

# Archaeology of Body and Thought





# **Archaeology of Body and Thought**

From the Neolithic to the beginning  
of the Middle Ages

Tomasz Gralak

ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD  
Summertown Pavilion  
18-24 Middle Way  
Summertown  
Oxford OX2 7LG

[www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

ISBN 978-1-80327-721-9  
ISBN 978-1-80327-722-6 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and Tomasz Gralak 2024

Cover: photo by T. Gralak

Translated by Bartłomiej Madejski

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website [www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

# Contents

List of Figures .....	iii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: The Neolithic. Bodies of First Farmers .....	6
Chapter III: The Chalcolithic. The Dark Side of the Sun – Warriors .....	16
Chapter IV: The Únětice Culture. Bone Collectors .....	29
Chapter V: Man of Bronze. The Period of Tumulus Cultures’ Domination.....	35
Chapter VI: Figurative Representations and Perception of Corporality in Minoan and Mycenaean Traditions .....	42
Chapter VII: Burnt by the Sun. The Lusatian Culture and Cremation .....	53
Chapter VIII: The People of Rock Carvings. The Nordic Bronze Age .....	64
Chapter IX: The Decline of the Bronze Age and the Onset of the Iron Age.....	75
Chapter X: Pomeranian Canopic Jars .....	97
Chapter XI: People on the Steppes. Creators of the Saka-Scythian Animal Style.....	102
Chapter XII: Head Hunters. The Celts of the La Tène Culture.....	110
Chapter XIII: Bodies Of The Barbarians.....	123
Chapter XIV: Migration Period. Bodies And Souls In Turmoil .....	135
Chapter XV: Epilogue. Slavs and the Myth Of Vampire .....	148
Chapter XVI: Conclusion.....	151
Bibliography .....	153

