

Mařík, Jan

List of illustrations

In: Mařík, Jan. *Libická sídelní aglomerace a její zázemí v raném středověku*. Klápště, Jan (editor); Měřínský, Zdeněk (editor). Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta, 2009, pp. 178-183

ISBN 9788086124964

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/127565>

Access Date: 11. 12. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

smaller part was dependent on settlements forming the economical hinterland of the agglomeration. **Not a single one of these three models is a reconstruction of the past reality**, because many factors that could influence the results have not been taken into consideration. Higher-ranking members of society as well as some groups of specialised craftsmen did not take the same part on agricultural production as the rest of the community. Furthermore trade, which indubitably strongly influenced the life of Libice, is not part of the calculations. All the three models simply try to define the boundaries of further thinking about the economy of centres like Libice.

Potential Economical Hinterland of Early Medieval Libice

The space of potential economic hinterland of the Early Medieval Libice was defined and explored under several conditions:

A – Diversity of natural environment: The space has to cover more geological units as well as more than one type of natural environment (see Fig. 57, 58).

C – Distance between the Libice agglomeration and borders of the investigated area has to be more than half the distance between Libice and other centres of comparable importance in the same period. Two sites fulfill this condition: the Early Medieval Hillfort of Kouřim and the agglomeration at Kolín (see Fig. 62–65).

B – Density of archaeological activities has to be evenly distributed within borders of investigated area (see Fig. 60).

The potential economical hinterland of Libice was analysed on area covering 500 square kilometres. The main source of archaeological data represented Archaeological Database of Bohemia⁴ (Fig. 61–64). In the middle ‘Hillfort’ period (the first phase of Libice) were founded settlement agglomerations in Libice and Kolín. The agricultural settlements were situated on the edges of river terraces on light sandy brown soils. The density of agricultural settlement increased during the following the Late ‘Hillfort’ period (the second phase of Libice). This chronological phase is also connected with a new feature in the settlement network. There were founded 3 new fortified settlements between Libice and Kolín on the right bank of Elbe (Fig. 64). These fortified locations are very comparable in terms of: 1. location – They were founded on remnants of river terraces surrounded by floodplain, 2. extent – It was ranging between 2.7 ha – 5 ha, 3. dating – They were indwelled in the Late ‘Hillfort’

period (the second phase of Libice) to the Terminal ‘Hillfort’ (the third phase of Libice). For these reasons they are assumed as part of larger settlement system connected with the centres in Libice and Kolín.

The most of open settlements within the analysed area were concentrated along the Cidlina (east of Libice) and the Elbe rivers (south of Libice). The concentration of settlements along the river of Cidlina is assumed to be more convenient for of the economical hinterland of the Libice agglomeration especially in the Late ‘Hillfort’ and the Terminal ‘Hillfort’ when the new strongholds were built along the Elbe river. This hypothesis can confirm also the donation deed to the Saint George monastery at the Prague Castle from 1227. This document mentioned a group of six villages around former stronghold of Libice (Fig. 69). Similar settlement structures based on written sources have been identified in case of other Přemyslid centres. The princely donations (villages, services, taxes, products of specialised craftsmen) to ecclesiastic institutions dated to the 10th – 11th century were concentrated within the distance of 8 kilometres (Fig. 70, 71) and spatial analyses of these donations implies that they mirror part of the economical hinterland of the former centres.

It is obvious that the radius of 6 or 8 km did not cover all the needs of a central place (like some mineral raw materials, specialized professions, etc.). However, it seems rather evident that the impact on natural environment as well as the need of human labour did not exceed the latter mentioned distance of several kilometres.

