

Karol Dziągiewlewski, Marcin S. Przybyła and Anna Gawlik

RECONSIDERING MIGRATION IN BRONZE AND EARLY IRON AGE EUROPE: BRIDGING A GAP IN EUROPEAN MOBILITY?

ABSTRACT: Article gives a review of phenomena from the European Bronze and Early Iron Ages, which have been explained by the migratory scenarios. It recaps also the current stage of discussion on migration as an explanatory concept in archaeology, indicating how do contributions gathered in the present volume refer to this issue.

STRESZCZENIE: Artykuł podaje przeglądową charakterystykę zjawisk z europejskiej epoki brązu i wczesnej epoki żelaza, dla których wyjaśniania stosowano scenariusze migracyjne. Podsumowuje także stan dyskusji nad zagadnieniem migracji w archeologii, omawiając, w jaki sposób odnoszą się do tej dyskusji prace zgromadzone w niniejszym tomie.

KEY WORDS: culture change, migration, local development, Bronze and Early Iron Ages, history of archaeological thought

1. MIGRATION IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

The idea of migration as a factor influencing development of European prehistoric societies appeared anew in literature at the end of the 20th century, after a few decades of total rejection. As incentives for reconsidering migration as explanatory concept in European archaeology served undoubtedly some of the works of American scholars (e.g. Rouse 1986; Anthony 1990; but compare also: Ruiz Zapatero 1983). However, a tempestuous methodological discussion, which still continues in archaeology, has been employing only a selected range of examples. Among them, one can name the mobility of the Upper and Late Palaeolithic as well as Mesolithic hunter-gatherer societies (e.g. Pryor 2008), movements of people in the process of spreading agriculture in Europe (e.g. Ammerman, Cavalli-Sforza 1973; Renfrew 2001; Prien 2005), Late Neolithic migrations (Bell Beaker and Corded Ware cultures) (e.g. Burgess 1979; Kristiansen 1989; Price et al. 2004; Prien 2005; Machnik 2006) or presumed movements of East-European steppe communities at the transition between the Neolithic and Bronze Age (e.g. Anthony 1990; 2007; Kadrow 2001: 188-201). Researchers have turned particular attention to the proto-historic and historic migrations of the ancient Europe, especially Celtic (e.g. Kristiansen 1998; Ramsel 2003; Woźniak 2004) and Germanic ones (Wenskus 1961; Bierbrauer 1992; Godłowski

1992; Böhme 1996) and, finally, to great migrations from the Migration Period and the beginnings of the Early Medieval Period (e.g. Mączyńska 1993; 1996; Andresen 1996; Wilczyński 2004; Quast 2009). Among the latter, the Anglo-Saxon migration gained the largest repercussion in the theoretical literature (e.g. Hamerow 1997; Crawford 1997; Härke 1998; Burmeister 2000; Prien 2005).

In recent years, many meetings and conferences, devoted to migrations and mobility, have been organised: in Durham, 1993 (Chapman, Hamerow eds. 1997), Berlin, 1999 (Eichmann, Parzinger eds. 2001), Kraków, 2003 (Salamon, Strzelczyk eds. 2004), Xanten, 2006 as well as sessions at the EAA Meetings in: Riga, 1996, Esslingen, 2001, La Valetta, 2008 (Dzięgielewski, Przybyła 2009; current volume), to name only some of them.

Current discussion on migration as archaeological explanation rarely employs examples of people movements from the European Bronze and Early Iron Age, although such explanations are frequently implemented in studies of particular cases of culture change during this segment of prehistory (see chapter 2). This lack of Bronze Age examples in theoretical studies on migrations can incline some scholars (e.g. Leciejewicz 2006: 17-18) to regard the period in question as a time of unquestionable 'immobility' and unparalleled stability of settlement structures in Europe (cf. Hansen 1998: 6). Indeed, the Bronze (especially Late Bronze) and Early Iron Age communities established long-lasting, stable structures over vast areas of Europe. However, many events of migratory character must have taken place, as is evidenced by archaeological and (far scarcer) early historical sources.

2. THE BRONZE AND EARLY IRON AGE PHENOMENA EXPLAINED WITH MIGRATION

The aim of the current volume is to throw some light on the supposed cases of mobility in Bronze and Early Iron Age Europe. Due to the fact that particular contributions do not cover the whole range of migration problem during that part of prehistory, we shall briefly refer to other frequently discussed cases. Three of them have been particularly important in archaeological narrative: the role of migration in the spread of the Tumulus culture (see chapter 2.1), its role in the expansion of Urnfield culture (see chapter 2.2; Bouzek; Górski, in this volume) and in the influx of eastern Steppe cultures to Central Europe (see: Kadrow; Metzner-Nebelsick; Gawlik, in this volume; also: Chochorowski 1993; 1994).

2.1. Tumulus complex

One of the issues most frequently raised when discussing Bronze Age migrations is the phenomenon of Tumulus cultures spread. Distribution of assemblages representing the earliest phase of that cultural complex (phase BrB1 – 17th-16th centuries BC) ranges from territories in the upper basins of the Rhine and Danube (with sparse sites in the Rhone basin marking the western border), the upper Elbe basin, territories on both sides of the Moravian Gate, to Transdanubia and Great Hungarian Plain (with only isolated assemblages

from phase BrB1). The appearance of relatively uniform inventories on such a vast area was interpreted in the spirit of culture-historical tradition as a result of mass migrations. This interpretation was enhanced by the conviction about mobility of the Tumulus culture population (Kraft 1926), expressed also in more recent literature (e.g. Kristiansen 1998: 414, Fig. 224), and by distinct differences between this culture and Danubian cultures from the Early Bronze Age. More recent studies have demonstrated the presence of stable forms of Tumulus settlement (e.g. Primas 2008: 26-28), but these observations are valid only for some regions. Therefore, we can still perceive the Tumulus period as an epoch of increased mobility. Equally ambiguous are the results of studies on continuation, during the Tumulus period, of some elements of Early Bronze Age tradition, manifesting itself in metallurgy or burial ritual (e.g. Kubach 1977; Stuchlik 1990; 2006: 228-229; Łęczycki 1993; Lichardus, Vladár 1996: 33; Novotná 1999: 242-243).

Dynamics of the Tumulus complex spreading was discussed especially in the context of the presence of Tumulus assemblages in the Carpathian Basin. The appearance of that group of finds is synchronized with the end of development of the so-called Tell cultures, which occupied the Tisa basin in the Middle Bronze Age (in Hungarian terminology; this corresponds to phases BrA2-BrB1). Historical vision of great migrations, which were to take place during the Tumulus period in the Carpathian Basin, was born in the 1950's among Hungarian archaeologists investigating Early Bronze Age fortified settlements on the Danube. This view was more recently presented in details by Wolfgang David (1998: 240-241; 2002: 14, 23-26), so here we will recall only the most important conclusions. A direct inspiration for this hypothesis was the discovery of four hoards on the settlement at Dunaújváros-Kosziderpadlás. They were deposited in ceiling layers of the site, that is in times of its abandonment. In her classic, broadly cited paper Amalia Mozsolics (1958) assumed that the appearance of hoards on fortified settlements on the Danube was a trace of hiding the belongings by the inhabitants endangered with an invasion (which was a typical view of Central-European archaeology – compare Bradley 1998: 15-17). Mozsolics also concluded that: (i) abandoning the settlements (including defensive and tell sites) – which had often been functioning since the beginnings of the Bronze Age – took place over vast areas, encompassing the whole territory of the present day Hungary; (ii) the phenomenon cannot be explained by climate changes (cooling, increased humidity), because it occurred both in lowlands and in higher located loess areas; (iii) the development of local metallurgic centres ends with the abandonment of tell settlements; (iv) bronze objects start to flow in from the Alpine zone; (v) some of tell sites, where later occupation did not destruct the upper levels revealed traces of fire. According to A. Mozsolics, these observations may indicate that the tell cultures collapsed in a short time, as a result of invasion of warlike groups from outside the Carpathian Basin. Proceeding from slightly earlier studies on the Tumulus culture, A. Mozsolics (1958: 141-144) assumed that one should seek the invaders just in that cultural milieu, which was reflected in her historicizing description of the phenomena in question as a great migration of “Tumulus people with long swords (*langschwertige Hügelgräbervolkes*)”.

During the following decades, a concept of destructive invasion of Tumulus groups (a vision close to the historic process of seizing the Danubian territories by Hungarians) was being further developed and supplemented with more detailed conclusions, chronological in particular. Special emphasis was put to prolonged character of the process. At

the earliest (in phase BrB1, that is still at the 17th/16th centuries), Tumulus groups were to appear in Transdanubia (e.g. Kemenczei 1984: 9; Horváth 1994: 219), where they caused the settlement of the Panonian Incrusted Pottery culture to disappear, while defensive settlements of the Vatyá culture located along the Danube were believed to have resisted the invasion for longer (Bóna 1975: 57-58). Tumulus migrations into Transdanubia were supposed to have induced another wave of resettlement, during which the populations producing incrusted pottery moved from the region where the Drava flows into the Danube (the so-called Szeremle group) further along the Danube to the western Oltenia and north-western Bulgaria (the so-called Dubovac-Cîrma group) (Bándi, Kovács 1970; Kovács 1988; Hänsel, Medović 1994; Medović 1996; Tasić 1996; Uzelac 1996; Krstić 2003). This last process was believed to have been slightly younger (although the chronology was disputable) and generally contemporaneous with the appearance of Tumulus assemblages on the left bank of the middle and lower Tisa (the so-called Egyek, Rákóczi-falva and Tápé groups). Also in this region the appearance of “Tumulus people” was claimed to have caused the fall of tell settlements and the acculturation of local Middle Bronze Age population (Kalicz 1958: 63-64; Bóna 1959; 1975; 1992: 32-38; Kovács 1965: 86; 1975: 42; Trogmayer, Szekeres 1968; Kemenczei 1984: 9-10). From the beginning, the above vision of dynamic processes of the Tumulus epoch in the Carpathian Basin raised discussions both among Hungarian archaeologists and abroad. Critics of this view discussed chronological issues in particular. It was postulated that the process of cultural change in the Carpathian Basin was much more stretched in time (Lomborg 1959; Hänsel 1968: 15-19, 159-165, 169; Rittershofer 1984). It was also noticed that not all of tell sites yielded traces which would allow regarding their abandonment as rapid and linked with the destruction of settlement (Gogáltan 2005: 172; 2008: 52 – examples given there). However, it seems that till today no other interpretation has been proposed in literature which could be an alternative for the concept of “Tumulus people” migration. Possible ecological reasons of the abandonment of tell settlements, such as rather vaguely defined climate changes (e.g. Novotná 1999), or local environmental transformations resulting from anthropopressure, e.g. the so-called timber crisis (deforestation caused by intensive construction activity on tells – F. Gogáltan, private information) could be a significant factor weakening socio-cultural systems of tell populations, especially in the backwater regions in the Tisa basin. However, these processes cannot explain the cultural change itself – a very radical change indeed – and in particular they cannot explain the appearance of “foreign” elements connected with the Tumulus complex (compare David 1998: 244). Thus, we can say that the character of changes which took place in the Carpathian Basin at the dawn of Tumulus period still remains unexplained. Here we would only like to present selected observations, which – as it seems – may suggest directions for future interpretations.