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1.	Ceramic figurines. 1-5 Cernavodă, Romania, Hamangia culture. 1-5 acc. to Berciu 1966, Fig. 1, 2, 49: 1-3. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	8
Figure 2.2.	Ceramic figurines. 1-2 Tésétice-Kyjovice 2. Czech Republic, Moravian Painted Pottery culture; 3 Brno-Maloměřice, Czech Republic, Moravian Painted Pottery culture; 4, 6 Cernavodă, Romania, Hamangia culture; 5 Cucutieni, Romania, Cucutieni culture. 1-3 acc. to Podborský 1993, Fig. 30; 4, 6 acc. to Berciu 1966, Fig. 46, 49: 7; 5 acc. to Daicovicu 1969, Fig. 21. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	9
Figure 2.3.	Anthropomorphic ceramic vessels. 1 Sultana, Romania, Gumielnița culture; 2 Budapest-Budai Skála, Hungary, Želiezovce culture; 3 Szegvár-Tüzköves, Hungary, Tisza culture; 4 Parța, Romania, Bucovaț culture; 5 Kleinfahner, Germany, Linear Pottery culture; 6 Cerje-Govrlevo, Northern Macedonia; 7 Erfurt, Germany, Linear Pottery culture. 1 acc. to Marinescu-Bîlcu 1967, Fig. 1; 2, 4-5 acc. to Tomašovičová 2018, Fig. 3: 5; 4: 3; 4: 1; 2; 6 acc. Chausidis 2019, to fig. 3; 7 acc. to Jażdżewski 1981, Fig. 69, 52: 15. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	12
Figure 2.4.	Longhouses. 1 Biskupin, district of Żnin, Poland, longhouse and graves of Lengyel culture (Brześć Kujawski group); 2 Wietrzychowice, district of Włocławek, Poland, the so-called Kuyavian tomb; 3 Sarnowo, district of Włocławek, Poland, plan of cemetery of Kuyavian tombs; 4 Brześć Kujawski, district of Włocławek, Poland, plan of part of the settlement of Lengyel culture (Brześć Kujawski group). 1, 4 acc. to Kulczycka-Leciejewiczowa 1979, Fig. 48, 46; 2-3 acc. to Wiślański 1979a, Fig. 148: 3, 118. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	14
Figure 3.1.	Barrows of Corded Ware culture. 1 Lipie, district of Lubaczów, Poland; 2-3 Brzezinki, district of Lubaczów, Poland. Acc. to Machnik 1979, Fig. 208. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	18
Figure 3.2.	Ways of arranging corpses in graves. Acc. to Häusler 1977. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	19
Figure 3.3.	Corded Ware culture. Cups: 1 Bogdaszowice, district of Środa Śląska, Poland; 2 Wrocław-Marszowice, district <i>loco.</i> , Poland; 3 Breitenau, district of Środa Śląska, Poland. Grave furnishing: 4 Kaszowo, district of Milicz. 1-3 acc. to Petersen 1934, Table XII; 4 acc. to Nowothing 1937, Fig. 1-7, Table 62: 2. ....	20
Figure 3.4.	Battle-axes from the turn of the Neolithic and Bronze Age. 1 Jordanów Śląski, district of Wrocław, Poland; 2 Czernica, district of Jawor, Poland; 3 Ludmierzyce, district of Głubczyce, Poland; 4 Juszwice, district of Lubin, Poland; 5 Nasławice, district of Wrocław, Poland; 6 Wrocław-Osobowice, river Odra, Poland. 1-2-3-5 acc. to Mertins 1904, Fig. 61, 68-75; 4 acc. to Vermerhung, 1924, 105, Fig. 2; 6 acc. to Zotz 1937, Table 61: 2. ....	21
Figure 3.5.	Beakers. 1 Bieradz, district of Sandomierz, Poland. Beakers among grave furnishings: 2 Kietrz, district of Głubczyce, Poland; 3 Wrocław-Wojszyce, district <i>loco.</i> , Poland. 1 acc. to Żurowski 1932, Fig. 5; 2-3 acc. to Seger 1919, Fig. 289-291. ....	23
Figure 3.6.	Stelae. 1 Petit-Chasseur à Sion, Switzerland, 2 stele Cemmo 3, Italy, 3 Montecchio di Darfo, Valcamonica, Italy. 1 acc. to Favre <i>et al.</i> , 1986, planche 20; 3 acc. to Gąssowski 1994, 130. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	25
Figure 4.1.	Únětice culture. Graves: 1 Królikowice, district of Wrocław, Poland, grave 5; 2 Żerniki Wielkie, district of Wrocław, Poland, grave 6. 1-2 acc. to State Archives in Wrocław. ....	30
Figure 4.2.	Únětice culture. Graves: 1 Wojkowice 15, district of Wrocław, Poland, grave 1058-III-00, open grave pit; 2 Piskorzówek 14, district of Oława, Poland, grave 16, burial with skeleton without skull; 3 Wojkowice 15, grave 1044-III-00, partial burial, Poland; 4 Wojkowice 15, grave 1, 304-III-99, burial of skull. 1, 3 acc. to Gralak 2007, Fig. 72, 79; 2 acc. to Gralak 2009a, Fig. 7; 4 acc. to Gralak 2009b, Fig. 3. ....	31
Figure 4.3.	Únětice culture. Daggers: 1-3 Praha-Suchbát, Kozí Hřbety, Czech Republic. Halberds: 4 Mierzeszyn, district of Gdańsk, Poland; 5 Łęki Małe, district of Kościan, Poland; 6 Inowrocław, district <i>loco.</i> Poland. 1-3 acc. to Jiráň L. (ed.) 2013, Fig. 25: 5, 6, 9; 4-6 acc. to Sarnowska 1969, Fig. 22. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	32
Figure 5.1.	1. Tumulus culture (pre-Lusatian). Barrows: 1 Grabonóg, district of Gostyń, Poland; 2 Rościszowice, district of Trzebnica, Poland; 3 Smoszew, district of Krotoszyn, Poland. Weapons: 4 Domanowice, district of Wrocław, Poland; 5 Brzyków, district of Trzebnica, Poland; 6 Złotoryja/vicinity, Poland; 7 Cisek, district of Kędzierzyn-Koźle, Poland. 1 acc. to Gedl 1975, Fig. 8, Table XLIV: 1, 5; Table XXVII: 1, 2, 5; Table V: 7. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	36
Figure 5.2.	Tumulus culture (pre-Lusatian). Selection of bronze elements of attire: 1 Wrocław-Księża Wielkie, Poland; 2 Powidzki, district of Milicz, Poland; 3 Mogilno, district <i>loco.</i> , Poland; 4 Greater Poland, Poland; 5 Silesia, Poland; 6 Namysłów, district <i>loco.</i> Poland; 7 Kleszczewo, district of Leszno, Poland; 8 Kruszyniec, district of Góra, Poland, 9 Opatów, district of Kłobuck, Poland; 10 Krzydłina Mała, district of Wołów, Poland; 11 Kietrz, district of Głubczyce, Poland; 12 Bocheniec, district of Brzeg, Poland; 13 Głuszyna, district of Namysłów, Poland. Acc. to Gedl 1975, Table II: 16, 17; VIII: 1-2; IX: 3, 18; XIII: 10, 15; XVII: 5, XVIII: 14, XIX: 15. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	37
Figure 5.3.	Graves of women of Tumulus culture furnished with bronze objects: 1 Tiszafüred, Hungary, grave 102; 2 Tiszafüred, Hungary, grave 160. 1-2 Acc. to Kovács 1975, Fig. 9b, 12b. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	38
Figure 6.1.	Akrotiri, Thira, Greece, fresco; 2 Mycenae, Greece, dagger, 1 acc. to Marinatos 1988, Fig. 72; 2 acc. to Evans 1930, Fig. 71. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	43
Figure 6.2.	Knossos, Crete, Greece, fresco; 2 reconstruction of acrobat's leap. Acc. to Evans 1930, Fig. 144, 156. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	44
Figure 6.3.	Akrotirii, Thira, Grece, fresco – detail. 2, 4 Knossos, Crete, Greece, pottery; 3, 5 Vase from Argos, Greece. 1 acc. to Marinatos 1988, Fig. 63; 2 acc. to Evans 1935, Fig. 239; 3, 5 acc. to Evans 1935, Fig. 276-277; 4 acc. to Evans 1935, Fig. 215. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	45
Figure 6.4.	Knossos, Crete, Greece, fresco. Acc. to Evans 1935, Fig. 884. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	46
Figure 6.5.	Characters of linear writing. 1 Man; 2 Woman. ....	47

