. In particular, the collaboration between archaeology and environmental/natural and exact sciences is quite promising. It can provide valuable insights into natural environmental processes, different human adaptations to the environment, the human impact on the environment and so on. However, in an interdisciplinary endeavor it has to be made certain that every stage of the research should be aided by specialists from other disciplines bordering on archaeology. What is also important is that it has to comply with archaeological theory and methods of research; only then can interpretations be proposed (Minta-Tworzowska 2006).

An application of any research methods in archaeology must not be disconnected from methodology and theoretical approaches; this refers us to a very important issue, namely the methodology of archaeology. While one cannot expect a methodological compendium in a publication planned to be a general synthesis of the Polish lands, as it does not pretend to be a methodological piece of work, it is nonetheless very important. Since theory is inseparable from any stage of research, playing a steering and controlling role whether we like it or not, the use of discipline-specific theoretical frameworks, analytical tools, and methods of data interpretation is crucial in any interpretation of the past. Putting it simply: “theory is the order we put facts in” (Johnson 2010, 2). Seen from such a perspective, the synthesis of the past is an effect of combining selected facts, resulting in a comprehensive and coherent narration. The content of the synthesis is thus an outcome of the selection of certain facts while its basic condition is the coherence of facts; it does not mean, however, that it is sufficient. The reconstruction (synthesis) of the past adopts some theoretical assumptions that control the process of its interpretation and generally the ways of looking at prehistory. Its most important component is a specific “view” of the past and the process of giving meaning to the past by scientists. Theory steers the cognitive process, allows it to capture the presented facts into a coherent narration and, finally, justify them. Consequently, it is impossible to construct a synthesis of the past without a theory since it is the basic element of archaeological research. What also has to be remembered is that the synthesis of the past, understood as a reconstruction of bygone times, includes not only the past facts, since it is always influenced by many conditions, but also includes the present context in which it is created.

Thus, some general theoretical assumptions of “TPS” should be formulated *expressis verbis*, yet some essays are lacking a clear statement of which theory and analytical categories they apply to interpret past facts. In sum, we have been provided with one general picture of the prehistory of Polish lands, written by different authors, and this may cause some confusion. Obviously, this does not aim to raise objections to authors as they try to report a state of knowledge about particular periods of prehistory. It could be done even briefly by the editors of particular volumes at the very least. It is known that various paradigms approach an explanation of the same processes or phenomena differently. In sum, every time the picture of the past is a result of a certain approach applied and adoption of some theoretical assumptions used in analysis of material remains. The absence of an explanation of which theoretical assumptions are applied by archaeologists does not make the reception of “TPS” easier.

The use of discipline-specific theoretical frameworks, analytical tools and methods of data interpretation is crucial in the interpretation of the past and many authors of this publication are aware of this connection. It is impossible to refer to or to trace all methodological aspects presented explicit or implicit in particular chapters but only some general remarks can be made. In the case of “TPS”, authors represent different theoretical approaches and various archaeological schools of thought, from cultural-historical,

through processual, functionalist, structuralist to including some elements of symbolic, contextual or postprocessual archaeology. What is important is that the majority of authors of “TPS” go beyond the traditional models of reasoning applied by the cultural-historical school of archaeology and try to show changes in particular periods of prehistory not so much as changes in material culture patterns only, but to present them in a broader context of ideological, social and economic changes that are reflected, for example, in modes of economy, subsistence, settlement patterns, funeral rites, etc.