First of all, it should be noticed that the correlation which can be sometimes seen in archaeological record between the traces of possible conflict (abandonment of settlements, fire levels) and the appearance of inventories or artefacts “foreign” to the local milieu need not mean that a conflict was a consequence of a new population coming, or literally of an invasion. The chain of cause and effect can be in this case turned upside down – it was conflict and structural crisis of a local community that made it open to external influences or enabled the penetration of its territory by “foreign” groups. There

exist observations which suggest this last scenario to be likely with reference to the disappearance of tell groups. Lack of continuity of tell sites was recorded also in the area east of the Tisa, in the territory with no finds attributed to the Tumulus circle. In this area, the period from times when the Koszider type hoards were deposited in the western part of the Carpathian Basin (probably the 17th century) to the second phase of the Late Bronze Age (14th-13th centuries) (Kovács 1970: 46-47; Néméti 1990: 53; Kacsó 1995: 111; 1999: 97) is represented by a small group of burials or small cremation cemeteries, accompanied by short-term settlements, which Hungarian and Romanian scholars describe as the Hajdúbagos group (Kovács 1970), Cehăluț group (Kacsó 1987) or phase Otomani IV (Bader 1978: 136). Materials of this group, which generally follow the Middle Bronze Age pottery tradition, in several cases occurred in upper layers of tell sites (Kacsó 1999: 92; Bejinariu, Lakó 2000: 183). However, small thickness of occupation layers and lack of traces of permanent architecture (Kacsó 1999: 92) indicate distinct differences between the Late Bronze Age settlement forms and those typical of tell cultures. Therefore, we can claim that abandonment of tell settlements and structural crisis (decay?) of human groups inhabiting them occurred in the Carpathian Basin independently from the appearance of the Tumulus culture, and covered also the territories not affected by the expansion of the latter.

There is one more group of observations which can suggest the presence of conflicts or, in a broader sense, crisis symptoms among communities inhabiting defensive settlements at the close of the Middle Bronze Age. The most famous examples come from two sites: Feudvar by Mošorin in Voivodina and Nižná Myšľa in eastern Slovakia. Feudvar site – situated on the northern edge of a loess plateau called Titel – yielded the settlement in tell type, functioning for the whole period of the Middle Bronze Age Vattina culture development, with successive traces of more episodic occupation from various phases of the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age (Hänsel, Medović 1992; 1994). Fieldwalking proved that almost all settlement centres of the Vattina culture located in the investigated, marginal zone of Titel plateau had been abandoned on the transition between classic and late phase of this culture. The only exception was the Feudvar tell, which in that period experienced its heyday (Falkenstein 1998: 264-269). Perhaps, we deal here with a concentration of whole nearby population in one centre of proto-urban character (Hänsel 2003: 213-214). According to Christian Ihde (2001: 137-138), the fact that the site yielded two types of ritual pottery (miniature tablets and doubled vessels), which usually appeared in geographically exceptive parts of the Carpathian Basin, may suggest that the settlement was inhabited by at least two populations (which originally were separate local communities or clans?), following different ritual traditions. Settlement concentration on tell Feudvar could be a consequence of increasing threat from groups occupying the neighbouring territories. However, it cannot be also excluded that conflicts erupted within the population, just because of its size. This could be testified by traces of fire in levels corresponding with classic phase of the Vattina culture (Urban 1992). It should be once more emphasized that these events took place in chronological horizon undoubtedly preceding the period of the Tumulus culture expansion. The latter period is manifested on Feudvar site by the definitive collapse of tell settlement, the presence of finds of “northern” origin (new pottery forms, a pin with thickened, pierced shaft, typical of Lochham phase) and dispersion of settlements again over the whole investigated part of

Titel plateau (Hänsel, Medović 1992: 66-68, Fig. 6:1; Grčki-Stanimirov 1992: 116-117; Falkenstein 1998: 269-271; Medović 2007).

A similar situation was observed in Nižná Myšľa. A tell-like defensive settlement, ca 1 ha in area, was functioning there during the classic phase of the Otomani culture. It was inhabited probably by a group of about 150-200 people (Olexa 2003: 55). In the late phase, new fortifications were erected, covering the area seven times larger than this of the classic phase. This was most likely connected with a significant growth of population inhabiting the settlement. It is symptomatic that the new zone of settlement encroached upon cemetery located in the vicinity of the older settlement (David 1998: 247; Olexa 2003 – and further literature). Therefore, it can be assumed that the increase in number of inhabitants was accompanied by breaking the tradition connected with the burial place.

Another set of observations, which may shed light on the processes of cultural change in the Carpathian Basin at the close of the Middle Bronze Age, comes from the Tumulus culture sites from the middle and lower Tisa river. Except for the few excavated settlements (e.g. Kállay 1986; Szabó 2007), data acquired during investigation of several large biritual cemeteries still remain the main source for studies on the Tumulus culture in territories on the Tisa river (see Kalicz 1958; Kovács 1966; 1975; 1981; Trogmayer 1975; Csányi 1980; Hänsel, Kalicz 1986; Kemenczei 1989; Kustár, Wicker 2002). On the surface, these sites are characterized by a far going similarity both in burial rite and the inventories, which combine Middle Bronze Age elements with “foreign” Tumulus tradition. However, the more detailed examination reveals considerable differences. There is virtually no one attribute present in all known cases. For example, most cemeteries were newly established, without connection to older settlement complexes. In Tiszafüred though (Kovács 1975), a Middle Bronze Age necropolis continued to be used in the Tumulus period. Moreover, this site yielded the oldest Tumulus culture burials known from the area, with Lochham phase (BrB1) pins in the inventories (e.g. Kovács 1975: no 102, 188, 354). Other cemeteries produced mainly graves from younger horizon, characterized by the occurrence of pins with nail- or stamp-like heads (BrC1-BrC2). Almost all cemeteries are flat (which distinguishes the assemblages on the Tisa among the whole Tumulus complex), but there is an exception in Jánoshida (Csányi 1980), where the presence of barrows was recorded. Biritualism – with cremation/inhumation ratio considerably varying between particular sites (Furmánek, Ožd’áni 1989) – could be seen as reflecting the continuation of Middle Bronze Age tradition. But while the late Otomani culture sites do not reveal differences in grave equipment between the two burial types (Bátora 2004), in the Tumulus period cemeteries such differentiation can be noticed. Similar inconsequence can be seen in the arrangement of bodies and the orientation of grave pits. The arrangement of a body on its side, with face to the south and the grave pit oriented along E-W axis, which dominates on all sites, follows the tradition of tell cultures. However, the correlation between the sex and body position (on the left or right side), which was strictly obeyed in Middle Bronze Age communities, was not recorded in the Mezöcsát cemetery, for which anthropological analyses are available (Hänsel, Kalicz 1986: 45-46). Most likely, this correlation is lacking also on other sites (compare Trogmayer 1975: 148). Tradition of Middle Bronze Age cultures is also represented by a significant part of pottery discovered on Tumulus culture cemeteries on the Tisa. But once again, its share varies in comparison to vessels typical of Tumulus complex:

in Mezöcsát, for example, the group in question is generally not represented, while in Tiszafüred it seems to be predominant. In the discussed inventories, the most “western” traits are revealed by bronze objects. Their particular types, as well as their assemblages known from burials, refer strictly to Central-European Tumulus cultures. It should be noticed, though, that this observation concerns first of all dress elements, women dress in particular. Graves with long, rapier-like swords – which are so typical of Alpine zone – are not known (or at least not published) from the territories on the Tisa River. Only single burials yielded bronze daggers.

Generalizing the above observations, one can say that translocations of groups represented by the Tumulus culture to the territories in the Tisa basin – if they really took place – were not a one-time mass migration, but rather a series of overlapping, small-scale movements – a period of increased mobility. Therefore, the process of merging the incomers’ culture with local tradition took place independently in every local group, and gave different results, manifested by differences between particular sites. There is no doubt about a significant role of local cultural traditions (including the differences between them) in shaping the cultural picture of the middle and lower Tisa basin. But equally important were the changes: abandonment of tell sites, foundation of new cemeteries and finally transformations of burial ritual – sex, the key criterion of social group division, ceased to be manifested in the ritual. These changes indicate that a considerable “fracture” must have occurred in the culture of the Tisa populations at that time.

2.2 Urnfields

The emergence of the so-called Urnfield complex between the late 14th and the 11th century BC (BrC/D – HaA2) is regarded as one of the most important episodes of cultural change in Bronze Age Central Europe. In a global perspective, a continuation of socio-cultural development directly from the Tumulus complex cultures is most often assumed for vast parts of Central Europe. In the context of studies on the beginnings and spread of Urnfield cultural model in particular areas, one can encounter theories positing a certain role of migrations in that process. During the last several years, this view was most clearly expressed by Kristian Kristiansen (1998: 384-394). It is widely accepted that such mechanism of the Urnfield culture spread may apply particularly to peripheral territories, occupied in the Middle Bronze Age by groups representing cultural traditions other than the Tumulus complex (e.g. Milošević 1952: 325). One of such examples, discussed in this volume (Górski, in this volume), is the issue of the Urnfield (Lusatian) culture appearance in western Małopolska (Lesser Poland), a territory occupied in the Middle Bronze Age by Trzciniec culture communities which represented cultural tradition other than the Tumulus one (in this case: lowland/post-Neolithic one).

