

Summary

Jiří Sláma: Mode of governance and its transformations in early medieval Bohemia

The ethnic composition of medieval Europe was basically completed during the Migration Period. Justinian I's attempt to restore the Roman Empire failed and considerable changes to this effect did not recur until Charlemagne's reign. The Slavs appeared on the scene for the first time, their beginnings being characterised by the Balto-Slavic language unity connected with the territories of Ukraine and Belarus. The Migration Period began in 375 with an onrush of the Huns who pushed out the Germanic Goths – a response to drought in the area between the Black Sea and Mongolia. The Slavic expansion 150 years later was induced either by a population explosion among the Slavs or by the pressure of other nomads, such as the Avars. The first known Slavic migration took place in the first half of the sixth century, heading southward along the eastern arc of the Carpathians into the Byzantine Empire's territory. Thanks to their excellent organisational and military abilities, the Slavic rulers occupied the Balkans. Another stream of the Slavs was heading to the west, through southern Poland to territories north of the Danube. A part of it went also westwards into the regions near the Rivers Naab, Saale and Danube. At the same time or a somewhat later, the Slavs migrated to the northern part of Eastern Europe, to areas with Finno-Ugric and Baltic inhabitants. It was during these movements that the Slavs came also to Bohemia, where they met earlier Germanic inhabitants whose toponymic traces are sought in names such as Vltava, Říp, etc. This earlier population disappeared in the seventh century – it had either been assimilated or left the land. The earliest Slavic population of Bohemia were farmers with a culture characterised by Prague-type pottery and unfortified settlements. It was probably ruled by an elite with administrative, judicial, military and cultic functions. When the Avars penetrated the Carpathian Basin (khaganate), they started to subjugate Slavic inhabitants, which aroused revolts from the late sixth century. A chronicle by the Burgundian monk Fredegar describing the victorious fight of the Slavs against the Avars and later also against the Franks came into existence in the 660s. They were led by Samo, a tribal prince with a judicial, military and sacral authority. An analogous social organization existed among the Polabian Slavs. At the same time, one of the first documented Christian missions led by St Amantius appears in the southern neighbourhood of Bohemia. Slavic settlement in Bohemia continued developing after Samo's death: first hillforts emerged, specialized production is documented (metallurgy, smithery, jewellery). Another wave of inhabitants burying their dead under barrows came in the eighth century. After the second khaganate came into existence in the second half of the seventh century, areas with a Slavic populace and elites taking over the Avar culture formed on the periphery of the Avar territory. This situation changed during the reign of Charlemagne. He destroyed the Avar Empire in the late eighth century, and the Slavs created independent organised units. In 805, the Franks invaded Bohemia, besieged Canburg Castle and killed a ruler named Lecho. Another campaign in the following year resulted in the imposition of a tribute on the local inhabitants. Frankish influence manifested itself in the culture of the local nobility, which sought close contacts with Frankish culture and built courts at its castles following the model of Frankish magnates. Local rulers tried to gain Frankish wives, and the influence of Bavarian missions was penetrating the land. During the ninth century, the Bohemian lands found themselves between Carolingian and Moravian influences. Moravia gained hegemony in the territory of the former khaganate. The Carolingian pressure ceased after the death of Charlemagne (814). As late as 845, the Annals of Fulda mention Bohemian dukes and their retinues who came – probably to Regensburg – to be baptized. Frankish expeditions continued invading Bohemia; in 857, one headed towards Duke Wistrach's castle and expelled his son Slavitah from it; he fled to Duke Rostislav in Moravia. In 872, the army of the archbishop of Mainz defeated the forces of five Bohemian dukes; later sources add the name of Duke Bořivoj to them. He had himself bap-

tized at the court of Svatopluk of Great Moravia in the late 870s or early 880s; this resembles the story of a Vistulan duke who, however, accepted Christianity under Svatopluk's coercion. The example of both rulers documents a subjugation of neighbours whose obedience a Christian conqueror compelled, including the acceptance of the Christian religion. After Bořivoj's death (888/889), Svatopluk reigned in Bohemia until 894. After his death, the reign in Bohemia went to Bořivoj's son Spytihněv who, together with other Bohemian leaders, sought the protection of Arnulf, the ruler of East Francia. He did so again in 897 when other dukes acted for the last time as representatives of Bohemia; from then on, only the Přemyslids appeared in this role. The building of the Přemyslids' central Bohemian domain with a system of defensive and administrative castles had been completed by Spytihněv's death. Bavarian missionaries were active all over Bohemia (and especially in central Bohemia). The Hungarians started to penetrate Central Europe from the late ninth century. Their attacks destroyed Great Moravia and caused a disintegration of East Francia, which was re-consolidated under the reign of Henry I (919–936). The short reign of Bořivoj's second son, Vratislav I, took place at that time, and Vratislav's son Wenceslas ascended the ducal seat probably in 925. Wenceslas's fight against a neighbour from Kouřim documents that while the land was not yet united under the Přemyslids, the individual regional dukes acknowledged their overlordship. Wenceslas reconciled with Henry I in 929 and confirmed the tributary status of the Bohemian lands. He was murdered in 935 by his brother Boleslas I, who commenced the unification of the individual regional duchies under his reign. The first to be conquered was the castle of a *subregulus* in the western part of Bohemia. In 950, Boleslas managed to cope with Otto I's pressure, thus unbinding his hands for a major expansion into Lesser Poland, Moravia and as far as the Kievan Rus'. The gigantic territorial conglomerate he had built was kept alive for some time by his son, Boleslas II. Several important steps took place during his reign, including the foundation of the bishopric of Prague. Afterwards, however, the whole *regnum* entered a deep crisis that was not to be overcome until the reigns of Dukes Oldřich and Břetislav I.