Let me refer here to one particular topic as an example, namely to the funerary sphere of past people and social issues along with the stratification determined on its basis. In “TPS” we can mostly observe an approach to funerary rites in the wider context of ideological, social or economic changes of past societies. It leaves the narrow notion of the status of the deceased as a reflection of his/her wealth during their life or a position in a given society. Most promising here seem to be analyses of burials as arenas of social display (vol. 2, 304-305; 386-389; vol. 3, 225). However, a few authors do not propose the broader interpretation of funerary rites in terms of social issues and only stick to describing graves and grave goods (vol. 4, 58-64) and accessing the status of the deceased on the basis of grave goods (vol. 1, 307). Such an approach has its roots in older literature and for many years has been criticised by numerous archaeologists who present the complicated nature of mortuary rituals and burial practices that means that the status of the dead cannot simply be read-off on the basis of grave goods (Parker-Pearson 1999). In some of the chapters there can also be found anachronisms, especially when skeletal remains have not been anthropologically determined by sex and age, as for example an assumed strict gender-division of labour as reflected in grave goods, male dominancy in past societies (as exemplified by the notion of the exchange of women with the peoples living in Carpathian and trans-Carpathian territory in the Trzciniec culture – vol. 3, 109), or using of ethnographic analogies out of context (e.g., the explanation of the practicing of cannibalism by prehistoric communities as evidenced (?) in Maszycka Cave by analogy to tribes in New Guinea – vol. 1, 308). We can also notice that some authors confuse the category of gender with sex, evident for example in the statement of “anthropological analyses determining the age and gender” (vol. 3, 316). However, gender is not determined by anthropologists as it is not a biological category but a cultural interpretation of sexual differences (see Arnold and Wicker 2001). Such anachronisms and shortcomings are thus a result of a lack of particular theories or the application by authors of common-sense and other taken-for-granted categories.

However, in “TPS” numerous references to social theories in archaeology can be observed. Some authors refer to models developed by social anthropologists and sociologists, e.g., for the purpose of reconstruction of the symbolic world of hunters-gatherers and foragers and the role of symbols in social communication and display (vol. 1, 319). There are also references to anthropological frameworks which accentuate the arbitrary nature of social taxonomies such as divisions into segmental organizations, chiefdoms, or tribes

(vol. 3, 298) or to the world-systems theory of Immanuel Wallerstein and the theory of core-periphery relations (vol. 3, 15). Some authors also approach material culture in a more complex and contextual way, seeing it as an important social medium (Hodder 1989). Material culture is understood by them as social agent or agency that was constantly animated, permanently revitalized and conspicuously used by specific groups of people in creation, negotiation and manipulation of meanings. (vol. 2, 259). Of importance here is also the symbolic aspect of material culture that holds a wealth of information about the people who made it. It is clearly visible for example in the process of individualization as observed in case of Eneolithic and early Bronze age communities across Europe – the case of Corded Ware and Funnel Beaker cultures (vol. 2, chapter 7). Moreover, there are a number of chapters that do not present a uniform line of interpretation but rather a multifaceted and heterogeneous one that can be seen as an indicator of the multivocality of present day archaeology (vol. 1, chapter 14).

One may regret that not all of the authors make use of social theories and there is no reference to the numerous theoretical assets present in archaeological discourse worldwide that have proven to be very useful in the interpretation of material culture – either the physical nature of archaeological evidence as well as the social and symbolic side of history. Incorporation of some of the assets that are at the core of archaeological interpretations in worldwide archaeology would certainly enrich and intersperse the proposed interpretations and lead towards a more integrated archaeological perspective.

When P. Urbańczyk states in the Preface that: “the main focus in the present publication is to trace the social aspects of processes described in specific temporal and spatial contexts”, one could expect that attention to the humanistic perspective would not only be a declaration. However, it may be striking that in the presented chapters there is no broader incorporation of theoretical standpoints that have at their core the creativity of human beings into the research. For instance, there is no reference to the notion of “agency” that may have been more fruitful in this context (e.g., Dobres and Robb 2000) as it emphasizes the active role of human beings which is not dominated entirely by abstract structures or by the discursive sphere. Also, incorporation into research of such issues as personhood (e.g., Fowler 2004), the changing notions of individuals in long-term processes (e.g., Knapp and van Dommelen 2008), human body and embodiment (e.g., Robb and Harris 2013) or human-thing entanglement (Hodder 2012) would be useful sources here as well.