We will try to demonstrate here – in a broader and at the same time more general outline – the impact that migratory theories had on the evolution of views about the spread of the Urnfields.

Cremation burial rite and the appearance of characteristic cemeteries – “urn fields” – were relatively early (second half of the 19th century) identified as a cultural phenomena typical of the younger stage of the Bronze Age in Central and partially Western Europe (Müller-Karpe 1980: 7). A rather rapid spread of a complex of new phenomena, including

new ritual, ceramic style and settlement pattern, was in early 20th century interpreted in the spirit of culture-historical archaeology as a result of migration. The discussion was dominated by the migration-diffusion paradigm, used in the interpretation of cultural change in that time. In spite of the lack of circumstances speaking for mass and universal character of that particular mechanism (migration), “Urnfields expansion” was explained in majority of regions as resulting from the inflow of new population. Writing about the Urnfield culture in central and southern Germany, G. Behrens (1927: 260) stated: *„Ihre Urheimat ist noch unbekannt (...)”*, thus dogmatically assuming the foreign origin of its bearers. Migratory explanation of the Urnfields spread was significantly strengthened by the influential prehistorian V. Gordon Childe. Starting from the 1920’s, he regarded the bearers of the Lusatian culture (and later, more generally, the “Urnfield cultures people”) as those who, after having swarmed from territorially constrained homelands in northern central Europe, were co-responsible for cultural perturbations in eastern Mediterranean at the close of the 2nd millennium BC (Kimmig 1964). In later period, Childe gave up some of his daring opinions about the role of central-European migrants during the events of “Sea People” epoch, although he still sustained the vision of Urnfields expansion in Europe as physical movements of human groups (Childe 1969: 209-219). However, the basic problem with global perspectives remained the identification of original reasons and sources of the assumed migration, as was metaphorically expressed by Wolfgang Kimmig in one of classic papers: *„Wir wissen noch nicht einmal mit Sicherheit, wo denn eigentlich der Stein in den glatten Wasserspiegel der hochbronzezeitlichen Welt geworfen worden ist. Im Grunde lassen sich nur die Wellenringe erkennen, die sich nach allen Seiten ausgedehnt, die sich gegenseitig überschneiden haben und die erst nach langer Zeit wieder zur Ruhe gekommen sind.”* (Kimmig 1964: 269).

2.2.1. Western Urnfields

In the mid-20th century, with the growing source basis, the role of a local, post-Tumulus factor began to be emphasized in the genesis of local Urnfields variants, particularly in Germany (Milojčić 1952; Holste 1953 after: Hansen 1998; Müller-Karpe 1959). Proceeding from thorough typological-chronological and settlement studies, most authors writing in the 1970’s and 1980’s about Urnfield cultures, in particular in regions of southern and central Germany, took a critical stand about migratory mechanism (e.g. Herrmann 1966: 46-47; Hennig 1970: 56-57; Dehn 1972: 62-63; Wilbertz 1982: 97; Kubach 1991: 154). The causes of cultural change started to be sought in issues such as economic (intensification of agriculture) and demographic breakthrough, as well as in more complete (compared with the Tumulus period) incorporation of southern Germany into the network of cultural contacts between east and west. Ideological messages shaping new cultural landscape of that territory were to flow from the east (Hennig 1970: 57; compare also Kimmig 1964: 268-272). The inflow of objects from the opposite direction (e.g. Atlantic bronzes) was seen as a confirmation of peaceful character of these processes. Changes in pottery style were explained – apart from inspirations by eastern forms (e.g. double-bodied vessels) – by the development of pottery making into a specialized craftsmanship (Dehn 1972: 62). In some territories, an uninterrupted settlement and demographic development was to be proved by the continuity of cemeteries (from

late Tumulus phase – BrD – to HaA1b) or by the presence of syncretistic elements (biritualism) (Wilbertz 1982; Dehn 1972). Despite the emphasis put on the continuous cultural development of the upper Rhine and Danube basins at the transition between the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, many scholars admitted that period BrD, as well as Ha A1 (14th/13th-12th centuries BC) was a time of unrest and cultural perturbations, during which some limited translocations of human groups could have taken place (Herrmann 1966: 47; Kubach 1991: 154). Potential larger migrations (colonization) were admitted only for territories previously poorly settled, where a rapid rise of settlement representing already the developed model of Urnfield-type culture was recorded, starting from phase HaA (e.g. in Neuwieder Becken on Rhein, compare Dohle 1970: 152-153). At the same time, there appeared first interpretations of the discussed changes that used social and socio-religious approach, particularly in the context of studies on hoards (Dehn 1972: 62; compare also Hansen 1998).

The history of research on the issue in question looks similar in western peripheries of the “Urnfields world”, to the west from the Rhine. Majority of older views assumed that the discussed culture appeared in the present day France as a result of expansion from the Rhine valley and from sub-Alpine territories (compare Schauer 1975: 48; Roudil, Guilaine 1976: 463; Zumstein 1976: 638). However, with growing number of regional analyses of diversified local Urnfields variants in eastern and southern France, it became more and more difficult to regard the process as a rapid mass infiltration (compare Hatt 1988: 175; Schauer 1991). The Rhine-Swiss-East France group of the Urnfield culture is today interpreted generally as an effect of long-term transformations among local Middle Bronze Age societies (including those of Tumulus tradition), under intensive influences – particularly in pottery – from centres on the Rhine (Brun 1988; Mordant 1988; Gasco 1988). Like in Germany, also in peripheral territories (e.g. Picardy) in Bronze Final IIa/IIb (corresponding to HaA) one can notice the appearance of cultural groups revealing set of attributes totally new to the area. Only for those cases seems justified the assumption about the inflow of population representing the Urnfield-type culture (Blanchet 1988: 272; Brun 1988: 618).

The lower Rhine basin was outside the range of the Tumulus culture. The appearance – in Hallstatt A period – of cultural formations resembling in many aspects the Urnfields complex on both banks of the Rhine induced many scholars (W. Kersten, S. De Laet, M. Desittere) to treat them as a part of Central-European phenomena. Their Central-European origins were sometimes directly indicated (compare Roymans, Kortlang 1999: 33-36). However, more detailed analysis of particular elements of culture clearly showed that attributing the Lower Rhine groups to the Urnfield culture encounters many difficulties. Pottery style refers to the Rhine-Swiss-East France group, but is significantly transformed (Ruppel 1990: 128), the tradition of cremation burial rite traces back to the period of the Middle Bronze Age Hilversum culture (Ruppel 1990: 128; Roymans, Kortlang 1999: 36), and analyses of settlement structures confirm the intensification and rearrangement of the previously existing settlement rather than its replacement with new forms (Fokkens 1997: 364-367; Roymans, Kortlang 1999: 36-38). Another important factor which favoured giving up the migratory model in the interpretation of cultural change in Netherlands was a methodological turnabout towards interpretations which emphasize the economic factor, and – recently – particularly the

social and ideological dimension of cultural change (Fokkens 1997; Roymans, Kortlang 1999).

The development of views on the Urnfields genesis in other peripheral region, namely north-eastern part of the Iberian Peninsula (in Catalonia and partially Meseta) followed a slightly different pattern. First attempts to interpret the Urnfield-type finds in the region also referred to migrations, although their historical interpretation (“waves of Celtic migrations”) was totally wrong due to basic chronological problems (delay in the inflow of cultural elements to the present day Spain) (for summary of the discussion see Lenerz-de Wilde 1987). At present, it is assumed that there are no major differences in the pace of the Urnfield culture appearance between the western part of Central Europe, southern France and north-western part of the Iberian Peninsula. In the light of radiocarbon dates¹, obtained mainly for the materials from settlements, it can be concluded that the totally new set of material culture attributes (including characteristic biconical urns with separated rim), together with cremation cemeteries, appeared here in the 11th century BC at the latest, which is only slightly later than in southern France (Ruiz Zapatero 1997: 163). Proceeding from the assumption that the higher is the number of new cultural elements appearing simultaneously on a given territory, the more likely migration is to occur, G. Ruiz Zapatero argues that in Catalonia the most probable scenario of the Urnfield-type culture appearance consists in penetration of small groups of people through the Pyrenees during a relatively short time horizon (Late Bronze II). According to this author, a potential small-scale migration may be a consequence of a tradition of trans-Pyreanean contacts and population flow, which existed during the earlier period (Middle Bronze Age). However, the adaptation of new patterns would not be possible without internal changes of social and economic character, which had to take place within local communities (Ruiz Zapatero 1997: 170-171). Other scholars, who reduce the role of external impulses (e.g. Pons i Brun, Maya 1988), emphasize this last aspect as a crucial factor conditioning the cultural change in Catalonia in the Late Bronze Age.

Another territory where the Urnfield culture was to appear as a result of migration from Central Europe was the western Po river basin in northern Italy. In phase BrD, between the Alps and the Po valley appeared cremation cemeteries, which yielded characteristic sepulchral pottery (biconical urns with everted rims) and bronze objects (swords, pins), referring to finds from the territories in the north-western arch of the Alps. In the 1950's, F. Rittatore Vonwiller expressed a hypothesis positing the emergence of this group of sites (including the eponymous cemetery at Canegrate) as a result of the population inflow from the north-west, from behind the Alps (Pauli 1971: 43). Such scenario was also adopted by L. Pauli (1971), who declared the Canegrate phase to be the first stage in the development of the Golasecca culture (the latter being generally connected with the Early Iron Age). He also noticed the role of a local factor (representing the *terramare* culture tradition), as well as problems with a more precise determination of the origin of the alleged trans-Alpine migrants (Pauli 1971: 43-46). He emphasized that the elements of material culture of the Canegrate phase had so strongly interregional character that their place of origin could be only broadly defined as “Central Europe”.

