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The Creation of New Social Space - Barrows of the Corded Ware Culture and the Trzciniec Circle as Markers of a Mental Map in the Upland Parts of Poland and the Western Ukraine

By Przemysław Makarowicz

Introduction

The origins of the custom of building round barrows (kurgans) go back to pre-Yamnaya societies settling Eurasian steppes in the second half of the 5th millennium BC. In the Pontic area, the first small stone structures, probably covered by earthen mounds, appearing between 4550 and 4100 BC in the Sredniy Stog (Telegin 1973) or Skelia cultures (Rassamakin 1997), were taken to be graves of local elites. A slightly later chronology is shared by barrows in the Carpathian Basin and the Balkans (Ślusarska 2007, 251). The custom of raising mounds was spread all over the Pontic steppe and parts of the forest-steppe by semi-nomadic societies of the pastoral Yamnaya culture (Rassamakin 1997, 360–362; 2002, 61). It was hence that the custom must have been adopted by the populations of varied regional groups of the Corded Ware culture (Kośko 1997; 2000; Kruk/Milisauskas 1999; Włodarczak 2006).

In her work, Marija Gimbutas associated the spreading of barrows across Old Europe with three waves of invasions by warlike Indo-European peoples of the Kurgan culture (cf. Gimbutas 1970; 1979). Later research and alternative conceptions negated this migrational and expansionist view (see Malloiry 1989; Anthony 2007, 306ff.). Nevertheless, it has taken a firm root in the literature, associating pastoral (nomadic, semi-nomadic) communities and groups of mobile herders with the rising of mounds and stressing the eastern, steppe origins of round barrows (Berezanska/Otroshchenko 1997, 227; Rassamakin 1997, 362; Chochorowski 1999, 266; Kruk/Milisauskas 1999, 215–267; some papers in Davis/Kimbrell et al. (eds.) 2000, and in Kośko/Szymt (eds.) 2004). It is emphasized that barrows were a lasting element of a cultural landscape and – in the absence of stable settlements – the only permanent anthropogenic point of reference in the area being settled for migratory peoples (Shennan 1993, 13; Kadrow 1995, 109ff.; Chochorowski 1999, 266; Koryakova 2000, 15ff.; Florek/Taras 2003, 70; Górski/Jarosz 2007, 243). In the opinion of Ukrainian scholars, the spreading of barrow rituals among inhabitants of other ecological zones (forest-steppe and forest) had many causes among which economic ones could have been the most important. They were related to the crisis of agrarian societies (Berezanska/Otroshchenko 1997, 227).

On the steppes, barrows – ‘pyramids of the steppe’ – were a monumental and dominant architectural element from the Eneolithic to as late as the early Middle Ages. Against the background of a flat and monotonous landscape, clusters of barrows formed orientation points on the routes along which breeders and their herds moved and delineated the oecumenes of pastoral groups. Raised over graves, frequently over ancestor graves, they were sometimes quasi-temples (Rassamakin 1997, 359ff.; Koryakova 2000, 15ff; Buniatyan 2001, 227). Hence, they served not only funerary purposes, but also sacred ones; as such they created social space.

In Eastern Europe, earthen mounds were built by the societies of the Catacomb culture, e.g. the Mnogovalikovaya culture, however, they more often took advantage of older ‘pit-grave’ features (Savva 1992; Berezanska/Otroshchenko 1997), and the Timber-Grave culture (Sruba) (Tsherdenichchenko 1986). In the areas later occupied by the societies of the Trzciniec Cultural circle (TCC), in the ‘pre-Trzciniec’ stage, barrows were raised by the groups of the Middle Dnieper culture, settling the forest-steppes and forests between the Pripiet and Dniester rivers, as well as other regional CWC groups (Machnik 1966; 1979; 2003; Sulimirski 1968; Sveshikov 1974; Artemenko 1987; Kalentshyck/Kryvatshevich 1997). The barrow – a grave with an earthen mound – was known to the Bronze Age communities in central Europe which were chronologically closer to or partially synchronous with the TCC, i.e. Bell Beakers, the Unetice, Iwno and Tumulus cultures (Makarowicz 2009a).
In this paper the author shall not dwell on the complex symbolism of barrows (on this issue see, for instance Eliade 1966; Koryakova 2000, 15ff.; Ślusarska 2007, 252ff.). What is of interest here is the question of their use by specific communities to build a social space or ‘tame’ an unknown land. The author shall discuss their role in the strategies of transforming a ‘wild’ natural landscape and only slightly transformed anthropogenic landscape into a ‘domesticated’ cultural landscape. In the project the focus will be on the question of continuity of a ‘barrow’ cultural landscape on the uplands of central and Eastern Europe in the 3rd and in the first half of the 2nd millennia BC. The article concentrates in particular on the impact of CWC populations’ tradition of raising barrows on the emergence of this custom among later societies of colonists descending from the north and representing the Trzciniec complex. They appeared in the region in question several hundred years after the CWC had disintegrated. The author shall begin by analyzing the distribution of barrow sites within the vast TCC oecumene.

