THE "PRE-LUSATIAN AND TRZCINIEC" PHASE SPREADING OVER THE AREA NORTH OF THE CARPATHIANS AND THE SUDETEN MOUNTAINS

1. THE STATE OF RESEARCH

I wish to limit my present remarks, concerning the situation in the Early Bronze Age over areas lying north of the Carpathians and the Sudeten Mountains, to showing only their general development trends. Important will be here the dating and synchronization of culture complexes, and also disclosing the culture-settlement continuation, or essential changes occurring in this range. Moreover, I shall attend particularly to controversial questions that are subject of lively discussion just now, in Polish literature. The comparative table joined to the present work (see p.) shows so far well fixed dates, referring to particular cultures and culture groups, and their mutual relations. Absolute dates accepted for findings determined by method C\textsubscript{14}, do not, however, take account of their calibration.

In prehistory of southern Poland very important attention is due to the phase to which the development of the so-called pre-Lusatian and Trzciniec cultures falls. Considering the entire process of evolution of their settlement here, and also the aspect of their material culture, we should suppose these assemblies to have been partly a junction between groups that had their basic elements in the epi-Corded Ware culture and Chlopič-Veselé culture—and the big groups known to have been the Únětice culture. Viewing them afterwards in the context of a later history of these lands, we may conclude that both cultures mentioned in the title of this work, are an important link in the genetic process of the Lusatian culture.

Polish archaeology has no doubt made essential progress in studying the set of problems of the early phase of the Bronze Age in the Odra and Vistula basin. We have now indeed a number of synthetic and monographic works concerning that matter. Particularly important is the monograph of A. Kempisty (1978), explaining the source phase and stratigraphy of cultural phenomena from the Final Neolithic and Early Bronze Age in
the Highland of Little Poland. The two-part work of W. Sarnowska (1969 and 1975) is devoted to characteristic of the Unetice culture in the Polish lands. J. Machnik grasped the total set of problems of the Early Bronze Age in Poland in this synthetic work of 1977, and M. Gedl, that of assemblies linked with the so-called pre-Lusatian culture. Finally, there appeared in the pages of the 3rd volume of The Prehistory of Polish Land (Prahistoria ziem polskich, 1978) the joint work of three authors concerning problems of the Early Bronze Age: J. Machnik, B. Gediga and J. Miśkiewicz. It is a summing up of the current state of knowledge on problems examined against the background of the European development tendency. There are, moreover, several smaller works that deserve mentioning, for they bring new cognitive elements into this set of questions (see their bibliography Z. Bukowski 1980, p. 89 fol.).

The quantity of accessible sources on settlements, cemeteries, treasures etc., and particular categories of mobile relics, is not satisfactory. It concerns mainly their occurrence in various territories. Many regions of Silesia, Little Poland and southern Great Poland, cannot be well characterized in this respect. Also the classifying of a number of findings and complexes has often a controversial character. Materials mostly require repeated typological and chronological verification, aiming, among others, at distinguishing local forms, therefore at knowing details not only of the development process in the macroregion scale, but also of its synchronization with similar processes in neighbouring areas.

There is one more problem rendering the above mentioned activity difficult against a wide comparative background. Polish archaeology, apart from following the northern system of Montelius-Kostrzewski, draws now profit, in a steadily growing degree, from general assumptions of the Danubian chronological system (with its regional modifications) including dating particular periods and phases. Their synchronization continues to be difficult, although some essential determinations have been reached. Nevertheless, the question of synchronisation of distinguished periods and subperiods with absolute dating remains still difficult, particularly in the light of calibrating dates by \( C_{14} \), becoming recently a general rule; these dates differ often too much from the hitherto settled ones, thus they can not be too easily accepted.

The aim of Polish archaeology is, however, the working out of a chronological system for lands in the Odra-Vistula basin, which would take account of the specific character of this zone: it should certainly be bound with the general frames of the Danubian system, because the entire development of Southern Poland’s zone depends closely on a similar process-forming culture in the Carpathian Basin, noticeable since the decline of the Chłopice-Veselé culture and the oldest phase of the Unetice culture.
Although the above-presented state of research reveals serious gaps in the approach to general problems and also to many minor questions, there are certainly good reasons to undertake efforts aimed at a more detailed presentation of tendencies and directions in the development of culture groups north of the Carpathians and the Sudeten Mountains, although many of them will continue to be of controversial character.

