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Abstract: The author carried out a thorough re-analysis of two eneolithic grave assemblages from Upper Silesia. Both burials discussed in the text yielded culturally and chronologically distinct vessels with discoid attachments of handles (Germ. Scheibenhenkel). The findings in question are very important for the understanding of the decline of the Middle Eneolithic ‘Danubian’ traditions in the area.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In archaeology, as in any other scientific domain, there are some ‘known knowns’, i.e. things we all rather know, many ‘known unknowns’, i.e. things we would like to know, and plenty ‘unknown unknowns’, i.e. things we do not even know of. But there are also issues known for so long and seemingly so well that any discussion upon them is perpetuated exclusively by constantly repeated old and commonly shared preconceptions. Even if the latter are wrong and should be revisited. Two such ‘unknown knowns’ from the Opole Silesia will be discussed below. One of them is an alleged grave discovered over 130 years ago in Kietrz–Łegi, the other – a burial unearthed shortly before the Second World War merely 14 kilometers from the former one, in Racibórz–Studzienna. This article aims to present both the findings anew in more detail and to show their importance for the understanding of the end of the Middle Eneolithic in Upper Silesia as well as adjacent areas (see Fig. 1 for general localization of all sites discussed in the text).
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2. KIETRZ–ŁĘGI-GÓRSKA STREET, SITE 19 (PAR 102-38, SITE 19/17), KIETRZ DISTRICT

2.1. Lieutenant Rudolf Stöckel and his archaeological activity in Upper Silesia

Even though the prehistoric research of Upper Silesia in the second half of the 19th century was still crawling on all fours, some amateurs of archaeology made this infancy a very promising time. Half-jokingly, it can be said that when Theodor Mommsen qualified Prehistory as “a science of the illiterate, an area of activity for rural pastors and retired officers”, he luckily somehow underappreciated at least one ex-service Prussian officer from Racibórz (Germ. Ratibor) – lieutenant Rudolf Stöckel. If the silhouette of Oberleutnant Stöckel appears rather blurred to us and still waits for its biographer, then his scientific activity reported in carefully edited and illustrated letters sent to the Museum of Silesian Antiquities in Wrocław (Germ. Museum Schlesischer Altertümer, Breslau) has long become part of regional history of archaeology. As I will prove below by making use of it, this correspondence ought to be highly valued for more than purely antiquarian reasons. The letter which will attract our attention here is dated 8th of August 1883, and gives an account of a very important discovery made in May of the same year at the site of Kietrz–Łęgi-Górskia street (Germ. Katscher–Langenau–Ehrenberg), at the property of Joseph Thomik.

2.2. The site and the excavations from 1883

Even today, much of what is known about the locality (Fig. 2.1) is based exactly on reports of lieutenant Stöckel. Information provided by him is referred to, directly or not, starting from the first catalogue of Silesian archaeological findings prepared by Julius Zimmermann, ending with modern comprehensive archaeological studies concerning the region. An exceptional care R. Stöckel took over this site, being at the time destroyed by exploitation of clay for local brickyard, resulted also in excavations. In the course of three actions carried out by him firstly in autumn 1882, and then twice in the early springtime of 1883, several pits visible in clay extraction pits were explored and documented. However, in what follows we will be interested not in the features recorded at the time by Oberleutnant Stöckel, but in one of the graves unearthed slightly later. Although the finding was reported by R. Stöckel, it was explored under the supervision of a principal of a local school, Mr Gröger. The discovery in question as well as circumstances in which it came to light were presented to a wider body of archaeologists nearly three decades later by professor Hans Seger in a half-page paragraph which, as a matter of fact, is nothing but partially edited, partially quoted word for word, extract from Stöckel’s letter. In the present discussion I should like to get back to the original manuscript because to some extent gives us a chance to verify, the version presented by the professor from Breslau.
Fig. 2. Localization of the two archaeological sites discussed in the text:
1: Kietrz–Łęgi, site 19; 2: Racibórz–Studzienna, site 9 (graphics by Maksym Mackiewicz)
The grave which is of our particular interest here was described by R. Stöckel as follows:

“[The dead] was buried at a depth of 2.60 m, [oriented] from N to S, with the head to N, without coffin or board-pad, directly on a yellow clay (loess) and laid on the right side, with the right hand under the head, the left arm on the left thigh and with bent knees.

The bones were in such degree of decay, that not even one part of the skull could be reconstructed as it was intended. Except for single shards of the Lusitian and Burgwall type [Lusitian and medieval pottery – T.J.Ch.], which prevail also all over the cultural layer […], no gifts like weapon, ornaments or things of the kind came to light in the proximity of the body during exploration of the skeleton.

Just one day later some 30 cm above the head as well as 50 cm above and 30 cm sideward from it, two laying pots were recovered, comprising pressed jug and somewhat better preserved vessel. The two contained no ashes but earth. Because only single parts are missing, they were handed over with the earth-filling undoubtedly intact, and for that they must be treated as grave goods, more likely as they were found in the vicinity of the skeleton. […]”

2.3. The findings

Although shortly after their discovery both the pots were handed forward to the collection of the Archaeological Museum in Wrocław, today one of them (nota bene – the one of lesser importance to us) appears to be lost. This, however, does not constitute a serious obstacle, because the original description and the primary publication offer us a good description, drawings as well as a photograph of the artifacts.

2.3.1. The jug (Fig. 3.1 and 4)

The jug has a flat bottom, a slightly curved belly with a high shoulder and a sub-conical neck narrowing toward the rim; the joint between the belly and the neck is strongly accented with a ledge; the rim and the base of the neck are connected with a single wide strap handle of the Scheibenhenkel type; 214 mm (220 mm at the rim); diameter of the rim – 86 mm (95 mm when measured in the handle’s plain); maximal diameter of the belly – 174–182 mm; diameter of the bottom – 76–83 mm.
2.3.2. The single-eared pot (Fig. 3.2)\textsuperscript{15}

As can clearly be seen on the figure and the photograph published\textsuperscript{16} this is a smoothly s-profiled pot with a single small handle joining its rim with the upper part of the belly; height – 16 cm; diameter of the rim – 12.5 cm; maximal diameter of the belly – 13.5 cm; diameter of the bottom – 8 cm.\textsuperscript{17}

2.3.3. Human remains

The second half of the 19th century was the time when physical anthropology in Germany gained its principal impetus and, as we can learn from the report, even amateur archaeologists apparently started to pay much attention to prehistoric human remains. Regrettably, the strongly decayed from human bones discovered in Kietrz–Łęgi were recognized by principal Gröger and lieutenant Stöckel as not very useful for further studies and probably left where they were found. Well, more detailed field documentation and analyses of skeletal remains were yet to become a part of archaeological routine…

\textsuperscript{15} The pot was originally recorded under number 346: 83.
\textsuperscript{16} SEGER 1919, Abb. 286.
\textsuperscript{17} Since measurements of the jug currently made by the author are very close to the ones taken by R. Stöckel, we can rely on the original report also when describing dimensions of the other (pot) under consideration (STÖCKEL 1983c, 3, Fig. 1).
3. RACIBÓRZ–STUDZIENNA, SITE 9 (PAR 102-39, SITE 9/76), 18 THE RACIBÓRZ DISTRICT

3.1. Doctor Gerhard Jürgen Fock and his research in Upper Silesia

Regardless of additional ideological and political incentives, as a result of long-lasting and forward-looking stimuli of the state and local authorities, archaeology in German part of Upper Silesia in 1930’s had already been excellently organized. In the years preceding the outbreak of the war institutional development of prehistoric research in the region resulted, among others, in considerable growth of qualified personnel. If at the beginning of the third decade the only really active expert in Upper Silesia was doctor Georg Raschke, then in the end of this period outposts in Racibórz and Bytom (Germ. Beuthen) gave employment also to a few young archaeologists. 19 What is important, professional archaeology had already made such progress in Germany that a number of highly qualified researchers could be easily assigned to these newly created positions. 20 One of the new employees was doctor Gerhard Fock, who started to work on 16th of January, 1938 as a second Senior Archaeologist and Keeper of Antiquities at the Archaeological Survey of Upper Silesia (Germ. Landesamt für Vorgeschichte der Oberschlesien) in the Provincial Historical Monuments Bureau in Racibórz. 21

Fig. 4. The jug from the alleged grave discovered in Kietrz–Łęgi, site 19 (drawn by N. Lenkow, photographed by M. Mackiewicz)

18 The PAR survey and record made by Jerzy Golubkow (1985).
20 See Pape 2002.
21 See Raschke 1941, 9.
The research carried out by G. Fock in the late 1930’s and early 1940’s in Upper Silesia is just an episode both in his career\textsuperscript{22} as well as in the long history of archaeology in the area.\textsuperscript{23} Professional activity of doctor Fock in the area lasted for no longer than two to three years, and was spent rather intensely on conducting excavations, writing and publishing reports as well as arranging museum events. The accidentally uncovered eneolithic burial from Racibórz–Studzienna (Germ. Ratibor–Süd) that will be in the focus of our attention in the following discussion is decidedly the most broadly known of all his discoveries from the time.

3.2. The site and the excavations

In the course of routine rescue excavations undertaken on behalf of the Archaeological Survey between 14\textsuperscript{th} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} of September, 1938 at the locality long known to German archaeologists as Ratibor-Süd-Kiesgrube Matuschek ("Matuschek’s gravel pit"), site 2 (Fig. 2.2 and 5), G. Fock unearthed three features. Because pits number 1 and 2 yielded just single not really distinctive eneolithic shards and as such today they are of little scientific value, it is only the grave labelled as pit number 3 that will attract our attention.

