

DISCUSSIONS AND POLEMICS

Jacek Gackowski*

THE MOST RECENT MONOGRAPH ON THE KASHUBIAN BARROWS IN THE BRONZE AND IRON AGES, IN OTHER WORDS, HOW SOME ARCHAEOLOGISTS FIND THEMSELVES IN A POST-TRUTH WORLD

ABSTRACT

Gackowski J. 2018. The most recent monograph on the Kashubian barrows in the Bronze and Iron Ages, in other words, how some archaeologists find themselves in a post-truth world. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 70, 339-351.

This text presents some critical comments on the most recent monograph by Radosław Janiak, referring to barrows of the Lusatian and Pomeranian Cultures from the region of the Kashubian Lake District. Apart from comments relating to ordinal and periodisation issues, the reviewer mainly stressed the research approach assumed in the monograph in question, one which is unjustified from the viewpoint of the present studies on prehistory. This approach leads to formulating conclusions which are not supported by either the existing source materials, or particularly in the course of non-scientific reasoning proposed by the author. Unfortunately, the latter has very little in common with the contemporary theory of studies on prehistoric cultures. Finally, it should be stressed that while Radosław Janiak has prepared a relatively extensive work, he considers stone burial mounds as separate objects, excluded from their cultural context of that time.

Keywords: burrows, Kashubian Lake District, Bronze Age, Early Iron Age

Received: 09.05.2018; Revised: 07.07.2018; Accepted: 14.09.2018

In 2014 the scientific environment engaged in studies on the history and cultural picture of Eastern Pomerania in the Younger Bronze Age was provided with a relatively extensive publication prepared by Radosław Janiak (2014) entitled: *Kurhany z młodszych okresów epoki brązu i wczesnej epoki żelaza na Pojezierzu Kaszubskim* (in English: *Burial Mounds from the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages in the Kashubian Lake District*). This work was published in book form by the Institute of Archaeology, University of Łódź, and reviewed by Andrzej Pelisiak, Professor of the University of Rzeszów, an archaeologist with long-term research experience, who specialises mainly in the Neolithic. My assessment of the scientific value of the monograph under review is presented below. However, before I explain my viewpoint it should be mentioned that the work in question had already been the subject of critical comments expressed by S. Rzepecki, to which R. Janiak responded by recalling his scientific achievements of the past years presented in the above-mentioned publication of 2014 (comp. Rzepecki 2016, 409-419; Janiak 2017, 421-431).

Preceding the major part of my assessment I would like to draw the reader's attention to a certain general aspect of papers written nowadays by archaeologists presenting results of their studies on prehistory of Eastern Pomerania. Publications of the recent decades have been released in the context of a natural process of generation change within a group of scholars engaged in archaeology of the Metal Ages in Eastern Pomerania. This group has recently spoken with the voice of relatively young people, and although they were educated based on the fundamental research knowledge developed by the generation of "masters", namely J. Kostrzewski, L. J. Łuka, or T. Malinowski, I often get the impression that a certain part of the former accepts the interpretational cannons worked out throughout many past years without any deeper reflection. In general, these narrations are often formulated in a repeatable, not to say, imitative manner, when referring to the classification of archaeological sources into three taxa: the Lusatian and Pomeranian Cultures, as well as the unit of rather mysterious nature, namely the Wielka Wieś phase/group, located between both former cultural units. Furthermore, I am afraid that the above-mentioned indiscriminate consent to this tri-partite division (obviously, lacking any ethnical divagations at present) may result in the solidification of this research approach, and consequently significantly affect the quality of conducted studies and publication of their results. Although a natural generational change is inevitable, it is hard, in my opinion, to see in the available publications an actual cognitive breakthrough in terms of cultural and chronological characteristics of the period in question. I may not be entirely fair in my assessment of the most recent achievements in the scope in question, though unfortunately this is the impression I got as I went through at least few of the above-mentioned publications.