2. THE DIVISION INTO ZONES

Already in BA$_1$, a distinct division into two zones: the western and eastern one, could be noticed in the southern part of Polish lands. The first is initially represented by the settlement of the Bell Beaker culture and remnants of epi-Corded Ware elements, while from the decline of BA$_1$, the Únětice culture starts its formation here, lasting till the beginning of BB$_1$. In the eastern zone the Chlopice-Veselé culture gets transformed within the frames of the same settlement into two cultures: Mierzanowice and Strzyżów, both lasting till the end of BA$_2$. Although their entire development underwent strong influences from the range of the Carpathian Basin — the above proposed division allows for distinguishing two areas of the “Carpathian” influence: the eastern one from Slovakia, North Hungary and Transylvania, i.e. from the eastern territories of the Carpathian Basin, and the western one from Moravia, Bohemia and the Middle Danubian basin through the Moravian Gate, i.e. from the western part of this Lowland.

The division was maintained from the decline of BA$_1$, which is about 1750 BC, up to an early phase of the La Tène period, i.e. till about 400—300 BC, which makes nearly 1500 years. It marks there two zones of a different demographic substratum, with the line separating them defined as their so-called cultural-ethnic border (see J. Machnik 1978, p. 30, fig. 12 — map). Its beginnings probably go back to the moment of expansion, from the Middle Danube basin, of the Bell Beaker, the Chlopice-Veselé and the Únětice cultures' population, being then a foreign demographic element in relation to the local autochthonic population.

For the early phases of the Bronze Age, the Carpathian Basin ought to be considered as an area mediating between two vast culture zones: the so-called Balkan-Aegean one and the Middle-European one. An essential role was played here by the Carpathian Basin and the lands lying north of the Carpathians and the Sudeten Mountains, linking the Balkans with the well-developed framework of exchange routes, between widely understood South and North. The role of the settlement in the Carpathian Basin was not then limited to mediation in spreading all sorts of imports.
Table 1. Comparative chronological diagram of the Early and Middle European Bronze Age (BA-BD). After J. Machnik and Z. Bukowski.
over Central Europe, but included also spreading of elements of belief and culture, setting new forms, technical and agricultural achievements, the presence of which was particularly remarkable within the Mad’arovce, Aětěrov and Otomani cultures. It was less significant, however, in the areas neighbouring with them from the north, i.e. Silesia, Little Poland and south-western Great Poland. The Carpathian Basin influence is, however, more and more distinctly corroborated by new findings in these parts of our country.

3. THE WESTERN ZONE

Towards the decline of the Únětice culture (phase III for Silesia, phase VI for Bohemia and Moravia), i.e. at the turning point of BA₂ and BB₁, strong influences, defined in Polish literature as Mad’arovce and Věteřov or more exactly only Věteřov, can be noticed in Silesia. They are confirmed by many findings in this region (see e.g. M. Gedl 1978, p. 86 fol.). They had reached north up to south-western Great Poland, in the opinion of some researchers even up to Kuyavia. In this context we should observe the forming of a local group in Upper Silesia, the so-called Nowa Cerekwia Group, which continued until BB₁, thought by some writers to have been an independent culture (e.g. M. Gedl 1963, p. 50 fol.), which does not, however, seem justified. Maybe it was an immigratory population of southern origin, probably from the Věteřov environment. In the context of these influences we may suppose that it was from here that the impulse had come for building a defence settlement in Nowa Cerekwia, the voivodship of Opole (Kunawicz 1976, p. 229 fol.), dated most probably to BB₁. About the same time there appear the first signs of a new “Tumulus culture” influence, unnoticed so far in the Nowa Cerekwia group.