Summary

Ivana Boháčová: Possibilities of knowledge of the genesis of early state based on archaeological study of its (historically known) centres. Example: historical core of Bohemia

The contribution deals with the possibilities offered for the study of the genesis of the early Bohemian state by archaeological sources from those early medieval power centres within its historical core for which we also have numerous written sources available. This concerns above all the testimony of the sources from those centres that are described as residences of members of the Přemyslid dynasty in the written sources. For them, archaeological sources document a strikingly synchronous development in the initial stages of their existence in the late ninth and the first half of the tenth centuries - the construction and subsequent early first reconstruction of monumental walls of the same type, the emergence of sacral buildings and a unified manifestation of the arrival and further development of a new technology in the sphere of the most common utility object - pottery vessels. These manifestations, including the topography of the centres, identical in general features and with similar spatial parameters, testify to a unified model of the construction of a power unit and thus to an advanced stage of the centralization of power based on economic prosperity and a concentration of economic potential. Another documented feature is the concurrence of the power rise of these centres with the onset of the process of Christianization manifesting itself in higher strata of society. The text also points out a conspicuous concurrence of the second wave of changes, manifesting itself in a synchronous reconstruction of the walls of these centres (and apparently also the construction of new centres), with the historically documented assumption of power by Boleslas I.

Summary

Jan Hasil: Ducēs Boemanorum of the pre-Přemyslid period as an issue of interpretation

The title of the duke of the Bohemians (*dux Boemanorum*) is usually linked to its meaning in the context of the Přemyslid state in the tenth to twelfth centuries and, thus, the descendants of Duke Bořivoj I. Written sources of the Carolingian period, however, know about thirty other, sharply, less sharply or altogether vaguely profiled personages of the ninth and early tenth centuries with whom this title is connected. Despite the long tradition of research into the Bohemian *gens* and the Bohemian state, these dukes have not found a stable place in Czech history and therefore pose an interpretive issue also for current medieval studies. The present text points to some aspects of the prosopography of west Slavic dukes of the Carolingian period based on an arbitrarily chosen reference group. Rather than on historical narration, it is primarily focused on an analysis of the highest echelon of the social structure in Bohemia and adjacent regions in the ninth and early tenth centuries. The key finding seems to be that the discussed titular is independent of those components of the identity of its bearer that are bound to his ethnicity, while clearly correlating with his integration in the social structure of the Frankish world, primarily with the acceptance of the Christian faith. Frankish cultural, political and power influence (especially the imposed tribute) can thus be contemplated as an important catalyst of the beginnings of the state-forming process in Bohemia. The study addresses F. Graus's long-ago appeal to search for traces of non-Cosmas approaches to older Czech history.

znamně podílelo na christianizaci země a podstatným způsobem figurovalo v mnohdy krutém procesu budování českého raně středověkého státu, zaniklo bez další sídlištní kontinuity.

PhDr. Andrea Bartošková
Archeologický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i.
Letenská 4
118 01 Praha 1 – Malá Strana
bartoskova@arup.cas.cz

Summary

Andrea Bartošková: Budeč – archaeology's contribution to the understanding of the process of building early Bohemian state