An overview map (Fig. 1) shows certain patterns in the distribution of barrows on a macro-territorial scale. Groups of these structures and single mounds concentrate chiefly in the southern portion of the territory occupied by the TCC and earlier settled by the CWC. Almost 85 per cent of all features of this type are found in a compact belt of uplands stretching east-west from the upper Vistula drainage, across the drainage of the upper Dniester, and as far as the drainage of the upper Teterew and Rosi rivers – tributaries of the Dnieper. In the drainage of the upper Desna and the middle Seym River, the mounds of the local variety of the Trzciniec complex are found in the northwestern approaches to the Central Russian Upland.

Even in the areas located north of the compact upland belt – generally, in the lowland portion of east-central Europe – barrow cemeteries were usually situated in elevated areas of local hill chains, characterized by varied terrain. There is no doubt that such features were located in the lowlands only very rarely.

In recent years, a number of publications have appeared, taking up the question of symbolism of ‘Trzciniec’ barrows (Górski 1996; Makarowicz 1998, 261; 2003; 2009b; Florek/Taras 2003, 70; Górski/Makarowicz/Taras 2004, 202; Górski/Jarosz 2007). They may have delineated a territory under the ‘jurisdiction’ of a given group and proclaimed its right to the settled area. Hence, their chief role was to assert a group identity (Górski 1996, 208). Apart from this, Trzciniec barrows served other crucial socio-religious purposes, such as burial, sacrificial, or integrative ones, the discussion of which goes beyond the scope of this paper. It is rather certain that barrow building was an integral part of designing the cultural space of Trzciniec groups and a permanent custom regulating the life of TCC social structures organized along kinship lines (Makarowicz 2003).

The origins of the custom of raising barrows in the TCC are a rather complex matter. Theoretically, it can be assumed either that barrows had been built since the inception of the TCC or that they were adopted by ‘Trzciniec’ societies during the later stages of its development. If the first assumption is adopted, then the origins of Trzciniec barrows must necessarily be tied to the initial stage of the TCC formation; hence a claim has to be accepted that the custom of raising barrows was taken over directly or indirectly (through an intermediary) from representatives of earlier cultural traditions. If the other assumption is followed, the custom will be taken to be a result of intercultural contact with societies building grave mounds contemporary to the Trzciniec complex. A question needs to be asked, too, if the custom of raising barrows in the TCC was related to a single cultural tradition or if it had many centres of topogenesis. In other words, was it a peculiar, individualized process in terms of culture or a link in a trans-European-Asian process of adopting barrows by many cultural environments?

Despite suggestions by some authors that the CWC had a share in the formation of the TCC, the hypothesis that the custom of raising barrows had been taken over from the CWC did not meet with approval in the literature (e.g. Gardawski 1959; Sveshnikov 1974; Czebreszuk 1996; 2001; Makarowicz 1998). Quite understandably, as a major, several-hundred-year gap separated declined ‘corded’ societies, observing the custom of raising mounds, and the emergence of TCC groups (Kempisty 1978; see also Górski/Jarosz 2007, 246). It seems, however, that the difficulties in tracing the origins of the practice stemmed from two false assumptions. It was believed that it must have been related to the origins of the Trzciniec complex, hence that barrows had identified the cultural unit from the very beginning and that the custom must have been transferred by one society to another, in this case by CWC communities to TCC populations. A key to understanding the relationships between CWC barrows and TCC ones is the rejection of the above assumptions in favour of two others. First, mounds appeared as an identifier of TCC societies only when they settled the uplands of central and Eastern Europe. Second, the custom of raising mounds was not transferred through the agency of people, but
solely through a complex and active impact of the upland cultural landscape, or rather 'corded barrow landscapes', on the mental-ritual sphere of colonizers representing the Trzciniec complex. I shall begin with a brief description of the location of barrows (and their clusters) of both cultures within specific landscape zones and in relation to one another.