Moreover, the incorporation of sociological theories into archaeological discourse and the interpretation of past social life – not only of people but also of “things” – is crucial. Let me mention here, for example, P. Bourdieu’s theory of social practice, A. Giddens’ theory of structuration, a “return to things” and the “new materiality” studies (Olsen *et al.* 2012; Olsen 2014) or action-network theory (Knappett 2011). They would enable us to see what kind of input the investigation of past materialities has in the reconstruction of human history and sociality. A deeper reflection upon the meaning of “things” for the existence of

the social world, and the recognition of the mechanisms that create everyday life and connect them with the issue of change and continuity of culture also seems to be exceptionally inspiring (Kadrow and Wojakowski 2014).

EDITORIAL LAYOUT

As with every scientific publication, the editorial level of “TPS” should also be briefly evaluated. Undoubtedly, it is a very well prepared and high quality printed set of books. It is a well-researched, logically organized and well-written publication. Every volume has been preceded by a short chapter written by its editor(-s) (except volume three, where the introduction was written by S. Kadrow). It works as a very general introduction to the issues addressed in a given volume and as a sketch of its outline. For example, in volume one J. Kabaciński describes the structure of the whole volume and its particular chapters, outlining its general layout, pointing to some key concepts, aspects and breakthroughs in this period of prehistory. He also briefly summarizes the individual chapters and puts them into the scheme of the organization of this volume. Thus, it works as a useful navigational map that facilitates the reception of the content contained herein. The rest of the volumes are also prefaced by opening chapters that generally introduce the pivotal points of given epochs. Yet, not all editors refer to individual chapters in a particular volume, something which in my opinion should be done consistently.

To facilitate the understanding of its content, the vast number of colorful illustrations, of which there are a total of over 1,600, are very helpful. Among them, there are either illustrations or photos of prehistoric artefacts and structures, but also maps, tables, graphs, drawings or photos of reconstructions of prehistoric structures (e.g., Neolithic graves, houses and huts), different tools (e.g., flint sickle insets), production processes, etc.

Despite the high quality of the publication, it contains a few minor mistakes and shortcomings. One element is the inconsistency in Polish-language geographical terms and other nomenclature. The editors of “TPS” assure us that it has been “edited with respect for Polish-language geographical terms and other nomenclature”. Thus, the regions otherwise known as Greater Poland, Lesser Poland, Pomerania or Silesia are given as Wielkopolska, Małopolska, Pomorze, and Śląsk. However, a wide margin of discretion in employing geographical terms by individual authors is observable. There can be found many examples of divergences, sometimes even in one chapter, as for example: “the Holy Cross Mountains” (vol. 1, 232); “the Masury Lake District” (vol. 1, 232), “the Masurian Lake District” (vol. 1, 284), “the Masury region” (vol. 1, 284), “Masuria” (vol. 1, 327); “the Sudeten mountains” (vol. 2, 27), “the Sudetes” (vol. 2, 327), “the Sudety” (vol. 1, 278); “Lower Śląsk” (vol. 1, 283); “Masovia” (vol. 1, 202, 327); “High Tatras” (vol. 3, 188). Such inconsistency obviously obstructs the reading of the work.

One may also find it disappointing that particular volumes of “TPS” were not equipped with any index. It suffices to recall that the main idea of a book index is to help the reader

to find necessary information quickly and easily. It is thus of great relevance and interest to readers as it guides and helps them to find what he or she may be looking for in a book. Thus, the lack of an index in a book which is meant to be used as a practical and even inspirational guide for people interested in the oldest history of Polish lands may potentially have a negative impact on its usefulness and should be considered a weak point.

What is also striking from the editorial point of view is the inconsistency in reference systems applied in particular volumes. For example, in the first volume there is no information about the publisher of a book listed in a bibliography, however in volume three it is already provided. In the first volume, page numbers of a cited publication are included at the end of a given reference, while in volume one they are in the middle of it. Moreover, sometimes the page/s of a reference in a body text is preceded by a comma, at others by a colon. It differs not only between particular volumes, but in some cases also between chapters in a single volume. Moreover, the situation is similar with captions which differ between individual volumes. Another omission is a list of volume contributors – only volume one is provided with it and the rest lacks them. On the other hand, only the chapters in volume five are preceded with short abstracts while they are absent in the remaining ones. Obviously, errors and omissions are unavoidable in such an extensive publication and they do not diminish the value of “TPS”, nevertheless these shortcomings should be corrected and complemented. It would then require a considerable amount of proof-reading work to unify all of the volumes and make the publication consistent in this regard before “TPS” is published in Polish.