In the light of the so far accessible Únětice culture materials from the territory of Silesia, two of its subphases should be accepted: 1. Únětice-Věteřov phase, dated to the beginning of BB₁, and 2. “Early-Tumulus” phase, following the developed BB₁. Moreover, the latter determines the final moment of the Únětice culture and the appearance of a new population, represented by the “Early-Tumulus” settlement, described in Polish literature as an early phase of the pre-Lusatian culture. The findings of Silesia (settlements, cemeteries) do not confirm the possibility of settlement continuation, i.e. cultural changes only within the same population. This would mean an altered demographic substratum for the western Polish zone, although the assimilation of a part of the “Únětice” population by the newcomers may have occurred. The territories lying near Silesia do not
provide convincing evidence that part of the local population had been driven out of the Odra basin on to those territories, owing to the pressure of new groups.

Particular attention is due to finds of the Vêteřov type. The range of their occurrence north of their initial areas embraced the whole of Silesia, Upper Lusatia and partly Saxony, touching south-western Great Poland and the Lubusz land (W. Coblenz 1977, p. 72; W. Szmukier 1977, p. 396 fol.). Single finds of earthenware of the Vêteřov type have been disclosed in the neighbourhood of Chełm Lubelski (L. Gajewski, 1975, p. 590 fol. and fig. 2), attesting to the wide range of their occurrence. The existence of Vêteřov elements during all the period of the so-called pre-Lusatian culture, until the time of the Lusatian culture appearing in Moravia and Upper Silesia (E. Plesl 1974, p. 353), seems to confirm the share of these elements in the genesis of the Lusatian culture, all the more so that the process of the Vêteřov type changing into the so-called proto-Lusatian horizon, is quite distinct.

While postulating the necessity of distinguishing the Vêteřov influence out of the framework of the so far accepted Maďarovce-Vêteřov influences, I have in mind, in the first place, the range of single constituents of the culture complex, determined as “Maďarovce-Vêteřov-Böheimkirchen” (see E. Schubert 1974, fig 3 — map: Z. Benkovsky-Pivovarová 1976, p. 341 fol. and p. 345, fig. 1 — map). The course of the river Morava drew a distinct borderline between the range of Maďarovce and Vêteřov settlements. Only the Vêteřov settlement had reached the Moravian Gate. Even if in Silesian complexes there had indeed occurred Maďarovce forms, they should be judged to have belonged partly to the Vêteřov type formed on a part of the Maďarovce culture range. Because of a too general classification of relic materials, it has not been possible to determine in Polish literature what should be understood under the notion of Maďarovce or of Vêteřov finds, therefore these terms are accepted conventionally. In my opinion it would be fully justified to specify this process by a more exact term, i.e. “Vêteřov influence”, while the term “Maďarovce” would be right for the territories of western Little Poland (I shall discuss the problem further on). The names suggest that both culture complexes had embraced different, distinct regions north of the Carpathian and Sudeten Mountains. falling chronologically to the period of full development of these groups (the so-called classical phase). It is most probably with this period that imports of southern origin are connected, among others the so-called Brotilaibidol from Pilat-Oszczywilk. Voivodship of Kalisz, and Biskupin, Voivodship of Bydgoszcz, dated by analogies to the turning point of BA and BB (see e.g. J. Vladár 1973, p. 323 and fig. 81), the model of a clay four-spoked wheel from Mojećice, the Voivodship of Wrocław, and a pair
of small copper oxen from Bytyń, the Voivodship of Poznań. Also at that time the idea of building defence settlements became spread here. In comparison with the situation over the Carpathian Basin, finds of the above-mentioned type are only a weak reflection of what was then lively in the “Carpathian” areas. An import is also the Syrian figurine of Sernai, the region of Klaipeda (Memel. USSR). (see Z. Bukowski 1980, p. 316 fol., ibid, the description of finds).

The final phase of the proper Věteřov influence in the territory of the Odra basin fell most probably to the developed BB₁, or to about 1500 BC, which was the time of the Middle-Danubian Tumulus culture settling here, with the Carpathian Tumulus culture proceeding alike in South Slovakia (see Z. Benkovsky-Pivovarová 1976, p. 357 fol. and 358 fig. 11 — map). Discoveries made in the necropolis of Kietrz, Voivodship of Opole, confirm dates given to the oldest “Tumulus” finds in Upper Silesia.