Originally, in the upland belt between the upper Vistula and the upper Dniester and on the Podolia and Volhynia uplands, there could have been over a dozen thousand CWC and TCC barrows. In recent years, during investigations carried out by a joint Polish-Ukrainian team of archaeologists headed by Prof. Jan Machnik in the upper Dnieper drainage, many new barrow sites have been discovered, encompassing in sum about 1500 mounds (Machnik et al. 2002; 2006a; 2006b; 2006c). Most of them certainly belong to the CWC, however, a significant number can be associated with the Trzciniec complex. Single barrows and their clusters were usually placed on hilltops, on the highest elevations of a given area, on hills adjoining plateau edges, meadow terraces and promontories protruding into river valleys. In some cases, long barrow sequences were placed on hill ridges along river watersheds.

'Trzciniec' barrows occurred alone like in Miernów, mounds I and II (Fig. 2A), Żerniki Górne, site 1 (Fig. 2B), Goszyce (Fig. 2C), Gabultów near Jakuszowice (Fig. 3C), and Januszowice (Fig. 2D), Małopolska Upland (Górski 1996; Górski / Jarosz 2007), Dubeczno, site 1 and Zienki, Lublin Polisia (Górski / Makarowicz / Taras 2004), Dacharzów, site 1 (Fig. 3B) Sandomierz Upland (Taras 1995), Kazimierzów, site 3 Lublin Upland (Florek / Taras 2003), Kustovcy, Podolia Upland, Čersk and Trojaniv, Volhynia Upland, and Bahr, Dniester Upland (Sulimirski 1968). They occurred also arranged in pairs, relatively close to each other, e.g. in Ivanje.
Fig. 2. Examples of occurrences of ‘Trzciniec’ barrows alone in the Małopolska upland. A – Miernów, barrow I; B – Żerniki Górne, site 1; C – Goszyce: 1 – barrow, 2 – settlement; D – Januszowice: 1 – settlement; 2 – camp; 3 – barrow. According to Górski 1996; Makarowicz 2009a; 2009b.
Fig. 3. Examples of occurrences of 'Trzciniec' barrows alone in pairs and threes in the Małopolska and Sandomierz uplands. A – Rosiejów; B – Dacharzów, site 1; C – neighbourhood of Jakuszowice, Zagórzycy and Grodowice: 1 – settlement; 2 – barrow; D – neighbourhood of Proszowice: 1 – settlement; 2 – barrow. According to Górski 1996; Górski / Makarowicz / Taras 2004; Makarowicz 2009a; 2009b.
The Origins and Social Meaning of the ‘Trzciniec’ Barrows – an Attempt at Interpretation

What could have been the scenario of adopting earthen mounds by ‘Trzciniec’ populations? An interpretational framework is provided by observing how TCC communities in the drainages of the upper Vistula and the upper Dniester embraced barrow building. In the upland environment, they were an alien group. In terms of archaeological systematics, the diagnostic traits of their material culture are classed as a classic phase. In their home lowland enclave in the north, extending between the drainages of the lower and middle Vistula, the Neman and the upper Pripet, these populations did not raise any barrows (Fig. 1). However, they could have noticed ‘corded’ barrows while on their way south in stages, onto the uplands.

When they appeared on the Małopolska Upland (before 1700 BC) and in the drainage of the upper Dniester (shortly after 1700 BC?), TCC societies could come in contact only with MC populations, who did not raise any barrows. However, earthen mounds were found in the regions in question – they had been raised earlier by the populations representing a traditionalist streak in the CWC. The youngest ‘corded’ barrows date back to the end of the 3rd millennium BC and were recorded in the upper Dniester drainage; even earlier they stopped being built in the upper Vistula drainage (Machnik 1979; Kruk/Milisauskas 1999). The period of time separating the decline of the CWC groups and early TCC societies in the deforestation and urbanization. These facts, unfavourable to the preservation of barrows, considerably restrict the opportunities for field observation as well.