Although the pit under consideration was already presented by its explorer in Nachrichtenblatt für deutsche Vorzeit,\textsuperscript{24} we can learn much more about it from the original report worded shortly after the excavations.\textsuperscript{25} Large part of this typescript dated 7\textsuperscript{th} of October is taken up by a diary detailing the course of the fieldwork. The discovering of the feature under discussion was described there as follows:

"Tuesday, 20\textsuperscript{th} of September 1938. […] In the afternoon a discolouration of a new feature (3) appeared. This feature was dug up deeper. It is a very hard gritty feature without inclusions. At the depth of 1.35 m a cattle tooth was found. The contour enlarged so the excavation had to be widened. Wednesday, 21\textsuperscript{st} of September 1938. As again only one worker appeared, I took Mr Swirczek with me to Studzienna. The feature 3 was dug up deeper. The soil is still very hard and gritty, without inclusions. At the depth of 1.80 m a tulip-beaker appeared, which regretfully was broken during digging. Nevertheless, all shards were saved. At the depth of 1.83 m a new pot came to light. As it was already late in the afternoon, I covered the newly found pot 2 back and took pot 1, the tulip-beaker, away so that the children, who had seen the finding, would not demolish the site. The contour enlarged even more. The gritty layer is now fine-grained and not so hard anymore. Clay appeared again. The outer part of the feature is notably lighter than the inner part. Thursday, 22\textsuperscript{nd} of September 1938. The work was started in misty weather at 6 a.m. At the site there are two workers as well as Mr Swirczek, and from 7 a.m., Mr Slanina. The tulip-beaker was put back on the spot. The trench was widened once more. At the northern edge laid the snake-shaped beaker [sic!; collared flask] (pot 2). In the presence of Mr Dr Raschke the size of the feature was confirmed and measured anew. At the depth of 1.83 m Mr Ulrich took two photographs [Fig. 6a].\textsuperscript{26} From the depth of 1.80 m on, the inner part went down synclinally. Pots 1 and 2 stood at the margin of the darker discolouration. The middle of the discolouration is strongly clayish whereas the outer part is gritty. At the depth of 1.83 m some charcoals were found. From the depth of 1.85 m the dark discolouration was smaller. The snake-shaped beaker appeared to be a collared flask. New photographs were taken at the depth of 1.90 m [Fig. 6b]. The lighter discolouration is filled with charcoals. The diameter of the discolouration measures 1.20 m. At this depth two samples of soil were taken. A shadow of a skeleton appeared in the discolouration. The dark discolouration contrasts sharply with the lighter. (At 14 p.m. Mr Dr Raschke said that the Czech government has resigned.)\textsuperscript{27}

At 14.45 a new pot with two handles, a Jordansmühl [Pol. Jordanów Śląski] pot, came to light (at the depth of 1.90 m). At the depth of 2 m in the light discolouration a spot with concentration of charcoals appeared. In general, the light discolouration makes impression of a layer of wood. During digging up there appeared a shard which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Cf. Wendt 1982, 2; Rust 1982, 7; Morris 1989, 2–3; Morris 1991, 44; Chmielewski 2014.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Cf. Janka 1961, 6–7; Kramarek 1971, 244–246; Chojecki 2006, 238; Tomczak 2013, 275, and 282–287.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Fock 1941, 37–38.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Fock 1938. Short descriptions presented in Polish firstly by Janina Bukowska-Gedigowa (Bukowska-Gedigowa 1975, 157) and recently by Małgorzata Kurgan-Przybyska (Kurgan-Przybyska 2013, 65) follow the one published in 1941.
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Digitalized versions of the photographs that can be accessed on the website of the Museum of Opole Silesia at http://www.mso-archeologia.pl/node/5883 and http://…/5886.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} The excavations took place in the days preceding the Munich agreement.
\end{itemize}
at first was considered as a new pot. Next to it two arrowheads came out; from this spot a soil sample was taken. In the vicinity of the pot with handles (pot 3) at the depth of 2.05 m there lay teeth in a row; so we have also remains of a skull. In addition at this depth there appeared the third small arrowhead. At the depth of 2.10 m one more shard was found. A soil sample was taken from the vicinity of the belly [of the pot].

During further digging up the feature disappeared. The bottom of the grave pit was reached. And so all the findings were recovered. The last traces of the discolouration appeared at the depth of 2.17 m.

Bottom edges of the pots were:
the pot 1 at the depth of 1.98 m
the pot 2 at the depth of 2.00 m
the pot 3 at the depth of 2.05 m


Fig. 5. Racibórz–Studzienna, site 9, at the beginning of excavations conducted in September 1938 (photographed by Ulrich; courtesy of the Museum of Opole Silesia)
3.3. The findings

Considering that in the end of World War II and shortly after it, when German administration had already withdrawn and the front had passed, yet no new local archaeological authorities were established, findings gathered in Racibórz suffered the most serious losses of all archaeological collections in Upper Silesia, it was a stroke of luck that the grave assemblage under consideration survived almost intact.29 ‘Almost’ because the assemblage stored today in the Upper Silesian Museum in Bytom (Pol. Muzeum Górniośląskie w Bytomiu) is incomplete. Probably as a result of many relocations of regional archaeological collections during and after the Second World War two from the set of three arrowheads were lost30 and we know about them only as much as we can learn from the Fock’s article. Other findings can and will be presented anew in more detail below.

3.3.1. The tulip-like beaker (Fig. 7)31

The open-mouthed pot was built of two parts – a low round-bottomed belly and a high funnel-shaped neck; height – 112 mm; diameter of the rim – 153 mm; maximal diameter of the belly – 90 mm.

3.3.2. The collared flask (Fig. 8)32

The flask has a flat bottom, a rounded belly and concave neck with a collar localized in the mid-height; profile of the pot’s wall is smoothly s-shaped; it should be noticed that the body of the belly was originally slightly flattened at the maximal protrusion (the part of belly which is biconical was reconstructed with gypsum); height – 160–167 mm; diameter of the rim – 72–75 mm; diameter of the collar – 87–89 mm; maximal diameter of the belly – 112 mm; diameter of the bottom – 64–68 mm.

3.3.3. The amphora (Fig. 9)33

This is an amphora with a flat bottom, an almost spherical belly and a concave neck that slightly narrows down towards its rim; at a joint of the neck and the belly tectonics of the s-profiled pot is accentuated with a small ledge; the amphora bears two not exactly opposite wide strap handles running from the rim to the shoulder; both the ears rise slightly above the rim and are attached to the pot’s shoulder with disc-shaped flattened ends (Scheibenhenkel); height – 170 mm (160 mm at the rim); diameter of the rim – 86 mm (96 mm when measured in the plain of handles); maximal diameter of the belly – 146 mm (148 mm when measured in the plain of handles); diameter of the bottom – 68 mm (70 mm when measured in the plain of handles).

29 TomCzak 2013, 276; WóJCik-kühnel–holC–MuTuSz-Czyk 2013, 303, 314.
30 In the course of the war the assemblage was moved from Racibórz to Brno. According to Mr Lubomir Šebela (personal communication from 09.09.2013.) possibility that any artifacts were left in the Moravian Museum should be rather excluded.
31 Inventory number B. 725/3978:58.
32 Inventory number B. 725/3945:58.
33 Inventory number B. 725/3979:58.
Fig. 6. Racibórz-Studzienna, site 9, bottom part of the grave during exploration
(photographed by Ullrich; courtesy of the Museum of Opole Silesia)
3.3.4. The projectile-points (Fig. 10)

What can be read in the report and seen on one of the photographs (Fig. 6b), is that there were three arrowheads discovered in a cluster at the level of the grave deposit:

Arrowhead no. 1 (Fig. 10.1): quite slender bifacial form with approximately half-of-the-width narrow short tang; remains of ventral side and negatives of primary removals on the dorsal face of the blank from which the point was made clearly indicate that it was a blade or a blade-like flake; the two negatives on the upper face form a kind of occasional rib; as evidenced by the large negative of Janus flake detached from the butt of the blank, the bulbular protrusion was removed prior to bifacial shaping of the point and the tang; the blade of the projectile-point was formed bifacially with sub-lamellar covering retouch on the tip and similar invasive retouch on both the edges, except for the mesial part on the right dorsal face, which was left unmodified; the tang is clearly distinguished from the blade by notches formed at both sides in the ventral proximal part of the blank; the straight base of the haft element was shaped with a short semi-abrupt retouch removing the butt as well as some part of the bulbular section of the primary flake; no traces of wear (basal grinding etc.) could be observed macroscopically; raw material – local erratic flint; length – 37.4 mm, width – 16.1 mm, thickness – 4.9 mm, weight – 2.8 g.

Arrowhead no. 2 (Fig. 10.2): because the drawings of lithic findings published by G. Fock do not bear as much information as we expect them to do nowadays, not all characteristics can be read out from them; despite these limitations, it can be said with all certainty that the projectile-point under consideration represents the same design as the previously described one; large negatives on the upper and lower face of the specimen show that it was made on a blade-like blank, the small sub-lamellar centripetal negatives on the arrowhead’s blade clearly show that it was shaped bifacially, whereas the tang was distinguished from the blade with notches and formed with short retouch at its base; raw material – undetermined; length – 43 mm, width – 17.5 mm, thickness – 6 mm.

Inventory number B.829/4082:58.

Fig. 7. The tulip-like shaped beaker from the gravediscovered in Racibórz–Studzienna, site 9 (drawn by Nicole Lenkow, photographed by M. Mackiewicz)
Arrowhead no. 3 (Fig. 10.3): similarly to arrowhead number 2, based on the figures presented here after the primary publication, it can be said that the point number 3 represents the same design as specimens number 1 and 2; again, large negatives visible on the upper and lower face of the projectile-point show that it was made on a blade-like blank, the small sub-lamellar centripetal negatives on the arrowhead’s blade clearly show that it was shaped bifacially whereas the tang was distinguished from the blade with notches and formed with a short retouch at its base; raw material – undetermined; length – 29.5 mm, width – 14.5 mm, thickness – 4.5 mm.