Taking into consideration all that was said above, Janusz Podgórski, an outstanding researcher, closes, so to speak, a generation that developed (following an intense activity of former scholars, e.g. the above-mentioned L. J. Łuka, T. Malinowski or Z. Bukowski) and established regional chronological and source-based schemes, used by archaeologists presently investigating Eastern Pomerania. Admittedly, the latest conclusions proposed

by J. Podgórski raised intensive discussions but, typically of these days, they mostly emerged in works of these young archaeologists. There was a time when the issue of settlement in the Early Iron Age was addressed by J. Ostoja-Zagórski, and the attempts to interpret cultural meanings encoded within material sources of the Pomeranian Culture were made by M. Kwapiński. This trend has been very close to scholars specialised in culture-historical archaeology (e.g. M. Kowalska and A. P. Kowalski). Nevertheless, the very essence of taxonomic divisions, developed throughout many years of studies, is not subject to any serious contestation nowadays, with regard to analyses and description of sources belonging to the Lusatian and Pomeranian Cultures. Though, it must be admitted that it would be difficult to formulate any opinion on the Wielka Wieś phase without former achievements of K. Walenty in this respect. The youngest generation of today's investigators of Eastern Pomerania is associated with a few universities (University of Łódź, e.g. R. Janiak and University of Gdańsk, e.g. K. Ślusarska), and museums (Archaeological Museum in Gdańsk, P. Fudziński). The stream of palaeoenvironmental research is the most fully represented within the Lodz scientific environment (e.g. P. Kittel, or E. Grzelakowska earlier), although an activity of K. Dzięgielewski, an archaeologist from Cracow, cannot be neglected either. Into the group of researchers engaged in studies on the Eastern Pomeranian prehistory, or simply including sources from this region in their investigations, one should name a relatively young generation of archaeologists from Germany (e.g. J. Kneisel, or H. v. d. Boom earlier). Nevertheless, at this point it is difficult to judge whether the above-mentioned scientific activity of the young generation of archaeologists (in particular, within the Polish scientific environment) will achieve the level of scientific recognition sufficient to elaborate a comprehensive monograph on Eastern Pomerania in the Bronze Age, as postulated during the Sessions of Studies on Pomerania on many occasions. Having read the work by R. Janiak I have serious doubts about this, which is demonstrated in the following part of this review.

The monograph on cemeteries with burial mounds in the region of the Kashubian Lake District is a self-elaborated work by R. Janiak, based on the analysis of the current source-based knowledge, existing literature and archival materials, as well as his own investigations conducted at four necropolises. The latter were carried out in the years 2002-2013. As mentioned above, the book in question is, at first sight, a relatively excessive work, since it encloses nearly 470 pages of text (including references, English summary, tables, catalogue of known and analysed necropolises with burial mounds, figures and indices), although its substantial analytical and descriptive part, as well as conclusions drawn by the author are comprised on less than 300 pages of continuous text. This work was divided into five essential chapters addressing the issues of history and the state of research (chapter I), dating (chapter II), architectural and utilitarian shape of the burrows (chapter III), and proposition of reconstruction of funeral rites (chapter IV). The final part contains reflections referring to the burrow tradition in general (chapter V), and finally, in the "Summary" the author explained the cognitive value of his own scientific inquiries. In page 17

the author states that his work was divided into four parts, while the substantial part of this elaboration (excluding the Summary) was contained within five chapters (I-V). I particularly stressed this inconsistency since, in my reception, it is a "litmus paper" of a greater number of underdeveloped, less or more serious errors of the editorial nature. Due to this in my further assessment I decided not to address this issue at all. Jointly, 147 burrows were subject to analysis (within the total number of 163), encountered at 35 cremation cemeteries.

In the introduction R. Janiak informs a reader about his scientific approach, stating that: *this elaboration is an attempt to characterise burrows not only in terms of their location and number within particular necropolises, or their construction, the type of burial and its position within the burrow. The investigations firstly aimed to establish the significance of burrows in everyday life and system of beliefs of societies erecting those mounds, as well as changes recorded in this field* (pp. 11-12). Below, yet still in the introductory part, the author stipulated: *An extremely significant issue [...] are the relationships between the location of cemeteries with burrows of the cultural units under scrutiny [i.e. Lusatian and Pomeranian - J.G.] and the settlement forms referring to these cemeteries. This issue was purposely excluded from this elaboration. And then: The issue referring to the settlement in the Kashubian Lake District requires undertaking separate studies* (p. 19).