14.3. List of Illustrations:

Fig. 1 Early Medieval agglomerations. **Litoměřice:** 1 – burial places, 2 – Middle and the Late ‘Hillfort’ period settlement, 3 – the Late ‘Hillfort’ period settlement, 4 – fortification (after *Zápotocký 1965*, Fig. 27); **Kaupang:** Viking period (after *Clarke – Ambrosiani 1991*, Fig. 4.16); **Žatec:** Early Medieval agglomeration, A – castle, B – fortified outer bailey, C – southern unfortified bailey, D – suburbium, 1 – non-church burial places, 2 – settlement (modified after: *Čech 2008*, Fig. 1); **Haithabu:** Viking period, (after *Clarke – Ambrosiani 1991*, Fig. 4.12); **Gniezno:** 10th–11th century, A – castle, B – cathedral, C – church, D – settlement at the Lech Hill, E – stronghold, F – burial place, G – settlement, H – dam, I – bridge (after *Janiak – Stryżewski 2001*, Ryc. 2); **Dorestad:** Early Medieval Age (after *Verwers 1988*, Fig. 16); **Staré Město:** Great Moravian settlement agglomeration, A – Na Valách church, B – Na Špitálkách, C – St. Michael church and Na Dědině palace, D – church Rybárny, E – chapel at the island of St. George (after *Galuška 2008*); **Nitra:** Great Mo-

4 The database is central evidence of archaeological excavations in Bohemia and it is maintained by the Institute of Archaeology of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague.

ravian Period, A – stronghold, B – outer bailey, C – monastery (hypothetic), d – church (hypothetic), e – church (hypothetic), f – settlement, g – burial place, h – settlement graves (after *Fusek 2008*, Abb. 14); **Kolín**: the Middle and the Late ‘Hillfort’ period settlement, 1 – individual Early Medieval graves, 2 – settlement, 3 – floodplain, A – height at St. Bartholomew church, B – Kolín-Hánín (modified after *Valentová – Tvrđík 2004*); **Libice nad Cidlinou**: the Middle and the Late ‘Hillfort’ period settlement (see Fig. 2).

Fig. 2 Early Medieval settlement agglomeration of Libice. A – inner bailey (acropolis), B – outer bailey, C – settlement on the right bank of Cidlina, D – Kanín, E – Kuchynka, F – Huslák, G – U radiostanice, H – Mýto, I – Na Střelnici, J – Na křížkách (Trench 320).

Fig. 3 Libice nad Cidlinou 2007, inner bailey (Photo: M. Gojda).

Fig. 4 Libice nad Cidlinou, inner bailey, non-destructive research conducted in the year 2008. Black: cropmarks, coloured: concentrations of Early Medieval pottery from surface collection.

Fig. 5 Libice nad Cidlinou, map of archaeological trenches. 1 – Early Medieval graves, 2 – trenches with Early Medieval sunken features outside the fortified area, 3 – trenches with Early Medieval cultural layer, 4 – excavations of J. Hellich.

Fig. 6 Libice nad Cidlinou, fortified area. Locations with finds documenting processing of gold, silver and iron; 2 – jeweller’s pliers (Trench 14A/2).

Fig. 7 Libice nad Cidlinou, trenches on southern edge of the outer bailey, section through the fortification.

Trench 236/1: a – greyish ashy and sandy loam; b – greyish white sintered sand; c – reddish yellow sandy loam; d – marlstone; 1001 topsoil; 1003 brownish sandy loam, bricks and marlstone clasts; 1004, 10011, 1013, 1022 yellowish brown, sporadically reddish sandy loam; 1007 compact brownish sandy loam; 1008 yellowish brown sandy loam with low portion of charcoals; 1010 greyish sandy loam; 1012 reddish yellow sandy loam; 1016, 1018, 1020, 1021, 1027, 1032 greyish white sintered sand; 1017, 1029 greyish ashy and sandy loam; 1019 reddish yellow sandy loam; 1024 greyish sandy loam; 1026, 1028 reddish yellow sandy loam; 1027, 1030 brownish sandy loam; 1031 greyish brown sandy loam; 1033 brownish sandy loam; 1035 yellowish sand; 1036 brownish loamy sand.