¹ Traditional relative chronology, based on metal artifacts, is not reliable for this group of sites due to the small number of such objects.

Furthermore, dating of some forms seemed to precede their appearance in the north to the Alps (Pauli 1971: 44-46). Studies on the continuity of some culture attributes from the Middle Bronze Age met serious difficulties due to the poor state of investigation of the relevant sites, cemeteries in particular. The increase in source basis resulted with time in some scholars speaking more cautiously about the origins of the Urnfield-type culture in Italy (compare e.g. Peroni 1995: 227), especially as already from phase Ha A1 (Protogolasecca B1) the connections between the western Po Plain and the Urnfield complex become clearly weakened (Pauli 1971: 46). This issue, however, requires further studies.

2.2.2. Lusatian culture and Eastern Urnfields

The Lusatian culture should be regarded as a northern branch of the Urnfields. This unit has been known in archaeological literature since the late 19th century, and is the topic of extremely large number of studies. Nevertheless, the discussion on the very definition of the phenomenon described as “Lusatian culture” is still alive: beginning from the adequacy of the name, to the range and status of local groups (see e.g. Gedl 1975; Gediga 1980; Dąbrowski 1980; Bukowski 1988; Mierzwiński 1994). One of the discussed topics is the spread of the Lusatian culture. In the early stage of research, according to the then-current tendency, territorial development of the Lusatian culture was explained in terms of migration (Kozłowski 1928; Kostrzewski 1939), or even military expansion (cf. Bouzek 1988: 183). At least till mid-20th century, the Lusatian culture was recognized as the oldest branch of the Urnfields, and was credited with the role of the place of origin for vast migratory movements towards south and west of Europe (compare Miložčić 1952). This approach changed distinctly during the 1970’s and 1980’s, when a considerable role of acculturation processes started to be emphasized. Although the idea of migration was never fully rejected, such explanation was used on a significantly lesser scale (compare Plesl, Hrala eds. 1987; Bukowski 1988). At present, there are two regions where the initial stage of Lusatian settlement is considered in the context of population movements: western Małopolska (Lesser Poland, in vicinity of Kraków) in Montelius Period III (BrD) (Górski, in this volume) and the territory of Warmia and Mazury in northern Poland, in Period IV (Dąbrowski 2009: 40, 107-109). Basing on the analyses of inventories from north-western Poland, J. Dąbrowski (1997: 93) claims that Lusatian assemblages appear in that territory relatively late and in a fully developed form, without a so-called transitory stage between the settlement of Trzciniec and Lusatian cultures (which is recorded in many other parts of eastern Poland). Moreover, he notices the following tendency: the further to the north, the later is the chronology of first Lusatian assemblages. The quoted author clearly emphasizes that the appearance of Lusatian settlement in the region is a complex process, which most likely encompasses also the acculturation of communities previously inhabiting the area (namely the Trzciniec culture). However, he demonstrates a high probability of migration to Warmia and Mazury from other territories occupied by the Lusatian culture (Dąbrowski 1997: 99).

The issue of migration appeared in the literature also in the context of the Urnfields expansion to the east. This applies, among others, to the origin and disappearance of the

so-called Wysocko culture from western Ukraine². This culture was distinguished in the 1920's by Leon Kozłowski (1928). He noticed a considerable similarity in pottery forms between the Lusatian and Wysocko cultures, which gave grounds for defining the latter as the easternmost group of the former. In his subsequent works L. Kozłowski (1939: 59 ff.) simply claimed that the appearance of the Wysocko culture resulted from the eastward expansion of the Lusatian culture population, which blended with local communities at the transition between the Bronze and Early Iron Ages (the migration was to be caused by climate changes). Similar view was expressed, among others, by Tadeusz Sulimirski, who in his 1931 work recognized the appearance of Wysocko culture communities as a result of mixing local, "Cimmerian" elements with foreign element, namely the population from territories occupied by the Lusatian and Thracian cultures (from the so-called Brandenburg-Greater Poland group) (Sulimirski 1931: 163-173). The immigrants were seen as relatively sparse in comparison with the local milieu (in archaeological material, this situation was supposed to be reflected by isolated cremations on inhumation-dominated cemeteries). Nevertheless, their impact was clearly visible, i.a. in the domination of Lusatian style in vessel forms and bronze objects. Such interpretation of the Wysocko culture genesis was also shared by J. Kostrzewski (1939: 272). However, T. Sulimirski retreated in his later works from the hypothesis about Lusatian migration to Podolia (Sulimirski 1948: 155). He assumed that Lusatian colonization stopped on the Bug river and that the Wysocko culture was a separate archaeological unit, with Lusatian influences. Migratory interpretations of Lusatian materials in the present day Western Ukraine were criticized by W. Hensel (1948: 22 ff.) who did not deny their presence, but emphasized that they most likely resulted from peaceful intercultural relations.

As is clearly seen from the above remarks, in the first half of the 20th century and in the 1960's and 1970's the alleged Lusatian migrations to Podolia region were discussed mainly by Polish archaeologists. Ukrainian scholars in majority opted for local origin of the Wysocko culture (Kanivets 1953; Terenozhkin 1961; Krushel'nits'ka 1976).

Second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century was the period of significant intensification of studies on the Wysocko culture. At present, most scholars regard it as a unit separate from the Lusatian culture, rooted into local Trzciniec-Komarów tradition. Similarities to the Lusatian culture (especially to its eastern groups, the Tamobrzeg group in particular) are interpreted as resulting from a common cultural background (Trzciniec-Komarów-Sośnica complex) and mutual interactions (Dąbrowski 1972: 61 ff.; 2009: 65-67; Krushel'nits'ka 1976; Bandrivs'kyi, Krushel'nits'ka 1998; Czopek 2005). However, this does not mean that all doubts have been dispelled. The issue of genesis and dating of the oldest Wysocko assemblages is still vigorously discussed (e.g. Bandrivs'kyi, Krushel'nits'ka 1998; Czopek 2005; Godlewski 2005), although now nobody claims that the appearance of the Wysocko culture was a result of migration³.

² The decline of the Wysocko culture is discussed in this volume in A. Gawlik's paper, hence the issue is only mentioned here.

³ It is worthwhile mentioning here that the attempt to rethink the chronology of early Wysocko assemblages led M. Bandrivs'kyi and L. Krushel'nits'ka to rather controversial hypothesis: they claimed that early Wysocko culture influences, dated yet to BrD, gave rise to inhumation burials in the early phase of the Tamobrzeg group (Bandrivs'kyi, Krushel'nits'ka 1998: 207-224). This view, as well as such an early dating of Wysocko assemblages, was criticized, among others, by P. Godlewski (2005).

The issue of population movements is discussed also in the case of the eastern border of the Gáva culture, first of all in the context of the so-called Holih rady culture genesis. Already in the 1930's the archaeological assemblages from the upper Dnister basin (now identified as the Holih rady culture) started to be regarded as having no connections with local archaeological cultures and being rather the reflection of "Thracian" population migration from Transylvania (Sulimirski 1938: 129). T. Sulimirski dated this episode very late – as late as the 7th century BC, based mainly on the chronology of metal objects. The view about foreign origin of the Holih rady communities was also accepted by I.K. Svieshnikov, although he linked them with representatives of the Urnfields groups Vál and Chotín (Svieshnikov 1958). Despite the rejection of the above-presented hypotheses in later studies, the view about foreign origin of the Holih rady culture remains valid, and its appearance is now connected with migrations from the range of the Gáva culture. In literature, there exists even the term "Gáva-Holih rady complex" (Smirmova 1976; 1993; Bukowski 1969: 448-452; Krushel'nitskaya, Maleev 1990: 132). Similarity between the Holih rady assemblages and materials from the upper Tisa region was clearly noticed already by A.I. Meljukova (1960: 139). The analysis of materials from the Magala settlement by G.I. Smirmova (1969; 1976) only strengthened this hypothesis. It should be emphasized that similarities between the Gáva and Holih rady cultures are not limited to ceramic forms, but are seen in the whole archaeological culture (arrangement of settlements, hoards, metal inventory etc.).

2.2.3. Northward influences

In the context of studies on movements of ethnic groups, the archaeologists, particularly during the inter-war period, discussed one more group of finds connected with the Urnfield period. It was the pottery, typical of the Younger Bronze Age in the Vistula basin (the Lusatian culture), which occurred on the Nordic circle sites: on Danish islands, in southern and central Sweden, on Gotland, on Aland Islands, on the south-western coast of Finland (Dąbrowski 1987; Kaliff 2001: 48-53, and older literature cited there). Previous data, mainly from cemeteries (e.g. Thrane 1975: 177-182), have been supplemented in recent decades with large series of sources collected during investigation of settlements (e.g. Jaanusson 1981; Dąbrowski 1983; Kaliff 2001: 49-54; Larsson, Hulthén 2004). Detailed comparative studies on the material from sites located in Sweden and north-western Poland showed significant similarities in vessel forms and in techniques of vessel surface treatment between the two regions (Dąbrowski 1983: 146-153; 1987: 72-73). However, analyses of pottery mass proved that "Lusatian" vessels found in Scandinavia were manufactured on place (compare e.g. Thrane 1984: 125, 216). The above mentioned similarities allow assuming that in the Younger Bronze Age migration of groups from the Vistula basin to Denmark and Sweden took place, however it seems that it was not a large-scale one (e.g. Dąbrowski 1983: 155; Kaliff 2001: 51; Kristiansen, Larsson 2005: 50, and further literature there). Except for the appearance of new vessel forms and gradual spread of cremation, in Younger Bronze Age Scandinavia one can observe a general continuation and lack of similarities to the Lusatian culture, neither in secondary traits of funeral rite nor in predominant settlement forms.