3.3.5. Human remains

Since the few skeletal remains recovered from the deposit, i.e. the teeth, can no longer be found in storehouses of Silesian museums, and the report yields no anthropological characteristics of the individual buried, no further information can be provided in this regard.\(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\) While searching for the human remains in question some attention should be probably paid to acquaintance of G. Fock with anthropologist doctor Gisela Asmus. About her long stay in Racibórz the German archaeologist mentions in his memoirs, fragments of which were kindly sent to me by Mrs. Hanne Baumecker.
Fig. 9. The amphora from the grave discovered in Racibórz–Studzienna, site 9 (drawn by N. Lenkow, photographed by M. Mackiewicz)
4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. The archaeologists, their fieldwork and reports

The main reason to present both the discoveries under consideration with short historiographic prefaces was to set them in their situational, institutional and personal context. No experienced field or archive researcher can claim such background to be of no other value than an emphatic bridge to the past events, for none of us has to be convinced as to what extent credibility of results achieved during excavations and reports compiled later on their basis depend upon such particular circumstances. It is also rather needless to explain how revealing in this regard lectures of original relations can be, especially when they concern some absorbing episodes as in here. For these reasons the long passes from reports cited above almost in extenso should be subject to at least general content analysis. Moreover, if we want to infer as much as possible from the assemblages under discussion, we also have to know how far both the related documents can be used as sources of unified data.

Concerning the letter reporting the discovery from Kietrz, the conspicuous precision of every line and drawing reflects the intellectual engagement as well as discipline of its author. All in all, the letter comes from the desk of a man who was not only a dedicated enthusiast of archaeology, but also officer emeritus with certain routine in reporting gained during years of military service. Wording of this relation is not only exact and logically arranged, but reveals also that R. Stöckel – not forgetting about his informant, Mr Gröger, though! – had a firm grasp of general archaeological debate of the time. Let it be just recalled how much attention was paid to questions such as homogenity (when discussing connection between the skeleton and pottery findings), context (in the minute description of body’s position in the grave), or preservation of human remains. The use of professional terminology (notice – for instance – reference to the Lusitian type\(^\text{36}\)), should not be overlooked either.\(^\text{37}\) What is more, it is detailed to the degree which makes the reconstruction of the grave and its furnishing somehow verifiable (see below). Summing up, even if we do not handle the first-hand report of a professional excavator, its lecture makes us believe that both the narrative and narrator are reliable.

In so far the only paper in which some attention was paid to the people taking part in excavations conducted in autumn of 1938 at Racibórz–Studzienna we meet a short remark that the research was “after all [underlining by T.J.Ch.] conducted in the field by assistants and auxiliary personnel of the Landesamt für Vorgeschichte in

\(^{36}\) Distinguished not so long before by Rudolf Virchow (Virchow 1872).

\(^{37}\) As we can learn from an introduction to one of excavation reports concerning Kietrz–Łęgi (Stöckel 1883b), lieutenant Stöckel gained this knowledge directly from meetings of the Berlin Anthropological Society (Germ. Berliner Anthropologischer Gesellschaft) and professional literature.
As for the fieldwork, at the beginning it was similar to many other preventive actions routinely undertaken by archaeologists working for Landesamt. In the introduction to the report cited, G. Fock\textsuperscript{40} even mentioned such excavations carried out in preceding weeks in Kietrz (Germ. Katscher) and Pietrowice Wielkie (Germ. Groß Peterwitz). Generally speaking, such interventions were often conducted within both narrowly limited funds and time. Because of the justifiable haste, resulting documentation was not always of high standard. To a certain point it was no different in the case of Racibórz. However, when it became clear that one of the pits contained peculiarly interesting assemblage, the works were apparently slowed down, observations made more carefully and documentation completed with more scrutiny. Especially valuable are the few photographs of the bottom part of this feature. Together with descriptions quoted above that follow the excavation report they shed some new light on problems such as grave pit’s construction, microstratigraphic relations and arrangement of grave goods. What concerns the content of the written record, even though it is apparently loaded with some dose of post-factum creation (insofar as probably every record addressing discovery of certain and realized value is), the discourse in fact does not affect factual description. The text is possibly detailed, coherent and refers to all photographs, findings and soil samples (regularly!) collected in the course of excavations. Although there are also serious shortcomings, such as lack of any plan or description of the trench and its localization and also drawings of discovered features to mention just the most obvious ones, the weak points do not shake the credibility of the report.\textsuperscript{41}

Both the documents, concise and reliable, are prepared scrupulously. However, not without some surprise the reader come to the conclusion, that also in its merits the half-amateur report written a hundred and thirty years ago in many points stands comparison with the description made by a professional archaeologist over fifty years later. It appears that in principle Gröger and Stöckel paid attention to the same methodical (stratigraphy, homogenity etc.) and prehistoric (cultural attribution of the findings, elements of burial rite etc.) questions as Fock. Such conclusions, naturally, by no means demonstrate any anachronism of Fock’s approach (after all these questions remain crucial until today), but rather emphasize the unique character of Stöckel’s report. Still, there are also certain reasons for which the relation about the burial unearthed at Racibórz–Studzienna can be used with more confidence than the one concerning the discovery from Kietrz–Łęgi. First of all, there was considerable technical and institutional progress made during decades that passed from the 19\textsuperscript{th} century pioneering research. Probably the main advantage of G. Fock over R. Stöckel was having the photographic equipment and even a photographer at his disposal. Apparently Fock used it to take a short-cut as regards graphic documentation of the finding, but it cannot be denied that owing to this we have more – nomen omen – earthy record from the grave’s exploration (drawings tend to be much more interpretation-laden). As already mentioned, in the case of the alleged grave from Kietrz there is no graphic documentation at all. Another reason to value Fock’s report higher is situational: in contrast to the research in Kietrz, the excavations conducted in Racibórz have been supervised and then reported by the same person; additionally, Fock’s description of the discovery was written immediately after the excavations and promptly published.

Having presented and commented on the reports in general, we should briefly specify what sort of data they do or do not provide, and to what degree information that pertains to each finding can be confronted with those concerning the second one discussed here as well as other similar findings. Undeniably the most severe limitation is complete inability to localize the burials under discussion within the sites and in relation to other features, hypothetically post-factum creation (insofar as probably every record addressing discovery of certain and realized value is). However, whether notes made by Fock during the excavations contained them or any other valuable pieces of information we will rather never know. The little hope that some documents from Racibórz could be found in personal archive of G. Fock collected after his death by Dorothea Fock was dispelled by living members of his family. As provided by H. Kleyenstüber (G. Fock’s daughter from the first marriage born in Racibórz in 1943) and H. Baumecker (D. Fock’s daughter from her first marriage), all G. Fock’s documents from this time were left in Racibórz or lost during his military service and ensuing captivity (personal communication with H. Baumecker, 06.07.-16.09.2013.).

\textsuperscript{38} “[…] prowadzone zresztą [underlining by T.J.Ch.] w terenie przez laborantów i pomocniczy personel raciborskiego Landesamt für Vorgeschichte” (Kozłowski 1965, 75).

\textsuperscript{39} Morzes 1989.

\textsuperscript{40} Fock 1938, 1.

\textsuperscript{41} On the one hand, as there was no mentioning of any situational sketches in the report and all we have at our disposal in Silesian archives is the above-presented photograph of the unearthed block, it should probably be assumed that no such drawings were ever made. On the other hand it cannot be neglected that the official typescript was apparently based on the field notes arranged in a kind of a diary which, as we know from common practice, very often contain some additional drawings. However, whether notes made by Fock during the excavations contained them or any other valuable pieces of information we will never rather know. The little hope that some documents from Racibórz could be found in personal archive of G. Fock collected after his death by Dorothea Fock was dispelled by living members of his family. As provided by H. Kleyenstüber (G. Fock’s daughter from the first marriage born in Racibórz in 1943) and H. Baumecker (D. Fock’s daughter from her first marriage), all G. Fock’s documents from this time were left in Racibórz or lost during his military service and ensuing captivity (personal communication with H. Baumecker, 06.07.-16.09.2013.).

\textsuperscript{40} “nomen omen” – earthy record from the grave’s exploration (drawings tend to be much more interpretation-laden). As already mentioned, in the case of the alleged grave from Kietrz there is no graphic documentation at all. Another reason to value Fock’s report higher is situational: in contrast to the research in Kietrz, the excavations conducted in Racibórz have been supervised and then reported by the same person; additionally, Fock’s description of the discovery was written immediately after the excavations and promptly published.
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thetically contemporaneous with them. In the case of the alleged grave from Kietrz it is also impossible to reconstruct the shape of the pit in which the dead was interred. At least in this regard the report concerning excavations conducted in Studzienna is more complete. Going further from the general to more particular aspects of information we find out that both the reports can be compared as regards grave assemblages, the way funeral gifts were arranged, and to certain extent also positions and orientations of bodies in the graves.

All the above discussion about description of basic facts on the two grave findings under consideration could have made false impression of following the ethos-pathos-logos rule. Of course such pyramid of criteria used in our everyday communication, where weight and strength of opinions are usually measured first by authority, then by expressiveness and persuasiveness of a given speaker and only then by merits presented by this person, should not be applied to verification or falsification of facts in serious scientific discourse. The only way to assess the reports without judging them on the strength of their authors or detailedness and inner coherence of records provided by them, is to confront the data inferred from them with our general knowledge about given problem. And this moves us to the main part of this reasoning, i.e. to prehistoric issues.

4.2. The assemblages

The discussion on the discoveries will be conducted in reversed order to the one in which they were presented above all with detailed questions of cultural and chronological attribution of viz. findings being addressed first. This will allow analyzing more general issues (as, for instance, funeral rite) in their right contexts.

There are two reasons for which the grave assemblages in question will be subject to traditional descriptive analysis. First of all, each of the findings has already been discussed or mentioned on different occasions by many authors and such formula, even if old-fashioned, seems to be the most appropriate for critical introduction of the main threads of these debates. Secondly, the small number of related discoveries from Upper Silesia makes it impossible to approach the problem with the use of more advanced analytical tools.