However, R. Janiak underlines that with his publication he responds to certain research expectations stating that: *this elaboration is an attempt, made for the first time in Polish archaeology, to compare cemeteries with burrows from the Kashubian Lake District with necropolises of this type from the regions of southern Scandinavia, Gotland and Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania* (p. 16). Unfortunately, the following pages of this book strengthened my opinion that the author had assumed an approach of a scientific ignorant in terms of significance of contextual studies (not only on a regional scale), which affected interpretations proposed by the author many times, in various fragments of the work under review.

Below I would like to draw the attention of readers to, in my opinion, the major issues and research findings contained within selected chapters of the work under review. I have also referred to the construction of this entire monograph. Firstly, there are a few comments on the manner of determining the periodisation assumed by the author. In the chapter II (*Datowanie kurhanów*, in English: *Dating of burial mounds*) the author informs a reader that such assessments should be based on the construction of a burial itself and grave offerings it contained. He drew a conclusion that cremation necropolises with burrows, in their oldest phase, can be correlated with the III period of the Bronze Age (hereinafter referred to as OEB), namely the so-called proto-Lusatian phase, however their essential development, in respect to the activity of communities counted to this cultural taxon, falls at the IV-V OEB. R. Janiak used the nomenclature developed by J. Podgórski (1992, 199), although in my opinion any considerations concerning the processes of spreading the idea of cremation influenced by the Urnfield Cultures Circle should be linked

with the phenomenon of expansion of the Lusatian Culture in the earliest phase of its development. Thus, determinations proposed by Z. Bukowski are more adequate in this respect, i.e. counting this type of sources to the early Lusatian phase (Bukowski 1998, 147-188). The difference may not be very significant, yet using the prefix “proto-“ suggests an important contribution of “Mound Culture-related” component (due to bronze artefacts encountered) in creating a cultural picture of a particular region in the Middle Bronze Age, which is difficult to prove convincingly for Eastern Pomerania. This issue was addressed in the further part of my review, concerning the relationships between the region under scrutiny and the settlement zone situated to the east of the Lower Vistula River in the middle phase of the Bronze Age. Whereas, in the following period of the so-called Wielka Wieś phase, correlated with the Ha C period, burrows were supposed to lose their significance, or at least, their number had definitely decreased when compared with those of former and following times. I believe that a much easier and more comprehensive approach would be to evaluate these processes according to the suggestion expressed by J. Dąbrowski (e.g. Dąbrowski 2005), thus consequently use the northern periodisation, and stressing the regional cultural characteristics of the VI OEB, postulated by the above-mentioned author. Indeed, the Kashubian Lake District is a fragment of geographical space, but also a part of the cultural picture of Pomerania within the Younger Bronze Age. Thus, R. Janiak, having extensive source-based knowledge on burrows and contexts of their occurrence, should have referred to the concept of distinguishing the so-called coastal Lusatian Culture, which was once proposed by the above-mentioned author (Dąbrowski 1980, 44-45), and thereby express his opinion on this proposition, and confront it with the results of his own research findings. At this point it should be mentioned that the concept of J. Dąbrowski, at the very moment of its announcement, was not accepted indiscriminately, although many of his observations have had a strong impact on discussions on the regional cultural divisions even nowadays, the best example of which are publications concerning the Tarnobrzeg group of the Lusatian Culture. This is the kind of intellectual effort that cannot be seen in the monograph by R. Janiak, which unfortunately affects the quality of narration presented in the work under review. The following and in fact, the final developmental stage of the burrow tradition is determined by relatively numerous, again, burial mounds associated with the settlement of communities of the Pomeranian Culture, erected in the initial phase of the Iron Age in Pomerania, namely the Ha D period. Also at this point a reflection referring to the periodisation nomenclature came to my mind. Personally, I tend to replace the terms of Ha D period (though mostly Ha D3) and the beginning of the La Tène period (up to the Lt B inclusively) with the proposition formulated by R. Wołągiewicz (1979), who once announced the term of the older Pre-Roman period (hereinafter referred to as SOP), and published a suitable justification in terms of its greater adequacy and source-based reliability, when compared with the “Hallstatt”, “early La Tène” and “middle La Tène” periods. Thus, also in this case an indiscriminate usage of nomenclature developed for periodisation and chronological systems from the south of Europe is totally irrelevant

for relatively objective assessment of phenomena and processes undergoing within a far distance from the culture-forming centres of the “Hallstatt” and “La Tène” cultural units in Europe.