Trench 236/2: 2001 greyish loam with marl clasts (60%), rich in humus; 2002 greyish brown loamy ma-

trix with marl stones (up to 25 cm); 2003 black organic layer; 2004 calcareous dark brown loam with organic material; 2005 greyish coarse grained sand with low portion of loam; 2006 yellowish sand.

Trench 265/6: 1 brownish sandy loam with charcoals; 2 marlstone clasts; 3 marlstone clasts with sandy loam (50%), brownish sandy loam (50%); 4 brownish sandy loam; 5 yellowish sandy loam; 6 brownish sandy loam, marlstone blocks (30%); 7 marlstone clasts with sandy loam (50%), brownish sandy loam (50%); 8 greyish brown with white sandstone clasts, charcoals; 9 yellowish sand with pieces of sandy loam; 10 greyish sandy loam with pieces of yellowish clay, charcoals, daub; 11 yellowish loam (80%), daub, charcoals; 12 greyish brown sandy loam; 13 greyish sandy loam with pieces of yellowish clay, charcoals, daub; 14 greyish brown loam, rare charcoals; 15 greyish brown sandy loam, charcoals, rare daub; 16 greyish sandy loam, charcoals, daub, sporadically marlstone blocks, rare pieces of clay; 17 greyish sandy loam, charcoals up to 2 cm, rare marlstone blocks up to 20 cm; 19 greyish sand, charcoals and sandstone clasts; 20 compact greyish sandy loam, with pieces of yellowish clay and charcoals; 21 greyish sand, daub clasts and organic material; 22 greyish sandy loam with pieces of yellowish clay and charcoals; 23 yellowish sand with brownish loam; 24 greyish sandy loam with pieces of yellowish clay and charcoals; 25 yellowish sand; 26 greyish sandy loam and marlstones up to 25 cm, charcoals; 27 compact greyish sandy loam; 30 marlstone blocks up to 30 cm (80%), greyish sandy loam (20%); 32 – greyish watery loam, marlstone blocks up to 15 cm (50%), timber pieces; 33 – greyish sandy and watery loam, rare charcoals, rich in timber pieces; 34 – auburn sandy loam on charcoals and timber pieces; 35 – auburn sandy loam, with organic material rich in charcoals and timber pieces; 36 – greyish coarse grained sand with pieces of blackish sandy loam rich in charcoals and timber pieces; 38 – auburn sandy loam, numerous timber pieces; 39 – greyish coarse grained sand with brownish loam layers, charcoals and timber pieces; 40 – compact blackish brown sandy loam rich in charcoals and timber pieces; 41 – marlstone blocks up to 10 cm; 42 – yellowish fine-grained sand; 43 – marlstone blocks up to 10 cm.

Trench 265/7: 1 compact greyish sandy loam rich in charcoals, rare marlstone blocks up to 10 cm; 2 marlstone blocks up to 60 cm (80%), compact greyish sandy loam rich in charcoals (20%); 3 brownish yellow loamy sand; 4 marlstone blocks up to 60 cm (80%), compact greyish sandy loam rich in charcoals (20%); 5 greyish brown sandy loam (50%), marlstone blocks up to 10 cm (50%); 6 greyish sandy loam

(50%), marlstone blocks up to 10 cm (50%), rare marlstone blocks up to 20 cm; 7 compact yellowish loamy sand; 8 brownish sandy loam rich in charcoals, rare marlstone blocks up to 10 cm; 9 greyish fine-grained sand, rare marlstone blocks up to 20 cm; 10 brownish loamy sand rich in charcoals, pebble stones up to 3 cm, low portion of timber pieces; 11 greyish coarse grained sand rich in pebble stones up to 10 cm; 12 coarse grained loamy sand rich in pebble stones up to 3 cm; 13 brownish loamy sand; 14 frictional greyish fine-grained sand rich in charcoals; 15 brownish loamy sand, rare organic materials, pieces of timber; 16 yellowish fine-coarse sand; 17 greyish brown sand, rare charcoals, marlstones blocks up to 10 cm; 18 greyish brown sand fine-coarse sand rich in charcoals; 19 yellowish fine coarse sand; 20 blackish watery loam rich in charcoals and pieces of timber; 21 yellowish coarse grained sand rich in pebble stones up to 1 cm; 22 yellowish fine coarse sand; 23 greyish fine coarse sand with brownish sandy loamy sand layers; 24 greyish sand (80%), clay (20%); 25 brownish sandy loam (40%), marlstone clasts up to 10 cm (60%); 27 greyish sandy loam rich in brick and glass clasts; 28 compact brownish sandy loam; 29 greyish sand rich in marlstone blocks up to 10 cm.