To some extent understandably, all discussions regarding discoveries from Kietrz–Łęgi focused almost exclusively on typologically distinct jug with Scheibenhenkel. For this reason our analysis of the assemblage will
start from this pot as well. As mentioned above, the findings from Kietrz and circumstances in which they had been unearthed were presented to a wider body of specialists by H. Seger. He described them among assemblages of the so-called Marszowice group (Marschowitz Gruppe) of the Corded Ware culture. However, the few archaeologists studying this vessel so far immediately noticed that it was completely dissimilar to other pottery attributed to the Marszowice group(!). Probably the first to exclude the jug under consideration from the Marszowice group on typological ground was Carl Umbreit. He attributed the pot to the Britz group. Marta Soltýkowska-Godłowska, whose attitude to the old conception of the Marszowice group as a regional variant of the Corded Ware culture was rather skeptical, and who considered this taxonomic unit (in a way correctly) to represent regional Early Bronze Age, also called the opinion of H. Seger in question. According to her, this pot was related to the Bohemian group of the Corded Ware culture. Several years later the Marszowice Group was proven to be a complete misconception created by mixing up findings that belonged to the Corded Ware and the Úfetít culture, but the question of the jug was forgotten. As regards both the above quoted opinions concerning cultural affinity of the vessel in question, they tacitly became part of the history of archaeology when Ida Bognár-Kutzián laid foundation for the discussion on the Scheibenhenkel phenomenon in the Carpathian Basin. We can suppose that someone would finally solve the question of the jug from Kietrz if only the discussion addressing it had not died in the early 1960’s. What would the authors quoted presumably write about the finding today then?

The presence of the handle with discoidal attachment at its base directs our attention to the South, beyond the Carpathian Arch. Without going too deep into the debate carried on for over four decades, we can say that the discussed type of handle is characteristic for the developed Middle Copper Age in the Carpathian Basin, occurring mostly to the east from the Danube-Tisza interfluve. Scheibenhenkel is present at least in three distinguishable, subsequent stages corresponding to the Bodrogkeresztúr B, the Hunyadi-halom culture and the so-called Proto-boleráz phase. As an influence from the Polgár centre, the idea of such handle appears in all neighboring areas. Even though up to now the uppermost part of the Odra basin has not been taken into consideration as a spread area of Scheibenhenkel, the (re)discovery of the jug in question and the amphora from Racibórz described above and discussed in more detail below (see p. 198) leave no doubt that Upper Silesia, together with Moravia and western Little Poland, constitute north-western periphery of its diffusion. All such ears found so far in the surroundings of Kraków belong to pottery assemblages connected with the late phase of the Wyciąże–Złotniki group. Also a little bit more to the north, and east, at the territory settled by bearers of the Lublin-Volhynian culture, this handle-fixing pattern was applied as such and infrequently imitated by marking ears’ bases with thumb-pressed negatives. To the south from the upper Odra basin, in Moravia, handles with disc-shaped attachments occur exclusively in the Baalberg culture/group. What must be pointed out here, Scheibenhenkel does not occur in its basic form further to the west. Bohemian Baalberg assemblages yielded only interesting Scheibenhenkel-modeled skeuomorphic form of applied plastic decoration, called sometimes inverted U-shaped mustache (Cze. spodni U-vousy). Such imitation is made with the use of a single coil of clay applied to the handle’s base in a form of ring-like flattened rib. This pseudo-Scheibenhenkel type occurred in the Funnel Beaker culture pottery from Benátky, Mladá Boleslav district, and Cimburk–Hradisté, Kutná hora.

As it clearly follows from this cursory review, the sole presence of handles with discoidal attachments might be at best interpreted in terms of general cultural stream reaching Upper Silesia in the Middle Eneolithic and should

---

42 Seger 1919, 77, Abb. 285.
43 Umbreit 1937, 107.
44 Ebd., 160.
46 Machnik 1978, 83–84.
47 Bognár-Kutzián 1967.
48 It should be clearly pointed out that the author is aware of strong skepticism of some archaeologists (see e.g. opinion of Tünde Horváth – Horváth 2009, 105) in regard to the ‘Protoboleráz phase’ as defined by Nándor Kalicz and Łaszło A. Horváth (see e.g. Kalicz-Horváth 2011). These critical opinions are certainly partially right, do not undermine whole the conception of taxonomically and chronologically separable final phase of the Middle Eneolithic (or the Middle Copper Age, to use traditional Hungarian terminology).
51 Kaczanowska 1986, 46, Chmielewski 2008, 60.
52 Kortüskl 2007, 44, tab. 11:11, 14:8, 18:2; Śmig 2007, 38, obr. 22:2, 7; Śmig 2012, 162, obr. 11:1.
53 Kalferst–Zapotocky 1991, obr. 9:7; probably also obr. 7:12, 10:7 and 14:7. The findings can be found in the East Bohemian Museum (Cze. Muzeum východních Čech) in Hradec Králové under respective inventory numbers: 66031, 66066, 66131 and 69340.
not be used as *criterium crucis* upon which cultural attribution and detailed chronology of the finding from Kietrz can be decided. Therefore the *Scheibenhenkel* must not be discussed as if it was broken-off from the jug.

To the north from the Sudentes and the Carpathian Mountains, in times preceding the period the jug from Kietrz–Łęgi belongs to, single-handled vases represent rather uncommon phenomenon and do not resemble the pot in question. Because of small number of Upper Silesian findings dated to the phase corresponding with the advanced Middle Copper Age in the Carpathian Basin, it is hard to say whether vessels of the kind, and such pitchers in particular, started to be used more commonly. *Nolens volens*, looking for their origins, we have to turn down south again.

The nearest area where jugs occur frequently and where *Scheibenhenkel* appears, is the eastern periphery of the Baalberg culture, i.e. Moravia and Lower Austria. However, this region yielded only one single-handled pitcher with the ear’s base applied with disc-shaped attachment. The one found in a of stone box graves unearthed in Kosiň near Slatinky, Prostějov district. Moreover, the pot indicated represents the so-called Baalberg jug *par excellence,* a well-defined category of vessels the one from Kietrz–Łęgi certainly does not belong to. What differentiates Baalberg jugs from the one discussed here is that the latter has conical (not cylindrical or funnel-like) neck distinguished from the belly with a ledge and handle attached to its rim (not below it). Both the elements of jugs’ morphology which do not really fit the ‘funnel beaker’ canon, viz. the handle attached directly to the edge and the con-subconical shape of the neck, are very typical for pottery traditions developing concurrently in the western part of the Carpathian Basin.

In the fundamental monographic paper addressing the Middle-Danube group with stab-and-drag ornamented pottery A. Točík indicated jugs “having higher or lower slightly or strongly conical neck with a handle, which runs from the edge and clasps the neck”, as one of the most characteristic forms constituting this archaeo-

taxon. From among few vessels described for the first time in the just cited article of Slovakian archaeologist a specimen discovered singly in pit IV-1/59 at the site of Bajč–tehelňa SM, Komářno district, should attract our
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55 KURGAN-PŘIZÝVŠKÁ 2007, 518.
57 This kind of vessel was specified by Milan ZAPOTOCKÝ as follows: “[w]hen considered from a typological point of view, they are quite uniform. Two important factors are particularly important: 1. Body shape of all the jugs is substantially identical. One can find certain variability only in the form of the neck and its base. The former is always clearly distinguished from the belly with the base being abruptly (2/3 of all jugs) or smoothly insetted (1/3 of all jugs). It is usually funnel-shaped with straight or slightly everted walls. Cylindrical neck is an exception [...]. 2. Ear’s form. Baalberg jugs from Bohemia for the most part have wide strap and only exceptionally cylindrical [...] or prismatic [...] handles. There occurs plastic rib on upper surface of an ear. It is typical for handles mounted below the rim [...]. The last distinctive feature of handles is their binding. Accordingly, they can be divided into: a) knife-like handles – sharply [...] or gently [...] bended (60% of jugs); b) sharply-arched handles [...] – 29% of jugs; c) gently arched handles [...] – 11% of jugs” (*Typologické průzkumy* 1956, 548–549). In general, Baalberg jug forms commonly found in Moravia or Lower Austria, and infrequently occurring also in Upper Silesia, do not differ from the Bohemian ones (cf. HOUŤOVÁ 1960; HRLE,JAROSZ–MA-
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This multicultural site was excavated by János Korek. It is located in the Vásárosnamény district – and their cultural affiliation is disputable. Because of lack of typical stab-and-drag adornments and presence of Scheibenhenkel, these are commonly and rightly regarded as at least inspired by late Polgár tradition (the Hunyadi-halom culture). As opposed to Transdabubian potters though, bearers of the eastern-Carpathian traditions very infrequently made jugs of this type, a technical pattern which extremely rarely occurs in Transdanubia and Western Slovakia.

Only two unornamented jugs with Scheibenhenkel might be connected with the Middle-Danube complex with stab-and-drag pottery. However, both the vessels were found in eastern peripheries of this cultural phenomenon – in Tolna–Mőzs (previously Mőzs), Tolna district and Zebegény–Kalváriapart, Pest district – and their cultural attribution is disputable. Because of lack of typical stab-and-drag adornments and presence of Scheibenhenkel, these are commonly and rightly regarded as at least inspired by late Polgár tradition (the Hunyadi-halom culture). As opposed to Transdabubian potters though, bearers of the eastern-Carpathian traditions very infrequently made jugs and single-handled pots in general. One of the very few such vessels resembling the pot from Kietrz–Łęgi, is a jug discovered among findings from a supposed Hunyadi-halom culture cemetery unearthed at Kisvarsány–Hidéri, Vásárosnamény district (Fig. 12). Still, it must be stressed, that this analogy does not match perfectly either. The handle of the specimen from Kietrz represents the Scheibenhenkel type, a technical pattern which extremely rarely occurs in Transdanubia and Western Slovakia.

Slowly concluding this lengthy, nonetheless really justifiable, typological peregrination that started from the jug discovered at Górska street in Kietrz, it can be stated that: (1.) its shape finds quite good analogies in the jug discovered at Branč, Nitra district. Very similar jug comes also from Branč, Nitra district. What is significant, and has already noticed by Stojan Dimitrijević, motives decorating both the vessels differ from ornaments known from other analogous pitchers. They have much more in common with the Balaton–Lasinja culture style. More importantly this is not just about adornment patterns. In the opinion of N. Kalicz and L.A. Horváth, expressed in their recent contribution to this discussion, shorter conical necks as well as higher shoulders of the pots in question should be also listed among the features typical for the middle stage of the Middle Copper Age in Transdanubia, currently distinguished by them as the Furchenstichkeramik-Kultur (earlier known under the name of Balaton–Lasinja II). To the contrary, jugs with more slender but less distinguished necks and lower (stubby) belly are supposed to appear in the subsequent so-called Protoboléraz phase. This plausibly later type can be exemplified, inter alia, by a finding from Šurany–Nitransky Hrádok–Zámeček, Šurany district (formerly Nitransky Hrádok–Zámeček).