Figure 6.6.	1 Piraeus, Crete, Greece; 2 Knossos, Crete, Greece; 3 Mycenae, Greece, stele from grave V; 4 Knossos, Queen's Megaron. 1 acc. to Evans 1930, Fig. 320; 2 acc. to Evans 1935 Fig. 869; 3 acc. to Evans 1929, Fig. 42; 4 acc. to Evans 1930, Fig. 40. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	47
Figure 7.1.	Graves of Urnfield tradition. Rakowice Wielkie, district of Lwówek, Poland, excavations from 1920s. Acc. to State Archives in Wrocław. ....	54
Figure 7.2.	Representation of fire drill: 1 Ancient Egypt; 2 Tanum, Sweden, rock carving; 3-4 Ligurian Alps, Italy, rock carvings; Wichów, district of Żagań: 5 view of boulder; 6 evidence of kindling fire seen on upper surface. 1-4 acc. to Almgren 1934, Fig. 127, 97-98, redrawn by Tomasz Gralak, 5-6 acc. to Geschwendt 1939b, Fig. 3, 4.....	57
Figure 7.3.	1 Reconstruction of warrior's gear from Danube area; 2 Hungary, unknown localisation, helmet; 3 Zvolen, Slovakia, reconstruction of shield; 4 Caka, Slovakia, cuirass – reconstruction. 1 acc. to Kovács 1977, 2 Mozsolics 1967, Table 136: 2; 3-4 acc. to Furmáněk and others 1991, Table 12, 51. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	60
Figure 7.4.	Decorations – elements of protective armament. 1-4 Dunaújváros, Kosziderpaldás III, Hungary; 5 Zalkod, Hungary. 1-4 acc. to Mozsolics 1967, Fig. 51; 5 acc. to Mozsolics 1985, Table 9:1. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	61
Figure 8.1.	Grave equipment. Muldebjerg, Denmark. Acc. to Kossinna 1941, Fig. 191. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	65
Figure 8.2.	Grave equipment. 1 Oby, Hojelse, Denmark, 2-3 Hesselager, Hesselager, Denmark. 1 acc. to Boye 1896, Table XXIV; 2-3 acc. to Sehested 1884, Table IV, VI. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	65
Figure 8.3.	1 Reconstruction of woman's attire; 2 Langstrup, Seeland, Denmark. 1-2 acc. to Kossinna 1941, Fig. 194, 198.....	66
Figure 8.4.	Petroglyphs. Kalleby, Tanums Socken, Sweden; 2 Vitlycke, Sweden; 3, 4, 5, 6 Asperberget, Sweden. 1 acc. to Almgren 1934, Fig. 7; redrawn by N. Lenkow, 5-6 photo by Tomasz Gralak.....	67
Figure 8.5.	Petroglyphs. 1 Lökeberget/Foss, Sweden; 2 Ekenberg/Norrköping, Sweden; 3 Litsleby, Sweden. Acc. to Almgren 1927, Fig. 49; 71. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	69
Figure 8.6.	Petroglyphs. 1 Botna socken, Sweden; 2 Tose socken, Sweden; 3 Storop, Sweden; 4 Hvitlycke, Sweden; 5 Görlöf, Sweden. Acc. to Almgren 1927, Fig. 2; 4; 13b; 16a; 17. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	70
Figure 8.7.	Kivik, Sweden, selected panels from grave chamber. Acc. to Nordén 1939, Fig. 11. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	71
Figure 9.1.	Lusatian culture. 1 Przechylice, district of Będzin, Poland, Pan flute; 2 Danków, district of Kłobuck, Poland, rattles. Ceramic anthropomorphic figurines: 3 Gliniany, district of Wołów, Poland; 4 Deszczno, district of Gorzów, Poland. Vessels in shape of shoe: 5 Strassfurt, Germany; 6 Cerekwica, district of Poznań, Poland. Ceramic figurines of birds: 7 Ścinawa, district of Lubin, Poland; 8 Strzemięno, district of Zielona Góra, Poland; 9 Gorzupia Dolna, district of Żagań, Poland; 10 Ulina, district of Jelenia Góra, Poland; 11 Strachowice, district of Legnica, Poland. The so-called cult wagon: 10 Kałowice, district of Trzebnica, Poland. 1 acc. to Gediga 2006, Fig. 1; 2, 3, 10 acc. to Hensel 1988, Fig. 208, 210, 211; 4 acc. to Gediga 1976, 13; 5 acc. to Almgren 1934, Fig. 133a; 6 acc. to Gediga 1970, Figure 31; 7-9, 11-12 acc. to Gediga 1979, Fig. 206. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. .	76
Figure 9.2.	Vessels with representations of figurative scenes: 1, 2 Sopron, Hungary, 3 Wenecja Górna, district of Żnin, Poland. 1, 2 acc. to Schlette 1984, 94; 3 acc. to Zajączkowski 2000, Fig. 3. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	77
Figure 9.3.	1 Representations of animals – decoration of ceramic vessels from Hallstatt culture (selection); 2-3 Tresta Rządowa, district of Tomaszów, Poland. 1 acc. to Dobiat 1982, Fig. 20-21; 2-3 acc. to Oleszczak, Twardowski 2011, Table 40, c, d. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	78
Figure 9.4.	Litsleby, Tanum, Sweden. Photo by Tomasz Gralak. ....	79
Figure 9.5.	Traditional measures of length in Rus'. Acc. to Rybakow 1949, Fig. 1 B.....	80
Figure 9.6.	1 Human being of geometric period; 2 Athens (Agora), Greece, ceramic shard; 3 graphic representation of tetraktys, 4 Syntomachion – square; 5 Platonian solids; 6 ceramic solids from cemetery in Miłosławice, district of Milicz, Poland. 1 acc. to Snell 1953, Fig. 2; 2 acc. to Bugaj 2010, Fig. 12; 5 acc. to Gombrich 2009; 6 acc. to Lasak, Krukiewicz 2000, 152, Fig. 6: 1-4. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	81
Figure 9.7.	1 Situla Kuffern, Statzendorf, Austria, grave 1; 2 Situla Arnoaldi, Bologna, Italy; 3 Cysta Sanzeno, Val di Non/Nonsberg, Italy; 4 Dürrnberg/Kranzbichel, Austria, grave 346. Acc. to A. Eibner 2012, Fig. 7, 8, 6, 9. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	92
Figure 9.8.	1, 2. Situla Este Benvenuti, Italy, grave 126; 3, 4 Situla Bologna/Certosa, Italy, grave 68; 5-6 Situla Providance Bologna, Italy. 1 acc. to Frey 1969, Table 16: 18; 2, 3-6 acc. to A. Eibner 2016, Fig. 7, 3, 4. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ..	93
Figure 10.1.	Face- and house urns. 1 Igrzyczno, district of Wejherowo, Poland; 2 Karczemki, district of Wejherowo, Poland; 3-4 Niepoczłowice, district of Wejherowo, Poland. Acc. to Kwapiński 1999, 73, 80, 124, Table. CXXIII, CXXIV, LXXXV, LXXI. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	98
Figure 10.2.	Face-urns. 1 Luzino, district of Wejherowo, Poland; 2 Grabowo Bobowski, district of Starogard, Poland; 3 Obliwowice, district of Lębork, Poland; 4 Borucino, district of Kartuzy, Poland. 1-2, 4 acc. to Kwapiński 1999, 107-108, 71, Fig. 604, Table CXI, XXXIX; 3 acc. to Hensel 1988, Fig. 253. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	98
Figure 10.3.	Box-shaped graves. 1 Turza Wilcza, district of Lipno, Poland; 2 Nowy Dwór Mazowiecki, district <i>loco</i> . Poland. 1-2 acc. to Hensel 1988, Fig. 279. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	100
Figure 11.1.	1-2 Ust-Tuba III. 60, Russia, petroglyphs. 3 Verkh Kardzhin II, barrow 3, Russia, tattoo on mummy's skin. 4-6 Vtoroy Bashadarsky Kurgan, Russia, wood carving motifs on cover of wooden sarcophagus. 7 Pazyryk kg. II, Russia, textile decoration of horse's back cover. Russia. 1-2 acc. to Sher 1980, Fig. 3; 3 acc. to Polosmak 2001, Fig. 147; 4-6 acc. to S. I. Rudenko 1960, Fig. 22, 25b, 26; 7 acc. to Rudenko 1953, Fig. 159. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	103
Figure 11.2.	Pazyryk, Altai Krai, Russia, barrow II. 1 Tattoos on mummified body; 2 tattoos of right hand; 3 tattoos of left hand; 4 tattoos of leg. 1-4 acc. to Rudenko 1953, Fig. 80, 82-83, 172. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	105
Figure 12.1.	Sobocisko, district of Oława, Poland. Graves 25, 27 (women's); 8, 25 (men's). Acc. to Hoffmann 1940, Fig. 13, 20, 6, 11.....	111
Figure 12.2.	Mšcké Žehrovice. Acc. to Venclová <i>et al.</i> 2008, Table 10: 1-2. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	114
Figure 13.1.	Strong profiling of solids: 1-4 Starý Vestec, Czech Republic; 5 Wólka Domaniowska, district of Radomsko, Poland, grave 57; 6 Třebusice, Czech Republic, grave XVI/42; 7 Dobřichov-Pičhora, Czech Republic, grave VI. 1-4 acc. to Droberjar 2002; 5 Ołędzki 1994; 6 Motyková-Šneidrová 1963, 7 Droberjar 1999, Table 113:10. Redrawn by N. Lenkow.....	124