Trench 267a:1 greyish brown loam with marlstone clasts (up to 5 cm); 2 greyish brown loam, rare marlstone blocks (up to 15 cm), low portion of charcoals; 3 yellowish brown silty loam; 4 auburn sandy loam (50%), sandy loam (50%); 5 marlstones up to 25 cm (80%), greyish brown sandy loam (20%); 6 greyish sandy loam (50%), marlstone blocks up to 10 cm (50%); 7 marlstone clasts up to 5 cm (90%), rare marlstone blocks up to 30 cm; 8 greyish black loamy sand, numerous charcoals; 9 marlstone blocks up to 40 cm (70%), marlstone clasts up to 5 cm (20%), greyish loamy sand (10%); 10 yellowish compact sand, rare charcoals and pebble stones up to 3 cm; 11 greyish brown loamy sand, numerous pebble stones up to 3 cm, rare marlstone blocks up to 10 cm; 12 coarse grained sand, numerous pebble stones up to 3 cm, rare slag.

Fig. 8 Libice nad Cidlinou, selected fragments of pottery vessels significant for individual chronological phases.

Fig. 9 Libice nad Cidlinou, Trenches 236, 265/6, 265/7, 267a. Absolute percentual distribution of decorated sherds and rims. 1 – horizontal lines, 2 – combed stitches, 3 – combed wavy lines, 4 – the so-called pottery of the Slavniks phase, 5 – simple wavy lines, 6 – simple rims, 7 – rims with emphasized upper edge.

Fig. 10 Libice nad Cidlinou, outer bailey, Trench 28 (1981). Selected pottery sherds from layer 6 in the inner defensive ditch, related to layer 5 containing a denar of Bořivoj II from the years 1118–1120. 1–10 – pottery with drawn up rim; 11 – lid; 12 – small bowl; 13, 14 & 17 – basal markings; 15, 16 – club-shaped rim of a graphite-coated storage jar; 18 – denar of Bořivoj II.

Fig. 11 Kouřim, At St. George and St. Kliment. Absolute percentual distribution of selected rims, after M. Šolle (1969). A – simple rims, B+D – rims with emphasized upper edge, E – drawn up rims.

Fig. 12 Libice nad Cidlinou, inner bailey cemetery. A – graves dated stratigraphically, B – graves dated by pottery from the filling, Blue – the Middle 'Hillfort' period, red – the Late 'Hillfort' period.

Fig. 13 Libice nad Cidlinou, outer bailey, Trench 267h (2004). Superposition of an Early Slavic sunken dwelling (layers 11–13) and a sunken feature dated to the Middle 'Hillfort' period (layers 5, 4, 8), the both features are covered by a layer (2, 10) dated to the Late 'Hillfort' period.

Fig. 14 Libice nad Cidlinou, outer bailey, Trench 267h (2004). 1–5 – the so-called pottery of the Slavniks phase (layers 2, 10); 6–7 – ceramics from the Central Bohemian production sphere – grey-white with gritty surface (layers 2, 10); 8–12 – layer 5; 13–15 – layer 11.

Fig. 15 Sunken features outside fortifications on the right bank of Cidlina. A – the Middle 'Hillfort' period, B – the Late 'Hillfort' period. 1 – cemetery, 2 – sunken feature dated to the 'Hillfort' period, 3 – sunken features with slag in the filling, 4 – sunken feature dated to the Middle 'Hillfort' period, 5 – sunken feature dated to the Late 'Hillfort' period, 6 – floodplain.