A LIMITED PREHISTORY?

Last, but not least, there is also the issue of the target reader and the accessibility of “TPS” raises some justifiable doubts in this respect. It was written in English as the intention was to reach a wider audience than Polish researchers, particularly a non-scholarly one. “TPS” was published in 100 (*sic!*) copies and the price for a five-volume set is rather expensive – about 1,000 PLN (app. €230). An e-book version has also been prepared which is cheaper – a full set costs about 350 PLN (app. €16 per volume). The editor has also announced a Polish edition of “TPS” (yet the question remains if it is ready and awaits only publication or, if this is not the case, who will finance further works connected with the preparation and publication of it?).

The very limited print run of 100 copies (which includes 60 author’s copies) is something that is difficult to find an explanation for. The whole edition of “TPS” after publication was virtually out of stock in a few days. Consequently, it will not reach even the majority of Polish libraries, not to mention archaeological libraries in other countries which for sure would be very interested in purchasing “TPS” in a printed version. For the average reader, finding a paper version will be virtually impossible. The solution to this problem is an electronic version that is available for purchase only via the App Store as an iBook. The

choice of that platform was intended to guarantee the high quality of the iBook. It is true that nowadays more and more (mostly young) customers buy Apple products, however they are quite expensive. Yet, the overwhelming majority use Android and the leading PC platform of Windows. Why the editors of “TPS” did not choose the most popular platform or did not decide to prepare pdf, EPUB or MOBI versions (that also guarantee the fixity of a content) remains unclear. It is not only my objection, as similar opinions have also been presented on many Internet forums. Of course, there are a lot of benefits and advantages of using iBooks but they are still a novelty and represent a future, unknown perspective on the reading market in Poland, not to mention readers of scientific publications. Moreover, older recipients are usually not acquainted with new technological devices and it would be especially difficult for them to use iBooks if a paper version is not available for them. This will certainly result in a reduction in the number of readers of “TPS”.

Thus, I see it rather as a paradox that, due to the very limited access to “TPS”, not many would have a chance to read this publication thoroughly and to cite it in scientific publications. As a consequence, it will simply not reach even the scientific milieu, not to mention the general public. This is all the more unreasonable due to the fact that the preparation and publication of it was made possible thanks to the money of taxpayers who – through a grant from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education – spent 1.4 million PLN on the whole project. It raises an important question of why, if “TPS” was published with the financial support of a governmental NPRH programme and in fact was financed with public money, was it not done in a more accessible manner, either through a larger number of cheaper printed copies or in an electronic version via the dominant PC platform? Of course, keeping in mind the market regulations and demands, such a situation can be partly justifiable. Nonetheless, it is at odds with the proclaimed access of everyone to the past, archaeological heritage and knowledge about that heritage that archaeology has a privilege to research. Such voices can be heard among archaeologists worldwide, as well in Poland. They are congruent with the idea of archaeological heritage as public property. For example, *Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* signed in Faro in 2005 (Article 12) clearly states that the Parties undertake to “take steps to improve access to the heritage (...) in order to raise awareness about its value, the need to maintain and preserve it, and the benefits which may be derived from it”.

Sad to say, “TPS” takes a step back here. Archaeology should not be disseminated in such a limiting way as it is at odds with the declared need to raise social awareness of prehistory of Polish lands, archaeological heritage and the discipline among the general public. Such a policy finds no acceptance and can be witnessed by the petition addressed to Jarosław Gowin, Minister of Science and Higher Education and the Director of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology PAS, for “revising the publishing policy and enabling wider access to the latest knowledge about the prehistory of our homeland to a wide group of people interested in it” (see: <https://podpisz.to/petycja/apelujemy-o-zwiekszenie-nakladu-the-past-societies>, 286).

