

# Fontes Archaeologici Posnanienses, vol. 50, pars 1

## *Spis treści*

### *Table of Contents*

Od Redakcji.....	5
------------------	---

#### **Temat Specjalny: Profesor Józef Kostrzewski: człowiek i dzieło**

JACEK KABACIŃSKI

Znaczenie Józefa Kostrzewskiego dla badań nad starszą i środkową epoką kamienia.....	7
--	---

Józef Kostrzewski's contribution to the Paleolithic and Mesolithic research.....	16
--	----

MARZENA SZMYT

Młodsza epoka kamienia w dorobku Józefa Kostrzewskiego.....	19
---	----

The New Stone Age in Józef Kostrzewski's achievement.....	37
---	----

SŁAWOMIR KADROW

Neolit i początki epoki brązu na ziemiach polskich w ujęciu Józefa Kostrzewskiego .....	39
---	----

Neolithic and the beginnings of the Bronze Age in Polish territories: Józef Kostrzewski's approach .....	47
---	----

JANUSZ CZEBRESZUK, PRZEMYSŁAW MAKAROWICZ

Józef Kostrzewski – badacz wczesnej i środkowej epoki brązu .....	49
---	----

Józef Kostrzewski – an explorer of the Early and Middle Bronze Age .....	58
--	----

MACIEJ KACZMAREK

Józefa Kostrzewskiego koncept kultury łuszyckiej.....	59
---	----

Józef Kostrzewski's conception of the Lusatian culture.....	66
---	----

SYLWESTER CZOPEK

Chronologia i podziały kulturowe późnej epoki brązu i wczesnej epoki żelaza na ziemiach polskich w ujęciu Józefa Kostrzewskiego – próba oceny z “perspektywy południowej”.....	69
--	----

Józef Kostrzewski's chronology and cultural periodisation of the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age in Polish territories - - an assessment from the “southern perspective” .....	78
---	----

HENRYK MACHAJEWSKI

Studia Józefa Kostrzewskiego nad schyłkiem starożytności .....	79
--	----

Professor Józef Kostrzewski's studies on the close of the Antiquity.....	88
--	----

MICHAŁ BRZOSTOWICZ

Osiągnięcia Józefa Kostrzewskiego w badaniach nad wczesnym średniowieczem w Polsce .....	89
---	----

Józef Kostrzewski's achievement in studies of the Early Middle Ages in Poland .....	100
---	-----

ANDRZEJ BUKO

Czy Józef Kostrzewski był badaczem wczesnego średniowiecza?.....	101
--	-----

Was Józef Kostrzewski an investigator of the Polish Middle Ages?.....	109
---	-----

ARKADIUSZ MARCINIAK

Józef Kostrzewski a początki europejskiej bioarcheologii .....	111
Józef Kostrzewski and the beginnings of European bioarchaeology .....	122
ANNA GROSSMAN, WOJCIECH PIOTROWSKI	
Badania interdyscyplinarne w przedwojennym Biskupinie .....	123
Józef Kostrzewski and interdisciplinary research in pre-war Biskupin .....	134
DANUTA MINTA-TWORZOWSKA	
Podjęcie do źródeł Józefa Kostrzewskiego jako wyraz jego metodologii prahistorii .....	137
Józef Kostrzewski's approach to sources <i>vis-à-vis</i> present-day archaeology .....	144
TADEUSZ IGNACY GRABSKI	
Działalność profesora Józefa Kostrzewskiego w Muzeum Wielkopolskim .....	147
Professor Józef Kostrzewski and his work in Muzeum Wielkopolskie .....	161
ANDRZEJ PRINKE	
Poza archeologią: Józefa Kostrzewskiego działalność społeczna, obywatelska i patriotyczna .....	163
Beyond archaeology: public welfare, civic spirit and patriotic duty in the life of Józef Kostrzewski .....	175
TERESA PODGÓRSKA	
Formacja duchowa młodego Józefa Kostrzewskiego: Stowarzyszenie Eleusis i Filarecki Związek Elsów (1903-1912).....	177
Józef Kostrzewski's spiritual formation: the Filaret Eleusis Society/the ELS Society.....	179
KONRAD BIALECKI	
Józef Kostrzewski jako człowiek Kościoła.....	181
Józef Kostrzewski - A Man of the Church.....	188
JAROSŁAW MATYSIAK	
Zasoby archiwalne do badań nad życiem i dziełem prof. Józefa Kostrzewskiego w Archiwum PAN w Poznaniu.....	189
Archive resources for the study of life and achievement of Prof. Józef Kostrzewski in the Archives of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Poznań.....	197
STEFAN KAROL KOZŁOWSKI	
Archeologii wczesnodziejowej polskie początki .....	199
The Beginnings of Early Medieval Archaeology in Poland .....	203
MACIEJ PRZYBYŁ	
Wystawa "Nie tylko Biskupin. Józef Kostrzewski oczami współczesnych.....	205
The exhibition "Not only Biskupin. Józef Kostrzewski through the eyes of contemporaries" ..	205
Autorzy/Authors .....	211

## Józef Kostrzewski's contribution to the Paleolithic and Mesolithic research

### Summary

Several generations of scholars involved in studies of prehistory, the Middle Ages and the Modern Age have regarded Józef Kostrzewski as their mentor. He is a monumental figure cast in bronze and perhaps for this very reason he seems so remote and his achievement so hard to appreciate. The basic problem is answering the following question: was Józef Kostrzewski at all concerned with the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic research and what was the extent of his interest? J. Kostrzewski, as a researcher aiming at a synthesis of all prehistory, undoubtedly paid attention to those periods. His knowledge of the subject, however, was mostly drawn from works of other scholars specialising in the relevant epochs; he followed closely the changes taking place in scientific thinking about the Neolithic and, on a wider basis, in natural sciences, which he then would incorporate in his consecutive synthetic texts.

In this particular field some of Prof. Kostrzewski's most valuable achievement would include his successful efforts to finalise in 1939 the publication of the first part of *The prehistory of the Polish territories*, a work about the Palaeolithic by Stefan Krukowski. Krukowski's *The Palaeolithic* is rightly considered to be work of greatest excellence, written by a prominent self-taught prehistorian and an expert about the Palaeolithic.

From the point of view of the contemporary research on the Palaeolithic and the Neolithic Prof. Józef Kostrzewski has gone down in history due to his discovery in 1921 of a Palaeolithic site in Tarnowa, gmina Września. In his *The Palaeolithic* Stefan Krukowski wrote the following about that discovery (Krukowski 1939, p.92-93): "*Tarnowa (J. Kostrzewski). Eastern Wielkopolska. The right bank of the Warta opposite the mouth of the Proсна. (...) Tarnovian industry is (...) above all identical with Azilian production (Mas-d'Azil) known from northern Spain, France, north-western Switzerland, a little from southern England and quite a lot from German caves. Local differences in Azilian industry are not bigger than in other industries with a wide distribution. (...) For that reason Azilian flint industry is just simply Tarnovian.*" In this way Stefan Krukowski immortalised Prof. Kostrzewski's discovery and Tarnovian (Tarnovian industry) has forever entered archaeological literature as a synonym of late-Palaeolithic assemblages with Tarnovian endscrapers and backed pieces of the Polish Lowland.