Fig. 16 Libice nad Cidlinou, burial place 'U cukrovaru' (after Hellich 1892)

Fig. 17 Libice nad Cidlinou, burial place 'U nádraží'. Redrawn after original field documentation, archive of the Polabské Museum in Poděbrady, signature 13 830.

Fig. 18 Kanín, review of archaeological excavations conducted in 1905–2005.

Fig. 19 Sunken features at the site of *Kanín II*.

Fig. 20 Libice nad Cidlinou, the site of '*Na střelnici*'. Archaeological excavations conducted in the year 1891, archive of the Polabské Museum in Poděbrady, signature 13 830.

Fig. 21 Kanín, Trench 320. Blue – sunken features dated to the Early Slavic period.

Fig. 22 Confluence of Morava and Dyje Rivers. Red – sand dunes with Early Medieval settlement (after *Poláček – Škojec – Havlíček 2005, Abb. 4*).

Fig. 23 Map of 'The Elbe flood' (1885). A – site '*Huslík*', B – nameless site to the east of the site '*Huslík*', C – '*U radiostanice*', 1, 2 – archaeological excavations (1970–72). Red dashed line – extent of sand-gravel terraces according geological map (after *Holásek et al. 1993*).

Fig. 24 Libice nad Cidlinou, site '*Kuchynka*' from the north.

Fig. 25 Burial places at Kanín on the map of the first Military Survey. 1 – Kanín II, 2 – Kanín I, III. © 1st (2nd) Military Survey, Section No. 110, Austrian State Archive/Military Archive, Vienna, © Geoinformatics Laboratory, University of J.E.Purkyne – <http://www.geolab.cz>, © Ministry of Environment of Czech Republic – <http://www.env.cz>.

Fig. 26 Kanín, site '*Na křemenu*'. Archaeological excavations in 1903. archiv archive of Polabské muzeum in Poděbrady, sign: 13 829.

Fig. 27 Kanín 2004. Geophysical survey between sites of Kanín I and Kanín III (R. Křivánek, ARÚ AV ČR, Praha, v. v. i.).

Fig. 28 Kanín II. Archaeological excavations conducted in 1961–1970.

Fig. 29 Libice nad Cidlinou, cemetery '*Na rúžku*'. Archive of the Polabské Museum in Poděbrady, signature 13 829.

Fig. 30 Libice nad Cidlinou, cemetery '*U katolické fary*'.

Fig. 31 Libice in the second half of 17th century. After M. B. Bolelucky: *Rosa Boemica sivr Vita sancti Woytiechi agnomine Adalberti Pragensis episcopi Vngariae Poloniae Prussiae apostoli*, Praha 1668. Drawn by Karel Škréta.

Fig. 32 Libice nad Cidlinou, cemetery '*U katolické fary*', assumed extent of the burial place.

Fig. 33 Libice nad Cidlinou, cemetery in the street *Ke hradišti*.

Fig. 34 Libice nad Cidlinou, cemetery '*U evangelické fary*'

Fig. 35 Kanín II, Grave 187 (photo: F. Velímský).

Fig. 36 Kanín II, cubature of graves (in m³).

Fig. 37 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, materials used for constructions of graves. 1 wood and stones, 2 wood, 3 stones.

Fig. 38 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, orientation of graves. 1 S – N, 2 SE – NW, 3 SES – NWN, 4 SW – NE, 5 SWS – NEN, 6 N – S, 7 NE – SW, 8 NW – SE, 9 NWN – SES, 10 E – W, 11 ESE – WNW, 12 W – E, 13 WSW – ENE, 14 WNW – ESE.

Fig. 39 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with unusual position of body. 1 man, 2 woman, 3 infans/juvenis, 4 adultus, 5 maturus, 6 senilis, 7 adult, 8 unspecified.