In the light of the so far accessible finds, an inflowing character of “Tumulus” population for the lands of the Odra basin should be accepted, and not exclusively a process of culture changes achieved by the same population. This would suggest a repeated, essential change of the demographic aspect of West Poland’s zone (see e.g. M. Gedl 1975, p. 81; Z. Bukowski 1980, passim) although some writers (B. Gediga 1978, p. 163 fol.) advance the necessity of accepting a far greater share of the local population (i.e. Unetice people) in this process.

In Polish literature the newly formed group is known as the so-called pre-Lusatian culture (M. Gedl 1975, passim). In the light of recent discussion (see Geneza 1977, p. 8 fol.— the opinion of B. Gediga; p. 17 fol.— E. Plesl and p. 239 fol.— Z. Bukowski) the current ascertainment have been critically appraised, and it has been stressed that we have to deal here not with an independent archaeological culture, in a sense assumed by M. Gedl, but with a complex diversified in its cultural and probably also in its ethnic character, of undoubtedly southern origin. It should therefore be defined by the name of “Silesian and Great Poland’s Tumulus culture”, and placed in a period from BB₁ to BC₁₂. Within such frames it is already possible to distinguish two groups: a Silesian one and a Middle Silesian-Great Poland one. The fact that many finds from the Odra and partly Warta basin point in the following stage to the distinct process of transformation from the Tumulus into Lusatian culture (its early phase), seems to soundly confirm the culture-and-settlement continuity of this Polish zone. It has also essential meaning for the determination of the origin and character (including also material culture) of the Lusatian culture population in the Odra and partly Warta basin. The process of transformation from the “Tumulus” into the “early”-Lusatian” phase took place in the course of BC, therefore somewhat later than the similar process
observed in North-East Slovakia and North Moravia. It took, however, a relatively swift course embracing in its first phase nearly all the area of Silesia and the Land of Lubusz, large spaces of Great Poland and probably also the western regions of Little Poland; it is distinct through Bohemia in the territory of Saxony and Lusatia.

We may suppose that the influence of the “Tumulus” phase left a diverse relic material in the settlement of Bruszczo, the Voivodship of Lesznô (Z. Pieczyński 1974, p. 47 fol.; 1975 p. 205 fol.). There are sufficient grounds for distinguishing two levels in its compass: 1. the older one, with open settlement and Unètice. Chłopice-Veselé and early Trzciniec materials, dated to BA-BB; and 2. the later level, with defence settlement, the Veteřov type and Tumulus, and Trzciniec materials (from the developed phase), dated to BB$. Dates acquired by the C$\text{}^{14}$ method seem to confirm this dating for the inside of the settlement and fortifications (Z. Pieczyński 1974, p. 49). Perhaps, with the settlement complex of phase 1 in Bruszcze we may connect the Unètice grave mounds in Łeki Małe, the Voivodship of Leszno; they are situated at a distance of 16 km and dated to BA/BB, though one of the mounds bears the date 1655 ± 50 BC, determined by the method C$\text{}^{14}$ (see J.A. Bakker, J.C. Vogel and T. Wiślański 1969, p. 231). Calibration has not been applied to these dates. One more fortified settlement is dated to the “Tumulus” phase, namely Pudliszki, the Voivodship of Leszno, for it contained material typical of just this phase (see Informator 1974, p. 187: B. Gediga 1977, p. 11). This fact confirms our assumption concerning the necessity of distinguishing the second defence phase in Bruszcze.