Figure 13.2.	Przeworsk culture. Biała, district of Zgierz, Poland: 1 decorations of vessel; 2 enlarged human figures. Figurative representations: 3 Zadowice, district of Kalisz, Poland; 4 Babimost, district of Zielona Góra, Poland. Acc. to Bugaj 1999. Redrawn by N. Lenkow .....	125
Figure 13.3.	Graves of warriors of Przeworsk culture. Wesółki, district of Kalisz, Poland: 1, grave 20; 2 grave 36; 3 grave 48. 1-3 acc. to Dąbrowska and Dąbrowski 1967, Table VIII: 3; IX: 4; X: 2.....	126
Figure 13.4.	Furnishing of warrior's grave, Przeworsk culture. Brodno, district of Środa Śląska, Poland. Acc. to Vermerhung..., 1926, 273, Fig. 18. ....	126
Figure 14.1.	Migration period. Graves. 1 Żerniki Wielkie, district of Wrocław, Poland, grave 30; 2 Tîrșor, Romania, grave 4; 3 Tyniec nad Ślęzą, district of Wrocław, Poland, grave 12; 4 Tyniec nad Ślęzą, grave 9. 1 acc. to Zötz 1935, Table VI, IX; 2 acc. to Diaconu 1965, Fig. 8: 1, 3-4 photo by W. Waniek, 2 redrawn by T. Galak.....	139
Figure 14.2.	Migration period. 1-3 Żerniki Wielkie, district of Wrocław, grave 51. 1 acc. to Zötz 1935, Table IX; 2-3 acc. to State Archives in Wrocław. ....	140
Figure 14.3.	Migration period. 1-4 Zagórzyn, district of Kalisz, Poland; 5 reconstruction of way of deforming skull; 6 deformed skull; 7 Konarzew, district of Łęczyca, Poland. 1-4 acc. to Petersen 1933, Table 1; 5-6 acc. to Droberjar 2002, 47; 7 acc. to Mączyńska 1999, Fig. 14: 1. Redrawn by N. Lenkow. ....	146
Figure 15.1.	Anti-vampire burials. Early Medieval Period. Cedynia, district of Gryfino, Poland: 1 grave 76; 2 grave 146; 3 grave 530; 4 Radom, district loco., Poland: grave 47. 1-3 acc. 1. Porzeziński 2008, 24, 28, 32; 4 acc. Gąssowski 1950, Table 76: 5. Redrawn by T. Galak. ....	149