Fig. 40 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with knives according to their length. 1 man, 2 woman, 3 child.

Fig. 41 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with temporal rings according to their diameter. Black: diameter was not recorded.

Fig. 42 Relative proportion of temporal rings according to their diameter at cemeteries in Libice agglomeration.

Fig. 43 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with jewellery. 1 button, 2 captorg-box, 3 earring with spiral pendant, 4 grape-shape earring, 5 basket-shape earring, 6 ring, 7 pyramid-shape earring, 8 bell, 9 fibula, 10 tag-shape temporal ring.

Fig. 44 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with necklaces. Beads: 1 stone, 2 amber, 3 glass, 4 olive beads, 5 segmented beads.

Fig. 45 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with ceramic vessels and buckets. 1 bucket, 2 ceramic vessels dated to the Late 'Hillfort'

period, 3 ceramic vessels dated to the Middle 'Hillfort' period, 4 ceramic vessel dated to the 'Hillfort' period.

Fig. 46 Relative proportion of ceramic vessels according to their volume from Kanín cemeteries.

Fig. 47 Cemeteries in Libice agglomeration, distribution of graves with swords, spurs, axes and arrowheads. 1 sword, 2 spur, 3 axe, 4 arrowhead.

Fig. 48 Cemeteries at Libice, inner bailey and Kanín. Relative proportion of items indicating higher social status.

Fig. 49 Libice, agglomeration. Estimation of the population size of the agglomeration.

Fig. 50 Libická agglomeration, excavated graves and estimation of total number buried individuals.

Fig. 51 Dating of cemeteries within Libice agglomeration. 1 the Middle 'Hillfort' period, 2 the Late 'Hillfort' period, 3 the Late – Terminal 'Hillfort' periods.

Fig. 52 Libice, agglomeration. Estimation of the arable land area.

Fig. 53 Wood management in historical sources. 1. British Library, London. Ms. 19619, The Julius Calendar and Hymnai, fo. 7, Cantenbury, the first half of the 11th century. 2. British Library, London. Kings Ms 9 fol. 3v, Netherlands, 16th century. 3. British Library, London. 4. Egerton Ms. 1146 fol. 11, Germanz or Austria, around 1500. 5. Saint Wenceslas working on field. Liber depictus, National Bibliothek Wien, around 1350. 6. Podiven escapes to woods. Liber depictus, National Bibliothek Wien, around 1350. 7. British Library, London. Ms. c2192-02, f.108v, Tours (France), 1510–1525.

Fig. 54 Libice, agglomeration. Area estimation of the clear cut forest needed for construction of rampart and houses in Phases I and II.

Fig. 55 Libice, agglomeration. Estimation of coppiced forest needed for heating and regular renovations of homesteads.

Fig. 56 The agglomeration of Libice, spatial models of hypothetical demands on arable land and timber resources. 1 – brown sandy soil; 2 – black soil; 3 – gley soils, podzolic soils; 4 – floodplain deposits; 5 – water and oxbows; 6 – recently damaged; 7 – coppiced forest; 8 – clear cut forest, 9 – arable land; 10 – the Middle 'Hillfort' period settlement; 11 – the Late 'Hillfort' peri-

od settlement; 12 – the Late – Terminal 'Hillfort' period settlement, 13 – 'Hillfort' period settlement; 14 – 'Hillfort' period cemetery; 15 – Middle 'Hillfort' period cemetery; 16 – the Late 'Hillfort' period cemetery.

Fig. 57 Basic geological units of the analysed area (after Demek et kol. 1987)

Fig. 58 Map of potential natural vegetation on analysed area (after Neuhäuslová et kol. 2001). 1. Bird cherry-ash woodland, 2. Oak woodland with *Lathyrus versicolor* and/or *Buglossoides purpureocaerulea*, 3. Oak woodland with *Potentilla alba*, 4. Woodrush-oak and/or silver fir-oak woodland, 5. Oak woodland with *Molinia arundinacea*, 6. Pine-oak woodland with *Festuca ovina*, 7. Elm-pedunculate oak woodland, 8. Oak-hornbeam woodland with *Melampyrum nemorosum*, 9. Lime-oak woodland with *Betula Pendula*.