Owing to Prof. Kostrzewski's personal initiative the collection of Poznań Archaeological Museum was enlarged by the addition of valuable Palaeolithic assemblages, including those from Grotte de Bedeilhac and Dolní Věstonice.

Professor Józef Kostrzewski is still remembered not just as a prominent scholar but also as a community and social activist and a passionate promoter of knowledge about our past. In his Introduction to the first edition of *Wielkopolska in prehistoric times* from 1914 he wrote: (Kostrzewski 1914, p. XI): "*The duty of every true citizen of the country is to rescue the mementoes of our most ancient past by giving all accidental finds to public museums (...). Archaeological excavations require as much expert knowledge as other professions and thus whoever begins such explorations without being primed for the work sins against our past. A broken tree will grow again, a wound will heal, but the damage caused by the destruction of an archaeological artefact cannot be ever repaired. Let us then protect and save these most ancient monuments to our past.*"

## The New Stone Age in Józef Kostrzewski's achievement

### Summary

Józef Kostrzewski himself was somewhat critical of his own involvement in the subject discussed in this paper, stating in 1927 that "...I was never very intimately occupied with the Stone Age..." Yet after many years a detached view of his achievement in the studies of the New Stone Age reveals an altogether different picture, if one takes into account the long-time effects of his work such as: huge enlargement of the source basis, establishment of fundamental Neolithic taxonomy, creation of typochronological schemata, setting up methodological principles for professional archaeological research, being a master tutor of brilliant students, awakening the sense of responsibility for the archaeological heritage as well as building public support for archaeology. This paper presents the importance of the Neolithic in Józef Kostrzewski's scholarly achievement from several complementary points of view: as part of scientific writings, as part of his understanding of archaeology and prehistory (and so as a theoretical reflection), as an aim of field studies and finally as an element of the heritage that should be protected with exceptional care.

On the impressive list of J. Kostrzewski's bibliography the subject of the Neolithic appears in several forms: as syntheses presenting an overall view of European or Polish prehistory or else focused on the prehistory of selected regions (eg Wielkopolska, Pomorze or Śląsk), and in more detailed publications, usually of a reporting type, and in reviews and polemics (Table 1). The main body of his work on the Neolithic falls between the years 1914-1939/1948. Publications produced at a later date reveal a repetition of the earlier established schemata, with new data added to the description of the Neolithic. However, compared to the later prehistoric periods he wrote relatively little about the Neolithic per se (or rather its selected aspects) and most of his publications on the subject were produced at the early stage of his career. In his later years he relied for matters Neolithic on Konrad Jażdżewski, who worked on relevant sections of Kostrzewski's books; the Professor proceeded in a similar way with the Palaeolithic, appreciating the competence of other archaeologists.

Obviously enough, J. Kostrzewski's publications, alike to those of L. Kozłowski's and W. Antoniewicz's, carry the mark of the period at which they appeared: the period during which the taxonomic and chronological principles of the Neolithic in Polish lands as well as over the whole continent were being established. The starting point was undoubtedly the basic typochronology of pottery constructed by G. Kossinna (1909; 1910) for the "northern" Neolithic (funnel beakers and collared flasks – globular amphorae – corded ware) and the Scandinavian chronological model (eg Montelius 1895). However, successive years brought new discoveries, concepts and discussions and presently the original, fairly simple picture of the Neolithic grew more complex, with a much bigger number of local features. The most important revision of Kostrzewski's opinions about the Neolithic appeared in the chapter on prehistory he was preparing on the commission of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences (Learning) and which was finally published after the war (Kostrzewski 1939-1948). This work differs from his earlier ones mainly in terms of the overall outlook, the prehistory of Polish territories (within the then existing borders) being placed in a wide spatial context, against the European or central European background. The perusal of the "Neolithic" part reveals that the Author not only followed closely the findings of the 1920s and 1930s but above all devoted much time to reading and intellectual reflection, concentrating both on larger publications and on numerous shorter texts. The introduction devoted to the classification and chronology of the Polish Neolithic is of particular relevance. Following a critical analysis of the existing classificatory format based on the application of Scandinavian findings, Kostrzewski suggests a changeover to a more adequate periodisation fitting the Polish context and a consistent use of a taxonomy based on the notion of "archaeological culture". His proposal includes an autonomous and holistic template of the Neolithic divided into three periods. Period I saw the arrival of first farmers belonging to the Linear Pottery culture, with the Mesolithic trends still active. Period II covered the later "Danubian" cultures and crucially the Funnel Beaker culture in its older phase (Wiórek) as well as the older phase of the Globular Amphora culture. Period II included, among others, the younger phases of the Funnel Beaker (Luboń) and Globular Amphora, the Corded Ware and also Pre-Finnish and Bell Beaker cultures. Thus, starting with period II Kostrzewski accepted the co-existence of several cultures within one territory. This point of view, later to be upheld and verified by archaeologists, played an important role in subsequent studies of Neolithic on the Odra and Vistula.

How did Kostrzewski understand the Neolithic? In his first "Wielkopolska-centred monographs he described its gist in terms of new technical skills: first, polishing whole tool surfaces, then pot making and farming. The first more complete definition can be found in his general outline of the European prehistory (Kostrzewski 1931). There the Neolithic is characterised in terms of "technical developments and advance in the forms of economic life" and he was to adhere to this

way of defining a particular epoch, one which entailed elements of social processes, until the very end of his career as a scholar.

Kostrzewski remained throughout a follower of the migrationist idea, even though he would increasingly emphasize the role of local hunter-gatherers' communities which entered into some unspecified relationship with the farming arrivals. It must be added, however, that despite his acceptance of the "ethnographic" method and a favourable opinion of the cognitive insight archaeology could contribute to ethnographic diversity studies, Kostrzewski basically never joined the discussion concerning the origins of the Indo-Europeans. He left the polemic, very vigorous in the 30s of the 20th c., to other archaeologists (eg Sulimirski 1933).

Undeniably the first professionally conducted excavations of Neolithic sites, dwelling settlements as much as graves, were of primary importance. After the amateurish explorations of the 19th c. "antiquarians" and half-amateur performance of archaeologists in the early 20th, it took Kostrzewski's experience and reflection to produce the main framework of digging procedures and increase the rigorousness of exploration and documentation. A valuable feature was his inclusion of specialists from other disciplines in his archaeological studies. Most frequently he sought the assistance of excellent scholars from his own academia, ie the Poznań University. For Neolithic sites this is for instance apparent in the first publications of archaeozoological sources by Edward Lubicz Niezabitowski (1929; 1936). Another Poznań University professor, a prominent botanist Adam Wodziczko, analysed at Kostrzewski's request the impressions of cereal grains preserved on Linear Pottery culture potsherds from Chelmża.