In the light of the above remarks, beginnings of the Urnfields in Central Europe appear as a period of turmoil and cultural change, which reflects the crisis of the Tumulus era communities. These communities, even during their heyday, yielded evidence for mobility and openness, such as the connections with the Aegean cultural complex or the developed networks of interregional marital exchange (Kristiansen 1998: 376-384; Jöckenhovel 1991). It is beyond any doubt that the disturbance of social structures and ideological systems, which accompanied the birth of the Urnfields (13th-12th century BC), could push some individuals or groups to migrate. In fact, in some regions migration could be the only way to reduce social tensions. K. Kristiansen, in model work on these processes (1998), assumed that the cultures of Central European Bronze Age (especially those from the Danube basin) remained in close relation with the Mycenaean civilization. In his view, a large part of cultural phenomena of the European temperate zone was a reaction to events taking place in the Aegean circle. Kristiansen not only explicitly assumes that the events such as the appearance of Central European mercenaries in the Mycenaean world or invasions of warlike groups from the north to the Balkans took place in times corresponding to the beginnings of the Urnfields, but also argues that they could be analogous to Celtic or Germanic penetrations known from historic times (Kristiansen 1998: 388-390; compare also Bouzek 1985; 1988; in this volume). The world pictured by the above authors was characterized by the aura of mobility, including a readiness to maintain long-distance contacts, which was a response to both: external events and inner social conflicts (e.g. growing demographic pressure). This vision can be to some extent supported by the analyses of symbolic behaviours, such as e.g. patterns of hoards deposition (Hansen 1998) or making inter-group alliances (Blajer 1996). Finally, the already mentioned syntheses of regional groups on the peripheries of the discussed cultural complex account convincingly for the role of migrations in the spread of the Urnfields in Europe.

3. NEW PERSPECTIVE IN MIGRATORY STUDIES

Not all the papers constituting the present volume are fully optimistic about the usefulness of migratory explanations, and some of included case studies do not necessarily refer to undisputable migrations. Nevertheless, we hope that the book will fill, to certain degree, an empty space in the discussion upon European prehistoric mobility, which results from avoiding the Bronze Age examples.

According to some scholars (Chapman 1997; Kristiansen 1998: 315; Naum 2008: 10-11), the increased interest in prehistoric migration, observed in recent years, correlates with the current stage of socio-political development of European society. Europe without borders, mass movements of labour immigrants, etc. – these phenomena, obviously, may push contemporary researchers to trace mobility in archaeological record. Nevertheless, we believe that increasing interest in such areas stems also from changing perspective in the present-day archaeology. Regarding prehistoric migrations as a result of numerous individual-, family- or kin-level decisions, rather than as ‘movements of cultures’, is a common trait of many contemporaneous authors (e.g. Kristiansen 1998; Ruiz Zapatero 1997), those of the present volume included (see: Kadrow;

Vitale, Hancock Vitale; Przybyła; Dziegielewski, in this volume). In this context, local evidence is considered crucial. Although migrations frequently seem to be large-scale events, tracing them should start at site by site or region by region level (Rouse 1986: 163-165, Fig. 30; cf. Vitale, Hancock Vitale; Górski; Przybyła; Gawlik, in this volume). Another view shared by most authors consists in appreciating internal factors determining migration. Economic conditions or unusual external factors might produce circumstances necessary, although insufficient, for the decision on migration. However, in a given community, it is the openness of ideological system to such strategy that remains essential. This kind of readiness would be maintained e.g. by a tradition of former migrations, by a specific (mainly mobile) lifestyle or by susceptibility to innovative solutions (cf. Kadrow; Metzner-Nebelsick; Przybyła; Gawlik; Dziegielewski, in this volume). Some authors argue that external factors, such as climatic changes, are frequently over-estimated (e.g. Kadrow; Dziegielewski, in this volume). Most of the presented studies are characterised by a holistic approach. Taking into consideration that migration “has to be demonstrated rather than assumed” (Clark 1966: 188, after: Hakenbeck 2008: 14), they employ data from fields of archaeology, history, sociology, ethno-archaeology, archaeometry, palinology, climatology, etc.

Another important factor stimulating the interest in examining prehistoric migrations in recent years is the development of stable isotopes analyses, which creates a possibility to demonstrate people movements directly, using skeletal material. Unfortunately, bio-archaeological record of the Bronze (especially Late Bronze) and Iron Ages in Europe consists mainly of cremated human remains. The article by Stepańczak and Szostek (in this volume) discusses the potential of cremated bones for isotope analyses. Progress in this field shall be extremely appreciated by specialists of the Bronze and Iron Age.

* * *

From the works gathered in the current volume one can conclude that general models of migration, based mainly on modern sociology or historical examples of migrations, are hardly applicable to specific cases in prehistory. It is probably due to the fact that our knowledge about the reasons of the phenomena in question is too poor. Models based on the ‘push-pull’ paradigm do not take into account many non-economic, internal factors. Of course, it does not mean that we should reject attempts of building general models, but it must be done within a strict framework of anthropological theories focusing on pre-industrial societies.

The point of view outlined in this volume is concordant to some recent opinions concerning the today and future course of migration studies in archaeology (e.g. Kristiansen 1998; Kristiansen, Larsson 2005; Hakenbeck 2008; Naum 2008). Hopefully, such approach promises a new stage in these studies, unaffected by emotional attitude typical of both: culture-historical enthusiasm and New Archaeology’s scepticism (cf. Bouzek, in this volume).

References:

Ammerman, A.J. and Cavalli-Sforza, L.L.

1973 *A Population Model for the Diffusion of Early Farming in Europe*, in: *The Explanation of Culture Change. Models in Prehistory*, edited by C. Renfrew, London, pp. 343-357.

Andresen, M.

1996 *Akkulturation am Bestimmungsort einer Migration. Bemerkungen zum methodologischen Ansatz ihrer Erforschung*, *Archäologische Informationen* 19 (1-2): 23-37.

Anthony, D.W.

1990 *Migration in Archeology. The Baby and the Bathwater*, *American Anthropologist* 92: 895-914.

2007 *The Horse, the Wheel and Language. How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*, Princeton-Oxford.

Bader, T.

1978 *Epoca bronzului in nord-vestul Transilvaniei. Cultura pretracică și tracică*, București.

Bandi, T. and Kovács, T.

1970 *Die historischen Beziehungen der bronzezeitlichen Szeremle-Gruppe*, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 22: 25-39.

Bátora, J.

2004 *Die Anfänge der Hügelbestattungen in der Mittelbronzezeit im mittleren Donaugebiet*, in: *Einflüsse und Kontakte alteuropäischer Kulturen. Festschrift für Jozef Vladár zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by J. Bátora, V. Furmánek and L. Veliáčik (*Archaeologica Slovaca Monographiae* 6), Nitra, pp. 241-253.

Bandrivs'kyi, M. and Krushel'nits'ka, L.

1998 *Osnovni periody rozvytku visots'koï kul'tury (za materialamy pokhoval'nykh pam'yatok)*, *Zapysky Naukovogo Tovarystva Imeni Shevchenka* 235: 193-247.

Behrens, G.

1927 *Mittel- und Süddeutschland. C. Bronzezeit*, in: *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, vol. 8, edited by M. Ebert, Berlin, pp. 245-260.

Bejinariu, I. and Lakó, É.

2000 *Contribuții la cunoașterea bronzului târziu din nord-vestul României, Așezarea de la Crasna*, *Acta Musei Porolissensis* 23: 153-219.

Bierbrauer, V.

1992 *Die Goten vom 1. bis 7. Jahrhundert n.Chr. Siedelgebiete und Wanderbewegungen aufgrund archäologischer Quellen*, in: *Peregrinatio Gothica III*, edited by E. Straume and E. Skar (*Universitetets Oldsaksamlings Skrifter. Ny rekke* 14), Oslo, pp. 9-43.

Blajer, W.

1996 *Prinzessinnen und Schmiede. Einige Bemerkungen zur regionalen Differenzierung des Ringschmucks in der frühen Phase der Lausitzer Kultur*, in: *Problemy epoki brązu i wczesnej epoki żelaza w Europie Środkowej. Księga jubileuszowa poświęcona Markowi Gedłowi*, edited by J. Chochorowski, Kraków, pp. 83-110.

Blanchet, J.-C.

- 1988 *L'extension du groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale dans le nord de la France*, in: *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, edited by P. Brun and C. Mordant, Nemours, pp. 263-272.

Bóna, I.

- 1959 *Chronologie der Hortfunde vom Koszider-Typus*, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 9: 213-243.
- 1975 *Die mittlere Bronzezeit Ungarns und ihre südöstlichen Beziehungen (Archaeologia Hungarica 49)*, Budapest.
- 1992 *Bronzezeitliche Tell-Kulturen in Ungarn*, in: *Bronzezeit in Ungarn. Forschungen in Tell-Siedlungen an Donau und Theiß*, edited by W. Meier-Arendt, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 9-39.

Bouzek, J.

- 1985 *The Aegean, Anatolia and Europe. Cultural Interrelations in the Second Millenium B.C. (Studies in Mediterranean Archeology 29)*, Praha.
- 1988 *Die "Lausitzer Wanderung" und die Südgrenze der Lausitzer Kultur in Böhmen*, in: *Die Urnenfelderkulturen Mitteleuropas Symposium, Liblice, 21.-25.10.1985*, edited by E. Plesl and J. Hrala, Praha, pp. 181-187.

Böhme, H.W.

- 1996 *Kontinuität und Traditionen bei Wanderungsbewegungen im frühmittelalterlichen Europa vom 1.-6. Jahrhundert*, *Archäologische Informationen* 19 (1-2): 89-103.

Bradley, R.

- 1998 *The Passage of Arms. An Archaeological Analysis of Prehistoric Hoard and Votive Deposits*, Oxford.

Brun, P.

- 1988 *L'entité "Rhin-Suisse-France orientale". Nature et évolution*, in: *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, edited by P. Brun and C. Mordant, Nemours, pp. 599-620.

Brun, P. and Mordant, C. (eds.)

- 1988 *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, Nemours.

Bukowski, Z.

- 1966 *W sprawie genezy i rozwoju grupy wysockiej kultury lużyckiej*, *Archeologia Polski* 11: 28-106.
- 1969 *Studia nad południowym i południowo-wschodnim pograniczem kultury lużyckiej*, Wrocław.
- 1988 *Die Lausitzer Kultur. Einleitung zur Problematik*, in: *Forschungen zur Problematik der Lausitzer Kultur*, edited by Z. Bukowski, Wrocław. pp. 15-40.