The very manner of publishing such an important and a long overdue piece – as the “TPS” clearly is – indicates a partial, and I hope unintentional, misunderstanding of present realities and a lack of a true will to reach potential readers interested in archaeology and its discoveries. Thus, it is rather a step towards closing archaeology again in an “ivory tower” (Kobyliński 2002) and losing contact with the public. This is not only my opinion, as many similar comments have been expressed on the Internet and in different social media, such as for example in the text entitled: „Reglamentowane pradzieje” (“A limited prehistory”, see: <http://naukawpolsce.pap.pl/aktualnosci/news%2C460123%2CReglamentowane-pradzieje-o-nowej-syntezie-najstarszych-dziejow-naszego-kraju.html>) or „Archeologia coraz bardziej nieznaną” (“More and more unknown archaeology”, see: <http://stalagmit.szkolanawigatorow.pl/archeologia-coraz-bardziej-nieznaną>). The distancing of archaeologists from society creates a gap. What presents a real danger here is that nowadays this gap is successively being filled by pseudoscientific publications propagating ideas of “The Great Lechia” or so called “Turboslavs” (for an analysis of this phenomenon see: Żuchowicz 2018). They are gaining in popularity and are easily accessed in most of the main bookstores in Poland. Regrettably, “TPS”, being a scientifically valid and powerful counterpoint to them, is not present on bookstore shelves.

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, “TPS” shows the great progress that has been taking place in Polish archaeology over the past few decades. It presents not only new archaeological data acquired during recent, extensive rescue research campaigns, but also attempts to present them from a quite different and novel perspective from previous ones. It generally proposes a new conceptualization of the prehistory of Polish lands from an anthropological perspective, not so much material-oriented, as well as a new, essayistic form of writing about the past. Thus, it is a long-overdue departure from the more traditional, culture-historical approach (focused mainly on chronology, typology, material analysis, cultural classifications, taxonomies, etc.) which is still predominant in Polish archaeology, towards multi-aspect analyses of prehistoric communities and historical processes that allow the presentation of important cultural, economic, social or symbolic aspects of the lives of past people. A need for such a shift has been postulated and expected by many archaeologists for a long time. This five-volume synthesis also shows the significant progress of research methods undertaken in Polish archaeology – from the application of non-invasive methods through rapprochement with the exact sciences and its increasing interdisciplinarity and specialization. These methods and approaches allow us to analyse and write in a more comprehensive way about the different aspects of lives of past societies. This seems to be the key to a wider understanding of the role, research tasks and functions of contemporary archaeology.

“TPS” is a very valuable compendium of up-to-date knowledge about the oldest times of Polish lands, written by professionals with a long history of practice in the discipline but

also by younger researchers. Although it obviously provokes some debate, the reservations expressed above cannot diminish the significance of this publication. As I mentioned at the beginning, it is impossible to analyze and assess it broadly due to its extent and the abundance of issues it covers. Thus, the scientific content of particular volumes should then be evaluated in detail in the nearest future by specialists in particular periods of prehistory. From the methodological point of view, it would be desirable in the future that researchers more explicitly state their theoretical and/or methodological standpoints and try to integrate and apply different methodological approaches in their research. This is of crucial importance in understanding archaeological practice and interpretation. The abundance of theoretically-laden approaches that touches upon crucial aspects of human pasts – be they human agency, materiality, gender, social issues, time, economy, social memory, embodiment, human-animal relations, human-environment relations, etc. (e.g., Tabaczyński *et al.* 2012; Preucel and Mrozowski 2010; Harris and Cippola 2017) – give a valuable theoretical background and enable the past to be interpreted from different and integrated perspectives. Thus, they would not only enable the presentation of the current state of field research and be a valuable contribution to our knowledge about the past but also to ongoing debates in contemporary archaeology.

Undoubtedly, “TPS” will constitute a lasting and very important contribution to the development of Polish archaeology and will underpin its place within the framework of European and world archaeology. It might also take up the challenge and engage with contemporary international discussions about the role of our discipline within the general framework of humanities and sciences dealing with the human past. Yet, the true value of this publication – apart from the opinions of specialists – will be testified in the future by the frequency it will be referred to by professionals but also how it reaches non-professionals.