A survey of J. Kostrzewski's achievement in the Neolithic research seems to give an assessment very different to the highly self-critical one of the Professor himself.

## Neolithic and the beginnings of the Bronze Age in Polish territories: Józef Kostrzewski's approach

### Summary

It is not easy to discuss Józef Kostrzewski's vision of the Neolithic and the start of the Bronze Age in Polish territories as presented in his enormous scholarly achievement, since he preferred neither. Yet a greater difficulty any "reviewer" of Kostrzewski's work has to face is the immense force of his personality and unquestionable scientific standing. Last but not least, Tadeusz Wiślanski (1990) twenty five years ago produced a very competent assessment of Kostrzewski's research on the two epochs, while Jan Žak (1990) reconstructed the methodology that Kostrzewski had used.

At first Kostrzewski did not specify the concept of an archaeological culture. He wrote about peoples, groups and in yet another case about a set of recurring, connected sources or typical tools, graves or pottery. Each taxonomic unit (later – an archaeological culture) became an independent entity capable of unrestricted movement, of establishing contacts, of transmitting its individual features to other cultures or else merging with them. Cultures were ethnic monoliths and constituted parts of larger ethnic groups (eg Indo-European).

For Kostrzewski, the point of reference was the division of the south-Scandinavian Neolithic put forward by Oscar Montelius – a four-period classification based on the typology of graves and axes. He believed, after Gustaf Kossinna, that the area of southern Scandinavia and central Germany played a key role in the Neolithic revolution. As cultures, pressed by local forces, were expanding from these centres, they modified their original features along the way.

Kostrzewski believed that history was an evolution interrupted by disevolution (migration). He saw induction as the fundamental procedure in achieving genuine knowledge (Žak 1990:87). Similarly to Kossinna he thought that archaeological research should proceed along empiricist, three-stage lines: (1) description – (2) analysis – (3) synthesis (Žak 1990:87-88).

1. The preliminary stage includes: a description and arrangement of material, followed by a presentation of "bare facts". The form is of particular relevance for the research process, and the description follows from an immediate, direct observation of the artefact. The qualifications and skills of the viewer play a prominent role. The description should be presented in an interpretable manner. The classification has to consider the fact that artefacts are subject to variable and alternating regularities in the same way as biotic creatures are. Basing on typologically ordered material we can distinguish archaeological cultures.
2. "Historicisation" of an archaeological culture – giving it an ethnic label.
3. A reconstruction (synthesis) of the historical process within the framework of formal periodisation (problems of the relative ethno-cultural stabilisation).

The remarkable model of the archaeology of the Neolithic presented by Kostrzewski consists of a number of elements. The most important ones include: (a) acceptance of the normative theory of archaeological culture with the ensuing confidence in typological method, the aim of which was to be reconstruction of the norms of the living culture recorded in artefacts of the material culture, (b) identification of the archaeological culture with a (specific) population and fascination with the Indo-Europeans (and the recognition of the Corded Ware culture communities as IE) and a great emphasis on Pre-Slavs whom he identified with the people of, for instance, the Early Bronze Age Únětice culture, (c) asserting migration to be the main factor responsible for fundamental cultural changes, (d) (some) recognition of climatic and environmental changes as causes of migrations (transgression of the Baltic in southern Scandinavia) or as creating more favourable conditions for the wanderings of communities (drier climatic conditions during the Subatlantic phase), (e) ignoring the Euro-Asiatic east as a source of inspiration for civilisational progress in the Neolithic, (f) far-from-the-exotic vision of peoples that made up Neolithic populations with their rational use of resources (deposits) of for example copper, engagement in trade, etc.

The authority and attractiveness of Józef Kostrzewski's work seems to lie less in the perceptiveness of his diagnoses about the form and nature of central European Neolithic communities than in the power of the inspiration they contain. In this context the elegance, linguistic clarity and interpretational effectiveness of his typological and sources analyses in chronologico-cultural matters is of no lesser significance. For this type of investigation his is a definite canon.

Janusz Czebreszuk, Przemysław Makarowicz

## Józef Kostrzewski – an explorer of the Early and Middle Bronze Age

### Summary

Józef Kostrzewski produced a number of publications on his research of the beginnings of the Bronze Age in Polish territories and he conducted excavations and prospections of many Bronze Age sites as well. In his synthetic works he also discussed the Bronze Age culture, with the main focus on the funeral taxonomy and ritual.

He was the first to formulate the thesis of the westward progress of the Bronze Age culture, a belief based on his study of the distribution of Bronze Age sites, more numerous in the west (particularly in Wielkopolska), and on the higher number of bronze objects there registered (Kostrzewski 1925a, Table V and VI). The scholar can also be credited with singling out the so-called Pre-Lusatian culture and the unit's first systematic description (Kostrzewski 1925a: 176; 1925b: 262ff). As early as the 20s of the past century he headed a number of digging expeditions at the said culture's barrow cemeteries in Smoszewo, Krotoszyn and Wysocko Wielkie, Wielkopolska (Kostrzewski 1925a).

Also, Kostrzewski proposed names and a description of taxonomic units such as: Iwno culture (Kostrzewski 1924; 1935), Trzciniec culture (Jazdzewski 1930) and Biały Potok group (Kostrzewski 1928a). Because of his immense standing and authority the labels are still in use. Prof. Kostrzewski laid down the foundations of the notion of an interweaving zone, ie "Trzciniec - Pre-Lusatian" or else "Trzciniec - Tumulus" zone, to label the syncretisation area of the two units' cultural patterns, a name that would later prevail in Polish prehistoriography of the Bronze Age. True to the thesis of cultural development continuity in the Odra and Vistula basins, he constructed the idea of the crucial significance of the Pre-Lusatian and Trzciniec cultures (grown from a local foundation with outside inspirations) for the Pre-Slavonic, in his view, origins of the Lusatian culture.

Drawing on the examination of an increasing number of finds Józef Kostrzewski proved that during the I and II Bronze Age periods Polish territories were not depopulated. He also denied Leon Kozłowski's emphasis on the impact of climate changes on demographic processes, which he thought excessive.

Józef Kostrzewski's contribution to the exploration of the Early, Older and Middle Bronze Age was of no small importance, even though it never stood at the core of his scientific interests.