The text offers an overview of the results of the author's revision of the conclusions of the previous archaeological study of Budeč (M. Šolle and Z. Váňa). The first discussed topic is the dating of the origin of this important Přemyslid centre. Its foundation was originally dated in the late eighth or early ninth century. The author newly dates the origin of Budeč in the interval between the last third of the ninth and the early tenth century due to the occurrence of later pottery from the Middle Hillfort Period in the earliest wall and also in view of the relative stratigraphic relations including the relationship between this wall and the rotunda (built in 895–915). The author characterizes the subsequent period of c. the first third of the tenth century as the prime of the existence of this power centre. At its beginning, Budeč was included among the first Christianization centres in Bohemia; Budeč's rotunda of St Peter is the first church by which graves of persons of high social status have been detected. At the same time, as documented by written sources, Budeč was one of the residences of members of the Přemyslid dynasty. The construction of a wall protecting the bailey formed a massive two-section compound whose form indicates a rise of the locality. Contrary to earlier conclusions, the author dates the subsequent radical turn in the development of the hillfort in the second third of the tenth century. Archaeological sources document in unison that a violent incursion took place at that time. The destruction of a part of the wall, a mass grave of butchered people, the end of the existence of a ducal court and, finally, the overlapping of the cemetery near the rotunda by a newly built wall all fall into a period when, according to written sources, Duke Boleslas seized power after the liquidation of his brother Wenceslas. Written sources speak also about the persecution and killing of Wenceslas's supporters. From the perspective of the testimony of archaeological sources, the subsequent period is characterized by a spatially organized development of the area, new type of settlement features and mass occurrence of already standardized pottery, i.e., a qualitatively different form of development. This transformation is bound to the second half of the tenth century. The castle's form then remained almost unchanged until the end of its existence. This end, which the author shifts to the second half of the eleventh century, represents the fifth milestone in its development.

Summary

**Petr Čech: “Great Moravian“ and later early medieval horizon in Žatec
(summary of existing research)**

Archaeological research taking place in Žatec since 1992 has shed much light on the beginnings of the local settlement agglomeration. It is situated on the right bank of the River Ohře, on an elongated pear-shaped promontory with an area of 15 ha. A pointed fortification ditch divided the promontory into an 8-hectare castle and a 6.5-hectare outer bailey. A group of sunken features arranged into a rectangle and two wooden structures of a log and post construction have been excavated inside the castle. A fraction of a Great Moravian silver earring with a small knot, a bronze gilt boss from a harness and a fragment of a blue glass bead come from the layer between them. Pottery from the features is dated in the second half of the ninth century. A small residence fortified with a ditch was situated on an inconspicuous river terrace outside the castle promontory.

The second phase with a ditch and a wall dividing the promontory into a 4.5-hectare castle and a 10-hectare outer bailey defended by a fortification of oak hooked construction came into existence in the first third of the tenth century. Three samples have provided an interval of 925–937. Hypothetically, Žatec’s later castle might have been founded by Duke Wenceslas or his brother, Boleslas I. It might also have been built by a local duke and seized by the Přemyslids later. A court with log structures surrounded by a palisade documented by a 1.5-metre deep trench has been identified in the southwestern part of the fortified bailey. A copper gilt grapes-shaped earring was found inside the court. Two olive-like pearls come from the context of the settlement in the bailey. Pyrotechnological facilities for iron production and processing are documented. The absence of cemeteries is surprising; a warrior grave with a sword of type X, spurs with discs and two axes is an exception.

The Žatec castle shows numerous similarities with contemporary Great Moravian localities; movable finds document the presence of an elite.

Summary

**Pavel Bolina - Tomáš Klimek: Road context of Vinoř hillfort
(Contribution on the beginnings of Přemyslid state)**

The article discusses the interpretation of routes linked to the Vinoř hillfort that was built northeast of Prague in the earlier phase of the Late Hillfort Period. The authors try to describe the network of main routes that passed in the proximity of the hillfort and its transformations in time. Their analysis can be understood as a contribution to the interpretation of the importance of the given locality and an attempt at revealing the causes of the choice of this place for the construction of a hillfort. In their reconstruction of the main road network, the authors take into consideration the form and passability of a wider section of the landscape, the connection of the routes to important period centres, the remnants of the roads themselves in the terrain, the reflection of the course of vanished main roads in early modern maps as well as mentions in medieval and early modern texts. They come to the conclusion that Vinoř did not function as a control point for the earliest road connecting Prague and Stará Boleslav. The Vinoř hillfort built at the watershed between the Labe and Vltava Rivers had links to other routes not yet taken into account by researchers, long-distance ones that most probably had a prehistoric basis. The first of them came from the west via the north of the Plzeň region to the Bubny ford in the Prague Basin and the hinterland of the Vinoř hillfort, then crossing the Labe in Toušeň. From there, it continued to Lysá nad Labem and via the Hořice region to Kłodzko, Silesia and Lesser Poland. Another route of at least Central European importance came from Saxony over the Ore Mountains, the Chomutov region and Postoloprty towards Slaný. From there, it came around the Budeč hillfort to Levý Hradec and a Vltava ford between Roztoky and Brnky. From the broader hinterland of the Zámka hillfort near Bohnice, this route continued (around the Romanesque church in Dolní Chabry) through the hinterland of the Vinoř hillfort further on to the southeast via the Český Brod region to Moravia. A third route linked to the hillfort was a road from northeast crossing the Vltava in Ouholice and most probably continuing around the prehistoric hillfort Březí near Říčany to the southeast and further on to some of the crossings of the Sázava River. The research of these routes stands at its very beginning, however.