Burgess, C.

- 1979 *The Beaker Phenomenon. Some Suggestions*, part 1: *General Comments and the British Evidence*, in: *Settlement and Economy in the Third and Second Millennia B.C.*, edited by C. Burgess and R. Miket (*BAR International Series* 33), Oxford, pp. 309-323.

Burmeister, S.

- 2000 *Archaeology and Migration. Approaches to an Archaeological Proof of Migration*, *Current Anthropology* 41 (4): 539-553.

Chapman, J.

1997 *The Impact of Modern Invasions and Migrations on Archaeological Explanation*, in: *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation*, edited by J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (*BAR International Series* 664), Oxford, pp. 11-20.

Chapman, J. and Hamerow, H. (eds.)

1997 *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation* (*BAR International Series* 664), Oxford.

Childe, V.G.

1969 *Prehistoric migrations in Europe*, New York.

Chochorowski, J.

1993 *Ekspansja kimmeryjska na tereny Europy środkowej*, Kraków.

1994 *Skijске nabegi na teritoiyu Srednei Evropy*, Rossiiskaya Arkheologiya 1: 49-64.

Crawford, S.

1997 *Britons, Anglo-Saxons and the Germanic Burial Ritual*, in: *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation*, edited by J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (*BAR International Series* 664), Oxford, pp. 45-72.

Csányi, M.R.

1980 *Árokkaal körülvevett sírok a halomsíros kultúra Jánoshidai temetőjében*, *Archaeologiai Értesítő* 107: 153-165.

Czopek, S.

2005 *Główne problemy badawcze kultury wysockiej – wprowadzenie w tematykę konferencji*, in: *Problemy kultury wysockiej*, edited by S. Czopek, Rzeszów, pp. 9-19.

Dąbrowski, J.

1972 *Powiązania ziem polskich z terenami wschodnimi w epoce brązu*, Wrocław.

1980 *Przydatność ceramiki lużyckiej do podziałów kulturowych*, in: *Zróżnicowanie wewnętrzne kultury lużyckiej*, edited by M. Gedl, Kraków, pp. 35-55.

1983 *Zur Frage der nordwestlichen Auswirkungen der Lausitzer Keramik. Bemerkungen zur Bearbeitung des Fundmaterials aus Hallunda*, *Przegląd Archeologiczny* 31: 145-158.

1987 *Die Lausitzer Kultur und der Nordische Kreis*, in: *Die Urnenfelderkulturen Mitteleuropas Symposium, Liblice, 21.-25.10.1985*, edited by E. Plesl and J. Hrala, Praha, pp. 107-109.

1997 *Epoka brązu w północno-wschodniej Polsce*, Białystok.

2009 *Polska przed trzema tysiącami lat. Czasy kultury lużyckiej*, Warszawa.

David, W.

1998 *Zum Ende der bronzezeitlichen Tellsiedlungen im Karpatenbecken*, in: *Archäologische Forschungen in urgeschichtlichen Siedlungslandschaften. Festschrift für Georg Kossack zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by H. Küster, A. Lang and P. Schauer (*Regensburger Beiträge zur Prähistorischen Archäologie*), Regensburg, pp. 231-267.

2002 *Studien zu Ornamentik und Datierung der bronzezeitlichen Depotfundgruppe Hajdúsámson-Apa-Ighiel-Zajta* (*Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis* 18), Alba Iulia.

Dehn, R.

1972 *Die Urnenfelderkultur in Nordwürttemberg* (*Forschungen und Berichte zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Baden-Württemberg* 1), Stuttgart.

Dohle, G.

1970 *Die Urnenfelderkultur im Neuwieder Becken* (*Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Kunst des Mittelrheins. Beihefte* 2), Koblenz.

Dzięgielewski, K. and Przybyła, M.S.

2009 *Migration in the Bronze and Early Iron Age (Session Report)*, *The European Archaeologist* 30 (2008/2009): 22.

Eichmann, R. and Parzinger, H. (eds.)

2001 *Migration und Kulturtransfer. Der Wandel vorder- und zentralasiatischer Kulturen im Umbruch vom 2. und 1. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums. Berlin, 23. bis 26. November 1999 (Kolloquien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 6)*, Berlin.

Falkenstein, F.

1998 *Feudvar. Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in einer Mikroregion am Zusammenfluß von Donau und Theiß II. Die Siedlungsgeschichte des Titeler Plateaus (Prähistorische Archäologie in Süd-osteuropa 14)*, Kiel.

Fokkens, H.

1997 *The Genesis of Urnfields. Economic Crisis or Ideological Change?*, *Antiquity* 71 (272): 360-373.

Furmanek, V. and Ožd'áni, O.

1989 *Kontakte der Hügelgräberkulturen und des Kulturkomplexes der südöstlichen Urnenfelder, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur der mitteleuropäischen Bronzezeit*, edited by V. Furmáněk and F. Horst, Berlin-Nitra, pp. 129-141.

Gasco, J.

1988 *L'Age du Bronze final en Languedoc occidental. État de la question*, in: *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, edited by P. Brun and C. Mordant, Nemours, pp. 465-479.

Gediga, B.

1980 *Zagadnienie zakresu pojęcia "kultura łużycka" i jej wewnętrznego zróżnicowania*, in: *Zróżnicowanie wewnętrzne kultury łużyckiej*, edited by M. Gedl, Kraków, pp. 11-34.

Gedl, M.

1975 *Kultura łużycka*, Kraków.

Godlewski, P.

2005 *O nowych możliwościach datowania początków kultury wysockiej*, in: *Problemy kultury wysockiej*, edited by S. Czopek, Rzeszów, pp. 33-44.

Godłowski, K.

1992 *Germanische Wanderungen im 3. Jh. v.Chr. 6. Jh. n.Chr. und ihre Widerspiegelung in den historischen und archäologischen Quellen*, in: *Peregrinatio Gothica III*, edited by E. Straume and E. Skar (*Universitetets Oldsaksamlings Skrifter. Ny rekke* 14), Oslo, pp. 53-75.

Gogâltan, F.

2005 *Der Beginn der bronzezeitlichen Tellsiedlungen im Karpatenbecken. Chronologische Probleme*, in: *Interpretationsraum Bronzezeit. Bernhard Hänsel von seinen Schülern gewidmet*, edited by B. Horejs et al. (*Universitätsforschungen für Prähistorische Archäologie* 121), Bonn, pp. 161-179.

2008 *Fortified Bronze Age Tell Settlements in the Carpathian Basin. A General Overview*, in: *Defensive structures from Central Europe to the Aegean in the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C.*, edited by J. Czebreszuk, S. Kadrow and J. Müller, Poznań-Bonn, pp. 39-56.

Grčki-Stanimirov, S.

1992 *Eine bronzezeitliche Vorratsgrube*, in: *Vorbericht über die jugoslawisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen in der Siedlung von Feudvar bei Mošorin von 1986-1990*, Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission 72: 110-117.

Hakenbeck, S.

2008 *Migration in Archaeology. Are We Nearly There Yet?*, in: *Movement, mobility and migration*, edited by E. Lightfoot, *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 23 (2): 9-26.

Hamerow, H.

1997 *Migration Theory and the Anglo-Saxon "Identity Crisis"*, in: *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation*, edited by J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (*BAR International Series* 664), Oxford, pp. 33-44.

Hänsel, B.

1968 *Beiträge zur Chronologie der mittleren Bronzezeit im Karpatenbecken (Beiträge zur ur- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie des Mittelmeer-Kulturraumes 7-8)*, Bonn.

2003 *Bronzezeitliche Stadtkultur im Karpatenbecken?*, in: *Bronzezeitliche Kulturercheinungen im karpatischen Raum. Die Beziehungen zu den benachbarten Gebieten*, edited by C. Kacsó (*Bibliotheca Marmatica* 2), pp. 207-216.

Hänsel, B. and Kalicz, N.

1986 *Das bronzezeitliche Gräberfeld von Mezöcsát, Kom. Borsod, Nordostungarn*, Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission 67: 5-88.

Hänsel, B. and Medović, P.

1992 *Zum Forschungsstand der Eisen- und Bronzezeit an der Theißmündung*, in: *Vorbericht über die jugoslawisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen in der Siedlung von Feudvar bei Mošorin von 1986-1990*, Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission 72: 61-65.

1994 *Bronzezeitliche Inkrustationkeramik aus Feudvar bei Mošorin an der Theißmündung*, in: *Die Fragen der Bronzezeit. Archäologische Konferenz des Komitates Zala und Niederösterreichs III. Keszthely 5.-7.10. 1992 (Zalai Múzeum 5)*, pp. 189-199.

Hansen, S.

1998 *Migration und Kommunikation während der späten Bronzezeit. Die Depots als Quellen für ihren Nachweis*, *Dacia N.S.* 40-42 (1996-1998): 5-28.

Härke, H.

1998 *Archaeologists and Migrations. A Problem of Attitude?*, *Current Anthropology* 39 (1): 19-45.

Hatt, J.-J.

1988 *Invasion ou acculturation? Conditions régionales de la diffusion de la Culture des Champs d'Urnes en France. Maintien des traditions Champs d'Urnes et conséquences sur l'évolution de la religion*, in: *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, edited by P. Brun and C. Mordant, Nemours, pp. 173-177.

Hennig, H.

1970 *Die Grab- und Hortfunde der Urnenfelderkultur aus Ober- und Mittelfranken (Materialhefte zur bayerischen Vorgeschichte 23)*, Kallmünz/Opf.

Hensel, W.

1948 *Zagadnienie pochodzenia Słowian*, *Przegląd Zachodni* 4/1: 64-66.

Herrmann, F.-R.

1966 *Die Funde der Urnenfelderkultur in Mittel- und Südhessen. Text (Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 27)*, Berlin.

Horváth, L.

1994 *Adatok Délnyugat-Dunántúl későbronzkorának történetéhez*, in: *Die Fragen der Bronzezeit. Archäologische Konferenz des Komitates Zala und Niederösterreichs III. Keszthely 5.–7.10. 1992 (Zalai Múzeum 5)*, pp. 217-235.