Note has already been taken of the frequent custom of raising mounds by TCC societies over older ‘corded’ barrows, e.g. in Miernów, barrows I and II, Bejsce, Rosiejów, Eastern barrow, Gabtów, site 1, Małopolska Upland, Guciów, site 6, Roztocze, South-East Poland (Górska 1996; Górska/Jarosz 2007; Makarowicz 2009b). In Żerniki Górne, site 1, on the Małopolska Upland, a ‘Trzciniec’ barrow covered flat CWC and Mierzanowice culture (MC) cemeteries (Kempisty 1978). Sometimes, ‘Trzciniec’ graves were sunk into the mounds of CWC barrows, e.g. barrows 37 und 38 in Komarów, upper Dniester Basin (Sulimirski 1968). What else is frequently observed is the ‘inscribing’ of TCC features in the linear and linear-group arrangements of CWC mounds erected earlier (Makarowicz 2009a; 2009b). We deal with this custom in the TCC eastern province, in particular on the Volhynia and Podolia uplands as well as in the drainage of the upper and middle Dniester, e.g. in Kołpiec (Fig. 8A), Krasów (Fig. 8B), Sarniki (ryc. 8C), Komarów (Fig. 5A), Kryłos, Rakowa, Kulczyce, Kawsko, Czyżyków, Dąsawa, Dorogoszcz, Tłumacz, Ostatnje, Siwki, Czernielica, Łuka Wróblewiecka and Balice (Sulimirski 1968; Sveshnikov 1974, Fig. 3; see also Machnik et al., 2006a; 2006b; 2006c). It is also encountered in the TCC western province, specifically on the Lublin Upland and in Roztocze, southeast Poland, especially on the hilltops of Gręda Sokalska (Fig. 5A).
region was several hundred years (300 – 400 at a minimum). Hence, a direct contact between the two communities was not possible. Therefore, the adoption of the ‘corded’ tradition of raising barrows by ‘Trzciniec’ populations took place without a physical contact of two communities. Instead, what happened was an
adoption of the custom by observation of the location and arrangement of the barrows of CWC populations alone. ‘Corded’ mounds must have been visible to TCC groups coming from the north as the features were usually placed conspicuously in the landscape, for instance, on hilltops along watersheds. These landforms were deforested then, which has been shown by the palynological studies of soil underneath barrows. It follows then, that in many places ‘Trzciniec’ populations imitated the customs of CWC societies. What is important in this peculiar process of emulation is the continuation of earlier traditions of the use of a ritual place or rather ritual space. ‘Corded’ mounds were above all graves (Włodarczak 2006). Their arrangements suggest, however, that next to this important function – possibly the most important one – they served also as orientation points in space, they marked the limits of familiar territory while their peculiar linear and linear-group arrangements may have communicated the continuity of lineages making up larger communities.

The new-coming TCC populations either understood the symbolism of raising barrows by their predecessors, with all its original meanings, or they ‘thoughtlessly’ reproduced (imitated) the custom, constructing anew or rather inscribing into the social-cultural space, existing in illo tempore. Numerous barrows to be found in the upland zone (especially in the drainages of the upper Vistula and the upper Dniester) could have reminded TCC colonizers of ‘corded’ mounds known from their northern enclave. ‘Trzciniec’ societies may have started to raise barrows for the purpose of setting themselves apart from MC populations; conversely, the latter did not raise them to distinguish themselves from the traditionalist stream of CWC communities (Machnik 1994; Kruk/Milisauskas 1999). Although it is more difficult to validate, the first hypothesis – about a ‘thinking’ imitation – seems to be more plausible. For TCC populations, seeking to legitimate their presence on the colonized lands and the right to the territories they occupied, the adoption of the custom allowed them to show off their strangeness (ethnicity) in the face of natives. Barrows could have been visible, physical symbols of identity while at the same time most of them were a peculiar form of graves, covered with an earthen mound (Fig. 9). Finds of individual burials are made in them as well as of collective ones of men, women and children. The architecture of some barrows and rich grave goods are indicative of the high social position of individuals buried in them or the dominating character of lineages they belonged to (Makarowicz 2003; 2009a). The literature mentions other ‘functions’ of barrows, too. The custom of raising them in linear arrangements on deforested watershed hilltops may indicate communication trails following watersheds. Barrows marked their general course. The land routes (along watersheds) did not have, in principle, a character of ‘roads’; they were rather strips of land, several hundred metres or even several kilometres wide, conducive to the movement of people, animals, goods and, beginning with the 2nd millennium BC, possibly wagons as well (Makarowicz 2009a).

If we invoke the hypothesis that TCC population groups, while moving from the northeast towards the uplands, saw ‘corded’ barrows and knew their meaning, we can imagine the initial surprise of the colonizers at the sight of barrow landscapes. The few features of this kind that they had encountered on the lowlands and that must have been interpreted to be monumental relics of rather indeterminate predecessors (their own ancestors – forefathers?) appeared in incredibly large numbers on the occupied territory. No interest in them was shown by MC communities, which were rather egalitarian and organized along territorial patterns. They lived in large settlements and used communal cemeteries, conforming settlement micro-regions situated in other landscape zones than barrows. Whereas anthropological data and details of the funeral rite show that TCC communities were organized rather in kinship groups or lineages (Makarowicz 2003; 2009a); in this respect they resembled CWC structures.

