

VACLAV FURMANEK

## SOME ASPECTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL COOPERATION

Before sketching briefly the cultural-historical development of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages and indicating some problems that can be solved through interdisciplinary co-operation I would like to explain shortly the notion "archaeological culture" so frequently used in the archaeological practice, but perhaps of a bit obscure meaning for scholars working in other scientific branches.

Archaeology often works with the term archaeological culture comprehending it as a group of monuments that can be determined as to their shape, chronologically, territorially and to a certain extent also spiritually. Four basic elements are essential for its determination: space, time, basis and superstructure. These elements must not be comprehend separately, they must be approached in their dialectic unity.

With this reservation, and chiefly with the superstructural phenomena is closely connected the ethnicity of the archaeological culture. However, the more deeper we penetrate to the prehistoric ages, the more complicated and more difficult are these questions. It is worth mentioning that one of the founders of the German nationalist archaeology G. Kossina and his pupils tried to identify certain archaeological cultures with certain ethnic groups. This approach was based on the presumption that nationality, language and culture are three inseparable aspects of the same group. Naturally we still come across such schemes, but they are very rare and are not typical. All the views that the archaeological culture represents a national entity are forced and little convincing. We can say that the existing archaeological cultures can be regarded as cultural, economic, and to a certain extent also

historical entities, with the help of which we can describe the course of the primeval history. However, when using the notion "archaeological culture" we must bear in mind that it is just a working term facilitating our orientation in the complicated situation of the pre-class society. The present names of archeological cultures must be understood in a similar way. These names have lost their original content in many cases, but they are still in use because they are deep-rooted and traditional.

It follows from what we have said above that archaeological cultures as a rule cannot be regarded as ethnic entities. Certain progress could be brought about in this field by co-operation with other scientific disciplines, the most important of whom, without any doubt, is anthropology.

The beginning of the Middle Bronze Age in Slovakia is characterized, similarly as in other regions, by a changing cultural picture, by the rise of new archaeological cultures resulting in the cultural quadriparciality of Slovakia that had been maintained throughout the Bronze Age. The whole territory of Slovakia can be divided into four regions, whose territory with some modifications remains basically the same during the whole period: southwestern Slovakia, the northern half of Slovakia, the southern fringes of central Slovakia and southeastern Slovakia.

In the Middle Bronze Age the western part of southwestern Slovakia belongs to the Middle Danubian Tumulus culture. The eastern part of this territory was settled by the people of the Carpathian Tumulus culture. Generally the Váh River is believed to be the dividing line between the two cultures. This difference is maintained also in

the following Late Bronze Age, when the Middle Danubian Tumulus culture in the west is replaced by the Velatice culture and the people of the Carpathian tumuli by the Čaka culture. Towards the end of the Late Bronze Age the whole of southwestern Slovakia was settled by the people of the Podolí culture.

Throughout the Middle and Late Bronze Ages the northern half of Slovakia was settled by the Slovak branch of the Lusatian culture. The southern fringes of central Slovakia, parts of east Slovakia and the former Spiš County were occupied by the people of the Piliny culture throughout most of the Late Bronze Age. The Kyjatice culture, genetically connected with the Piliny people, lasted from the end of the Late Bronze Age to the end of the Final Late Bronze Age and covered only the southern part of central Slovakia.

Southeastern Slovakia in the Middle Bronze Age and at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age was under the influence of the Suciú de Sus culture, followed by the Gáva culture in the Late and Final Late Bronze Age.

Most of the above cultures used cremation burial rite. Only the Middle Danubian and Carpathian Tumulus cultures used both the inhumation and cremation rites. Though we can find skeletal remains also in cultures with exclusively cremation burial rite, these are always anomalies, changing nothing on the fact that all these archaeological cultures (The Velatice, Čaka, Podolí, Lusatian, Piliny, Kyjatice, Suciú de Sus and Gáva cultures) are characterized by the existence of large urnfields.

On this occasion I would like to tackle some of the principal problems of the Middle, Late and Final Late Bronze Ages (1500—700 B.C.) in the northern areas of the Carpathian Basin and its adjoining areas, which could be solved in the future with the help of archaeologico-anthropological co-operation (the tumulus expansion, the so-called Lusatian Expansion, the Great Migration of Nations and the ethnicity of the archaeological cultures).

### *1. Problems of the Expansion of the Tumulus Culture*

At the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age a Tumulus culture people appears in large areas of central Europe. The expansion of this people to further areas is at the centre of attention of many researchers. Shortly we can say that there are two hypotheses explaining the expansion of the Tumulus culture: The Hungarian conception supposing that the expansion of the Tumulus cultures from the west to the Carpathian Basin is connected with the decline of the autochthonous archaeological cultures; and the Czechoslovak conception based on the presumption that the crystallization area of the Tumulus cultures lay in the present-day territory of this country, i.e. that of the Carpathian Tumulus culture in the Carpathian Basin, and especially anthropology could contribute greatly to the solution of these schematically sketched problems.