It is also noticeable that the rhythm of changes in the number and nature of cultural quality of the “Kashubian” burrows, presented by the author, is indeed a duplication of propositions developed by J. Podgórski in 1992, which is, by the way, stressed by the author of the reviewed monograph on many occasions. At this point I would like to evoke my comments concerning periodisation, formulated above. It is important to note that an unclear cultural picture of the III OEB in Pomerania, with legible influences of the Mound and Nordic Cultures, as well as early Lusatian and generally, cultural units of eastern origins, including those of the Trzciniec Culture, would be more transparent to R. Janiak if he considered and included in his studies the findings of J. Eggers (1936, 1-47), above-quoted J. Dąbrowski (1990, 119-127), W. Blajer (1993), or finally Z. Bukowski (1998, 147-154). Admittedly, some determinations of the latter author were quoted in the monograph under review, though from my viewpoint the manner of their selection is difficult to understand.

I sincerely regret that despite the fact that the chapter II of the work in question refers to the issue of dating of burrows, I have not found there a single conclusion with regard to the literal meaning of the term of chronology, namely calendar dates. In my opinion this work lacks any factual calendar dating (e.g. radiocarbon) that would verify typological evaluations, or could be interpolated based on a traditional, northern, periodisation of the Bronze Age and the beginnings of the Iron Age. Finally, there is a general comment on a logical construction of this part of the monograph under review. In my opinion analyses of this kind can be performed once the reader was acquainted with source materials, i.a. burrows in question and related artefacts, diagnostic for the cultural and chronological evaluation of the former. Not sooner, only based on this input data, the classification of their cultural nature and the timeframes of determined progressive or regressive phenomena should be performed. Addressing the issues referring to dating before describing these finds is in fact, a plain declaration of R. Janiak that his conclusions would not bring anything new in this respect. The chapter III (*Charakterystyka kurhanów*, in English: *Characteristics of burrows*), which is admittedly very comprehensive and providing a full picture of typological variability of burial mounds, was, in my opinion, placed in the wrong fragment of the monograph since the content of this chapter is essential for evaluations contained within the chapter II, with regard to both, the “Lusatian” and “Pomeranian” burrows. Therefore, the second chapter should be moved to the third, while the third should be moved to the second one.

Whereas, the chapter IV was given an intriguing title (*Kurhanowy obrządek pogrzebowy – rekonstrukcja*, in English: *Rituals of burials under mounds – reconstruction*), which makes a reader expect that in this part of the monograph the author will provide him with reconstruction of behaviours accompanying the funerals. However, in the following

part the author states that the fact of erecting a burrow had actually crowned a certain stage of ritual and ceremonial activities. To my highest astonishment, in page 149 R. Janiak again awakes the expectation of a reader to be provided with a “recreation of a ritual scenario”. Under this reasoning, the author uses a nomenclature used in cultural anthropology and studies on religions, which cannot be documented using the methods of archaeological investigations (for instance, “the idea of holly mountain” quoted in the text on several occasions). There is not a shred of methodological reflection, therefore, at least according to my personal judgement, this part of the monograph reveals an unrestricted freedom in selection of non-scientific ideas and figures of speech. The further we get into this chapter, the more substantially irresponsible the narration becomes (e.g. in page 160: a mythological mountain rising from the ocean; in page 160 below: burrows functionally gifted with resurrection valour; in page 163 and the following: stone circle as a boundary between the *sacrum* and *profanum*; in page 168: symbolical closing up of the circumference, etc.). Escalation of verbal and interpretational constructions of this sort makes this section, unfortunately, more and more disturbing. While reading these propositions I asked myself a question where this knowledge of R. Janiak came from, since mechanical supporting such theses with works of authors in the type of M. Eliade cannot be sufficient if we consider archaeology seriously as one of the sciences, thus we aspire to be pre-historians striving to recognise the past historical processes and associate them with factual sources. Certainly, the author’s comments on the spatial expositions of burial mounds could be important for hierophanic organisation of “tamed” landscape but, except for a few remarks on the orographic nature of the region under scrutiny, the author completely neglects the issue of its botanical picture, for instance, deforestation that took place in the period between the Middle Bronze and the Early Iron Ages. Furthermore, on page 172 the author informs the reader that this stone pavement served for the “symbolic inclusion of the dead into the space of the cosmic mountain model”. Indeed, I cannot find any justification for this non-scientific and emotional fascination of the author in terms of attributing contemporary symbolic thinking to the Lusatian and Pomeranian societies. As a result, I can only suggest reading a series of publications by A. P. Kowalski referring to the issues of symbolic thinking in general, particularly a short paper written by the above-mentioned author considering the case study of Pomeranian communities (Kowalski 2009, 125-134).