There are, however, relevant dissimilarities between the pot from Kietrz and all the analogous forms described or referred to above. Firstly, in contrast to richly adorned ‘ewers’ from Hungary and Slovakia, the Silesian one is not ornamented at all. Secondly, even though the form of the finding from Kietrz resembles rather pots connected recently by Hungarian archaeologists with the Furchenstichkeramik-Kultur, we cannot fail to notice that only the presumably younger pots from the latter area have wide-strap handles. Finally, we cannot forget that the handle of the specimen from Kietrz represents the Scheibenhenkel type, a technical pattern which extremely rarely occurs in Transdanubia and Western Slovakia.
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Middle-Danubian complex with the stab-and-drag ornamented pottery, but (2.) the lack of any ornamentation and presence of *Scheibenhenkel* indicate closer affinity to the pottery making traditions of the Hunyadi-halom culture. Regardless of quite problematic cultural attribution of the pot, (3.) presence of the wide-strap handle speaks for its contemporaneity with the final stage of the Middle Eneolithic in the northern part of the Carpathian Basin, i.e. with the so-called Protoboleráz phase.

Since the pot in question cannot be seen as direct import or as perfect imitation of any peculiar type of vessel occurring to the south form the Carpathian Arch in the final Lengyel or the final Polgár cultural *milieu*, we should at least ask if it cannot represent regional or even local product only inspired by southern patterns. Looking for an answer to the question, we have to face the basic difficulty of still poorly advanced research upon late phases of the Lengyel culture in Opole Silesia. Nevertheless, what we presently know for certain is that communities settling in the upper Odra catchment at the time were culturally very closely related to the ones from the upper Vistula basin. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the vessels with bodies tectonics identical to the one of the jug from Kietrz–Łęgi, viz. with necks narrowing toward rim and joints between bellies and necks accentuated with ledges, represent the most typical forms of the Wyciąże–Złotniki group/phase pottery, and that probably under its influence pots shaped in such a way appeared in the Racibórz Hollow already in the late phase of the Lengyel culture. As suggested above, the idea of *Scheibenhenkel* might have been transferred to the Opole Silesia from this direction too. For these reasons, even if archaeological record regarding the final stage of the Wyciąże–Złotniki group/phase is rather scanty and so far yielded no jugs similar to the one from Kietrz–Łęgi, it is very likely that not only the peculiarly shaped handle but the whole discussed pitcher’s form constitute one more piece of evidence for some impact from Lesser Poland.

The report of R. Stöckel (see p. 181) as well as the paper of H. Seger state that the jug discussed above was accompanied by somewhat smaller and not peculiarly characteristic single-handled vessel (Fig. 3.2). Unfortunately, this finding has been lost. Basing on nothing but the archival drawing and the photograph published, it can only be inferred that its form is not distinctive enough either to be chronologically or culturally settled with any considerable precision, or to be excluded from among grave goods the dead could be buried with. Certainly, similar pots with small single ears are quite common at the time and co-occurrence of the one under discussion here with the above-discussed jug is plausible.
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72 *Kulczycka-Leciejewiczowa* 1979, 115, 124. This way probably, some patterns of the late Polgár origins were transmitted as far as to Lower Silesia (see Nowotting 1939; Gediga-Mozgala–Murzyński 2012, 76, ryc. 3:3, 6:6).
73 Cf. e.g. *Dzięduszycka-Machnikowa* 1969, Abb. 2:1–3; Kozłowski 2006, 57, ryc. 3:1–2, 4:1; Nowak 2010, 57, 69, ryc. 8:6–8, 9:2–4, 10:3.
74 *Kozłowski* 1972, 181–182.
75 *Seger* 1919, Abb. 286.
76 The pot was recorded in the old German catalogue under the number 346:83. In the inventory book started anew after the World War II this jug is not listed anymore. Search for it undertaken in the storehouse of the Archaeological Museum in Wrocław was unsuccessful.
77 Compare, for instance, Śiśka 1972, 136, Taf. IX:2, X:10.
If in the moment of their publication, by the title given to his article, *Tulpenbecher und Kragenflasche aus einem jungsteinzeitlichen Grab von Ratibor-Süd*, G. Fock somehow exposed co-presence of two other pots in this assemblage, from today’s perspective it is rather the third one, i.e. the amphora (Fig. 9), that becomes crucial for answering such important questions concerning the finding, as the problem of its chronology. It is not by chance then that the discussion upon grave-goods will start with this vessel.

Doctor Fock was the first to notice that even though the amphora resembles *kantharos*-like pottery forms the Jordanów Śląski culture (Germ. *Jordansmühler Kultur*),78 its spherical belly and the wide-strap handles rising above the mouth are not typical for these would-be originals from Lower Silesia, Moravia or Bohemia.79 Still, a few more decades of research must have passed before cultural attribution of the pot could be specified more precisely. Only in the 1970’s was this unique vessel rightly connected with cultures of the Danubian complex from the north-central area of the Carpathian Basin by indicating “some resemblance to forms that can be met in the Ludanice group and the Tiszapolgár–Bodrogkeresztúr complex”.80 As noticed by Jan Lichardus81 an amphora closely analogous to the one from Studzienna was found at Košice–Šebastovce–Lapiše, Košice IV district (formerly Šebastovce–Lapiše) at the cemetery of the Lažňany group.82 The vessel from Slovakia is a bit smaller, but its shape is identical.83 The only important yet so far unnoticed difference between the Silesian finding and its analogy is that the handles on the pot from Racibórz are actually of the *Scheibenhenkel* type. Obviously, their presence on a vessel exhibiting so perfectly the late Polgár impact (see above) cannot cause any confusion or controversy. What might be more revealing for our discussion though, ears of both the pots being compared are of the wide-strap type. Even if some may find it still unconvincing, this fact again should be considered as an argument for quite late chronology of the pot.84 This or other way, at this point the amphora with *Scheibenhenkel* is the most accurate chronological indicator in this pottery set. Its presence implies that the burial is contemporaneous with the Hunyadi-halom culture; most probably with its decline.85

No less intriguing form, especially in the context of the other two pots, is the tulip-like beaker (Fig. 7). Its unique cultural affiliation was recognized immediately. G. Fock stated that “peculiarly noticeable is the occurrence of the tulip-like beaker which appears here as the second finding of the Western culture [i.e. the Michelsberg culture – T.J.Ch.] to the East”.86 In the first paragraph of the same article the author refers also in detail to the only earlier finding of the kind – a twin beaker from Dolní Benešov, Hlučín district (formerly Benešov; Germ. Benešau, Bez. Ratibor)87 which had been already presented as a finding connected with the Michelsberg culture by his older colleagues88 (Fig. 13). However, for over seven decades on, as new similar discoveries and their ever more detailed analyses appeared, opinion about them slowly evolved.89 What has certainly changed from the time

78 Such cultural attribution of the pot is repeated in archaeological literature even today (e.g. NOWAK 2009, 525).
79 Fock 1941, 39.
80 [...] pewnych nawiązaniach do form spotykanych w grupie ludanickiej i kompleksie tiszapolgársko-bodrogkereszutzkisim (BUKOWSKA-GEREZOWA 1975, 91–92).
81 LICHARDUS 1976, 161.
82 J. Pavelčík (Pavelčík 1994, 28) as an analogy to the amphora from Racibórz mentioned also one finding from Charváty in the southern Moravia. He went even so far as to call the amphora from Racibórz “two-handle vessel of the Charváty-Šebastovce type/swu-uche naczynie typu Charváty-Šebastovce”. While referring to the southern Moravian finding the author probably (there is no quotation in the text!) ment the pot published by Pavel Košútik (KOSTURKA 1973, Taf. 12:17). This vessel, however, resembles neither the one from Šebastovce nor the one from Racibórz.
84 Readers should also notice that the amphora from Šebastovce belongs to one of these burials unearthed at the cemetery which were supposed by Stanislaw Śiśka to represent later stage of the Lažňany group evolution (Śiśka 1972, 148–149).
85 Some archaeologists (e.g. NOWAK 2009, 348) opt for younger chronology of the grave, connecting it with the early stage of the Funnel Beaker/Boleráz phase in Upper Silesia. The sole presence of the pot under discussion excludes such dating.
86 „Besonders auffällig ist das Vorkommen des eines Tulpenbechers, der hier als zweiter fund der westlichen Kultur im Osten auftritt.” (Fock 1941, 38).
87 The pot was originally held in Racibórz (inventory number R.1941:28). Today it can be found in the Upper Silesian Museum in Bytom (inventory number B. 969/4295-58).
88 RASCHKE 1931, 23, Abb. 20; PETERSEN 1935, 52, Abb. 92.
when the Silesian findings were published, these were opinions about geographical and cultural setting of the phenomenon they constitute.

First of all it was realized that the beakers of the kind occur not only in the upper Odra basin but also to the south from the Moravian Gate. Although there are probably even four vessels from Moravia that could be indicated here as analogies, only one of them – the pot quite recently discovered at Sudoměřice-Horní chmelnice/Valcha, Hodonín\(^{90}\) district – is evidently similar to the tulip-like beakers from Racibórz–Studzienna and Dolní Benešov. Unfortunately, every but the pot from Racibórz is stray finding, for what issues of their cultural affiliation and chronology must be discussed on the basis of more general premises.