The analysis points out the possible important communications role of the Vinoř hillfort, as the need for protection of an important trade route towards Kłodzko probably played an important part in its construction. It has also turned out that before the strengthening of the central role of the Prague Basin in the tenth century, a number of long-distance routes went in its close proximity while still bypassing Prague.

PhDr. Nad'a Profantová, CSc.
Archeologický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i.
Letenská 4
118 01 Praha 1 – Malá Strana
profantova@arup.cas.cz

Summary

Nad'a Profantová: Archaeology of elites in Bohemia

Archaeology documents the existence of elites in Bohemia in the late eighth century, somewhat earlier than the testimonies of the oldest written sources (805 A.D.). The evidence includes parts of clothing, arms and equipment, either imported or imitated by domestic production (e.g., belt decorations). Specifically, they include parts of belts or riding gear (esp. decorations of horse harness) of Late Avar origin and local imitations of Byzantine original ornaments, Carolingian swords and Western weapons generally, corresponding to the situation of the Slavs in the Alps and northern Croatia. Before inhumation burials began, however, it is difficult to distinguish which of these items really belonged to the domestic elite and which to travelling foreigners (including foreign soldiers, for instance). We also need to reckon with christening, diplomatic or wedding gifts and with war booty. Inhumation burials appear in Bohemia somewhat later than in Moravia or Bavaria – in central and north-west Bohemia, from the mid-ninth century. At that time, leaders were buried with arms and equipment of Carolingian type (Kolín, Stará Kouřim, G. 55 and 120, Levý Hradec, Libice, Prague Castle, Cheb – this might have been a church burial from the end of 9-1st half of 10th century). Nine or ten elite burials are known from the second half of the ninth century (none at all have yet been discovered in the south and south-west Bohemia), and the number rises in the course of the tenth century (graves with sword in Litoměřice – Božka, Kanín, Libice, Lázně Toušeň). We can state generally that the elite emphasizes its status the most in uncertain times, this includes children (e.g. burials of boys with spurs). The first stage of the formation of the elites lasted approximately from the middle of the ninth until the middle of the tenth centuries.

Apart from rider burials, there are also graves of foot warriors with axes and spears. Boy graves with spurs and weapons represent an important phenomenon, more frequent in Moravia than in Bohemia (Prague, Lumbe Garden, Milady Horákové street, Kouřim, Lhota – Závist). Female burials with exclusive grave goods probably testify to the marriage policy of the elites (Želénky, Kouřim, Prague Castle – Lumbe Garden, church of the Virgin Mary, Libice). Six cemeteries with more than 5 graves with jewellery of Great Moravian tradition are known today in central Bohemia (e.g. Kouřim, Lumbe Garden). Gold jewellery and Byzantine coins are rare; silk appears in child and female graves in the beginning of the 10th century, later on in the graves of dukes and bishops in Prague Castle. The stabilization of the elites manifests itself also in the transfer of their cemeteries to the inner areas of castles, sometimes close to churches (Budeč, the rotunda of St Peter; Virgin Mary at Prague Castle; small elite cemetery Klecany II on a hillfort without a documented church). A differentiation of cemeteries within a single site probably reflects not only the differentiation of the elite itself but also the level of its Christianization. Sainly and ducal graves appear in Prague Castle churches in the tenth century, as do burials in family graves (Prague Castle, Kouřim). Evidence of Christianization in the form of crosses becomes more numerous (Budeč, Levý Hradec, Želénky, Litoměřice); extraordinary forms of reverence appear in the form of relic receptacles, memorabilia, tomb-

stones with inscriptions (Libice; according to Cosmas, Prague Castle) or marking of the place of burial with a Mosaicsque ornament (Prague Castle, rotunda of St. Vitus) – an analogy can be found in Church IX in Mikulčice. Items as evidence of the elite become scarce from the last third of the tenth century but still exist (stirrups with gilded inlays from Zbečno and Dobruška, St Wenceslas helmet, sword and armour, from the late tenth century probably also the unpreserved but depicted lance with a banner whose analogues are known from graves in Kouřim and in Lumbe Garden). The earliest elite residences are known – castles/hillforts. The earliest one documented in written sources, Canburg, cannot be exactly localized, but lies somewhere in Elbe region; out of others, we know Budeč, Hradec (present-day Levý Hradec), Prague, Libice, Kouřim, later also Mělník, Malín, Plzeň, etc. The examples of Viztrach's castle as of 857 or later Libice testify that the possession of castles was inherited within the individual families. Dukes and outstanding members of their retinues resided in independent courts (interpretation of hillfort Němětice) or in courts within castle acropoleis or baileys (in the tenth and eleventh centuries: Budeč, Hradsko u Mšena, Žatec, Stará Boleslav - known only from written sources). The archpriest's palace at Prague Castle is mentioned, and with a 90 m long assembly structure in Kouřim belonged to the elites, as did perhaps also large structures in the baileys of Libice (22 m), and Žatec. Little is known about the inner equipment of these buildings (metal and glass vessels in Rubín, Libice and Žatec; chests and boxes in Žatec and Mladá Boleslav; a sunken case for valuables in the multiple-space log house on the third courtyard of Prague Castle; keys are known as well). Grape and fig seeds have been found in waste layers near elite residences, with cucumbers, damson and peach stones being less frequent; the consumption of nuts is documented, along with rare evidence of the use of exotic spices. The elite diet contained much meat (pork, poultry, game).