The author of the monograph under review has a serious problem with the interpretation of phenomena referred to the so-called Wielka Wieś phase (e.g. on page 174). This is not surprising at all regarding his declaration to neglect the settlement evaluations, which leaves him with only three burial sites. Again, this section contains no contextual reflection concerning this crucial period. After all, the above-mentioned VI OEB (in general, correlated in terms of chronology with the Ha C period, with regard to processes affected by the influences coming from the Eastern Hallstatt civilisation) is increasingly recognisable in the territory of Poland, including the region of Pomerania. The regressive tendency in

respect to the number and nature of barrows of those times, stressed by R. Janiak on several occasions, is supposed to be associated with climatic changes. I addressed the indicated coincidence once more in the following part of my review. Finally, there is the boat-like construction from Nowa Sikorska Huta, which was the subject of a previous publication written by the author. Conclusions referring to the issue of analogues for this type of burial finds are very significant. Yet again, if the author made an attempt to analyse these phenomena in a wider context, for instance, with reference to regions where urns were decorated with human faces, this issue would be more comprehensively explained. He could certainly have included the findings of J. Kneisel from 2001-2013. It is understandable that R. Janiak might not have read the most recent work of the researcher addressing this issue, published in Polish (Kneisel 2016, 391-413). The latter publication provided the grounds for presenting cultural processes within the Baltic coastal zone in a wider context; the processes that underwent autonomously, to certain degree, beyond direct influences coming from the Hallstatt world, and simultaneously taking place under conditions of "salvaging the achievements of the Bronze Age civilisation" in times of inevitable cultural conversion, as it was once formulated by J. Ostoja-Zagórski (1995, 41). The last mentioned author might have not been right, and perhaps discoveries like those from Nowa Sikorska Huta should be evaluated as northern counterparts, or rather distant echoes, of materialisation of the Mediterranean or Danubian eschatology in various forms of ekphora (journeys taken by the dead to the underworld by boats or carts). It must be stressed that this issue was raised by R. Janiak in a few fragments of the monograph under review. Unfortunately, the anthropological structure of individuals buried under burrows is rather poor, and R. Janiak is definitely not to be blamed for this.

The chapter V (*Poprzednicy-Współcześni-Następcy*, in English: *Ancestors-Contemporary-Successors*) is in fact a summary of the entire research achievements of the author over the past dozen or so years. I would like to address a few issues raised in this section. R. Janiak evoked his periodisation and chronological findings. He properly quoted particular analogues, mostly with regard to the construction of burrows. The author indicated three (or four) zones of the occurrence of cemeteries with burial mounds. He also stressed the varying position of the burial chest in relation to the barrow base, and the so-called stray burials dug into the mound itself. Although R. Janiak did not include the findings of J. Adamik (2012) in his work, I must admit that some of his observations are interesting. However, further musings on this subject on the basis of non-source-based evaluations, may raise many doubts since divagations on "the existence of souls travelling in the after-life" are, in my opinion, unjustified in any respect. This also concerns a "heavenly zone" that could have supposedly existed in the consciousness of the prehistoric Pomeranian societies (p. 264). Further pseudo religious-based overinterpretations are, in my opinion, an abuse of the role of the researcher and thus I have decided not to comment upon this in any way. All I have to say in this respect is that the contemporary hierarchy of values, e.g. standing within the Judeo-Christian or even Greek eschatology, must not be attributed to

any archaeological sources, which are literally scarce material remains left by communities of syncretic cultural models so different and distant from our own.