Regarding the problem of their cultural attribution, it was already in 1961 when Evžen Neustupný\(^{91}\) questioned the belief that the two beakers from Silesia belong to tulip-shaped vessels of the Michelsberg culture. Today we can say that this opinion holds true also for the mentioned finding(s?) from the Moravian area. Why is it so? Firstly, ‘canonic’ Michelsberg tulip-like beakers simply differ from Moravian and Silesian ones. Secondly, pots of the first form occur no further to the east than in western Bohemian assemblages of the early Funnel Beaker culture or the early Baalberg group/culture, whereas vessels of the latter type – to the contrary – never appeared in the core area of the Michelsberg culture.\(^{92}\) Because of these the round-bottomed beakers from Silesia and Moravia ought to
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\(^{90}\) PARMA-ŠMÍD 2007, 131, obr. 11:8; ŠMÍD 2008, 284. For different reasons three other Moravian findings of the kind should be treated with certain reservation. Two of them – a big fragment found in Jiříkovce, in the district of Brno–Venkov (HOUŠTOVÁ 1960, 19; NEUSTUPNÝ 1961a, 316, 319, Anm. 20; LUNING 1968, 294; ŠEBELA–LANGOVÁ–HLOŽEK 1997, 203), and a tulip-shaped beaker from the pre-Boleráz horizon in Hlinsko, Chrudim district (PAVLČÍK 1994, 29) – remain unpublished, whereas the third one – the sharp-bottomed beaker found in Otrokovic, Zlín district (ŠEBELA–LANGOVÁ–HLOŽEK 1997, 199–201, Abb. 2) – differs from the other pots when it comes to morphology and presence of adornment.

\(^{91}\) NEUSTUPNÝ 1961a, 316.

be seen as ceramic forms developed locally under indirect influence of the Michelsberg culture and accordingly named as ‘tulip-like beakers of the Michelsberg-Baalberg type’.

This peculiar ceramic pattern might have appeared in Moravia already around 3900 BC, at the initial stage of the Lower Austrian-Moravian Baalberg group/culture, not without good reasons being called ‘the Michelsberg-Baalberg horizon’. At least theoretically the possibility that the idea of tulip-like beaker of Michelsberg-Baalberg type spread to the north so early cannot be excluded as presence of some southern elements in the local epi-Lengyel (i.e. IVth phase of the Upper Silesian group of the Lengyel culture according to Vratislav Janák) has been already suggested. It seems more likely though that the transmission took place just few generations later. Obviously, it should be also asked here for how long beakers of the kind could have been in use here.

Attempting to answer this question though we will move east of Silesia. It is long and commonly known that very similar tulip-shaped vessels occur also in assemblages of the Funnel Beaker culture in Lesser Poland. As a direct phyletic relation between ceramics from this region and pottery of the Michelsberg culture can be decidedly excluded, it is highly probable that these distant beakers constitute somewhat later epiphenomenon, resulting from influence of communities living in the Silesian-Moravian area. Assuming this model of diffusion to be true, we can treat the moment when tulip-shaped beakers show up in Lesser Poland as terminus ante quem for their appearance in Upper Silesia.

Fortunately, chronology of ceramic forms discovered in the south-eastern Poland can be quite precisely established. Two pots come from megalithic graves: one of them from a triple burial number XII discovered at site 14/45 (PAR 75-76) in Las Stocki, Końkowola district (formerly Las Stocki, site B) and another from grave 4 unearthed at site 14/14 (PAR 75-77) in Klementowice Kurów district (formerly Klementowice, site XIV). Additionally, a fragment of comparable beaker was found in feature 72 in Zawarża, Pińczów district. All three vessels under consideration belong to assemblages representing the classical South-Eastern group of the Funnel Beaker culture. In the cases of two graves from the Nałęczow Plateau, a small number and chronological indistinctness of grave goods (typical for funeral assemblages of the South-Eastern group of the Funnel Beaker culture) make it impossible to say more precisely how they should be dated. However, a single radiocarbon date obtained for the burial from Las Stocki (Poz-54082: 4590 +/-40 BP) indicates that the grave ought to be synchronized with the Bronocice III phase (ca. 3500-3350/3300 BC). Chronology of the settlement from Zawarża can be narrowed down on the basis of typological analysis of rich pottery assemblages recovered. It can be firmly dated to the Bronocice II phase, i.e. ca 3650-3500 BC.

All these quite speculative considerations lead us firstly to rather general conclusion that tulip-like beakers of Michelsberg-Baalberg type could be in use in Silesia even for four-five hundred years, starting from around 3900 BC. Having deduced this, we can get back to the case of Racibórz–Studzienna. Because the long time span over which tulip-like beakers could plausibly occur in the upper Odra basin covers whole the period when the afore-discussed pattern of amphora must have appeared in the region, the latter one remains more precise chronological indicator.

Let us now move to the pot which belongs to leitforms of the Funnel Beaker culture – to the collared flask (Fig. 8). In spite of repeatedly conducted comprehensive studies upon this particular category of vessels, many questions concerning their chronological and spatial variability remain open.
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93 JANÁK 1994, 15.
95 JANÁK 1994, 15.
96 JANÁK 1994, 15.
97 The PAR survey and record made by Anna Zakościelna (1981). It should be noticed that the cemeteries known earlier as separate sites ‘B’ and ‘C’ constitute one burial ground.
98 JANÁK 1994, 15.
100 ZAKOŚCIELNA 1981.
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103 The PAR survey and record made by Jacek Górski has not been reported as yet (personal information of Mr. Daniel Czernek from 07.03.2013.).
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Although ceramic forms of the kind appeared for the first time at early (but not initial!) stages of the Funnel Beaker culture in its Northern and Eastern groups,\textsuperscript{107} for years they seemed to be completely absent in the Baalberg group. In Central Germany their presence was well confirmed just for the Salzmünde phase,\textsuperscript{108} in Bohemia – for the Šířem phase,\textsuperscript{109} and in Moravia – for the Drahanovice phase.\textsuperscript{110} However, a slowly growing body of evidence recently changed this picture. It seems that at least at the territory of present-day Bohemia and probably also Germany collared flasks were used already by bearers of the late Baalberg culture.\textsuperscript{111} Here, naturally, arises the question of collared flasks’ chronology in the large territory spreading between the northern centre, where they evidently come from, and the Moravian region where they appear rather later.

To the east form Upper Silesia, in western Lesser Poland, vessels of the kind appear together with the first communities of the Funnel Beaker culture, at the stage contemporaneous with the Baalberg phase.\textsuperscript{112} Turning to the west, i.e. to Lower Silesia, we can learn that even though they become commonly used just at the stage synchronized with the Salzmünde culture/phase,\textsuperscript{113} there are certain reasons to believe that such pots occurred there for the first time as early as it was in western Lesser Poland.\textsuperscript{114} But what is the situation in between these two regions, – in Upper Silesia? An overview of the Funnel Beaker culture assemblages which was presented by J. Bukowska-Gedigowa almost forty years ago,\textsuperscript{115} but actually is not outdated,\textsuperscript{116} clearly shows that the flask from Racibórz represents the very few vessels of the kind found in clearly defined context. Except for the pot in question, all collared flasks are dated to younger phases of the Funnel Beaker culture. Does it, however, determine the matter of the present finding? Rather not. The fact that it was discovered together with the above discussed amphora clearly points to earlier chronology of the collared flask in question and thereby also quite early appearance of this kind of pots in the upper Odra basin. Regrettably, chronology of the pot cannot be more precisely determined either on the basis of spatially close or distant typological comparisons.\textsuperscript{117}

The last constituent of the grave assemblage to be discussed is the set of three arrowheads (Fig. 10). As to their cultural attribution, lithic analysts – rather by the force of authorities and diffusionist paradigm than power of arguments – for decades have been on the same page: they considered the projectile points to be of western origins (the idea was to come from the Michelsberg or even the Chassey culture) and affiliated them to the Silesian Funnel Beaker culture.\textsuperscript{118} However, today there is no doubt that projectile points in question, known as arrowheads of the Štramberg type, appeared already at the late stage of development of the local Lengyel group (phase IV of the Upper Silesian Lengyel group after V. Janák)\textsuperscript{119} and so their presence in the grave from Racibórz proves nothing but continuity in regional traditions in chipped stone production.\textsuperscript{120} Since it is realized that they appeared considerably earlier, we should ask if their presence at this stage of the Upper Silesian group of the Lengyel culture’s development can be explained in terms of external impact? And because nothing speaks for such distant western influence, it seems that this form of projectile point, very often performed in a rather opportunistic way by shaping tang and point on blade and blade-like blanks with short, not necessarily bifacial retouch, might have been invented by local neolithic flint-knappers.

\textsuperscript{108} E.g. Preuss 1966, 21–23.
\textsuperscript{110} Šmid 2006, 214–216, ryc. 9.
\textsuperscript{112} See Nowak 1996, 51, tabl. Id; Nowak 2006, 50; as for chronology see also Nowak 2009, 337.
\textsuperscript{114} Wocechowski 1970, 63.
\textsuperscript{115} Bukowska-Gedigowa 1975, 113–114.
\textsuperscript{116} Very few collared flasks published from that time (see Chochorowska-Chochorowski 1980, 277, obr. 4:B; Holec–Jarosz–Matušczyk 1992, 9, ryc. 10d) do not change the conclusions of this old survey.
\textsuperscript{117} Cf. Bukowska-Gedigowa 1975, 113–119; Knoll, 1981, 52. In the article quoted, J. Bukowska-Gedigowa indicates a collared flask from Makotrały (see Pleslova-Štiková 1985, 107, Pl. LXVII:4) as the best analogy for the pot found in Racibórz–Studzienna.
\textsuperscript{119} Janák 2007a, 146–149, obr. 4: 1–4, 5: 1–11, 6: 1–4, tab. III/1–2.
\textsuperscript{120} What is noteworthy, an arrowhead of the type was found also in a grave from Bronocice, dated to the final phase of the Lublin-Volynian culture development (Kruk–Miśalska 1985, ryc. 13:8 = tabl. XIII/29). The projectile point in question has been long considered a form untypical for the chipped stone industry of the Lublin-Volynian culture and regarded as impact from the neolithic cultures of the so-called forest zone (Kruk–Miśalska 1985, 69; Zakoszelna 1996, 106; Zakoszelna 2000, 530). Needless to say that all the numerous findings from the upper Odra basin shed completely new light on the problem and make this old view hard to maintain.
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As localization of the two Silesian graves under discussion has never been and can no more be precisely indicated, relations between them and other possibly contemporaneous findings from these sites remain unknown. For this reason the two burials under discussion can yield no answer to such fundamental questions as the one concerning creation of burial grounds separated from settlements, or relation between graves and houses. Therefore, we have to focus exclusively on the burials themselves.