Drastic manifestations of the power struggle are also recorded – the slaughter of members of probably Duke Wenceslas's retinue is documented in a mass grave at Budeč – Týnice. Traces of injuries on warrior skeletons are known from cemeteries such as Žalov II, Klecany I or Prague, Lumbe Garden.

Entertainment and games represented another phenomenon characterizing the elite. Games of nine men's morris are documented, as is the use of bone astragals. Hunting and falconry undoubtedly belonged among the forms of elite entertainment.

The birth and development of the spiritual elite represent a specific case. Apart from mentions of the earliest priests (certainly with many foreigners among them) in the written sources, which become more numerous especially after the foundation of a bishopric in Prague, there are archaeological finds of styli and book fittings (Libice, Žatec), antler or metal reliquary decorations (Budeč, Libice). Specific finds come from clergymen's graves, such as a chalice and a paten from Prague Castle or a unique find of a part of a stone model of a church from Žatec (end of 11th-12th century).

Archaeology underlines the hereditary nature of the social statute until 2nd half of the 9th century. Especially small finds from female and child graves document the progress of Christianization of both the society and the elites.

Summary

Marcin Wołoszyn: Chervyen Castles – state and perspective of research. Contribution on issues of formation of eastern border of Piast *regnum*

The name Chervyen Castles (Chervyen) is known only from three mentions in the Tale of Bygone Years (*Povest vremennykh let*), a Kievan Rus' source from the early twelfth century: as of 981 when Vladimir occupied Przemyśl, Chervyen and other castles; as of 1018 when Bolesław Chrobry occupied Chervyen Castles; and as of 1031 when Jaroslav and Mstislav marched against the Lechs and conquered Chervyen Castles. For two centuries now, these strongholds have been linked to fortifications in the cadastral territory of present-day Czeremno nad Huczwow, namely the castles near Czeremno and Gródek. This territory was inhabited by Lech tribes, presumed predecessors of the Poles; in the mid-tenth century, it was under Bohemian or Russian influence. This was changed by Bolesław Chrobry's mentioned expansion in 1018 when the whole territory was added to Poland. The local situation was always uncertain; in the late twelfth century, Arpadian interests started to assert themselves there, too, while attempts at asserting Russian interests continued. Some even consider the possibility that in the eleventh to fourteenth centuries, Chervyen Castles were outside the borders of the Piast *regnum*. The main component of the fortified complex in Czeremno is the Zamczysko hillfort with an area of up to 150 ha. Its outer bailey is situated in the locations Podgrodzie Bliższe, west of the main castle, and Podgrodzie Dalsze, northwest of it. The complex is made complete by other settlements and cemeteries nearby. The Gródek hillfort is situated near the place where the River Huczwa joins the Bug. The settlement complex there has an area of about 15 ha. This localization was verified by archaeological excavations in the 1950s. Further research in the 1970s was focused above all on the road network and remnants of bridges; the hillfort's rampart and the related settlements were investigated. Dendrochronological data acquired from a part of the structure testifies that bridges were still functioning in the thirteenth century. There is a problem with data acquired from the rampart structure, which was built from trunks felled towards the end of the first half of the eleventh century or later, which would mean that the castle cannot be connected with dates and events stated in Nestor's manuscript. There is, of course, a question whether the acquired data does not come from the wood of later repairs of the fortification.

The need for proper research of Czeremno and Gródek has been ever clearer since the 1980s due to extensive looting at both sites. Professional research of Gródek yielded a new collection of 500 items deposited in the Hrubieszów museum including a set of devotional objects, parts of clothing and so-called Drohiczyn seals. Locations in the territory of Czeremno were investigated and documented anew in 2010–2011. In Podgrodzie Bliższe location, this brought another set of 2,500 finds – lead seals, encolpia, crosses, axes, darts, pointed grzywnas, clothing pendants, etc. Besides metal finds, there were also glass bracelets, whorls, a ceramic playing stone, a comb. Two depots of Byzantine jewellery, deposited on the acropolis 20 cm from each other in the mid-thirteenth to mid-fourteenth centuries, are of fundamental importance. In the literature, they are often linked to the period of a Mongol raid. Lead seals come from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries and were used by Russian dukes. So-called Drohiczyn seals are apparently merchant seals. Most of the seals were found in the baileys rather than on the hillforts, a fact that has been confirmed also at other sites. Overall, it can be stated that an extraordinary quantity of metal items has been found at the hillforts in Czeremno; this resembles the Kievan Rus' milieu and, after all, most of the finds are of "Russian cultural character". Despite that, we cannot say that the central Bug territory was Russian in the early Middle Ages. Distinguishing the ethnic affiliation of archaeological sources is generally difficult. In the northern part of the Slav world in the early and middle stronghold period (up to the tenth century), it is impossible to distinguish between West Slav and East Slav world in the burial