The differences between the “Lusatian” and “Pomeranian” eschatology are supposed to have resulted from the natural climatic transformations according to the author of the monograph under review. At this point R. Janiak quoted the proposition developed by K. Dziągiewski (2010, 176-189), who stated that the deterioration of climatic conditions (in fact, SA/SB change), that started around 850 BC and lasted until ca. 650 BC, was reflected by a regression related to the Wielka Wieś phase and a decrease in the significance of burial mounds in Pomerania. The above-quoted researcher, who, as I believe, is as a supporter of environmental determinism with regard to the civilisation-nature relationships, stands for a migration-based argumentation, explaining the driving force of cultural conversion. This concept fits a research stream of longstanding tradition in respect to the expansion of the settlement of the prehistoric Pomeranian communities (comp. also Dziągiewski 2012). Not mentioning the fact that the author did not include in his studies more recent publications referring to the Wielka Wieś phase (comp. e.g. Fudziński, Fudziński, Krzysiak, Cymek, Rożnowski 2005), he also did not use the findings of other scholars addressing the issue of human-natural environment relationship in Pomerania, such as E. Grzelakowska (1989), which, I believe, would be very useful in this respect. The findings of P. Kittel (2005) or the results of palynological experts relevant for this issue (e.g. Z. Balwierz or M. Latałowa) are treated marginally in the work under review. I cannot understand why the author neglected the publication of J. Ostojka-Zagórski (1982) in this part of his studies. Nevertheless, one must not forget that the above-mentioned period when the climatic fluctuations took place can be referred to the Younger Bronze Age, namely the V OEB (comp. e.g. Dąbrowski 2009, 17). Radosław Janiak stated that after the first half of the 7th century BC, funeral rites with burying the dead under barrows regained significance and were commonly practiced again. This is an interesting proposition which, although personally I am not one of its advocates, the author has the right to advance as his interpretational viewpoint. However, one should remember that the Ha C phase in Europe is correlated with a period of cultural transformations of crucial importance, towards the beginnings of the Iron Age, which took place in spite of these unfavourable changes recorded in the natural environment (comp. numerous relevant remarks and findings contained within the work by Ostojka-Zagórski 1982). Other publications referring to the settlement models at the turn of the Bronze and Iron Ages, stimulated by climatic fluctuations, do not support the ideas formulated by R. Janiak (comp. e.g. Kurnatowski 1992, 15-111; Mierzwiński 1994, 69-150; Szamalek 2006, 169-172).

The concept developed by R. Janiak, although based on a very small and therefore unreliable statistical sample, is strongly reminiscent of a proposition for explaining cultural conversion (Lusatian Culture/Pomeranian Culture) announced by J. Ostojka-Zagórski for strongholds of the Biskupin type (Ostojka-Zagórski 1976, 39-73), which was once strongly criticised. In fact, using only the findings of the above-mentioned K. Dziągiewski,

thus intentionally neglecting the available cultural and settlement context, and relevant literature at hand, must lead directly to an acceptance of the theory of expansion of the Pomeranian Culture, which is so frequently contested nowadays. Finally, there is an issue of the major chronological threshold of cultural phenomena related to the occurrence of barrows, falling within the Ha D period. The author of the monograph under review did not find any justification for the continuity of funeral rites of this type that could be correlated with the youngest periods of the Early Iron Age, namely the SOP period. In my opinion, there are some artefacts, mainly ceramics from Nowa Sikorska Huta, that should be linked with a phase of the end of the Pomeranian settlement in the region of the Lower Vistula River, the chronology of which should be slightly moved to the period indicated once by R. Wołagiewicz (1979, 54-57), namely to the Lt A period (comp. also Woźniak 1979, 128-148). These artefacts include certain types of brooches and open-work buckles from Gogolewo, near Tczew and Bojano, near Wejherowo, and indirectly a Kauri shell found in the Pomeranian box burials, that could be used for dating of the regressive models mentioned above (Megaw 2005, p. 258-260; Woźniak 2010, 47, 63, 55, 63, 84).