Maciej Kaczmarek

## Józef Kostrzewski's conception of the Lusatian culture

### Summary

The Lusatian culture question was one of the most important if not the most important issue in the whole spectrum of Professor's Kostrzewski scope of interests. It is beyond doubt that the reason for this state of affairs is to be sought in the concept already suggested by Czech scholars at the close of the 19th c. and which identified the culture's members with pre-Slavonic peoples. In his work Kostrzewski developed and widely spread the assumption, ascribing the alleged pre-Slavonic creators of the Lusatian culture the status of forbears of early mediaeval Slavs, and the Lechite tribes in particular. On such a basis, following the methodological principles of the then reigning culture-historical school, there emerged a conception of a homogenous and indivisible, significant regional variants notwithstanding, archaeological culture, the span of which stretched over almost a millennium. The turning point in the formation of the belief in the pre-Slavic nature of the Lusatian population, for scholars and laymen alike, were the excavations in the fortified settlement in Biskupin, both a brilliant achievement of Polish archaeology during the interwar period and an attractive propagandist tool in fighting the aggressive pressure of German scholarly milieu possessed with Nazi ideology. By the same token the ethnocentric conception of the pre-Slavic Lusatian culture created, propagated and defended against all odds and with full conviction by J. Kostrzewski and most of his disciples, for over half a century constituted the basis for a specific perception of the culture and the processes that took place in the Odra and Vistula river basins during the late Bronze Age and the early Iron Age. Apart from obvious scientific benefits, such a narrow focusing of intellectual concentration produced a number of negative phenomena that brought in their wake a stagnation in the studies of the relevant prehistorical period.

Undoubtedly, the cultural groupings distinguished by J. Kostrzewski within the "Lusatian culture" ought to be seen as a complex of autonomic cultural zones (eg the Odra culture, Carpathian culture, West Pomeranian and East Pomeranian culture), only in some cases interconnected and this mostly due to immediate vicinity, akin genetic substrate, elements of funerary rites, similarities in some pottery features and the use of a similar range of bronze objects. The legitimacy of singling out the Lusatian culture as a monolith, a view that has so far been fondly nurtured by generations of not exclusively Polish archaeologists, is indefensible once the ethnic, Kossinnian paradigm of doing archaeology is rejected. While questioning the connection of the Lusatian culture with pre-Slavs, a thesis that cannot be rationally verified, I am by no means taking sides with the former or present opponents of J. Kostrzewski's opinion on the subject. I believe that as far as ethnic matters are concerned prehistoric archaeology has still little to say and the research should not become futilely involved in such issues.



Sylwester Czopek

## Józef Kostrzewski's chronology and cultural periodisation of the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age in Polish territories - an assessment from the "southern perspective"

### Summary

Assessing Professor Józef Kostrzewski's scientific achievement in its entirety is a complex task, to say the least. This is not just due to the stature of the man himself but also to the scope of his research (at least from the Neolithic to Late Middle Ages) and its nature (from field work and source studies to huge syntheses and promotion of archaeology). The discussion in the present paper focuses on three issues relevant for the Bronze and Early Iron Age considerations:

- chronology and periodisation (an attempt to follow the meaning of the so-called "Kostrzewski system" ever present in Polish archaeology and beyond, despite years of many doubts and even criticism);
- cultural divisions (understood as a chronologico-territorial differentiation of the Lusatian culture and a stable/static existence of particular units perceived as physically existing regional communities);
- problems of ethnic interpretation (the autochthony of Slavic/pre-Slavic tribes identified with the Lusatian culture, based on findings drawn from archaeology, linguistics and natural sciences).

Overall, throughout his scientific career Józef Kostrzewski was consistent in his opinions and particular issues were only slightly modified. He had charted the research into the Younger Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age for years to come. One might claim that even his eventually falsified (or those entirely accepted) theories and pronouncements were a natural and necessary stage in the development of Polish prehistoric archaeology which incidentally followed the course adopted in all European archaeology. And this is the way in which the achievement of this great scholar ought to be assessed.

Henryk Machajewski

## Professor Józef Kostrzewski's studies on the close of the Antiquity Summary

Three phases can be distinguished in Prof. Józef Kostrzewski's involvement in the studies on the close of the Antiquity, ie the era from the Pre-Roman (La Tène) period to the early phase of the wanderings of the peoples (5<sup>th</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> c. A.D). The distinction is based on his sources and research methods as well as the political mood of his times.

Phase I: Studies in Berlin (1910/1911 – 1914) capped with a doctorate (J. Kostrzewski 1919), and the preparation of the first edition of his “Wielkopolska w czasach prehistorycznych” (*Wielkopolska in prehistoric times*) along the lines of positivist principles and ethnoarchaeological method.

Phase II: research and academic career, mainly concentrated in Poznań (end of the partitions and the Second Polish Republic period, 1914 – 1944; work targeted on the two themes of (1) chronological and chorological history of the Polish territories and (2) developing the thesis of Slavonic autochthonism, influenced by a post-positivist approach to the subject with the support the ethnoarchaeological method much flavoured with evolutionism.

Phase III: Poland 1945 – 1969, continuation of work on issues linked with phase II, now with the added attempt at a criticism of the ethnoarchaeological method and its bent towards the culture – language parallelism.

Michał Brzostowicz

## Józef Kostrzewski's achievement in studies of the Early Middle Ages in Poland Summary

The problems of the Early Middle Ages constitute an important part of Józef Kostrzewski's achievement. His work in the field can be divided into three basic sectors. The first comprises his work as a researcher which resulted in a number of valuable publications, among them the excellent *Kultura prapolska* with its sweeping and broad approach to the issue. The second involves organization of field work and in particular wide-ranging excavations in Gniezno, Kłeczek and Poznań (1936-1939) which in a sense constituted a prelude to the grand-scale "millennium" studies conducted after the war. The third sector included academic teaching and scientific supervision of new generations of scholars (eg W. Łęga, W. Kowalenko, Z. A. Rajewski, W. Hensel, W. Kóčka) who later continued their mentor's work. One should also mention Kostrzewski's inspirational role in the area of promotion and popularization, carried out with immense flair, arousing enormous interest in the beginnings of the Polish state among the public and creating a favourable ambiance around archaeology as such.

Professor Józef Kostrzewski brought to the early mediaeval studies an extraordinary vision, a sweeping panoramic approach to the epoch and an exceptional courage in addressing great challenges. And even if many theses and pronouncements of the Great Scholar failed the test of time, his achievements translated into solid foundations without which one could hardly envisage the future development of the mediaeval period archaeology in Poland.

Andrzej Buko

## Was Józef Kostrzewski an investigator of the Polish Middle Ages?

### Summary

The question posited in the paper's title may be come as a surprise since Kostrzewski's achievement in the studies of the Polish Middle Ages is indisputable. However, in his numerous publications those devoted to earlier epochs predominate.