# Chapter I

## Introduction

A human body is an artefact and an archaeological source. While its form obviously depends on purely biological factors, it is also influenced by culture. This results from conditions of life – nourishment, lifestyle, kind of work and even type of clothing. In some cases these factors distinctly affect the size and shape of human bodies. These phenomena are in a way side effects of particular cultural systems. However, people often decide to interfere intentionally with the biological form of their bodies, e.g. positively or negatively perceiving obesity or musculature. The undertaken measures may be completely irreversible; those least invasive concern skin, which may be tattooed or scarified, but there are customs involving knocking out teeth, amputating fingers or deforming skulls. Certain kinds of medical treatment may also cause permanent alterations. Such premises result in various funerary rites. Even today deformation of the body is a common phenomenon – often imperceptible and unintended, e.g. dental treatment or the fact that footwear greatly affects the shape of feet. An obvious deformation is a plastic – and any other – surgeon’s intervention. Quite importantly, it is not always perceived as deformation, but to the contrary – its effect is a correct shape, desirable appearance and appropriate physical condition. We may assume that in prehistory people were similarly motivated when interfering with their corporality. Additionally, an attitude to a human body also (or perhaps primarily) depends on ideological and religious premises. The flesh is thus a cultural phenomenon – and consequently an artefact, however exceptional (the most important?), but lending itself to a description just like any other archaeological find.

Thus, bodies have been and are being created – to an extent. The obvious limit here is the proper functioning of the organism (maintaining life and physical fitness). It has already been pointed out that an essential factor in this process is the relationship with the products of material culture. People and objects are mutually interconnected – at very many levels (see Boivin 2010; Knappett 2014). This phenomenon is described as ‘human-thing entanglement’ or ‘material entanglement’ (Hodder 2011). These relations are constitutive – as a matter of fact we do not know of any human culture that would not use material objects. If the latter disappeared, this would fundamentally change those who use them (Hoskins 1998). This type of relations is described by the ‘material engagement theory’ (see especially Malafouris 2013). It is work

with specific material that creates a potter (Malafouris 2008a); this creates his person in a social sense, but it also changes him internally and externally. His hands and trained touch begin to analyse and form clay. Similar experience concerns people who built houses with their own hands. Buildings (made of clay, mud, branches, timber) were the product of tactile experience. These reasons lay behind the publication of the books on traditional architecture: ‘The Eyes of the Skin’ or ‘The Thinking Hand’ (Pallasmaa 1996, 2009). And then, a blind person’s cane is not so much an extension of his or her body – it is its part. It is through the cane that he or she experiences and analyses the space where he or she moves (Malafouris 2008b). Similarly as a weapon for a warrior (Gosden 2008; Malafouris 2008c); it created him and let him act, i.e. fight and inflict death. But how can we understand the corporality of a blind man without his cane, a potter without clay and a warrior without a weapon? Is it different? What would the body be, i.e. how would it be perceived, without the changes made by matter and experience? It seems that it was seen and understood in different ways, depending on knowledge and adopted ideological attitudes. What is more, if the body is the material, it was formed according to the canons binding in a given era. The assumption here is that the style as ‘a way of doing’ something (Hodder 1990a, 45) is expressed through various media. Most probably the same ideological basis formed human corporality and the remaining artefacts. In accordance with this thesis, human corporality was perceived and shaped following the same principles as the objects made of clay or metal. Thus, understanding these rules enables understanding the ideological premises which they expressed. This assumption corresponds with the concept of habitus proposed by P. Bourdieu, i.e. principles of perceiving and categorising the world and the resulting structure (Bourdieu 2007: 454). Characteristically, similar premises were implemented in the analysis of the relationships between the Far-Eastern martial arts and philosophy (Tokarski 1989). This work aims at examining the ways of thinking about corporality. For these reasons the information about perception of the body may also be obtained from the analysis of means of artistic expression as it turns out that in each instance of artistic activity people draw, paint, etc. not so much what they see but what they know about what they see (Popek 1985: 25-27, 42-43, 55, 69; Arnheim 2013: 347-357). After all, visual perception is an intellectual process and cognitive activity – the world surrounding us is constantly being subject to the process of interpretation (Johnson M. 2015: 248-259).