The conclusion drawn from all that has been stated above cannot be favourable for the monograph. Although the author had indeed gathered all of the available objects considered to be the sources of his studies on the barrow tradition of the Younger Bronze and the Early Iron Ages in the region under scrutiny, there is still an unsolved problem of determining the actual relationship between each of the stone burial mounds and human activity. Since this issue had already been raised by S. Rzepecki, my comments in this respect are unnecessary (Rzepecki 2016). Radosław Janiak strove to interpret the materials he gathered in terms of their cultural and chronological attribution, providing the reader with his own vision of the cultural reality of those times, and cultural conversion stimulated mostly by changes in the natural environment. To achieve this goal, he assumed an extremely selective approach in quoting the existing literature referring to the crucial issues of the turn of the Bronze and Iron Ages. As I have tried to show in my review, the author failed to avoid numerous overinterpretations which are absolutely unjustified from the viewpoint of methodology of the present studies on prehistory, employing nomenclature normally used in studies on religions or cultural anthropology and without any restrictions. In my opinion, the author failed to deliver any convincing evidence on *establishing the significance of barrows in everyday life and system of beliefs of societies erecting those mounds*, as he said. Nevertheless, he proved that contemporary archaeology can find its place in something indicated in the title of the review, namely in the world of post-truth (comp. d'Ancona 2018). Perhaps, if the publication by R. Janiak had been reviewed by an archaeologist engaged in the Younger Bronze and the Early Iron Ages on an everyday basis, a lot of the critical comments included here would have not been necessary. I hope that my remarks will lead the editors and publishers to reflect on the "scientificity" of some of the works published by them.

References

- Adamik J. 2012. Idea skrzyni kamiennej jako formy grobu na terenie ziem polskich w późnej epoce brązu i wczesnej epoce żelaza (= *Collectio Archaeologica Ressoviensis* 18). Rzeszów: Fundacja Rzeszowskiego Ośrodka Archeologicznego, Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Blajer W. 1993. Przyczynek do badań nad zróżnicowaniem kulturowym Pomorza w środkowej epoce brązu. In F. Rożnowski (ed.), *Miscellanea archaeologica Thaddaeo Malinowski dedicata quae Franciscus Rożnowski redigendum curavit*. Słupsk, Poznań: Academia Paedagogica in Urbe Słupsk, 47-55.
- Bukowski Z. 1998. *Pomorze w epoce brązu w świetle dalekosiężnych kontaktów wymiennych*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.
- d'Ancona M. 2018. *Postprawda*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
- Dąbrowski J. 1980. Przydatność ceramiki lużyckiej dla podziałów kulturowych. In M. Gedl (ed.), *Zróżnicowanie wewnętrzne kultury lużyckiej. Materiały z konferencji zorganizowanej w ramach problemu resortowego R. III. 6: Pradzieje Polski na tle porównawczym*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 35-55.
- Dąbrowski J. 1990. Beiträge zur Mittelbronzezeit Nord-Polens. In B. Chropovský and J. Herrmann (eds.), *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur der Mitteleuropäischen Bronzezeit 2*. Berlin, Nitra: Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Reprographisches Zentrum des Archäologischen Institutes der Slowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 119-127.
- Dąbrowski J. 2005. Na styku kultur. Specyfika metali epoki brązu w północnej Polsce. *Pomorania Antiqua* 20, 73-95.
- Dąbrowski J. 2009. *Polska przed trzema tysiącami lat. Czasy kultury lużyckiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio.
- Dzięgielewski K. 2010. Expansion of the Pomeranian Culture in Poland during the Early Iron Age: remarks on the mechanism and possible causes. In K. Dzięgielewski, M. S. Przybyła and A. Gawlik (eds.), *Migration in Bronze and Early Iron Age Europe (= Prace Archeologiczne 63. Studia)*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 173-196.
- Dzięgielewski K. 2012. Problemy synchronizacji danych paleoklimatycznych i archeologicznych na przykładzie tzw. wahnięcia subatlantyckiego. In W. Blajer (ed.), *Peregrinationes Archaeologicae in Asia et Europa Joanni Chochorowski dedicatae*. Kraków: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 109-119.
- Eggers H. J. 1936. Das Fürstengrab von Bahn, Kr. Greifenhagen und die germanische Landnahme in Pommern. *Baltische Studien. Neue Folge* 38, 1-47.
- Fudziński M., Fudziński P., Krzysiak A., Cymek L. and Rożnowski F. 2005. Faza wielkowiejska a kultura lużycka i kultura pomorska – Nowa próba ustalenia wzajemnych relacji. In M. Fudziński and H. Paner (eds.), *Aktualne problemy kultury lużyckiej na Pomorzu*. Gdańsk: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Gdańsku, 47-59.