References

- Arnold B. and Wicker N. L. (eds.) 2001. *Gender and the Archaeology of Death*. Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Blajer W. and Kmiecński J. (eds.) 1989. *Pradzieje ziem polskich 1(2). Epoka brązu i początki epoki żelaza*. Warszawa, Łódź: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Chmielewski W. and Hensel W. 1975. *Prahistoria ziem polskich 1. Paleolit i mezolit*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Chmielewski W. and Kmiecński J. (eds.) 1989. *Pradzieje ziem polskich 1(1). Od paleolitu do środkowego okresu lateńskiego*. Warszawa, Łódź: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Dobres A.-M. and Robb J. (eds.) 2000. *Agency in Archaeology*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Fagan B. 2005. *Writing Archaeology: Telling Stories About the Past*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Fowler C. 2004. *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Approach*. London, New York: Routledge.

- Gardawski A. (ed.) 1979. *Prahistoria Ziemi Polskich 4. Od środkowej epoki brązu do środkowego okresu lateńskiego*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Godłowski K. and Kozłowski J. K. 1976. *Historia starożytna ziem polskich*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Harris O. J and Cipolla C. N. 2017. *Archaeological Theory in the New Millennium: Introducing Current Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Hensel W., Bukowski Z. and Wielowiejski J. (eds.) 1981. *Prahistoria ziem polskich 5. Późny okres lateński i okres rzymski*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Hensel W. and Wiślański T. (eds.) 1979. *Prahistoria ziem polskich 2. Neolit*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Hodder I. (ed.) 1989. *The Meaning of Things. Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hodder I. 2012. *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things*. Malden, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jażdżewski K. 1981. *Pradzieje Europy Środkowej*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Johnson M. 2010. *Archaeological Theory. An Introduction (Second Edition)*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kaczanowski P. and Kozłowski J.K. 1998. *Najdawniejsze dzieje ziem polskich: (do VII w.)*. Warszawa: Świat Książki.
- Kadrow S. and Wojakowski D. 2014. O dyskursie archeologiczno-socjologicznym. *Studia Humanistyczne AGH* 13(2), 7-17.
- Knapp B.A. and van Domelen P. 2008. Past Practices: Rethinking Individuals and Agents in Archaeology. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 18(1), 15-34.
- Knappett C. 2011. *An Archaeology of Interaction. Network Perspectives on Material Culture and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kobyliński Z. 2002. Archaeology on the Ruins of Ivory Towers. What Sort of Theory Do We Need?, In P. F. Biehl, A. Gramsch and A. Marciniak (eds.), *Archaeologies of Europe. History, Methods and Theories*. Münster: Waxmann, 421-424.
- Machnik J., Gediga B., Miśkiewicz J. and Hensel W. (eds.) 1978. *Prahistoria ziem polskich 3. Wczesna epoka brązu*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Minta-Tworzowska D. 2006. Interdisciplinary Research and Archaeology. *Archaeologia Polona* 44, 41-51.
- Olsen B. 2013. *W obronie rzeczy: archeologia i ontologia przedmiotów*. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.
- Olsen B., Shanks M., Webmoor T. and Witmore T. 2012. *Archaeology: The Discipline of Things*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, Ltd.
- Ostoja-Zagórski J. 1998. *Polska w starożytności: (500 000 lat p.n.e – 500 lat n.e.)*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

- Ostoja-Zagórski J. 2005. *Najstarsze dzieje ziem polskich*. Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Akademii Bydgoskiej.
- Parker Pearson M. 1999. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing Limited.
- Preucel R. W. and Malden S.A. (eds.) 2010. *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory. The New Pragmatism* (Second Edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Robb J. and Harris O. J. T. 2013. *The Body in History: Europe from the Palaeolithic to the Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tabaczyński S. 2000. *Kultury archeologiczne a rzeczywistość dziejowa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Tabaczyński S., Marciniak A., Cyngot D. and Zalewska A. (eds.) 2012. *Przeszość społeczna. Próba konceptualizacji*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Żuchowicz R. 2018. *Wielka Lechia. Źródła i przyczyny popularności teorii pseudonaukowej okiem historyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Sub Lupa.