Ihde, Ch.

2001 *Die früh- und mittelbronzezeitliche Keramik von Feudvar, Gem. Mošorin, Vojvodina (Serbien)*, *Archäologische Informationen* 24/1: 135-139.

Jaanusson, H.

1981 *Hallunda. A Study of Pottery from a Late Bronze Age Settlement in Central Sweden (Museum of National Antiquities 1)*, Stockholm.

Jöckenhovel, A.

1991 *Räumliche Mobilität von Personen in der mittleren Bronzezeit des westlichen Mitteleuropa*, *Germania* 69/1: 49-62.

Kacsó, C.

1987 *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Verbreitungsgebietes und Chronologie der Suci de Sus-Kultur, Dacia N.S. 31*: 51-75.

1995 *Der Hortfund von Arpășel, Kr. Bihor*, in: *Bronzefunde aus Rumänien*, edited by T. Soroceanu (*Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa* 10), Berlin, pp. 81-130.

1999 *Die Endphase der Otomani-Kultur und die darauffolgende kulturelle Entwicklung in Nordwesten Rumäniens*, in: *Kultura Otomani-Füzesabony – rozwój, chronologia, gospodarka*, edited by J. Gancarski, Krosno, pp. 85-112.

Kadrow, S.

2001 *U progu nowej epoki. Gospodarka i społeczeństwo wczesnego okresu epoki brązu w Europie Środkowej*, Kraków.

Kaliff, A.

2001 *Gothic Connections. Contacts Between Eastern Scandinavia and the Southern Baltic Coast 1000 BC-500 AD (Occasional Papers in Archaeology 26)*, Uppsala.

Kállay, Á.Sz.

1986 *Késo bronzkori edénydepot Battonya határában*, *Archaeologiai Értesítő* 113: 159-165.

Kalicz, N.

1958 *Későbronzkori urnatemető Igrici község határában*, *A Miskolci Herman Ottó Múzeum Évkönyve* 2: 45-72.

Kanivets, V.I.

1953 *Pamyatniki luzhitskoï kultury na territorii zapadnykh oblastei Ukrainy*, *Kratkie Soobshcheniya Instituta Archeologii AN USSR* 2: 44-45.

Kemenczei, T.

1984 *Die Spätbronzezeit Nordostungarns (Archaeologia Hungarica 51)*, Budapest.

1989 *Bemerkungen zur Chronologie der spätbronzezeitlichen Grabfunde im Donau-Theiß Zwischenstromgebiet*, *Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae* 1989: 73-96.

Kimmig, W.

- 1964 *Seevölkerbewegung und Urnenfelderkultur. Ein archäologisch-historischer Versuch*, in: *Studien aus Alteuropa*, vol. 1, edited by R. v. Uslar and K.J. Narr (*Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher* 10/1), Köln-Graz, pp. 220-283.

Kostrzewski, J.

- 1939 *Od mezolitu do okresu wędrówek ludów*, in: *Prahistoria ziem polskich*, edited by S. Krukowski, J. Kostrzewski, R. Jakimowicz (*Encyklopedia Polska PAU* 4/1), Kraków, pp. 120-359.

Kovács, T.

- 1965 *Adatok a későbronzkori Egyeki csoport kialakulásához*, A Debreceni Déri Múzeum Évkönyve 1962-1964: 75-86.
- 1966 *A halomsíros kultúra leletei az Észak-Alföldön*, *Archaeologiai Értesítő* 93: 159-202.
- 1970 *A Hajdúbagosi bronzkori temető*, *Folia Archaeologica* 21: 27-47.
- 1975 *Tumulus culture cemeteries of Tiszafüred (Régészeti Füzetek* 11/17), Budapest.
- 1981 *Zur Problematik der Entstehung der Hügelgräber in Ungarn*, *Slovenská Archeológia* 29: 87-96.
- 1988 *Die topografische und chronologische Stelle der Szeremle-Kultur in der Bronzezeit des südlichen Karpatenbeckens*, in: *Gomolava. Chronologie und Stratigraphie der vorgeschichtlichen und antiken Kulturen der Donauniederung und Südosteuropas*, edited by N. Tasić and J. Petrović, Novi Sad, pp. 155-167.

Kozłowski, L.

- 1928 *Wczesna, starsza i środkowa epoka brązu w Polsce w świetle subborealnego optimum klimatycznego i jego wypływu na ruchy etniczne i zaludnienie Polski (Archiwum Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie* 5/3), Lwów.
- 1939 *Zarys dziejów Polski południowo-wschodniej*, Lwów.

Kraft, G.

- 1926 *Die Kultur der Bronzezeit in Süddeutschland*, Augsburg.

Kristiansen, K.

- 1989 *Prehistoric Migrations. The Case of the Single Grave and Corded Ware Cultures*, *Journal of Danish Archaeology* 7: 211-225.
- 1998 *Europe Before History (New Studies in Archaeology)*, Cambridge.

Kristiansen, K. and Larsson, T.B.

- 2005 *The Rise of Bronze Age Society. Travels, Transmissions and Transformations*, Cambridge.

Krstić, D.

- 2003 *Glamija. Nekropola bronzanog doba u Korbovu (Arheološke Monografije* 15), Beograd.

Krushel'nits'ka, L.

- 1976 *Pivnichne Prykarpattya ta Zachidna Volyn 'za doby rann'ogo zaliza*, Kyiv.
- 1985 *Vzayemozv''yazky naseleenny Prykarpattya i Volyni z plemenamy Skhidnoi i Tsentral'noi Evropy*, Kyiv.

Krushel'nitskaya, L.I. and Maleev, Yu.N.

- 1990 *Plemena kul'tury frakijskogo gal'shtata (Gava-Goligrady)*, in: *Arkheologiya Prikarpat'ya, Volyni i Zakarpat'ya*, Kiev, pp. 123-132.

Kubach, W.

- 1977 *Zum Beginn der bronzezeitlichen Hügelgräberkultur in Süddeutschland*, *Jahresbericht des Instituts für Vorgeschichte der Universität Frankfurt am Main* 1977: 119-163.
- 1991 *Das Rhein-Main-Gebiet zwischen Hügelgräber- und Urnenfelderkultur*, in: *Die Anfänge der Urnenfelderkulturen in Europa. Początki kultur pól popielnicowych w Europie*, edited by M. Gedl (*Archaeologia Interregionalis* 13), Warszawa, pp. 141-156.

Kustár, R. and Wicker, E.

2002 *Biritualer Gräberfeld der Hügelgräberkultur in Csölyospálos (Ungarn)*, in: *Studies of the Ancient World in Honour of Mária Novotná*, Anodos 2: 169-192.

Larsson, T.B. and Hulthén, B.

2004 *Vistad '88 Revisited. Ceramological Analyses and Lusatian Connections (Archaeology and Environment 17)*, Umeå.

Leciejewicz, L.

2006 *Migracje w pradziejach i starożytności. Wprowadzenie do dyskusji*, in: *Migracje: dzieje, typologia, definicje*, edited by A. Furdal, W. Wysoczański (*Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* 2945), Wrocław, pp. 15-21.

Lenerz-de Wilde, M.

1987 *Die Urnenfelderkultur auf der Iberischen Halbinsel*, in: *Die Urnenfelderkulturen Mitteleuropas Symposium, Liblice, 21.-25.10.1985*, edited by E. Plesl and J. Hrala, Praha, pp. 387-398.

Lichardus, J. and Vladár, J.

1996 *Karpatenbecken-Sintašta-Mykene. Ein Beitrag zur Definition der Bronzezeit als historischer Epoche*, *Slovenská Archeológia* 44: 25-93.

Łęczycki, S.

1993 *Lochhalsnadeln in Mitteleuropa. Einheimische Entfaltung einer fremden Idee?*, *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 58: 305-324.

Lomborg, E.

1959 *Donauländische Kulturbeziehungen und die relative Chronologie der frühen nordischen Bronzezeit*, *Acta Archaeologica (København)* 30: 51-146.

Machnik, J.

2006 *Rola migracji w pradziejach*, in: *Migracje: dzieje, typologia, definicje*, edited by A. Furdal, W. Wysoczański (*Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* 2945), Wrocław, pp. 29-37.

Mączyńska, M.

1993 *Die Völkerwanderung. Geschichte einer ruhelosen Epoche im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert*, Zürich.

1996 *Wędrowki Ludów. Historia niespokojnej epoki IV i V wieku*, Warszawa-Kraków.

Medović, P.

1996 *Die inkrustierte Keramik der Mittelbronzezeit in der Vojvodina*, in: *The Yugoslav Danube Basin and the Neighbouring Regions in the 2nd Millennium BC*, edited by N. Tasić, Belgrad-Vršac, pp. 163-183.

2007 *Stubarlija. Nekropola naselja Feudvar kod Mošorina (Bačka) (Muzej Vojvodine, Posebna Izdanja 20)*, Novi Sad.

Meljukova, A.I.

1960 *Issledovanie pamyatnikov predskifskoj i skifskoj epokh v lesostepnoj Moldavii*, in: *Materialy i issledovaniya po archeologii yugo-zapada SSSR i Rumynskoj Narodnoj Respublik*, Kishiniev, pp. 129-150.

Mierzwiński, A.

1994 *Rozważania o studiach kulturowych (na marginesie problematyki tzw. grupy górnośląsko-małopolskiej kultury lużyckiej)*, *Przegląd Archeologiczny* 42: 111-127.

Milojčić, V.

1952 *Zur Frage der "Lausitzer Wanderung"*, *Germania* 30: 318-325.

Mordant, C.

- 1988 *De la céramique cannelée à la production Rhin-Suisse-France orientale (R.S.F.O.). La rupture IIa-IIb dans le Bassin parisien*, in: *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, edited by P. Brun and C. Mordant, Nemours, pp. 591-598.

Mozsolics, A.

- 1958 *Archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Grossen Wanderung*, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 8 (1957): 119-156.

Müller-Karpe, H.,

- 1959 *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen (Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 22)*, Berlin.
- 1980 *Handbuch der Vorgeschichte. Vierter Band. Bronzezeit. Erster Teilband*, München.