Until the 30s of the 20th c. the mediaeval issues rarely appear in his scientific work, while already at the close of the 20s there arose and was eventually met the urgent need of a thorough examination of the mediaeval period. The growth of research was at times stimulated by political circumstances. This was the case of the ethnic approach in archaeology put forward in the 20s of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. by the German prehistorian Gustaf Kossinna – Józef Kostrzewski's mentor. Polish response, with Kostrzewski in the lead, was to undertake studies that would prove the ancient Polishness (Slavonic-ness) of the territories situated between the Odra and Vistula rivers. And even though many mistakes in the assessment and interpretation of archaeological facts had been made, the work created an atmosphere apposite for the advance of Early Mediaeval studies as well.

Kostrzewski's achievement in mediaeval studies belong within four topical groups. These are: ethnogenesis of the Slavs including cultural continuance in the Polish territories, research and publication of sources for mediaeval archaeological sites, monographs and comprehensive synthetic publications.

Published in 1961, the treatise on settlement continuity in the Polish territories in prehistorical times (Kostrzewski 1961) dealt with the basic question, namely: did the antecedents of the Slavs inhabit the area in prehistory or did they appear only in the 6<sup>th</sup> c.? The basic premise was that cultural continuity attests settlement continuance. This provided the basis for a picture of relations between the pre-Polish early mediaeval culture and the Przeworsk Culture of the Roman Period and the wanderings of the peoples. In a different work *Prasłowiańszczyzna. Zarys dziejów i kultury Słowian* (Kostrzewski 1946a) the matter of the original homeland and the oldest history of the Slavs are predominant. According to Kostrzewski, the credibility of the descriptions of the Slavs at the period are verified by Roman authors.

In the quoted and also other publications of the author the Middle Ages in the sense of a separate historical period or an object of interest simply do not exist. They are there, however, to demonstrate the immediate and direct continuity between the present and the antiquity. As he perceived it, the Middle Ages are but a link between the two distant epochs.

The work on the potter marks of early Wielkopolska mediaeval vessels remains an exception among the publications of the Early Middle Ages sources that came out in the 20s of the 20th century. It is an interesting paper reaching far beyond the argument with German scholars typical of our hero, and its source material consists of the findings of marked vessels from Wielkopolska. His work *Obrządek ciałopalny u plemion polskich i Słowian północno-zachodnich* (Kostrzewski 1960) is of greater scope still; it was the first of its kind analytical presentation of selected elements of funerary rites from the early mediaeval period.

Arkadiusz Marciniak

## Józef Kostrzewski and the beginnings of European bioarchaeology

### Summary

The article aims to discuss the conditions and mechanisms of constructing major research paradigms in European archaeology by looking at the beginnings of integrated efforts of archaeologists and natural scientists in formulating the program of bioarchaeology. Józef Kostrzewski and his large scale research project in Biskupin in the 1930th significantly contributed to this process. These developments are presented in the context of similar studies in northern Europe, in particular works of a leading British prehistorian Grahame Clark. The paper further aims to explain reasons of an abrupt disappearance of these interests in Polish archaeology immediately after the Second World War. It happened in the period when bioarchaeology got transformed in other parts of Europe into an independent discipline with clearly defined objectives, efficient research strategy and a set of new methods that made it possible to achieve the postulated goals.

## Józef Kostrzewski and interdisciplinary research in pre-war Biskupin

### Summary

The paper discusses the agenda of interdisciplinary studies followed during the inter-war period in the excavations at Biskupin, initiated and conducted by Prof. J. Kostrzewski. It presents the development of the scholar's interests, from the early childhood passion for collecting, the nurture of patriotism and history at his family home and social awareness that introduced him to the broad field of the humanities, including the oldest history of Polish territories and adjunct disciplines.

The first area of studies Kostrzewski had begun in Wrocław in 1907 introduced him to anthropology. In 1909 he moved to Kraków and as a student of the Jagiellonian University he focused on prehistory, ethnography and anthropology under Prof. Kazimierz Demetrykiewicz. In the years 1910-1914 he studied under Prof. Gustaf Kossinna in Berlin (with the first year spent in the British Museum in London). In both cities he came into contact with both rich collections and extensive literature as well as specialists in various areas of humanities and natural sciences.

Since that time he intensified cooperation with naturalists, particularly after being appointed professor of prehistory at the Poznań University which was established in 1919 and of which he was a co-founder. Preparing his research in Biskupin, he very carefully planned the realization of the tasks he predicted to take at least several seasons. His archaeological team was joined by geologists, paleobotanists, biologists, anthropologists, wood conservators, photographers, ethnographers, visual artists, men of letters and historians, as well as numerous representatives of the media; it can be safely claimed that at the relevant period interdisciplinary activities from the very beginning involved and put the biggest emphasis on the cooperation with natural scientists, a move that produced the most prominent scientific achievements in Biskupin. The first palynological profile was analysed by Bronisław Jaroń (1936), itself a remarkable feat that went beyond the then level of knowledge. E. Lubicz-Niezabitowski, a physician, entomologist and palaeontologist, carried out the analysis of animal and human bone remains. Studies of the geological profiles of the headland performed by the geomorphologist Karol Paulo MA provided highly significant data.

Another important element of the description of the course of research project was the adopted system of recording the excavation work, and particularly vertical photography of wooden constructional remains that was a standard from the very first season and which was taken by Professor's pupil Wojciech Kóčka, a student of prehistory and anthropology. The fact that his photographs are now being used in the painstaking and laborious digitalisation of drawings documentation for Biskupin archives, part of which got lost during the Second World War, demonstrates their excellent quality.

Underwater research in Biskupin was carried out in 1936-1939 with the assistance of navy divers from the port in Gdynia. A different problem that Prof. Kostrzewski was facing was the conservation of the unearthed prehistoric wooden constructions. The methods applied differed, from covering the objects with moss to soaking them with paraffin and various chemical stuff.

A very important feature of Józef Kostrzewski and his team's activity was the instant publication of the results, from brief reports, analyses and comprehensive papers to monographs of highest attainable level, and making the reports and source material widely available.

The scope of the work carried out in Biskupin over barely six years is truly astounding, considering that at the same time their initiator performed many other functions at the university, the museum and international organisations, worked on numerous publications and coordinated the work of several teams. Yet because of his brilliant choice of co-workers and their unfailing involvement he was able to realise tasks of great importance for Polish archaeology and its promotion as a scientific discipline.

## Józef Kostrzewski's approach to sources vis-à-vis present-day archaeology

### Summary

Changes notwithstanding, the matter of sources in the examination of the past remains a major problem. The question of an archaeological source has concerned many archaeologists, a fact proved by the large number of publications on the subject. Sources are regarded either as a necessary tool for the "reconstruction" of the past (the traditional approach) or for the process of building models and explanations or interpretations. Depending on the perspective, be it historical (continental archaeology) or anthropological (Anglo-Saxon version), archaeological sources are handled in a different manner.