4. THE EASTERN ZONE

Towards the end of BA$\text{}^{1}$, on the background of the hitherto existing Chłopice-Veselé culture settlement, in the Vistula and San basin and the higher course of Dniestr, there developed the Mierzanowice culture, and on the foundation of chiefly Corded Ware culture elements, a new Strzyżów culture appeared in the higher course of the river Bug (J. Machnik 1978, p. 30, fig. 12 — map). Both cultures represented a new stage of development and a similar ethnic substratum for the mentioned territories. Their chronological frame includes the period BA$\text{}^{2}$, i.e. 1750—1600 BC, confirmed, among others, by the dating of complexes from Iwanowice and Dziekanowice, the Voivodship of Kielce. They represent a complex of related cultures, which, next to the complex of Chłopice-Veselé, are the base for distinguishing the Polish eastern zone. They also mark an early date of that division.
The disappearance of both these cultures about 1600 BC, i.e. the beginning of \( BB_1 \), was closely connected with their transformation in the Vistula and San basin into the Trzciniec culture, while over South Volhynia and Podolia — into the Komarów culture. Ethnic and culture continuity of both settlements is confirmed by many objects, mostly from cemeteries, but also settlements. That type of alterations embraced, however, a much larger area of Europe, from the higher course of the Vistula to the middle Dniepr course. Its result was the formation of a culture complex named “Trzciniec—Komarów—Sośnica”. In its range the complex of Trzciniec is split into two cultures: East-Trzciniec and Trzciniec proper, which should consequently bear the name of West-Trzciniec (see the cartographic approach. S. S. Bierezanska 1972, p. 138, fig. 45 — map; J. Dąbrowski 1975, p. 40, fig. 1).

I shall give some attention to the latter publication, presenting a few observations and directing people interested in characterization of relic material to accessible literature. It is to be noted that a distinct division into the West and East Polish zones continues to persist during the period of this culture.

The so-called West-Trzciniec culture developed since the decline of BA, and lasted till BC/BD or BD included, showing three phases of division: I — Żerniki phase. II — classic phase and III — decline phase. In the first phase we notice a distinct influence of the Tumulus culture and that of the Füzesabony phase of the Otomani culture, noticeable mostly in earthenware. Tumulus elements are particularly distinct at the western border zone of the West Trzciniec culture, i.e. in Łubna, the Voivodship of Sieradz, barrow 9, dated to \( BB_1 \) (see J. Miśkiewicz 1978, p. 190 fol.; W. Szymkier 1980, p. 17). In phase III, which revealed elements of the Piliny culture, the West-Trzciniec culture becomes transformed into the Lusatian culture (more exactly into its eastern group). It was a gradual process from west to east during BIC-BD. i.e. the IIIrd period of the Bronze Age, according to the so far applied chronological system.

The border zone of Trzciniec—Tumulus, to be noticed mostly between the rivers Prosnia and Warta, had a very mixed character, determining, moreover, the nature of mutual relations between neighbouring settlements of both cultures (see J. Dąbrowski 1977, p. 202, fig. 1 — map and p. 203 fol.; B. Gediga 1978. p. 156 fol. and p. 167. fig. 66). The “Trzciniec” settlement, stretching out to the south, never crossed the course of the Vistula and lower San (see K. Moskwá 1976, p. 140 fol. and p. 141/142 — map 2), it did not therefore embrace the whole of the highland and Sub-Carpathian zone. This requires particular stressing. as: 1 we meet many so-called “Carpathian” elements in the inventory of the West-Trzciniec culture, mostly noticeable in metal objects but also in earthenware. 2 — along the Sub-
Carpathian zone a relatively large number of finds and bronze treasures of southern origin is disclosed. Among others objects characteristic of the so-called Koszider type treasures, and later ones, of the so-called Rimavská Sobota type (see PZP 1978, p. 26, fig. 9 — map). These are, moreover, frequently discovered in the compass of the West-Trzciniec culture. The presence of these finds in the lower Carpathian belt suggests not only that exchange routes had been running through those territories, but also that we have to deal here with the presence of still undefined forms of settlement coming probably from over the mountains.

A distinct border is, however, marked between the West- and East-Trzciniec culture and the Komarów culture, but while the first two get mixed into one zone at the river Bug — in relation to the Komarów culture the border keeps fast (see J. Miśkiewicz, 1978, p. 195. fig. 69 — map) and the relic inventory only faintly reveals mutual influence. A successive culture-and-ethnic boundary is formed here, lasting since the West-Trzciniec throughout the Lusatian culture, up to occurrence of finds of the East-Pomeranian culture in early phases of the La Tène period (see Z. Bukowski 1980, p. 306).