Naum, M.

- 2008 *Homelands Lost and Gained. Slavic Migration and Settlement on Bornholm in the Early Middle Ages (Lund Studies in Historical Archaeology 9)*, Lund.

Németi, I.

- 1990 *Contribuți la cunoașterea sfirșitului epoci bronzului din nord-vestul României*, *Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche și Arheologie* 41: 19-54.

Novotná, M.

- 1999 *Beiträge zur Besiedlung der mitteldanubischen Hügelgräberkultur in der Slowakei*, in: *Aktuelle Probleme der Erforschung der Frühbronzezeit in Böhmen und Mähren und in der Slowakei*, edited by J. Batora and J. Peška (*Archaeologica Slovaca Monographiae* 1), Nitra, pp. 241-249.

Olexa, L.

- 2003 *Nízná Myšľa. Osada a pohrebisko z doby bronzovej (Monumenta Archaeologica Slovaciae 7)*, Košice.

Pauli, L.

- 1971 *Studien zur Golasecca-Kultur (Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung. Ergänzungshefte 19)*, Heidelberg.

Peroni, R.

- 1995 *Stand und Aufgaben der Urnenfelderforschung in Italien*, in: *Beiträge zur Chronologie Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen*, edited by H. Müller-Karpe (*Römisch-Germanische Zentralmuseum Mainz. Monographien* 35), Bonn, pp. 225-237.

Plesl, E. and Hrala, J. (eds.)

- 1987 *Die Urnenfelderkulturen Mitteleuropas Symposium, Liblice, 21.-25.10.1985*, Praha.

Pons i Brun, E. and Maya, J.L.

- 1988 *L'Age du Bronze final en Catalogne*, in: *Le groupe Rhin-Suisse-France orientale et la notion de civilisation des Champs d'Urnes. Actes du colloque international de Nemours 1986 (Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France 1)*, edited by P. Brun and C. Mordant, Nemours, pp. 545-557.

Price, T.D., Knipper, C., Grupe, G. and Smrcka, V.

- 2004 *Strontium Isotopes and Prehistoric Human Migration. The Bell Beaker Period in Central Europe*, *European Journal of Archaeology* 7 (1): 9-40.

Prien, R.

2005 *Archäologie und Migration. Vergleichende Studien zur archäologischen Nachweisbarkeit von Wanderungsbewegungen (Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 120)*, Bonn.

Primas, M.

2008 *Bronzezeit zwischen Elbe und Po. Strukturwandel in Zentraleuropa 2200-800 v. Chr. (Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorische Archäologie 150)*, Bonn.

Pryor, A.J.E.

2008 *Following the Fat. Food and Mobility in the European Upper Palaeolithic 45.000 to 18.000 BP*, in: *Movement, mobility and migration*, edited by E. Lightfoot, *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 23 (2): 161-180.

Quast, D.

2009 *Communication, Migration, Mobility and Trade. Explanatory Models for Exchange Processes from the Roman Iron Age to the Viking Age*, in: *Foreigners in Early Medieval Europe. Thirteen International Studies on Early Medieval Mobility*, edited by D. Quast (*Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* 78), Mainz, pp. 1-26.

Ramsl, P.C.

2003 *Migrationsphänomene (!) in der Frühlatènezeit*, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 133: 101-109.

Renfrew, C.

2001 *Archaeologia i język. Łamigłówka pochodzenia Indoeuropejczyków [Archaeology and Language. A Puzzle of Indo-European Origins]*, translated by E. Wilczyńska and A. Marciniak, Warszawa.

Rittershofer, K.-F.

1984 *Der Hortfund von Bühl und seine Beziehungen*, *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 64: 139-415.

Roudil, J.-L. and Guilaine, J.

1976 *Les civilisations de l'Age du Bronze en Languedoc*, in: *La préhistoire française*, vol. 2: *Les civilisations néolithiques et protohistoriques de la France*, edited by J. Guilaine, Paris, pp. 459-469.

Rouse, I.

1986 *Migrations in Prehistory. Inferring Population Movement from Cultural Remains*, New Haven-London.

Roymans, N. and Kortlang, F.

1999 *Urnfield Symbolism, Ancestors and the Land in the Lower Rhine Region*, in: *Land and Ancestors. Cultural Dynamics in the Urnfield Period and the Middle Ages in the Southern Netherlands*, edited by F. Theuvs and N. Roymans (*Archaeological Studies* 4), Amsterdam, pp. 33-62.

Ruiz Zapatero, G.

1983 *Modelos teóricos de invasiones/migraciones en arqueología prehistórica*, *Informació Arqueològica* 41: 147-157.

1997 *Migration Revisited. Urnfields in Iberia*, in: *The Archaeology of Iberia. The Dynamics of Change*, edited by M. Diaz-Andreu, S. Keay, London, pp. 158-176.

Ruppel, Th.

1990 *Die Urnenfelderzeit in der Niederrheinischen Bucht (Rheinische Ausgrabungen 30)*, Köln.

Salamon, M. and Strzelczyk, J. (eds.)

2004 *Wędrówka i etnogeneza w starożytności i w średniowieczu*, Kraków.

Schauer, P.

1975 *Beginn und Dauer der Urnenfelderkultur in Südfrankreich*, *Germania* 53: 47-63.

1991 *Zum Beginn der Urnenfelderkulturen in Ost- und Zentralfrankreich*, in: *Die Anfänge der Urnenfelderkulturen in Europa. Początki kultur pól popielnicowych w Europie*, edited by M. Gedl (*Archaeologia Interregionalis* 13), Warszawa, pp. 157-193.

Smimova, G.I.

1969 *Poselenie Magala – pamyatnik drevnefrakijskoj kul'tury v Prikarpat'e (vtoraya polovina XIII – seredina VII vv. do n.é.)*, in: *Drevnie frakijsy v Severnom Prichernomor'e*, Moskva, pp. 7-34.

1976 *Gavsko-goligradskii krug pamyatnikov vostochno-karpat'skogo basseina*, *Arkhelogicheskii Sbornik* 17: 18-34.

1993 *Zur Frage der thrakischen und illyrischen Komponenten in der Frühhallstattkultur des Vorkarpatenraums*, *Thraco-Dacica* 14/1-2: 91-99.

Stuchlík, S.

1990 *Počátky mohylového pohřbívání v době bronzové na Moravě*, in: *Praveke a slovanské osídlení Moravy. Sborník k 80. narozeninám Josefa Poulíka*, edited by V. Nekuda, Brno.

2006 *Borotice – mohylové pohřebiště z doby bronzové (Spisy Archeologického Ústavu 30)*, Brno.

Sulimirski, T.

1931 *Kultura wysocka*, Kraków.

1938 *Die thrako-kimmerische Periode in Südostpolen*, *Wiener Præhistorische Zeitschrift* 25: 129-151.

1948 *Zagadnienie upadku kultury lużyckiej*, *Slavia Antiqua* 1: 152-165.

Svieshnikov, I.K.

1958 *Pamyatniki plemen bronzovogo veka Prikarpat'ya i Zapadnoi Podolii. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertatsii*, Moskva.

Szabó, G.V.

2007 *Egy Polgár határában előkerült késő bronzkori kút feltárása és rekonstrukciója*, *Ősrégészeti Levelek* 7 (2005): 146-165.

Tasić, N.

1996 *Das Problem der Funde von Szeremle in Banat und ihre Chronologie*, in: *The Yugoslav Danube Basin and the Neighbouring Regions in the 2nd Millennium BC*, edited by N. Tasić, Belgrad-Vršac, pp. 147-163.

Terenozhkin, A.I.

1961 *Predskifskii period na Dneprovskom Pravoberezh'e*, Kiev.

Thrane, H.

1975 *Europæiske forbindelser. Bidrag til studiet af fremmede forbindelser i Danmarks yngre bronzealder (periode IV-V) (Nationalmuseets Skrifter 16)*, København.

1984 *Lusehøj ved Voldtofte – en sydvestfynsk storhøj fra yngre bronzealder (Fynske Studier 13)*, Odense.

Trogmayer, O.

1975 *Das bronzezeitliche Gräberfeld bei Tápé (Fontes Archaeologici Hungariae)*, Budapest.

Trogmayer, O. and Szekeres, L.

1968 *Prilogi itSORii kasnog bronzanog doba Vojvodinie*, *Rad Vojvodanskih Muzeja* 15-17 (1966-68): 17-30.

Urban, T.

1992 *Eine Hausstelle der frühen und mittleren Bronzezeit*, in: *Vorbericht über die jugoslawisch-deutschen Ausgrabungen in der Stellung von Feudvar bei Mošorin von 1986-1990*, *Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 72: 83-109.

Uzelac, J.

1996 *Bronze Age in the South of the Yugoslavian Banat*, in: *The Yugoslav Danube Basin and the Neighbouring Regions in the 2nd Millennium BC*, edited by N. Tasić, Belgrad-Vršac, pp. 23-43.

Wenskus, R.

1961 *Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterzeitlichen Gentes*, Köln.

Wilbertz, O.M.

1982 *Die Urnenfelderkultur in Unterfranken (Materialhefte zur bayerischen Vorgeschichte A 49)*, Kallmünz/Opf.

Wilczyński, M.

2004 *Gocja czy Romania? Migracje Wizygotów, Wandalów i Burgundów w V w. n.e. oraz stosunek ich władców do administracji i ludności rzymskiej*, in: *Wędrowka i etnogeneza w starożytności i w średniowieczu*, edited by M. Salamon and J. Strzelczyk, Kraków, pp. 159-178.

Woźniak, Z.

2004 *Wędrowki Celtów i ich odbicie w źródłach archeologicznych*, in: *Wędrowka i etnogeneza w starożytności i w średniowieczu*, edited by M. Salamon and J. Strzelczyk, Kraków, pp. 123-144.

Zumstein, H.

1976 *Les civilisations de l'Age du Bronze dans l'Est de la France. A – Les civilisations de l'Age du Bronze en Alsace*, in: *La préhistoire française*, vol. 2: *Les civilisations néolithiques et protohistoriques de la France*, edited by J. Guilaine, Paris, pp. 630-639.