Fig. 6. Examples of ‘Trzciniec’ barrow occurrences in group-linear arrangements. Excavated barrows are marked with numbers. A – Kalinivka, Volhynia Upland; B – Netishyn, Volhynia Upland; C – Wolica, upper Dniester Basin; D – Dominikanówka, Roztocze. According to Machnik 1960; Sulimirskí 1968; Berezanska, Samoljuk, Ţaras 2003.
The literature on the subject did not consider the reasons why TCC communities moved south. A high density of settlement sites on the lowlands may indicate that the main reason was increasing overpopulation of the areas of poor soils between the middle Vistula, the upper Priput and the middle Neman Rivers and a resultant ecological crisis. Land, especially fertile loess chernozem soils, found in the upland belt, was, therefore, greatly valued by TCC populations. There must have been a rivalry going on for the land among population groups pouring in from the north: both families and lineages.

For any society to continue in existence, in particular in a strange cultural environment, the most important attributes are the continuation of identity, preservation of distinguishing characteristics, and integrity which are usually defined in opposition to ‘aliens’ by practising rituals and liturgical acts recreating the ties with the past and ancestors. Such practices are present in the construction of barrows. The adoption of the custom of raising barrows could have been a material embodiment of a new foundation myth, allowing the newcomers to take root in the new environment, among the strange, organized in territorial communities, MC populations. Raising
barrows was a ‘foundation sacrifice’ of a kind. The building of barrows by TCC communities in places where earlier clusters of CWC population barrows stood may be interpreted as an attempt to incorporate the ‘pre-Mierzanowice past’ for the purpose of legitimating their own claims to the occupied territories. The continuation of CWC barrow sequences could have been a signal sent to the native populations that the newcomers were genetically related to the long extinct populations that once settled the occupied area. Thus, the colonizers, as successors or rather usurping the right to succession, won arguments sanctioned by tradition, hence carrying the most weight with illiterate societies. They styled themselves as heirs of great ‘corded’ predecessors (mythical ancestors?). It must be mentioned here that ‘Trzciniec’ mounds were usually bigger than those of the CWC and not because the latter were more badly damaged. A conclusion may be drawn that TCC societies tried in this way not only to emulate ancient builders (ancestors), but rather surpass them.
Conclusions

Finally, a question is worth asking whether barrows for ‘Trzciniec’ societies meant the same as for ‘Corded’ groups. There is no clear answer to this question, yet it seems that in general terms symbolism of barrow building was similar. Mounds, being permanent settlement elements, contributed to the development of a socio-cultural space – a cultural landscape or a mental map of both societies. They combined several functions related to the identity, integrity, funerary rites and spatial behaviour of human groups, inhabiting the borderland of eastern and central Europe in the period extending over the better part of the 3rd and 2nd millennia BC.

Associating the custom of barrow building by TCC societies with the CWC does not mean that it was borrowed directly from ‘Corded’ populations. Its adoption was related to the need of TCC populations to manifest their differences when migrating from the north vis-à-vis MC communities. The presented data suggest that the appearance of barrows in the TCC should not be linked to the origins of this cultural formation in the lowland zone of east-central Europe. It took place only in the classic phase (ca. 1800 BC at the earliest), in the upland part of this oecumene, in the vast belt extending from the upper Vistula drain-age to the upper Dniester and the upper drainages of the Styr, Sluch and Horyn rivers. The adoption of barrows lent to the southern – upland – TCC zone a specific appearance, making it different from lowland structures in the north. The cultural change, observed towards the end of the first quarter of the 2nd millennium BC in this part of east-central Europe, namely the replacing of MiC with the TCC, triggered a ‘reactivation’ of the still earlier customs that had died out there in the latter half of the 3rd millennium BC. An active role in the revivification of certain social, ritual and settlement CWC behaviour among TCC populations was played by a cultural landscape with sequences of monumental ‘Corded’ barrows.

The mechanisms of adopting the practice of raising barrows obviously call for further research. However, it can be seen already now that the adoption of barrow building illustrates well how prehistoric groups, using specific social strategies, took advantage of ‘physical’, cognitive and symbolic potential inherent in a culturally transformed landscape.
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