rite. The differences start to outline only in the late phase of this period, when the Christianization of the two groups of Slavs started, due to the difference of Constantinople's Christian influence on Kievan Rus' and Rome's on Gniezno (Romanization, Rhomaization). The building of hillforts is a typical phenomenon in this period. We can observe a great boom of their construction in Poland in the ninth century, with the earliest castles in Lesser Poland coming into existence as early as the eighth. Large-area castles (over 10 ha) were also more frequent in Lesser Poland. This phenomenon is observable also in neighbouring territories, which made it possible to form the thesis of a certain Bohemian, Moravian, Slovakian, Lesser Polish, partially Silesian and Polabian Slav cultural province. Apart from cremation burials, hillforts and sets of similar items (including non-coin media of exchange – Silesian bowls and grzywnas), there are also often items of Avar and Great Moravian origin. Chervyen Castles belong in this province. Based on archaeological finds, it cannot be stated that Lesser Poland was part of the Great Moravian or Bohemian *regnum* in the ninth and tenth centuries. We can state, however, that there are parallels between the material culture of southern Poland, Bohemia and Moravia and that, once again, Chervyen Castles belong in this context. There are few ninth and tenth-century items among the finds from Czermno and Gródek, and devotional objects are especially missing. The image of Russian culture is different, but it is created based on finds from sites along the "Way from the Varangians to the Greeks", where precisely the Varangians settled and Christianity proceeded with them. This apparently influenced the form of the local culture and caused its difference from the culture of western Belarus and Ukraine including Chervyen Castles. The course of the border between the Polish and the Russian worlds needs to be sought on the margins of tribal settlement territories rather than in the unoccupied spaces between them. At the same time, however, we need to reiterate that this is not possible based on differences in the cultures linked to these territories. This is also why it is impossible to say whether Chervyen Castles are culturally Russian or Polish. The study of the influences of the eastern and the western church is more important in the search for this border; in the future, it will perhaps make the boundary between the Rurik and the Piast worlds more precise.

Prof. PhDr. Tomáš Petráček, Ph.D., Th.D.
Pedagogická fakulta Univerzity Hradec Králové
Rokitanského 62,
500 03 Hradec Králové
tomas.petracek@uhk.cz

Summary

Tomáš Petráček: Sources and notions, scepticism and criticism Three essays on the possibilities of knowledge of Czech history in the tenth century

The author presents some topics related to both historical and archaeological research for discussion. He ponders the value of information contained in some early medieval sources – legends or Cosmas' Chronicle. It seems that the actuality of some of the described events, which is sometimes called into question (the violent assumption of power by Boleslas I, his cruelty in the assertion of his goals – namely the construction of an all-stone wall) is newly documented by archaeological finds. The next topic is the issue of the level of Christianization of early medieval society. Among key indicators of Christianization, he names above all power predominance, the inclination of the elites to the new cult and the support of spreading it society-wide but also the control of the symbolic and value framework of the life of the communities, however slowly it was asserting itself in everyday practice and, even more slowly, interiorizing. He also ponders the image of Bishop Adalbert and the interpretation of his life story.

The last discussed topic is an increase in the complexity and a shift of the periodization of the origin and the earliest phases of development of the Bohemian state repeatedly proved by archaeological sources in recent decades.

na „zlé rádce“.⁵⁸ Všechny uvedené texty tak vydávají primárně svědectví o úmyslech, s nimiž byly sepsány, už méně se lze na ně odvolávat při úvahách o politických dějinách Čech 10. století.

Mám-li shrnout své předchozí úvahy, vkrádá se mi na mysl jediné slovo: skepse. Nechci zde samozřejmě tvrdit, že jsou historická svědectví všímající si prostoru Čech 10. století bezcenná. Chci jenom zdůraznit, že tato svědectví říkají jenom málo o mocenských a sociálních proměnách tohoto prostoru. Jejich svědectví je příliš náhodné a z utřídění informací, jejichž četnost je nízká, nelze učinit žádné rozumné závěry. Respektive je možné na jejich základě zformulovat celou řadu vcelku rozumných hypotéz, aniž by se jejich autor ocitl mimo vědecký diskurs – přesvědčivé svědectví o tom ostatně podávají dějiny našich oborů. Přitom ale tato tvrzení nelze rozumně verifikovat.