Fig. 59 Analysed area, map showing activities of amateur archaeologists Jan Hellich a František Dvořák at the end of the 19th and in the first half of the 20th century.

Fig. 60 Intensity of archaeological activities in analysed area according to number of archaeological finds and excavations in the Archaeological database of Bohemia.

Fig. 61 Analysed area, the Early Slavic period (RS 1).

Fig. 62 Analysed area, the Early 'Hillfort' period (RS 2), a – finds dated to the 'Hillfort' period, b – settlements dated to the Early 'Hillfort' period (RS 2), c – strongholds.

A – The Middle 'Hillfort' period, B – the Late 'Hillfort' period. 1 – cemetery, 2 – sunken features dated to the 'Hillfort' period, 3 – sunken features with slag in the filling, 4 – sunken features dated to the Middle 'Hillfort' period 5 – sunken features dated to the Late 'Hillfort' period, 6 – floodplain.

Fig. 63 Analysed area, the Middle 'Hillfort' period (RS 3), a – finds dated to the 'Hillfort' period, b – settlements dated to the Middle 'Hillfort' period, c – cemeteries dated to the Middle 'Hillfort' period, d – strongholds, 1 – Kolaje – grave with axe (Hellich 1928).

Fig. 64 Analysed area, the Late 'Hillfort' period (RS 4), a – finds dated to the 'Hillfort' period, b – settlements dated to the Late 'Hillfort' period, c – cemeteries dated

to the Late 'Hillfort' period, d – strongholds, 1 – Oldříš (stronghold), 2 – Velký Osek – *Na kopci*, 3 – Pňov Předhradí, 4 – Hradištko – Svatovík (stronghold), 5 – Klavary, 6 – Hradištko (cemetery), 7 – deserted village Krněvice, 8 – deserted village Kratonohy.

Fig. 65 Kolín settlement agglomeration in Early Medieval period. Red – settlement finds, black – cemeteries.

Fig. 66 Velký Osek – *Na Oldříši*, finds from excavations conducted by Jan Hellich.

Fig. 67 Hradištko u Kolína, finds from surface collections.

Fig. 68 Pottery with remains of gold-smelting dated to the Late 'Hillfort' period. 1 – Velký Osek – *Na Oldříši* (Photo: Jan Zavřel), 2 – Libice nad Cidlinou, Trench 14/A2 (Photo: author).

Fig. 69 Sites owned by Saint George monastery at the Prague Castle in 1227.

Fig. 70 Number of princely donations to cannonries of Vyšehrad, Litoměřice and Stará Boleslav according to their distance from particular cannonry.

Fig. 71 Stronghold Prácheň and its potential hinterland. 1 – sites mentioned in donation deed for monastery in Břevnov, 2 – sites dated to the 'Hillfort' period in evidence of the Archaeological database of Bohemia.

14.4. List of tables

Tab. 1 Kanín II, 1: Grave 4, 2: Grave 5, 3: Grave 5, 4: Grave 7, 5: Grave 8, 6: Grave 9, 7: Grave 9, 8: Grave 10.

Tab. 2 Kanín II, 1: Grave 11, 2: Grave 13, 3: Grave 14, 4: Grave 15.

Tab. 3 Kanín II, Graves 18–20, 1: Grave 20.

Tab. 4 Kanín II, Graves 22–25, 1: Grave 23, 2: Grave 24, 3: Grave 25.

Tab. 5 Kanín II, Grave 25, 1–14: Grave 25.

Tab. 6 Kanín II, Graves 27, 28, 1: Grave 28.

Tab. 7 Kanín II, Graves 29–31, 1: Grave 29, 2: Grave 31, 3: Grave 32.