In the West Trzciniec culture the impact of the Otomani culture is distinct and noticeable in a number of pottery forms (M. Cabalska 1979, p. 53 fol.), particularly in the settlement of Maszkowice: the Voivodship of Nowy Sacz, which had probably been a trading post for the “Otomani” population (see M. Cabalska 1974, p. 57 fol.). In want of good chronological determinants from the region of the Trzciniec culture, it is accepted that Otomani influence fell in the north to the classical phase (Füzesabony) dated to BB₁, i.e. to the largest development of that culture and its share in the far-reaching trading contacts. The settlement of Maszkowice had occurred probably at the time of forming an important trading centre in Spiš (see J. Vladár 1973, p. 335) and was contemporary with the phase II of the defence settlement in Spišský Štvrtok (J. Vladár 1975, p. 14). It is also accepted that in phase II of the Otomani culture, the infiltration of its population from Spiš as well as from East Slovakia through the Carpathians ought to be considered. The first Piliny influences observable in the earthenware inventory of the Maszkowice settlement are probably connected with this period.

“Mad’arove” influences, that should be taken into account mostly in the higher Vistula basin. are much weaker. It is true that part of Little Poland has been poorly investigated. Further studies undertaken here should particularly concentrate on them, also because the Mad’arove culture settlement had subdued the valley of Vag, coming up to Orava (see E. Schubert 1974, map 3). The Veteřov type finds are completely lacking
here, which strengthens our previous assumption about the necessity of distinguishing the zones of Věteřov and Maďarovce influence acting northerly.

In phase III of the Otomani culture its influence becomes clearly weaker. In any case the oldest findings of the Lusatian culture from Little Poland, dated to the decline of BC and to BD, do not record elements of that culture. On the contrary, more lively influences of two Transcarpathian cultures: Piliny and may be Felsőszöcs-Stanove begin to rise, although they are still very weak north of the Carpathians (see M. Cabalska 1974, p. 90), and visible mainly in bronze products connected with the horizon of treasures of the Rimavská Sobota type.

The Otomani-Trzciniec connections should be considered in the context of that time’s trade between the Aegae-Balkan circle, the Carpathian Basin the eastern Baltic shores and Jutland (see J. Vladár 1973, p. 253 fol.: 1974 p. 222 fol.: J. Bouzek 1978 p. 47 fol.). The Otomani and West-Trzciniec settlements fulfilled here distinctly the role of mediators (see Z. Bukowski 1980. p. 312 fol., characteristics of southern imports in the Vistula-Odra basin and in Sambia). It seems also that the exploitation of copper ore in the Matra mountains and East Slovakia had played an important role in connections through the West Carpathians, which is recently an object of particular attention of archaeologists (J. Vladár — A. Bartoněk 1977, p. 384). The exceptional position of the population in the Otomani culture and of Maďarovce and Věteřov groups in trade-cultural exchange between south and north is indicated. This question is recently widely discussed in Czechoslovakian literature.

At the same time, the presence of bronze-working centres becomes ever clearer, also in the compass of the West-Trzciniec culture in Kuyavia and Great Poland (see J. Dąbrowski 1977, p. 209 fol.), as well as in the area taken up by Silesian Tumulus groups, for the latter had considerable share in the distribution of their own bronze products on to the area of the previously named culture. The raw material brought from beyond the Carpathians was, however, basic here.