Přesto nechci zakončit svůj text v pochmurném duchu – i raný středověk českých zemí se zdánlivě omezeným korpusem textů stále nabízí celou řadu otázek, na něž bychom měli hledat odpovědi, je zde dokonce šance na odpovědi narazit, a přesto zůstávají tyto stezky dosud neprošlapány. Mám na mysli např. jak srovnávací studium vzniku komplexních forem organizace společnosti, tak lepší poznání textů na úrovni samotných rukopisů, tedy jako komplexních kulturních artefaktů. Bude to totiž jedna z možností, jak rozmnožit soubor informací, kterými disponujeme, aby bylo možné provádět komparace a „vážit“ získaná data i informace. Vydáme-li se jimi my jako historikové, soustředění na texty, jistě při tom, snad i kouzlem nechtěného, narazíme na takové odpovědi, které zaujmou i naše kolegy archeology.

Doc. Mgr. David Kalhous, Ph.D.

Masarykova univerzita

bud. B1/B1.109

Arna Nováka 1

602 00 Brno

david.kalhous@phil.muni.cz

Summary

David Kalhous: History and archaeology: limits of inter-disciplinary cooperation and understanding

The cooperation between archaeology and history is limited by sociological factors as well as limits given by the very nature of the examined sources. The author shows on several examples that the different character and frequency of written documents considerably limits the weight of their testimony in confrontation with archaeological discoveries, often relegating them to mere illustrations and declaimed, somewhat hackneyed anecdotes. He believes

⁵⁸ *První staroslověnská legenda o sv. Václavu*, s. 38–39, 41, 42–43.

that in the long run, it will be better if instead of an effort aimed at a direct confrontation of incomparable sets of information, the two disciplines will respect the necessary need for the existence of a homogeneous set of data if any systematic knowledge is to be reached. Likewise, he believes it is necessary for researchers in various specializations to always endeavour to understand the knowledge in related disciplines as an open problem, to get to know well the methods of neighbouring disciplines and especially their limits.

do samozřejmě každodennosti, jako je pokřizování se, pokropení svěcenou vodou atd. na straně druhé, lze považovat za příznaky plné christianizace společnosti.⁴⁰ Setkat se s nimi lze až na konci dlouhého dramatického procesu, který u nás začíná v 10. století a uzavírá se ve století 13.

Studium tohoto procesu patří mezi stále zelená témata medievistiky. Mimo jiné i proto, že poskytuje nepříliš častou příležitost hlubokého nahlédnutí do duchovní kultury středověku, v níž se antické, židovské i předkřesťanské prvky slily společně s křesťanstvím do kultury srozumitelné všem Evropanům.

Tento text vznikl v rámci řešení projektu „Sázava – archeologie benediktinského kláštera“, GA ČR č. 19-17636S.

Prof. PhDr. Petr Sommer, CSc., DSc.
Archeologický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i.
Letenská 4
118 01 Praha 1 – Malá Strana

Filosofický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i./CMS
Jilská 1
110 00 Praha 1
sommer@arup.cas.cz

Summary

Petr Sommer: Christianization, introduction of Christianity; to Christianize, to convert to Christianity“

The definition in Otto's Encyclopaedia characterizes Christianization as a simple process; at a closer look, however, it is a very complex phenomenon characterizing a society in the state of transition from one religious system to another. Many sources also document that it was a complex process within which the society went through numerous partial catharses. The first contacts with Christianity were mediated by missionaries, who often sacrificed their lives to their task. Their activities had to be adapted to those on whom they were focused; the missionaries themselves therefore had to be good psychologists and masters of compromise. So, for instance, speaks the legend of St Adalbert by Bruno of Querfurt, mentioning the necessity to adjust the missionaries' appearance to domestic customs, or a report on an anti-Christian rebellion in Stettin in 1126 when missionaries had to tolerate a pagan ritual in their church for some time. On the other hand, the Christianization pressure was sometimes brutal, as was the

⁴⁰ Petr SOMMER, *Druhá vlna christianizace české společnosti*, in: Přemyslůvci. Budování českého státu, ed. Petr Sommer – Dušan Třeštík – Josef Žemlička, Praha 2009, s. 398–417.