- Grzelakowska E. 1989. Środowiskowe uwarunkowania osadnictwa pradziejowego i wczesnośrednio-wiecznego w północnej części Borów Tucholskich (= *Acta Universitatis Lodzianis. Folia Archaeologica* 11). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Janiak R. 2014. *Kurhany z młodszego okresu epoki brązu i wczesnej epoki żelaza na Pojezierzu Kaszubskim*. Łódź: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Janiak R. 2017. About the burial-free kurgans once again. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 69, 421-431.
- Kittel P. 2005. Uwarunkowania środowiskowe lokalizacji osadnictwa pradziejowego na Pojezierzu Kaszubskim i w północnej części Borów Tucholskich (= *Monografie Instytutu Archeologii Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego* 4). Łódź: Inicjał 3.
- Kneisel J. 2016. Twarze Europy – naczynia antropomorficzne późnej epoki brązu i wczesnej epoki żelaza. In B. Gediga, A. Grossman and W. Piotrowski (eds.), *Europa w okresie od VIII wieku przed narodzeniem Chrystusa do I wieku naszej ery* (= *Biskupińskie Prace Archeologiczne* 11). Biskupin, Wrocław: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Biskupinie. Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 391-413.
- Kowalski A. P. 2009. O posługiwaniu się znakami przez ludność tzw. kultury pomorskiej. In M. Fudziński and H. Paner (eds.), *Między kulturą łużycką a kulturą pomorską. Przemiany kulturowe we wczesnej epoce żelaza*. Gdańsk: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Gdańsku, 125-134.
- Kurnatowski S. 1992. Próba oceny zmian zaludnienia ziem polskich między XIII w. p.n.e. a IV w. n.e. In K. Kaczanowski, S. Kurnatowski, A. Malinowski and J. Piontek (eds.), *Zaludnienie ziem polskich między XIII w. p.n.e. a IV w. n.e. – materiały źródłowe, próba oceny* (= *Monografie i Opracowania* 342; *Uwarunkowania Demograficzne Rozwoju Społeczno-Gospodarczego Polski* 24). Warszawa: Szkoła Główna Handlowa, 15-111.
- Megaw V. 2005. Notes on two Belt-Plates of Early La Tène Type from Northern Poland. *Pomorania Antiqua* 20, 257-276.
- Mierzwiński A. 1994. *Przemiany osadnicze społeczności kultury łużyckiej na Śląsku*. Wrocław: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN.
- Ostoja-Zagórski J. 1976. Ze studiów nad zagadnieniem upadku grodów kultury łużyckiej. *Slavia Antiqua* 23, 39-73.
- Ostoja-Zagórski J. 1982. *Przemiany osadnicze, demograficzne i gospodarcze w okresie halsztackim na Pomorzu*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Ostoja-Zagórski J. 1995. Postłużyckie struktury gospodarcze. Próba rekonstrukcji. In T. Węgrzynowicz, M. Andrzejowska, J. Andrzejowski and E. Radziszewska (eds.), *Kultura pomorska i kultura grobów kloszowych. Razem czy osobno?* Warszawa: Państwowe Muzeum Archeologiczne, 37-42.
- Podgórski J. T. 1992. Fazy cmentarzysk kultury łużyckiej i pomorskiej na Pomorzu Wschodnim. In S. Czopek (ed.), *Ziemie polskie we wczesnej epoce żelaza i ich powiązania z innymi terenami*. Rzeszów: Muzeum Okręgowe w Rzeszowie, 199-215.
- Rzepecki S. 2016. From potatoes to barrows, or there and back again. *Sprawozdania Archeologiczne* 68, 409-419.

- Szamałek K. 2009. *Procesy integracji kulturowej w młodszej epoce brązu i początkach epoki żelaza na Pojezierzu Wielkopolskim*. Poznań: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN.
- Wołagiewicz R. 1979. Kultura pomorska a kultura oksywska. In T. Malinowski (ed.), *Problemy kultury pomorskiej*. Koszalin: Muzeum Okręgowe Koszalin, 33-69.
- Woźniak Z. 1979. Chronologia młodszej fazy kultury pomorskiej w świetle importów i naśladownictw zabytków pochodzenia południowego. In T. Malinowski (ed.), *Problemy kultury pomorskiej*. Koszalin: Muzeum Okręgowe Koszalin, 125-148.
- Woźniak Z. 2010. Kontakty mieszkańców ziem polskich ze światem celtyckim u schyłku okresu halsztackiego i we wczesnym okresie lateńskim. *Przegląd Archeologiczny* 58, 39-104.