The attitude presented above also results from a slightly different role of corporality in traditional societies. In many cultures (and especially among the Indo-Europeans) seeing is knowing (Kowalski A.P. 2001: 129-130). Modern cognitive analysis of the English language (as well as Polish) reveals that the terms referring to seeing are the metaphors describing cognitive processes (understanding) (Johnson M. 2015: 186-187). Also in classic Greek the notions referring to knowledge *ἰδέα* (*idéa*) and *εἶδος* (*eídos*) are rooted in the word *ἰδεῖν* (*ideîn*), which means 'to see'. This was reflected in the way of perceiving the world (Reale 2001: 88, 132). A properly demonstrated body thus constituted a very meaningful communication strategy, which is especially true in the case of illiterate societies. Additionally, the analysis of Greek archaic poetry and Homeric epics reveals that the personality structure of individuals lacks the guiding centre – the 'I' (Kowalski A.P. 1999: 148-152; Angutek 2003: 61-64). Homer's characters lay moral responsibility for their decisions (at least those wrong ones) on external forces – usually gods, who controlled their deeds (Dodds 1951: 1-25). The way of thinking of the time lacks the notion that would correspond to the modern concept of personal conscience (Jaeger 2001: 58; see also Hooker 1987). Thus human existence was expressed by being perceived and (and judged) by others (Vernant 2000; Segal 2000). A human being was as he or she was in the eye of the beholder – and therefore wanted to be seen (Mierzwinski 2012a: 82). Just like today, people wanted to be recognised – this constituted their identity (Agamben 2010: 56-57). Quite significantly, in many traditional societies the concept of personality is distinctly relational and results from interactions with other people (Mauss 1985; Strathern 1988; Battaglia 1990). They were often shame cultures identified by R. Benedict (see Benedict 1946). Appropriate behaviour resulted mainly from external sanctions. The feeling of shame, but also the feeling of success, were not an effect of personally professed and experienced moral values (guilt culture) – but resulted from disapproval or admiration of others, which in both cases required the presence of the public. This was especially true in the case of the cultures dominated by warriors, which elaborated complex concepts of honour – and its loss (French 2001; Gabriel 2016). On the other hand, the idea of autonomous individuals able to make their own decisions and act independently is in fact the product of modern philosophical thought (see Thomas J. 2002; 2004). In this sense a personality typical of many traditional societies is not individual but *dividual*, constructed by a number of external factors – social relations and the material objects (e.g. decorations) which they involve. As a matter of fact, the latter are often subject to ritualised exchange and thus a person (as well as his or her corporality) may be perceived as *partable* (see Fowler 2004; Linkenbach and Muslow 2020). This is how some authors describe

the populations of India (Marriott 1976) and Melanesia (Strathern 1988; Busby 1997; Mosko 2010) as well as prehistoric (see Fowler 2001; Hofmann 2005; Brick 2006a) and ancient societies (Whitley 2014).

The same reasons lie behind the great popularity of various paratheatrical activities. Together with the products of material culture the body was a medium employed in various rituals. Dance, song, eating and drinking together, funerary ceremonies often had a performative character (see Bloch 1974; Peterson Royce 2010: 247-268; Galak 2020). On the other hand, a social person was created with the use of make-up, requisites, appropriate scenery and ritualistic behaviour. It was these elements that created the participants in the social game (see Turner 2005: 15-46), where the actors were people and their bodies (see also Actor-Network Theory – Latour 2005). In this way messages, values and religious ideas were transmitted. According to J. Butler's theory, also gender may be expressed in a performative way (1990, 1993). In fact, this phenomenon may be observed through archaeological finds (Joyce 2008). It is thus hardly surprising that very soon, as early as in ancient Greece, a reflection emerged that a human life is a kind of theatrical play: 'Remember that you are an actor in a play, the character of which is determined by the Playwright: if He wishes the play to be short, it is short; if long, it is long; if He wishes you to play the part of a beggar, remember to act even this role adroitly; and so if your role be that of a cripple, an official, or a layman. For this is your business, to play admirably the role assigned you; but the selection of that role is Another's' (Epictetus, *Encheiridion* XVII).

Artistic expression, especially that expressed directly by the body, such as dance, song, clothes or hairstyle, is indivisibly combined with a social standing, while the latter is a consequence of access to resources – in other words: power. This directly affects perception of sexual attractiveness, access to partners and, consequently, having offspring. Thus, a social structure also forms bodies.