case of the Christianization of the Saxons by Charlemagne. An important factor is that pagan communities were regarded as unequal to the people who were bringing Christianity; one of the reasons was that their tribal organization without a particular overlord was considered primitive. The complexity of the first stages of Christianization is documented by Venerable Bede's testimony to the Christianization of the Angles. Like in many other cases, the first missionaries there were Benedictines led by Augustine, the archbishop of Canterbury from 601. Bishop of London Mellitus, who followed in his work, was in contact with Pope Gregory I, corresponding with him about the issues of Christianization. Gregory says there is no need to deprive a Christianized people of their everyday culture, as it is necessary to gain their confidence. Caution only needs to be exercised when considering actions that might jeopardize the main objective – the Christianization process. It was evident that violence in baptizing pagans frequently met with negative reactions and often even with the loss of previously achieved successes. Softer methods were to be used, often including psychological pressure. This was proved in our conditions by Josef Cibulka, who verified testimonies in the sources concerning the baptism of Duke Bořivoj at the court of Svatopluk of Great Moravia. This story, regarded by many historians as a poetic licence of the author of the legend, is corroborated by Bavarian missionary sources. A characteristic feature is that apart from becoming equal to the baptized, Bořivoj was also promised social elevation. After all, a twelfth-century source of Czech origin – the Homiliary of Opatovice – also documents psychological pressure as a tool used towards unbaptized people. The Christianization is regularly accompanied by many other phenomena, such as *interpretatio Christiana* – a reinterpretation of traditional cultural or religious phenomena adapting them to a Christian form. Such processes are archaeologically documented for instance in the development of a cult area in Jelling, Denmark, or in this country by the development and changes of cult structures in Pohansko, Mikulčice and elsewhere.

The effects of Christianization could be considered permanent when at least the basic network of ecclesiastical administration, the parish system, was built. This did not happen in this country until the period of so-called second (definitive) Christianization in the thirteenth century. This network not only enabled regular spiritual administration of the populace but also provided for existential securing of the whole system, among other things by ensuring the functionality of the tithes.

a duchovním úřadům, k jiným duchovním, k povinnostem spojených s farní službou, k beneficiím a desátkům. V pramenech církevní správy se vedle sporů o beneficium, event. o prosazení výkonu patronátních práv objevují také spory mezi dvěma duchovními o nárok na desátky z církevního majetku téže fary. Tyto prameny začaly být systematicky zpracovávány, ale rozsáhlost tématu doposud brání dokončení výzkumu.

PhDr. Eva Doležalová, Ph.D
Historický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i.
Prosecká 809/76
190 00 Praha 9
dolezal@hiu.cas.cz

Summary

Eva Doležalová: Present view of the development of medieval ecclesiastical organization in Central Europe

The basic image of the ecclesiastical organization in this country had been built by František Palacký, who was followed by Josef Kalousek, August Sedláček, Josef Kurka and others, the authors of numerous source editions in addition to texts that remain fundamental to this day. Zdeněk Boháč has followed in this study recently, for example. František Hrubý, Kamil Krofta, Jaroslav V. Polc and Zdeňka Hledíková above all have dealt with the process of Christianization and the formation of ecclesiastical administration. The basic element of this administration – a parish – appeared in Central Europe in the late twelfth century. During the thirteenth century, the parish network covered the whole population of the land, forming the basis of the ecclesiastical administration of the populace and being used also in the administration of the land, e.g. in tax collection. This form of administration followed an earlier model of large parishes whose administrative districts had been identical with the administrative territories of central castles. Proprietary churches and the territories they administered represented another element on the path towards classical parishes since the mid-twelfth century. Within this process, the church endeavoured to attain independence on and emancipation from secular power, which required stabilization of the regulations governing the use of immovable property. Important progress in this respect was made in the thirteenth century, and the church achieved full emancipation in the fourteenth century when the proprietary right of magnates was transformed into the right of patronage. Analogies (including terminological) with Western and Southern Europe are used when reconstructing this process in Central Europe, which may not always correspond to reality. What is followed above all is the constitution of ecclesiastical provinces, the disposal of church property or the real exercise of the episcopal authority over the clergy. The complexity of the subject is apparent already from an analysis of the term parish (*farnost*). At first, it was the territory administered by a bishop; only during the Middle Ages, it came to mean a church whose district is equipped with certain rights, above all to administer the sacraments and collect the tithe. It is evident, however, that a strict differentiation between parish and non-parish churches cannot be documented in the Middle

Ages. A similar problem is connected with the term parish priest (*farář*). Gregory IX's decretal clearly defining the categories of parishes and parish priests was not issued until 1234. The process of limitation of the parish districts represents a no less complex problem. It seems that the development of the parish administration in Central Europe did not precisely copy the situation in Western Europe in this respect, either. This is attested for instance by the presumed process of the election of parish priests and their confirmation by the parish community. The possibilities of study in this context are limited by the condition of the sources, which do not cast light on details of everyday practice, and the retrograde method cannot be always used. Much remains unclear concerning the operation of the church building itself including the liturgy, the spiritual life of the parishioners, property rights of the churches (including issues connected with the tithes), the delimitation of parish districts, etc. The subject of (early) medieval clergymen, starting with the administrators of the parish units, has not been sufficiently analysed, either.