All approaches formulate the theory of an archaeological source in a nonlinear way, even though they ascribe the predominance to one of them in a given period. The mosaic of differences is particularly evident today. Thus, on a "map" presenting the issue one can distinguish the basic generalised attitudes that shape the theory of the archaeological source: a) positivistic (culturo-historical), b) processual (modernist), c) post-processual (postmodernist) and d) post-postprocessual (known as new empiricism). The varying views offer a different approach to the sources, yet they do not succeed one another but rather often "co-exist", forming the map mentioned above. The theory of a source presents a similar picture. Obviously enough, I strongly believe that no archaeologist is neutral in his work vis-à-vis theoretical assumptions. For this very reason the effects of the cognitive procedures cannot be interpreted realistically, ie endowed with an existential status independent of the researcher's perceptiveness. Just the opposite – the realistic interpretation mentioned is inescapably relativised against the adopted research perspective (H. Putnam's internal realism).

Where, then, do Józef Kostrzewski's intellectual stand and particularly his approach to sources belong, the latter itself constituting a source for diagnosing his theoretical assumptions. This approach was once been defined as positivist (Żak 1990: 69-91), an opinion hard to defy. J. Kostrzewski focused on "archaeological facts" and called them "prehistoric artefacts"; he saw them as traces by which we can recognise past events. They were, in his perspective, carriers of an objective truth in the classic sense of the word. Kostrzewski himself wrote about sources as the basis of the archaeologist's work already in 1946, describing them as prehistoric artefacts, both portable and non-portable. For him and other archaeologists the artefacts compiled in the catalogues acquired the status of archaeological facts. The description would include two main parameters: dating, the territorial location included, and then consecutively the description of the physical features that in a way completed the archaeologist's ground work. J. Kostrzewski tackled further detailed classificational and typological procedures but treated any generalisations about them as a knowledge less certain than the one contained in huge and comprehensive catalogues. Let us answer the question: what was the past reconstructed by the archaeologists? It was something articulated in the language of objects. In such an approach the source is seen objectivistically. In this context the obvious fact of scholars' opinions being shaped by the times they live in is not taken into account. Here Kostrzewski himself (1946, p. 5) closely followed the Scandinavian archaeologist C. Montelius. Kostrzewski's aim was first and foremost to answer the question about the ethnicity of a given compact group of prehistoric producers occupying a given territory. Hence searching for a definition of a culture and treating artefacts as the key to recognise the given culture (defined as an archaeological culture) seen as a representation of a concrete social group.

At this stage let us pose a few questions that leave aside the times in which J. Kostrzewski lived and worked, and which are articulated from a more present-day perspective. Could Kostrzewski, with his opinion about sources, feel comfortable with processual archaeology? The answer, as far as thinking about sources is concerned, is no. He enumerates the characteristics of a "prehistoric artefact", while processualists introduce a different culture research model that determines the approach to sources – a systemic view of culture and sources. This is a perspective that changes all.

Another pertinent question is how far Kostrzewski would have been intrigued by the postprocessual outlook, and by contextualism in particular, and whether one can find such elements in his approach to archaeological sources. In this type of research the cultural meanings are facts, and objects in their physical description are not. An intellectual inquiry here stated differs from that of Kostrzewski's or the postprocessualists'. It is as follows: how to determine the cultural meaning of an extinct culture (not in the sense of archaeological cultures) that archaeology examines using the material correlates of those very cultures? Yet it seems that placing Kostrzewski's stand on sources within such an approach would not be easy, since even if he refers to cultural meanings, this derives from the physical features of the products and not from approaching them as a "text". Thus there is little to connect them with a contextualistic interpretation.

At this juncture one must mention the present-day discourse in the humanities, not necessarily a leading one, carried on within the "New Humanism": known as "studies of objects" or "a cultural biography of objects", sometimes understood as

the “new empiricism” that arose at the end of the 90s of the last century. Two ways of approaching objects seem to emerge: one referring to language-fettered literature and the other focusing on objects as independent entities. Archaeology then would belong in the approach that emphasises the entity of objects, since, as far as sources are concerned, from the 19th c. onwards it has been trying to expose their very existence. This is due to the contemporary trend of returning to “the origins”: origins of language, of perception, of culture. To some extent modern culture has endorsed the positivistic attempts to combine the chronology of man into the chronology of objects. Speaking about objects we set down a chronology fashioned after the biological evolution. In reference to human beings we speak of man experiencing objects, of man ‘s cognition of objects and the resultant knowledge amassed. Thus there arise two irreconcilable sequences; this speaks volumes about the asymmetry in thinking about origins. In this context, then, Kostrzewski’s viewpoint might tally with one of the asymmetry’s components, namely, the one relating to positivism. If it is accepted that in some versions the return to objects draws on positivism, then only in this sense J. Kostrzewski’s ideas carry any weight in modern archaeology, and then to a limited extent only.



Tadeusz Ignacy Grabski

## Professor Józef Kostrzewski and his work in Muzeum Wielkopolskie

### Summary

Prof. Józef Kostrzewski attached great importance to museum collections, and particularly to archaeological artefacts that constituted the basis for his scientific research on the prehistory of Polish territories. His work in this field contributed to the significance of Muzeum Wielkopolskie (MW) which next to the National Museums in Warszawa and Kraków was one of the most important and artefact-rich institutions of its kind in the Second Polish Republic.

He began his work for the Muzeum Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk Poznańskiego (from 1921 Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk – Poznań Friends of Sciences' Society; PTPN) in May 1914, where he was employed as the assistant conservator. He was the first fully professionally prepared expert in museum work to be given the charge of the archaeological department which he ran until 1923 (the same year he was also appointed Director of the Museum).

At the beginning of the Second Republic he was one of the co-organizers of scientific and museum activities in Wielkopolska. At the end of 1918 he was actively involved in securing and taking over cultural institutions in the Poznań area. One of them was the German Kaiser Friedrich Museum, in which until September 1919 together with Rev. Prof. Szczęśny Dettloff they held the post of pro tempore directors of the National Museum. They dismissed the Germans there employed and played a role in re-naming the institution as Muzeum Wielkopolskie.

As early as 1919 J. Kostrzewski was a fervent supporter of amassing the PTPN collection with that of MW, which was carried out over the years 1923-1933.

Kostrzewski became the director of the merged collections from the two museums and the very much sovereign Prehistory Department of MW was founded. Thanks to him and his co-workers, during the inter-war period the department accumulated one of the richest archaeological collections. Wide-ranging archaeological studies (among them those in Biskupin), exhibitions and didactic work all combined to make the department Poland's leading research and museum centre and an example to follow.

J. Kostrzewski was one of the few scholars and people involved with museum work who laid down permanent foundations of Polish science and museum expertise. For them, museum collections were treasures – anchors of memory that added to the development of national culture and identity.