Thus bodies, just like any other artefacts, carry meanings; therefore, this will be a story about bodies – but told through bodies as it is they that constitute the basic object of the research and at the same time a cognitive source. In this sense it will not be an objective and complete story – this results from the nature of archaeological sources. After all, they were created by the analysed communities and therefore their picture is a reflection of social stratification and relations between sexes. Consequently, there is much more information about the bodies of the dominating groups. i.e. variously understood elites. Also in this sense history is written by the victors. Besides, strongly patriarchal social relations may have been responsible

for the fact that it was the bodies of men that carried the meanings significant for a given culture. Thus, gender relations are obviously reflected in archaeological data (see the discussion Sørensen 2000, 2007; Alberti B. 2006; Arnold 2007; Matic, Jensen (eds.) 2017). The picture which they present may thus be interpreted in accordance with the concept of 'situated knowledge' proposed by D. Haraway (1991a). The information provided by the bodies was intended for particular eyes and had a distinctly specified purpose. They functioned and were interpreted in a concrete cultural system – in accordance with the accepted (and/or imposed) system of values. After all, bodies were displayed in a particular context and were seen in various ways, which imposed appropriate interpretations. It is on these technologies and skills that the following depend: 'How to see? Where to see from? What are limits to vision? What to see for? Whom to see with? Who gets to have more than one point of view? Who gets blinded? Who wears blinders? Who interprets the visual field? What other sensory powers do we wish to cultivate besides vision?' (Haraway 1991a: 192).

And therefore: 'Vision is *always* a question of the power to see – and perhaps of the violence implicit in our visualizing practices' (Haraway 1991a: 194).

In general this book aims to show what we as people can do with our bodies; what we can use them for, how we can alter and understand them. We will look into the ways of perceiving and treating the body by individual human groups from the Neolithic till the beginning of the Middle Ages. The analysis was carried out on the basis of the artefacts found in graves, anthropomorphic images and written sources. Our assumption is that principles of aesthetics or a canon of beauty express an emotional attitude to, understanding and evaluation of corporality commonly adopted in a given culture (see Johnson M. 2015). In the case of some cultures images of animals will also be analysed as they may be helpful in understanding the contemporary perception of human bodies. Due to the fact that sources from particular periods may belong to different categories, the chronologically arranged chapters are not devoted to exactly the same issues. However, what they have in common is the issue of corporality analysed in various contexts and from various perspectives. Sometimes these issues may be treated very broadly. In terms of territorial range of its focus, this work is concerned with broadly understood central Europe. Because it is the region where various cultural trends have always intersected, Greece, Scandinavia and Eurasian steppes will also be included in the analysis. This work also refers to numerous analogies from outside these areas – sometimes very distant chronologically and geographically. It was assumed that the issues concerning corporality can not be examined locally –

after all, cultural perception of the body is a universal phenomenon present in all cultures and ages. Therefore, the text may feature references to Africa or Asia. After all, the populations inhabiting different regions of the Old World share a common heritage – the experience of the Neolithic as well as the Bronze and Iron Ages – which sometimes results in surprisingly close similarities. Besides, an analogy in humanities replaces an experiment in physical sciences; it shows that a particular interpretation is feasible. Adopting this attitude renders the role of written sources essential in understanding corporality in all analysed ages. As it was mentioned above, the principles of understanding and forming the body were rooted in ideology, which may have been reflected in myths or philosophical deliberations. As the written sources mainly come from the Mediterranean, they have become the point of reference. It was there that ideas circulated widely, together with goods and people and therefore the author decided to use the data concerning various cultures – also because of recurring lack of information on the ideologies of the prehistoric barbarian peoples from central or northern Europe. Doubtful as it may appear, this attitude seems wholly justified. Throughout the prehistory the Mediterranean and Near East constituted a model and cultural inspiration for the peoples living further north. Therefore, this work encompasses very different sources – from the Bible to Plotinus, which seems well-founded if a source lends itself to interpreting corporality, material culture and social relations. What is more, because new cultural trends reach different areas at different times, the written sources do not have to be chronologically correlated with an analysed phenomenon. After all, every culture develops at its own pace, while some professed values may have very ancient origins. Obviously, this research procedure does not constitute a scientific proof, but it enables putting forward theses and formulating interpretations, which admittedly – as such – remain disputable. Yet, its advantage is that the analysed phenomena are described with the use of tools, notions and ideas implemented in the Antiquity, thus pre-empting any attempt at intellectual colonisation of the past. Therefore, the analysis aimed not so much at providing the explanations of individual phenomena as at searching for the already existing ones.