Tab. 8 Kanín II, Graves 33–37, 1: Grave 36.

Tab. 9 Kanín II, Graves 38–43, 1: Grave 38, 2: Grave 39, 3: Grave 43.

Tab. 10 Kanín II, Graves 44, 45, 1: Grave 44.

Tab. 11 Kanín II, Graves 46–48, 1: Grave 46, 2–3: Grave 48, 4–5: Grave 47.

Tab. 12 Kanín II, Graves 49–53, 1–2: Grave 52.

Tab. 13 Kanín II, Grave 54, 1–5: Grave 54.

Tab. 14 Kanín II, 1–8: Grave 54.

Tab. 15 Kanín II, Graves 55–57, 59.

Tab. 16 Kanín II, Graves 58, 60, 61, 1–3: Grave 58.

Tab. 17 Kanín II, Grave 62–65, 1–5: Grave 64.

Tab. 18 Kanín II, Grave 68–69, 1–2: Grave 69.

Tab. 19 Kanín II, Grave 70–71, 1–3: Grave 70, 4–5: grave 71.

Tab. 20 Kanín II, Grave 72–73, 1: Grave 73, 2–4: Grave e 72.

Tab. 21 Kanín II, Grave 74–75, 1: Grave 74.

Tab. 22 Kanín II, Grave 76–77, 1: Grave 76, 2–6: grave 77.

Tab. 23 Kanín II, Grave e 78–80.

Tab. 24 Kanín II, Grave 81–83, 1–2: Grave 82.

Tab. 25 Kanín II, Grave 84–86, 1: Grave 84, 2–10: Grave 86.

Tab. 26 Kanín II, Grave 87–89, 1–2: Grave 88, 3: Grave 89.

Tab. 27 Kanín II, Grave 90–93, 1–3: Grave 90, 4: Grave 93.

Tab. 28 Kanín II, Grave 94–95, 1–3: Grave 94, 4: Grave 95.

Tab. 29 Kanín II, Grave 96–99.

Tab. 30 Kanín II, Grave e 100–103.

Tab. 31 Kanín II, Grave 104–107, 1: Grave 106, 2: Grave 105, 3–5: Grave 107.

Tab. 32 Kanín II, Grave 108–111, 1: Grave 108.

Tab. 33 Kanín II, Grave 112–115, 1: Grave 114.

Tab. 34 Kanín II, Grave 116–118, 1–6: Grave 118, 7–10: Grave 117.

Tab. 35 Kanín II, Grave 119–122, 1–3: Grave 122, 4–6: Grave 121.

Tab. 36 Kanín II, Grave 123–126, 1: Grave 123.

Tab. 37 Kanín II, Grave 125, 1–17: Grave 125.

Tab. 38 Kanín II, 1–10: Grave 125.

Tab. 39 Kanín II, Grave 127–128, 1–3: Grave 127, 4–6: Grave 128.

Tab. 40 Kanín II, Grave 129, 131, 1: Grave 129.

Tab. 41 Kanín II, Grave 132, 1–6: Grave 132.

Tab. 42 Kanín II, Grave 133, 1–21: Grave 133.

Tab. 43 Kanín II, Grave 134–135, 1: Grave 134, 2–3: Grave 135.

Tab. 44 Kanín II, Grave 136–138, 1–11: Grave 138.

Tab. 45 Kanín II, Grave 139–142, 1: Grave 139, 2–4: Grave 141, 5–7: Grave 140.

Tab. 46 Kanín II, Grave 143–146, 1–5: Grave 144, 6: Grave 145.

Tab. 47 Kanín II, Grave 147–149, 1–3: Grave 148.

Tab. 48 Kanín II, Grave 150–152, 1–3: Grave 150.

Tab. 49 Kanín II, Grave 153–155, 1–2: Grave 153.

Tab. 50 Kanín II, Grave 156, 158–159, 1: Grave 159.

Tab. 51 Kanín II, Grave 157, 160–162, 1: Grave 157, 2: Grave 161.