As to efforts aiming at the reconstruction of trading tracts in the early phases of the Bronze Age presented in Polish literature concerning the subject, they should be very cautiously accepted (see our critical remarks, Z. Bukowski 1980. p. 312. fol.). The essential role of the Moravian Gate, a very distinct pass between Middle-Danubian Europe and territories lying north of the Carpathians and Sudeten Mountains, is no more discussed today. The chance of other tracts having existed during the Otomani culture should be admitted. They may have run from Spiš and Orava through the valley of Dunajec to the Vistula, or eastward from East Slovakia through the Užocka and Dukla pass, to be exploited later by the population of the Gava-Holíhrady complex.
The final phase of the West-Trzciniec culture is connected with a distinct process of its transformations into the Lusatian culture, most probably in the framework of the same settlement, although a wave of the early Lusatian culture stepping in here from the West is not excluded. The first assumption is confirmed by many mixed Trzciniec-Lusatian complexes in the regions where the local Lusatian groups — the Lublin and Tarnobrzeg ones — were formed (in the northern parts of the Lusatian culture). The process mentioned above started in territories lying west of the Vistula already at the decline of BC, i.e. at the turning point of Bronze Age II and III, being the continuation of a similar process in the basin of Odra and partly Warta. During BD it already embraced eastern regions over the rivers San and Bug (see Z. Bukowski 1969, p. 421 fol.; J. Dąbrowski 1977, p. 120 fol.). At the same time we notice a distinct influence of Sabatinovka-Noua complexes over the middle course of San: they are dated BD, i.e. 1300—1200 BC (see Z. Bukowski 1976, p. 13 fol.). The appearance of this complex in the place of the Komarów culture marks a complete alteration of settlement, and means that the postulated culture-and-ethnic borderline over the higher Bug and the higher Dniestr will then get strengthened and, along the eastern borderland of the Lusatian culture, a complex of proto-Thracian character will be formed.

The Tarnobrzeg group forming in BD and showing an inventory with a considerable share of Transcarpathian elements, begins then a process of settling in the eastern part of the Sub-Carpathian land (K. Moskwa 1976, p. 139 fol. and 144/145 — map 3). Further studies concerning that group should necessarily take account of the Transcarpathian cultural, and probably also ethnic elements in its genesis (K. Moskwa 1976, p. 141 fol.). Moreover, the share of an older population that had inhabited those regions is not to be excluded, being, however, still impossible to assess archaeologically, perhaps because of the unstable character of the settlement itself. This might explain the fact that recognizing the Tarnobrzeg group as a mixed settlement of decidedly peripheric character and situation has been recently postulated.

5. FINAL REMARKS

In the light of all the above observations, in the early phases of the Bronze Age we notice a close dependence of South Polish lands on development of the widely understood Carpathian Basin. Moreover, the distinction of two zones is fully justified: they are the western and eastern Polish zones, showing a diverse development process and probably different demographic background. The line running between them forms at the same
time the culture-and-ethnic borderline, which will keep fast till at least the end of the first millennium BC.

In the West-Polish zone there comes, after a period of the Bell Beaker culture and epi-Corded Ware elements, an inflow of the Únětice culture population, which will mark the first distinctly noticeable alteration of settlement. Towards the end of this culture (in BB₁), a strong influence of the Věteřov type becomes clear. Starting from BB₂, we observe a further change, due to the inflow of the Tumulus culture population (the so-called pre-Lusatian culture), which will get transformed during BC into the Lusatian culture. This means that in the Odra and partly Warta basin, a stabilization of the ethnic character of these lands will fall only to the “Tumulus” phase. The complete development of these lands shows close dependence on events occurring south and south-west of the Moravian Gate, thus the region conventionally called Middle-Danubian.

In the East-Polish zone, already from BA₁, settlement and ethnic continuity starting from the Chlopice-Vesele, through the Mierzanowice and West-Trzciniec to the Lusatian culture can be observed. This means that a principally unchanged demographic base had its roots here since at least the beginning of the Bronze Age. The development of this zone depended moreover closely on the development of the eastern Carpathian Basin.

In the range of the West-Trzciniec culture a strong influence of the Otomani culture can be observed (particularly its Fűzesabony phase). Much weaker is the impact of Maďarovce and Piliny, while at the time of passing on to the Lusatian culture we notice an influence of Sabatinovka-Noua. It is chiefly through the East-Polish zone that the inflow of bronze products or treasures of the Koszider type horizon (BB₂–BC₁) and the Rimavská Sobota (BC₂–BD) took place.

During the period of the Lusatian culture, in spite of great uniformity of cultural aspect, the division into two zones postulated above will be maintained till the final phase of this culture’s existence, with different directions of Transcarpathian influences.
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