4.3. The burials

As localization of the two Silesian graves under discussion has never been and can no more be precisely indicated, relations between them and other possibly contemporaneous findings from these sites remain unknown. For this reason the two burials under discussion can yield no answer to such fundamental questions as the one concerning creation of burial grounds separated from settlements, or relation between graves and houses. Therefore, we have to focus exclusively on the burials themselves.

4.3.1. Kietrz–Łęgi-ul. Górska

Considerations upon graves under discussion and inevitably also funeral practices of eneolithic communities settled in Silesia in general will start from the alleged grave from Kietrz–Łęgi. For the sake of this analysis it will be assumed that all the details concerning form, orientation and position of the body in the grave, as provided by R. Stöckel, are certain. Although not a single word has been written in the report about the grave pit’s shape, we can learn from it that the deceased was laid at the depth of over two and a half meter. This is rather considerable depth for burial in a usual grave pit, but certainly easy to accept for one arranged in storage pit. It is hard to go beyond speculations though. As for burying the body in flexed position and placing it in accordance with the N–S axis (with deviations, very often to the SW–NE), in the area to the north from the Carpathian Arch it was a tradition starting in the Neolithic and lasting till the end–phase of the so-called Danubian cultures’ development, viz the Lublin-Volhynian culture, the so-called Pleszów–Modlnica–Wyciąże group of the Lengyel culture, and the Brześć Kujawski culture. As has been recently stressed, this ‘meridional tendency’ in grave pits’ orientation differs from what was commonly practiced by communities of the Połgár and Lengyel complexes as well as the Baalberg culture/group. In the Carpathian Basin, Moravia and Bohemia graves predominantly respected the W–E axis. The conclusion appears to be simple: considering the position and the orientation of the body, the individual unearthed in Kietrz–Łęgi on Górska street was buried in full respect to the ‘northern Danubian’ rite. Just one detail does not perfectly fit the picture here: the skeleton found in Kietrz was laid with its skull to the north, whereas the ‘Danubian’ communities living to the North from the Carpathians and Sudetes usually placed their kinsmen with their heads directed southwards. There is, however, a single and significant exception from this rule – the very well known cemetery from site 5 in Wyciąże, where graves were oriented along the NW–SE axis and all people buried in them were laid with their heads to the north.

As long as both the pots discussed above are assumed to belong to grave goods deposited with the deceased and thereby to constitute chronological markers for the burial, there is every reason to claim that the dead was in fact a man, because in eneolithic burials from Lesser Poland, as it is also throughout the Carpathian Basin, opposition of sexes (man/woman) is perfectly mirrored by differentiation of position of bodies in graves (laid on the right side/on the left side respectively). Cf. e.g. J. Palczewski 1998, 100, 114, 116, 117–118; Lichter 2001, 219, 246–247, 276–280, 279–280, 355, Abb. 96, 109–110, 123; Šuteková 2005, 326, obr. 1. Probably needless to say that position of the body observed in Kietrz has also definitely nothing in common with funeral rites of ‘northern’ groups of the Funnel Beaker culture. Bearers of the latter tradition buried their dead tribesmen in extended supine position, respecting norms of completely different origins (cf. e.g. Hauler 1975; Wielanski 1979b, 172, 255; Hauler 1994, 50, Abb. 10; Nowak 2009a, 456, 469–470).
4.3.2. Racibórz–Studzienna

The burial from Racibórz–Studzienna directs our attention to funeral practices which were decidedly less common, but much more interesting for that. Before moving to general considerations upon this peculiar grave, its form has to be possibly well reconstructed.

As can be inferred from the report and the few photographs preserved, we deal with a burial deposited at the bottom of an over two meters deep pit. Even though the cross-section of the feature has not been documented, the widening of its regular round outline in consecutive horizontal sections clearly indicates that it was trapezoidal shape in cross-section. Its inner stratigraphy cannot be reconstructed with satisfactory precision, but from the report we can learn that clayish layer containing the burial and grave goods gradually narrowed-down unfolding a lighter layer of loess. The latter was interpreted as a layer of wood.

According to G. Fock, during the exploration of the dark layer a shadow of the decayed body could be observed. In the absence of a more detailed documentation, however, the position of the deceased in the grave pit can be just partially reconstructed. The only human remains unearthed – the teeth – belonged to a single individual. Their position in the vicinity of the amphora tells us where the head lay. Taking into consideration this fact as well as the way all other artifacts were arranged, it can be suggested that the dead was placed centrally. A little remark upon position of the head toward the cardinal points is the only hint that makes it possible to reconstruct the orientation of the pit, and thereby – of the buried person. As we can learn from the article quoted, the head, or rather what was left of it, laid in the eastern part of the grave ‘chamber’. It can be suggested then that the body was placed along the W–E axis. Since the number and the position of the three flint arrowheads rather exclude the possibility of them belonging to projectiles lodging in the body, their presence among grave goods not only indicates that the dead was a man but speaks also for his advanced age. The latter conclusion in connection with the quite small diam-

---

133 Fock 1941, 38.
eter of the dark layer in which the deceased was deposited, allows us to suggest that the body was placed in a flexed or even foetal position.

Cultural connections inferred or at least suggested in the course of earlier considerations on grave goods make us analyze this particular grave by comparison with funeral rites of the Michelsberg culture, the Funnel Beaker culture as well as late phases of the Lengyel and Polgár complexes.

Here, perhaps the most fascinating to prove would be any connection between the funeral rite observed at Studzienna and burying patterns of Michelsberg culture communities. As it is widely known, funeral norms followed by communities of this culture differ from those respected by people of other ‘funnel beaker’ or ‘Danubian’ traditions. Firstly, bodies interred in anatomical order comprise for not much more than 40 % burials whereas other funeral deposits encompass variously fragmented skeletons.\(^{134}\) Secondly, fragmented or not, human remains were commonly buried in settlement pits of various sizes, shapes, functions and locations.\(^{135}\) Considering the grave we refer to, it should be mentioned that trapeze- or bag-shaped pits occur exclusively in late phases of the Michelsberg culture, i.e. at the stage contemporaneous with the development of the Baalberg culture.\(^{136}\) What is also very important for our argumentation, regardless of burial form, is that regular grave goods in the funeral rite of the Michelsberg culture are conspicuous by… their absence.\(^{137}\) Apparently then, there are many reasons to question that features of the kind, even if sometimes clustered, should be really interpreted as graves.\(^{138}\) Without exploring the dilemma, for the sake of current discussion it should be only emphasized that, even though such funeral practices (if only funeral indeed!) were common for whole the Funnel Beaker complex, in the case of the Michelsberg culture they do not belong to burial rites that co-occur with regular cemeteries respecting some other, more strict and uniform, or perhaps simply more readable funeral patterns, as it is for instance in the Baalberg culture.\(^{139}\) Yet, how does this compare with the grave from Racibórz–Studzienna? Clearly, the one and only thing which the latter has in common with burying of the dead in the Michelsberg culture is the form of grave pit. However, such forms of funeral practices not only appeared in the Michelsberg culture, and all the Funnel Beaker complex’ cultures quite late – at the stage synchronous with the grave from Racibórz–Studzienna – but they were also common among bearers of ‘Danubian’ traditions.

Naturally, the discussion upon occurrence of similar graves in the so-called Danubian cultures should be primarily focused on funeral findings which are also possibly close from both chronological and territorial point of view. Two graves from western Lesser Poland certainly meet the criteria: a burial of a child\(^{140}\) from the site 17-18,20/8 (PAR 102/58)\(^{141}\) in Kraków–Nowa Huta (formerly Kraków–Nowa Huta–Pleszów, stan. 17), Kraków district, and an atypical two-level double burial from Bronocice, Działoszyce district. In the first case the deceased was laid in a crouched position on the right side along the E–W axis (head to the west) on the bottom of two meter deep trapezoidal pit; there were three items deposited on the level of the body: a cup, a bowl and a Hlinsko type pendant.\(^{142}\) In the second case, the grave was a little more shallow (circa 1.2 meter below ground level), but authors of its publication suggest that the difference between prehistoric and present-day ground level can reach even half a meter. In the pear-shaped pit there were two individuals interred: a 30–50 years old woman buried in a flexed position, facing the right, and an atypical two-level double burial from Bronocice, Działoszyce district. In the first case the deceased was laid in a crouched position on the right side along the E–W axis (head to the west) on the bottom of two meter deep trapezoidal pit; there were three items deposited on the level of the body: a cup, a bowl and a Hlinsko type pendant.\(^{143}\) After burying the dead the pit was sealed with burnt construction made of sticks and clay. Four vessels were deposited at the level of the bodies; there was one more pot and two stone tools (a grinding stone and the afore discussed arrowhead) on the burnt surface above.\(^{144}\)

---

136 Grund 2008, 183; about synchronization with the Baalberg group/culture see Grund 2008, 198–201.
139 E.g. Rulf 1996; Lichardus 1998b, 37; see also remarks in Grund 2008, 200–201; and Nickel 1997, 85, 129.
140 Even though at first glance the grave might seem to be a single-individual burial, it cannot be forgotten that a fragment of skull belonging to a 30–40 year old man was discovered in this pit as well.
141 The PAR survey and record made by Arkadiusz Watzyńczyk (1981).
With all certainty the burial from Kraków-Nowa Huta, connected with the final phase of the Lengyel culture and the similarly dated grave of the Lublin-Volhynian culture from Bronocice, are not typical for funeral rites dominating at the time in this area.\footnote{See e.g. 
Salacinska-Zakościelna 2007, 102, ryc. 32; Kadar 2009, 55, Tab. III; Kadar et al. 2009, 224–225, ryc. 49–50.} When analyzed separately, the grave from Racibórz–Studzienna also makes an impression of some kind of deviation from burial norms. Taken together though, the three burials appear to represent quite usual occurrence in funeral practices of the time. Furthermore, the practice of burying dead in trapeze-shaped pits (leaving aside other forms of burials in ‘settlement’ pits) is nothing new in ritual life of Danubian communities,\footnote{See fln. 138.} and was also performed later by bearers of the Funnel Beaker culture.\footnote{Cf. Florek 2006, 414–419; Jarosz–Matuszewicz 2001, 12–14; Schonigerova 2010.}

As has been already suggested, there was not enough room in the pit to bury an adult person in a supine position. Supposing then that the body of the dead was flexed, the possibility that the man was buried with respect to the ‘northern’ funeral tradition of the Funnel Beaker cultures should rather be excluded from further considerations.\footnote{See e.g. 
Salacinska-Zakościelna 2007, 102, ryc. 32; Kadar 2009, 55, Tab. III; Kadar et al. 2009, 224–225, ryc. 49–50.} At the same time orientation of the body along the W–E axis with the head directed eastwards is not a common occurrence in the ‘northern Danubian’ funeral rite. On the one hand, it is typical for graveyards from the south (see above), on the other, however, it cannot be overlooked that in both the graves from western Lesser Poland that were indicated before as closest analogies to the burial from Racibórz–Studzienna bodies were laid along the W–E axis as well.