The individual chapters will analyse the issue of corporality, but each will focus on a slightly different aspect as successive chronological periods are distinguished by different ways of treating bodies and different ideas which determined it. Succession of cultures will reveal repeatable trends and changes following one another. Depending on the available sources, the analysed issues will be more pronounced and more profoundly described. In this sense individual parts of this work constitute a whole, which reveals the

full *spectrum* of the ways of understanding corporality. Chapter two, following this introduction, will present relationships between perception of the body, farming and pottery-production technology in the Neolithic. Chapter three is devoted to the changes in the Chalcolithic, i.e. appearance of metal, emergence of the warrior class and the resulting social stratification. Chapter four will analyse the ways of manipulating human remains by the population of the **Únětice** culture, ways of fighting and the relationships between people and weapons. Chapter five devoted to the tumulus cultures is a study of interactions between human bodies and metal objects. It analyses the ways of constructing a social being and forming differences between genders. Here the issue of weaponry appears again. Chapter six discusses figurative representations from the Minoan and Mycenaean cultures in Greece. They will be basis for analysing the ways of understanding the principles of functioning of living organisms – i.e. their movement. The next chapter – chapter seven devoted to the Lusatian culture – focuses on ideological basis of cremation of human bodies. Chapter eight deals with the Bronze Age in Scandinavia. Figurative representations, i.e. petroglyphs, frequently found there will be the basis for a more profound study of interpersonal relations. Chapter nine discusses the beginnings of the Iron Age and the cultures of the Hallstatt period. The new forms of material culture which then emerged were compared with human corporality. This especially concerns the modular systems used at that time. It also discusses social stratification and ways of dominating. Chapter ten discusses the so-called face-urns present in the Baltic zone at the beginning of the Iron Age. When compared with the Hallstatt culture, this phenomenon reveals that various concepts of humanity functioned during that period. Chapter eleven analyses the ways of perceiving corporality by Scythian nomads and how the nomadic lifestyle and constant contact with animals influenced it. It also deals with the issue of violence. In chapter twelve the La Tène culture serves as an example of how a religious change affects the ways of understanding the body and interpersonal relations, focusing on violence and domination in particular. Chapter thirteen is devoted to the barbarians from the Roman period. Comparing contemporary written sources and archaeological data, the author tried to show how human beings functioned in a contemporary society. Chapter fourteen presents how violent political and religious changes during the Migration Period affected human corporality, ways of understanding humanity and the question of life in general. The epilogue, i.e. chapter fifteen, attempts to clarify the ideological basis of vampirism. This phenomenon – recurring in many cultures – was exemplified by the early-medieval Slavs. It may be perceived as an intellectual construct – a consistent implementation of principles of functioning of the

human body. Thus, all parts of this work are concerned with key issues of how the body was understood and what were the reasons and consequences. Consecutive chapters are intended to analyse various ideas affecting corporality.

The relationship between the body and culture has for a long time been a subject of ethnological analyses (see Libera 2008 for a review of theses and literature). This issue was recognised and discussed in classic works by M. Mauss (1935/2006), A. Leroi-Gourhan (1943) and M. Merleau-Ponty (1945/2012). For obvious reasons, these issues have been the focus of interest of theatre studies (e.g. Kolankiewicz 1999, 2016; Kocur 2013; Szturc 2017). Pioneering work, practical exercises and experiments were also carried out by J. Grotowski in his search for the so-called theatre of sources (*idem* 1979). Treatment and significance of the dead body have also for a long time been analysed by anthropology of culture (e.g. Thomas L.-V. 1991) and historians (see Domańska 2017 for further literature). Interestingly, the relationships between the body and culture have not been in the centre of interest of archaeology, constituting the margin of archaeological research. Naturally, they have been featured in very numerous studies on funerary rites (see especially Kopytoff 1971; Parker Pearson 1999; Williams 2004; Urbańczyk 2020). The literature devoted to this issue is so vast, dispersed and diverse that it actually constitutes a subject for a separate book.

Only recently have the issues concerning the relationship between the body and culture become one of the more frequently discussed subjects. Theoretical potential and various ways of conducting analyses were presented in a series of works (Yates 1993; Meskell 2000; Hamilakis *et al.* 2001; Fowler (ed.) 2004; Joyce 2005, 2008; Borić and Robb (eds) 2008). A detailed review of ways of examining and interpreting human remains was presented by J. Sofaer (2006). These issues were discussed in detail for the Neolithic in Europe (Hofmann and Whittle 2008; Hofmann 2015, 2017; Bickle and Sibbesson (eds) 2018). J. Brück studied these issues for the Neolithic and Bronze Age in the British Isles (2006a, 2006b, 2009; 2019). K. Rebay-Salisbury's works (2016, 2017) are concerned with corporality in central Europe in the Iron Age, presenting a detailed analysis of funerary rites – including cremation. Ways of perceiving the body in various periods in prehistory were also presented in consecutive works (Rebay-Salisbury, Sørensen, Hughes 2010; Robb and Harris (eds) 2013). We also need to mention a historiographic work, which is considered a precursor of this direction in the research of the body. The repeatedly reissued and expanded book by R. Onians 'The Origins of European Thought: About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate' until today remains an unattainable model for some, while it has been consistently ignored

## INTRODUCTION

by others. This work is to a certain extent a continuation of the author's previous book 'Architecture, Style and Structure in the Early Iron Age in Central Europe'. While previously the main issue was how an ideology affects understanding of and forming the space and material

culture, this time the study is devoted to the perception and forming of the physical aspect of human beings. This is why its title features the body and thought – it is the relationship between the two that constitutes the main theme of this publication.