### *2. Problems of the so-called Lusatian Expansion*

In Late Bronze Age there were four cultural complexes in Slovakia: the region of the Middle Danubian Urnfields (Velatice, Čaka and Podolí cultures), the area of the Lusatian Urnfields, the area of the Piliny Urnfields (the Piliny and Kyjatice cultures) and the area of the eastern urnfields (Suciú de Sus and Gáva cultures). In the view of the earlier scientific conceptions in the period of the Lusatian Urnfield there was an intense migration of the population to the south, changing the cultural outlook of the southern regions. It has been concluded in the recent year, however, that the barrier of the Middle Danubian and Piliny Urnfield cultures was so strong that they stopped the expansion of the Lusatians southwards. The correctness of this assumption might be proved also by the anthropological expertises on two large urnfield burial sites currently realized in the Prague National Museum. The burial sites involved in this work are Moravičany in north Moravia — a Lusatian cremation burial site comprising more than 1800 graves and the Radzovce site in the southern part of central Slovakia, a cremation burial site with 1334 graves belonging to the Piliny and Kyjatice cultures.

### *3. The Great Migration of Nations in the Bronze Age*

It is generally known that around 1200 B.C., some scholars put it between 1225—1187 B.C., the East Mediterranean civilizations were destroyed. It was the decay of the Mycenaean towns, and in this period occurred the fall of the Hittite Empire, the destruction of numerous settlements in Cyprus and on the Phoenician coast, and the incursion of the "Peoples of the Sea" to Egypt in the eighth year of Rameses III's reign. From the results of the recent research follows that the catastrophe was caused by tribal shifts. The problems connected with the centre of origin of this great Bronze Age migration of nations, consisting in a chain-reaction of shifting further and further ethnic groups towards south-east — the most important of these moves being the migration of the Dorians to their later historic homeland, have been best solved in Slovakia by J. Paulík (Paulík, 1974). He was successful in proving that the first tribal moves of this great migration of nations originated from a Carpathian-Central-European centre. This theory is supported besides archaeological and linguistic materials also by anthropological proofs.

The anthropological analysis of skeletons in Attica and Argolis shows a clear-cut difference between the populations before and after the fall of the Mycenaean force towards the end of the 12th century; in the later period conspicuously increased the percentage of the Alpine and Dinarian individuals, while the number of those belonging to the Mediterranean race is dropping (Bouzek, 1959). The problem is, however, that in this period

cremation burials prevail in Central Europe and the anthropological material contained by these burials can yield us little information.

#### 4. *The Ethnicity of Some Archaeological Cultures*

As I have mentioned in the introductory part of this paper the ethnicity of the archaeological cultures of the Bronze Age is rather problematic. Nevertheless there have been several attempts to throw light on the ethnicity of some of the archaeological cultures or cultural complexes. Generally known are the attempts of the Polish archaeological school to prove the Slavic origin of the Lusatian culture, as well as the attempts of the Rumanian colleagues to look for Proto-Thracians among the inhabitants of the north Carpathian Basin, especially in the period of the Piliny and Kyjatice cultures. Perhaps in the future we shall be also able to have a say to this question on the basis of anthropological analyses. Co-operation between archaeologists and anthropologists in the final period of the Bronze Age with its Thraco-Cimmerian horizon in our territory might prove also very interesting.

I have chosen at random several examples, in which interdisciplinary co-operation between archaeology and anthropology might bring interesting results clarifying some of the still unsolved problems of the European history. I have concentrated on the solution of the historic problems of the Bronze Age, and I realize that anthropology can play a unique role in the solution of the demographic, economic and social problems of the Bronze Age, and of course of other periods too, and in this respect anthropology can not be replaced by any other science.

#### LITERATURE

- PAULÍK, J.: Mohyla z mladšej doby bronzovej v Lužanoch. In: *Zbor. Slov. nár. Múz. 63, História 9. Bratislava 1939, s. 48*; K významu mohýl z mladšej doby bronzovej v pravekom vývoji Slovenska. *Slov. Archeol. 22, 1974, s. 73-81.*
- BOUZEK, J.: Attická geometrická keramika v Národném múseu v Praze a v jiných československých sbírkách. In: *Sbor. Nár. Mus. v Praze, řada A — Historie, sv. 13, č. 3, Praha 1959, s. 97.*

Dr. Václav Furmánek  
Archaeological Institute  
of the Slovak Academy of Sciences  
Nitra — Hrad