Andrzej Prinke

## Beyond archaeology: public welfare, civic spirit and patriotic duty in the life of Józef Kostrzewski Summary

The paper briefly outlines the abundant and multifaceted public sphere of Prof. Józef Kostrzewski's life. He was vigorously and enthusiastically involved in those activities since early youth and throughout his adult life parallel with his main vocation, which was scientific, academic, and museum-oriented career in the area of prehistory. Some of the aspects of his achievements that went beyond archaeology have been long unknown and have only been disclosed by the recent archival research done by the present author in the years 2010-2014. The paper presents in turn: (1) Józef Kostrzewski's support for the activities of patriotic movements and events (underground scout movement in Poznań during World War One, the uprisings in Wielkopolska and Śląsk, participation in group protests of Poznań academics against the May coup d'état by Józef Piłsudski, the Brześć trial and the Bereza Kartuska prison camp), (2) involvement in ethical and teetotal movements (*Els Filaret Society, the Poznań Club of Catholic Intelligentsia*), (3) teaching and education of young people (underground tutoring during the period of partitions, World War One and the German occupation, patronage of youth organizations), (4) philanthropy, (5) support of the Catholic Church (confidential counsellor of the Archbishop of Poznań, initiator of construction of a chapel, followed by a church at his residential area), (6) work as an editor and publisher outside archaeological matters, (7) many initiatives concerning founding new institutions and organisations, among them: the Poznań University and public lectures as well as the doctrine of the Polish Western Thought which arose in the between-war Poznań.

Teresa Podgórska

## Józef Kostrzewski's spiritual formation: the Filaret Eleusis Society and the Els Society

### Summary

The Filaret Society "Eleusis" (the Filaret Els Society since 1922) played a prominent role in the spiritual formation of Józef Kostrzewski.

Founded in 1903 by philosopher Wincenty Lutosławski, its primary aim was the moral rebirth of the Polish nation. The starting point of the renewal was to be the observance of the fourfold abstinence from tobacco, alcohol, gambling and debauchery. Positive self-work was a means of attaining a complete, all-round physical, intellectual and spiritual growth. The organization contributed considerably to the religious renewal of Polish intelligentsia, the patriotic awakening among workers in Śląsk and the growth of Polish scouting movement.

Konrad Białecki

## Józef Kostrzewski – A Man of the Church

### Summary

Although marginal at first glance, the confessional aspects of Józef Kostrzewski's life had a significant impact on shaping the personality of this prominent archaeologist. Undoubtedly, the personal piety of the future professor was strongly influenced by his mother, Elżbieta Kostrzewska, a deeply religious person. Some influence may also have been related to his education in Catholic schools and the fact that there were two priests in Kostrzewski's family: his mother's brother Henryk Brońkański and his cousin Kazimierz Kostrzewski. In his youth, Józef Kostrzewski was involved in numerous patriotic and abstinent initiatives with strong references to Christian values. Among those a crucial role was played by the Krakow-based Brotherhood of „Eleusis”, formally registered as the Filaret ELS Association after Poland regained its independence. Professor Kostrzewski was the co-founder and active member of the Catholic Intelligentsia Club in Poznań, as well as the head of a church building committee in Krzyżownicy near Poznań, at the same time supporting numerous academic organizations with religious affiliations, e.g. Caritas Academica. He also chaired the Committee for the Millennium of Poland's Baptism (appointed by Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński), preparing a detailed plan of celebrating that important anniversary. On many occasions, he offered advice and assistance to the Archbishop of Poznań Antoni Baraniak. For his commitment to the Church, he was awarded the highest distinction by the Holy See – the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

Jarosław Matysiak

## Archive resources for the study of life and achievement of Prof. Józef Kostrzewski in the Archives of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Poznań

### Summary

The Polish Academy of Sciences (PAS) in Warsaw, Poznań Division, is a scientific establishment operating since May 1956. Since then it has been carrying out the task of accumulating, editing and popularising the source materials for the history of Polish science in Poznań and Wielkopolska. These are mainly documents related with the legacy of particular scholars and records of the institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences active in the region.

The archive documentation is accessible to scientists at home and abroad, students and all members of the public interested in the region's achievement in the field of science and its history.

At present the resources of PAS Archives, Poznań Division, cover over 425 linear metres of documents. The archives contain 186 collections, including 2 collections from institutions active prior to PAS creation, 24 collections of PAS institutes and establishments and 160 private collections (legacies).

Researchers' interests focus overwhelmingly on the legacy of prominent scholars. The legacies, acquired and assembled after, at times, years of endeavour through purchases, bequests and deposits, constitute the core of the archive collection. The largest and most valuable legacies are those of humanists, and these include the records connected with Prof. Józef Kostrzewski (1885-1969), archaeologist, prehistorian, co-founder of the Poznań University, head of the Institute of Prehistory Institute/Chair of Archaeology, Poznań University, director of the Poznań Prehistoric/Archaeological Museum, a committed social activist.

This paper presents the circumstances accompanying the acquisition of Józef Kostrzewski's legacy by PAS Poznań Division, and describes records of his professional, scientific and community-oriented career as well as biographical and family documents. The vast body of Polish and Foreign correspondence with scientific institutions and societies and with outstanding members of both academic and social-work milieus is of particular value. Altogether, Józef Kostrzewski's documents and records collected in the Poznań PAS Archives are 6 linear metres long and are among the largest legacies housed at the Archives. Importantly, it is also an open collection and will be expanded following successive purchases or bequests.

Seven groups of materials can be distinguished in Józef Kostrzewski's legacy. The first one includes documents connected with his scientific work, mainly in the field of prehistory, the discipline he practiced. The second contains records of his professional, scientific and social welfare career. Fairly copious biographical materials are in group three.

The fourth group, the largest, is the in-coming correspondence. These are all kinds of dispatches, invitations, notices from scientific institutions and societies at home and abroad, from Polish scientific institutions and museums with then existing archaeological sections (PAS, Regional Conservationist Offices), major European museums holding archaeological collections (Berlin, Budapest, Copenhagen, Dresden, Leningrad, Moscow, Munich, Prague, Zagreb), church institutions, political parties, cultural and social organisations, scientific and social committees and finally correspondence from private individuals: co-workers, colleagues and friends both at home and abroad.

The fifth group contains reviews of Józef Kostrzewski's publications and press articles and cuttings related to his person, eg on the occasion of successive anniversaries of his scientific career, obituaries and posthumous tributes.

The sixth group covers family records. These include archive documents connected with the scholar's family: his grandfather Józef Cichocki-Bronkański, his wife Jadwiga, his sons Zbigniew, Bogdan and Przemysław, his daughter Maria Jagienka (Kostrzewska-Orlewicz), his daughters-in-law and his grandchildren.