Therefore, despite our limited knowledge about the burial customs at the decline of the Lengyel culture and the beginning of the Funnel Beaker culture development in the upper Odra basin,\footnote{See e.g. 
Salacinska-Zakościelna 2007, 102, ryc. 32; Kadar 2009, 55, Tab. III; Kadar et al. 2009, 224–225, ryc. 49–50.} there are no good reasons to consider the grave from Racibórz–Studzienna as a proof for an allochthonous impact on the local funeral traditions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Neither the progress in the settlement studies nor the present state of the research on the ‘pottery periodization’ of the Upper Silesian Eneolithic make it possible to distinguish and use as chronologically narrowed-down settlement phases as the one defined on the basis of the burials discovered at Racibórz–Studzienna and Kietrz–Łęgi. Still starting with the advent of agricultural communities, regional patterns in land occupation are so easily observable that it is enough to analyze them against the background of chronologically more generalized maps, presenting the so-called post-linear and the Funnel Beaker culture settlement.\footnote{See fln. 138.} When considered as a part of the bustling organism existing in Opole Silesia from the beginning of the Neolithic, the graves in question are localized not only within its central ecumene, lying on the left-hand side of the Odra river, but in the hearth of this zone (Głubczyce Plateau and Racibórz Hollow), the main artery of which is the valley system comprising the Troja river and its tributary – the Psina/Cyna river.\footnote{See e.g. 
Salacinska-Zakościelna 2007, 102, ryc. 32; Kadar 2009, 55, Tab. III; Kadar et al. 2009, 224–225, ryc. 49–50.} It must be noticed that the burials under discussion lie in the immediate vicinity of this watercourse (Kietrz–Łęgi simply on the edge of its fluvial terrace), at the distance of merely 14 kilometres from each other. All things considered, there is every reason to claim that they belonged to the same central and excellently communicated settlement cluster. These facts are very important for this reasoning inasmuch as they make us believe that cultural impulses readable in the eneolithic assemblages analysed do not belong to some marginal, but rather to the main stream affecting cultural landscape of whole the region. Having posited this, it should be finally pointed out what was so peculiar about this period and what can be said about it on the basis of the findings presented above.

The burials discovered at Kietrz–Łęgi and Racibórz–Studzienna belong to this peculiar moment in the development of Danubian eneolithic traditions when their bearers, having already reached social and technological
zenith, start to make way for other traditions. Chronologically this period starts with advance of the Hunyadi-halom–Lažňany culture/stab-and-drag pottery complex/early Baalberg culture, i.e. around 3900 BC, and lasts until the end of the so-called Protoboleráz phase, around 3650/3600 BC.\textsuperscript{151} As comes from the minute discussion concerning their chronology, it is very likely that the graves in question are contemporaneous with the latter stage, marking the decline of the Lower Eneolithic.

Especially in the western part of the Carpathian Basin and adjacent areas this time is characterized by a peculiar 'cultural promiscuity' that consists in fusion of various patterns rooted in Danubian world on the one hand and the ‘Funnel Beaker’ traditions on the other.\textsuperscript{152} The term proposed\textsuperscript{153} is obviously no more than a neat label but it seems to fit here as well. However, it should be stressed that in the Silesian assemblages under discussion we meet such configuration of elements which is unknown in the western Slovakia, Moravia and to the south of them. What I mean, of course, are findings like the amphora from Racibórz or the jug from Kietrz, clearly marking some impact from the Polgár milieu. Yet, does their presence make the graves in question outstanding findings from a regional perspective? Rather not. On many occasions, including the analyses presented above, it has been stressed that this area has much in common with the western part of Lesser Poland, from where different eastern Carpathian patterns have been transmitted continuously since much earlier times.\textsuperscript{154}

In the western part of Lesser Poland sets of co-occurring elements that is very similar to the one represented by the assemblage from Racibórz–Studzienna is known as the Niedźwiedź type.\textsuperscript{155} This stage in the concurrent development of both the areas follows (but is not necessarily directly subsequent to) the IV\textsuperscript{th} phase of the Upper Silesian group of the Lengyel culture (according to V. Janák\textsuperscript{156}) in the upper Odra basin and the Wyciąże–Zlotniki stage of the Lengyel culture development in the area of Kraków (according to M. Kaczanowska\textsuperscript{157}). It would be certainly tempting to distinguish the assemblages compared under a working name of the Niedźwiedź–Racibórz type or horizon, but it must be remembered that they exemplify just one of many possible cultural syntheses that can be met in the upper Odra and upper Vistula basins at the time.\textsuperscript{158} Determination of minute chronological relations between every such phenomena and even each component appearing in this cultural melting pot still invites minute intra- and interregional studies. For these reasons we should rather refrain from hasty recognition of one more taxonomic unit.

\textsuperscript{151} For relevant radiocarbon dates see Pata\l\ 2005, 131–132; Ruttkay 2006, 294–296; Rajna 2011, 106, 11. kép; Raczy\–SiklóSi 2013, 567, Table 1. The attempt made to obtain radiocarbon date corresponding with the grave assemblage was unsuccessful. Charred plant remains recovered from soil samples collected by G. Fock (see p. 185) were subeluded to archaeobotanical analysis (Mrs. A. Sady) and sent to the laboratory in Poznań for radiocarbon dating (Mr. T. Goslar). The date obtained from charcoals of somniferous trees (Poz-54083: 44000 +/-2000 BP; probably older!) indicates that they were re-deposited from Palaeolithic layers also present at the site (see e.g. BurCharD 2006, ryc. 16). Addmitedly, chronological position of the stage formerly named Balaton–Lasinja III and Boleráz was accepted when findings of the kind were defined for the first time in the end of 1980’s and beginning of 1990’s (see e.g. Kalicz 1992, 314). Yet, as it has been already mentioned, the Protoboleráz phase is currently considered to be slightly older – contemporaneous (and actually synonymous) with the so-called Protoboleráz in Transdanubia, he suggested that findings of kind should be dated to about 3500–3400 BC. In his view this stage would be contemporaneous with the developed classical phase (Bronocice III) of the South-Eastern group of the Funnel Beaker culture (see WłoDarCzak 2006, ryc. 16). Admittedly, chronological position of the Protoboleráz phase in regard to the Transdanubian Copper Age as a period between the Balaton–Lasinja III and Boleráz was accepted when findings of the kind were defined for the first time in the end of 1980’s and beginning of 1990’s (see e.g. Kalicz–Horváth 2011, 426–428). In the light of C14 dates obtained many years ago for Keszthely–Feneckpusza and recently for Abony, site 49 (Rajna 2011, 106, 11. kép), this period can be firmly dated to ca 3800–3650/3600 BC. Therefore, if the Protoboleráz phase is referred to the Bronocice chronological schema, it ought to be synchronized with assemblages representing the decline of the Lublin-Volhynian culture and beginning of the Funnel Beaker culture in the area, i.e. between Bronocice I and Bronocice II phase (cf. Krúk–MiláNSKas 1985, 81).


\textsuperscript{153} See e.g. Kamie\–Keszthely–Feneckpusza and recently for Abony, site 49 (Rajna 2011, 106, 11. kép), this period can be firmly dated to ca 3800–3650/3600 BC. Therefore, if the Protoboleráz phase is referred to the Bronocice chronological schema, it ought to be synchronized with assemblages representing the decline of the Lublin-Volhynian culture and beginning of the Funnel Beaker culture in the area, i.e. between Bronocice I and Bronocice II phase (cf. Krúk–MiláNSKas 1985, 81).


\textsuperscript{155} See e.g. Kamie\–Keszthely–Feneckpusza and recently for Abony, site 49 (Rajna 2011, 106, 11. kép), this period can be firmly dated to ca 3800–3650/3600 BC. Therefore, if the Protoboleráz phase is referred to the Bronocice chronological schema, it ought to be synchronized with assemblages representing the decline of the Lublin-Volhynian culture and beginning of the Funnel Beaker culture in the area, i.e. between Bronocice I and Bronocice II phase (cf. Krúk–MiláNSKas 1985, 81).

\textsuperscript{156} T. J. CHMIELEWSKI
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6. AFTERWORD

To make our conclusions more complete we should at least try to move on from this reserved archaeological classification to prehistoric reality hidden behind it. Because we have no proofs for breaking or even loosening of pre-existing regional bonds and traditions in Opole Silesia, the new identity, which manifests itself to us so clearly by the grave assemblage discovered at Studzienna, can be probably best described by a short paraphrase of the famous essay of Ralph Linton about the average American’s Americanism. Looking at the burial, with a hefty dose of poetic license we can imagine that the dead man’s family, having placed all the grave goods comprising a bundle of arrows tipped with innovative projectile points, origins of which were rather so obscure (and probably indifferent) for them as they are unknown for us today, the collared flask – a pot invented by communities living more to the north, somewhere in the North European Plain, the beaker of a ‘Moravian’ form inspired by western patterns and the amphora, which one would rather expect to find somewhere in the northern part of the Alföld, probably thanked some forgotten neolithic god in some long-extinct language for their late kinsman being good one hundred percent ‘son of their land’.
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