The seventh group comprises materials from/of unrelated persons. These include manuscripts and typescripts of scientific works and letters.

The Poznań PAS Archives also store other legacies containing information about Józef Kostrzewski's professional, scientific and community career. This is first of all the legacy of his son Bogdan Kostrzewski, but also those of Jan Jachowski, Stanisław Kozierowki, Wojciech Kóčka and Alojzy Stanisław Matyniak.

Józef Kostrzewski's legacy preserved in the Archives of PAS Poznań Division, carries catalogue number P. III-51. At the present moment its organisation and inventory are undergoing an intensive

overhaul in accordance with the guidelines concerning legacy care set down for the PAS Archives. The work is expected to be completed in the fourth quarter of 2015.

Stefan Karol Kozłowski

## The Beginnings of Early Medieval Archaeology in Poland

### Summary

The article is devoted to the beginnings of early medieval archaeology in Poland, which are placed by the Author in the years 1913/14-1948. The issues discussed involve the first educational classes in the specified field, publications, excavations, master and doctoral theses, and, at this background, the outline of successful, multi-dimensional activities of Józef Kostrzewski.

The origins of the field are traced back to the first lectures concerning the archaeology of Slavs, delivered by W. Demetrykiewicz at the Jagiellonian University in the academic year 1913/14. At other universities, lectures on the archaeology of the Early Medieval Period were presented only in the 1920s (lectures by J. Kostrzewski at Poznań University) and in the next decade of the 20th century (lectures by W. Antoniewicz at the University of Warsaw). The Author attaches particular importance to the classes conducted in Poznań in the years 1935-1938 by R. Jakimowicz - the first in Poland archaeologist with postdoctoral qualifications in the field of the Early Middle Ages. His lectures had great significance for the formation of the younger generation of distinguished researchers specialised in the Early Medieval Period, including W. Hensel, Z. Rajewski, W. Kočka or W. Kowalenko.

Archaeological excavations were carried out mostly at strongholds (e.g. Gniezno, Poznań, Kłecko, Sąsiadka, Wietrzno-Bóbrka, Grodno, Dawidgródek et al.), however, cemeteries (particularly barrow burial grounds) and other kinds of archaeological sites were also explored.

The list of the most important achievements in the initial stage of development of the field includes „Kultura prapolska”, the publication by Józef Kostrzewski released in 1947, supported by the outstanding work „Kultura ludowa Słowian” by ethnologist K. Moszyński (1929-1939), and the study by R. Jakimowicz, published in 1948.

## *Autorzy*

**dr hab. Konrad Bialecki**

*Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*  
*Oddział w Poznaniu*  
ul. Rolna 45a  
61-487 Poznań  
e-mail: kbarhp@amu.edu.pl

**dr Michał Brzostowicz**

*Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu*  
ul. Wodna 27  
61-781 Poznań  
e-mail: michal.brzostowicz@muzarp.poznan.pl

**prof. dr hab. Andrzej Buko**

*Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej*  
*Akademii Nauk, Warszawa*  
Al. Solidarności 105  
00-140 Warszawa  
e-mail: abuko@uw.edu.pl

**prof. dr hab. Janusz Czebreszuk**

*Instytut Prahistorii*  
*Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu*  
ul. Św. Marcin 78  
61-809 Poznań  
e-mail: jancze@amu.edu.pl

**prof. dr hab. Sylwester Czopek**

*Instytut Archeologii*  
*Uniwersytet Rzeszowski*  
ul. Hoffmanowej 8  
35-016 Rzeszów  
e-mail: sycz@archeologia.rzeszow.pl

**mgr Tadeusz Ignacy Grabski**

*Muzeum Narodowe w Poznaniu*  
Al. Marcinkowskiego 9  
61-745 Poznań  
e-mail: archiwum@mnp.art.pl

**mgr Anna Grossman**

*Muzeum Archeologiczne w Biskupinie*



*Oddział w Warszawie*  
ul. Długa 52 Arsenał  
00-241 Warszawa  
e-mail: grossbiskupin@wp.pl

**prof. dr hab. Jacek Kabaciński**  
*Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej*  
*Akademii Nauk, Poznań*  
ul. Rubież 46  
61-612 Poznań  
e-mail: jacek.kabacinski@iaepan.poznan.pl

**dr hab. Maciej Kaczmarek**  
*Instytut Prahistorii*  
*Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu*  
ul. Św. Marcin 78  
61-809 Poznań  
e-mail: maciej.kaczmarek@amu.edu.pl

**prof. dr hab. Sławomir Kadrow**  
*Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN*  
*Ośrodek Archeologii Gór i Wyzyn*  
ul. Sławkowska 17  
31-016 Kraków  
e-mail: slawekkadrow@gmail.com

**prof. dr hab. Stefan Karol Kozłowski**  
*Instytut Archeologii*  
*Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego*  
ul. Wóycickiego 1/3  
01-938 Warszawa  
e-mail: skkozłowski@op.pl

**prof. dr hab. Przemysław Makarowicz**  
*Instytut Prahistorii*  
*Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu*  
ul. Św. Marcin 78  
61-809 Poznań  
e-mail: przemom@amu.edu.pl

**prof. dr hab. Arkadiusz Marciniak**  
*Instytut Prahistorii*  
*Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu*  
ul. Św. Marcin 78  
61-809 Poznań  
e-mail: arekmar@amu.edu.pl

**dr Jarosław Matysiak**

*Polska Akademia Nauk*

*Archiwum w Warszawie, Oddział w Poznaniu*

ul. Mielżyńskiego 27/29

61-725 Poznań

e-mail: jarekm@man.poznan.pl

**prof. dr hab. Danuta Minta-Tworzowska**

*Instytut Prahistorii*

*Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu*

ul. Św. Marcin 78

61-809 Poznań

e-mail: danminta@amu.edu.pl

**mgr Wojciech Piotrowski**

*Muzeum Archeologiczne w Biskupinie*

*Oddział w Warszawie*

ul. Długa 52 Arsenał

00-241 Warszawa

e-mail: wojbiskupin@wp.pl

**dr Teresa Podgórska**

*emerytowany nauczyciel akademicki*

*Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego w Olsztynie*

ul. ks. J. Popieluszki 7/31

10-694 Olsztyn

**dr Andrzej Prinke**

*Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu*

ul. Wodna 27

61-781 Poznań

e-mail: andrzej.prinke@muzarp.poznan.pl

**dr Maciej Przybył**

*Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu*

ul. Wodna 27

61-781 Poznań

e-mail: maciej.przybyl@muzarp.poznan.pl

**prof. dr hab. Marzena Szmyt**

*Muzeum Archeologiczne w Poznaniu*

ul. Wodna 27

61-781 Poznań

e-mail: [marzena.szmyt@muzarp.poznan.pl](mailto:marzena.szmyt@muzarp.poznan.pl)