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ABSTRACT


A deeply patinated artifact, interpreted as a side-scraper, has been revealed during an evaluation of lithic chipped materials from the Eneolithic hillfort Starý Zámek near Jevišovice (Znojmo district). The artifact is made of raw material from Cracow-Częstochowa Jurassic area and its provenience should be sought within the Middle Paleolithic milieu in Poland rather than in Moravia. As the artifact is looking strange within the local Middle Paleolithic, it was very probable imported later. Presence of the Jurassic silicites from the Cracow-Częstochowa Upland within the Funnel Beaker context, i.e. in the layer C2 of the hillfort Starý Zámek, document a possible contact during the Eneolithic.
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A specific artifact — deeply patinated sidescraper apparently intrusive to the rest of the collection — has been brought to light during analysis of lithic material from the Jaroslav Palliardi’s collection excavated in the Eneolithic hillfort Starý Zámek near Jevišovice (Znojmo district). The artifact as well as the rest of the lithics are currently deposited in the Moravian Museum in Brno.

I. A LOCATION OF THE SITE AND A HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The prehistoric hillfort referred as Starý Zámek is located on the cadastral area of Střelice near Jevišovice, on the left-hand bank of the Jevišovka River, on a distinctive promontory ca 360 m a.s.l., i.e. 60 m above current water level.
The plateau protected by the steep slopes and accessible only from the northeast has dimensions about 100 × 30 m (Fig. 1). Jaroslav Palliardi, who found there the first archaeological artifacts in 1887, introduced this site to the archaeological literature (Palliardi 1888, 27, 33). He opened systematic excavations in 1909 and continued during 1912–1915 in collaboration with František Vildomec (cf. Červinka 1896, 50; Čižmář 2004, 136–138). Currently the site is forested.

After the death of J. Palliardi (1922) the majority of archaeological materials collected by him from the Starý Zámek site was transferred to the Moravian Museum and deposited under ordinal nos. Pa 16/24 a 17/24.
II. ARTIFACT

The artifact of our interest has no. Pa 17/24-157 in the Moravian Museum. It is a deeply white patinated flake, 84.5 × 55.5 × 8.0 mm in dimensions, and 66.16 g in weight. From the typological viewpoint it can be referred as a side-scraper with a thinned back, with a stepped retouch, and a convex scraping edge. The opposite (non-working) edge was formed by a removal from the distal end of blank (Fig. 2; 3:5).

The artifact has been subjected to petrographic determination. The dorsal surface is fully strongly patinated. Recently damaged areas, where the non-weathered surface is visible, indicate the patina thickness — up to 1 mm. The ventral side of the artifact is patinated on more or less half of the surface, also in abraded places. The other part is covered by a whitish film, through which a brownish (Munsell: moderate brown 5YR 4/4) siliceous mass is visible (Fig. 2). It contains a nubbly white inclusions and fragments (up to 1 mm) of undetermined fossils, some tinted with red ferruginous pigment. Similar pigment can be observed in within the siliceous mass. Remarkable is the presence of sizable (2.5 × 1.0 cm) sharp-edged petrosilex particles of “coffee-with-milk” color (Munsell: pale yellowish brown 10YR 6/2).

Petrographic examination under a stereomicroscope in water immersion has not revealed evident characteristic elements. Red pigment and sharp-edged petrosilex are typical for Jurassic silicites from the Cracow-Częstochowa Upland.

Fig. 2. Hillfort Starý Zámek near Jevišovice. Sidescraper. Middle Paleolithic; Photo by L. Plchová. After Šebela, Přichystal, Škrdlá, Humpolová et al. (2015)
However, a nubbly inclusions appear in the chocolate silicite from the northern outskirts of the Świętokrzyskie Mts. (Příhynstál 2009, 97). Generally, the observable elements point towards southern Poland and rather exclude relations with brownish silicites of the Opole-Groszowice type from glacial sediments, known also from the Ostrava region.

Both the typology and the thickness of the patina layer on the artifact suggests its Paleolithic age. The presence of Polish raw materials in the Moravian Middle Paleolithic is rather astonishing. Nonetheless, in materials from Micoquian and Taubachian layers of the Kůlna Cave in the Moravian Karst there is — besides predominating Moravian silicites — also mentioned by Valoch (1987, 264) the erratic flint coming from the area of continental glaciation and “brown flint” (altogether ca. 2 per cent), possibly from the Cracow area. Generally, we cannot exclude such long distance contacts already in the Middle Paleolithic as is proved by the presence of spotted Świeciechów silicite in the Raj Cave near Kielce about 100 km far of the source (Kozłowski 1972–1973) or even two tools made of this raw material found in the Solyomkuti abri in the Bükk Mountains in northern Hungary, roughly 400 km to the south from the resource (Vértés 1960).

We can conclude that the artifact from the Starý Zámek site has no analogies within the Czech Republic (ca. Rybová 1978, obr. 20; Valoch 1993, obr. 6–7; Valoch a kol. 2011, obr. 75; Pleiner). However, similar forms are known from the Middle Paleolithic assemblages of Lesser Poland, e.g. from the Zamkowa Dolna Cave in Olsztyn (Kopacz 1975, Tabl. VI:2) and the Towarna Cave in Kusięta (Kopacz, Skalski 1976, Fig. 58:a), both localities in the Częstochowa district.

III. HYPOTHESES

There are three basic hypotheses how to interpret the presence of the Middle Paleolithic side-scraper made of most probably of Cracow-Częstochowa Jurassic flint in southern Moravia:

1. Middle Paleolithic occupation of the site.
2. Eneolithic import from the Cracow-Częstochowa Jurassic area to Starý Zámek.
3. Gift to J. Palliardi not relating to Starý Zámek.

IV. DISCUSSION

When testing the first hypothesis supposing the Middle Paleolithic occupation of the plateau we have to refer another isolated Paleolithic artifacts from the site. The side-scaper of our interest was known already to Josef Skutil, who mentioned it in a short report published in Časopis Vlasteneckého
Unusual Middle Paleolithic stone tool from southern Moravia...

The author dated the find, as well as two other artifacts, to the Early Stone Age (i.e., the Paleolithic). Remarkable is the description of one of these artifacts, unfortunately not identified by the authors in the Moravian Museum “silný taktéž původně asi dvojitý, nepravidelný peckovitý ... oboustranně opracovaný hrot, zhotovený ze západomoravského domácího materiálu (bílé barvy)”. Inferring from the published drawing, it can be classified as racloir déjeté. Josef Skutil also noticed on it traces of an inventory number, already unreadable (Skutil 1941, 111–112, obr. 2). It may indicate that artifact in question had been obtained during the Palliardi’s excavations on the hillfort. The author interprets it as examples of reuse of Paleolithic artifacts in later prehistoric periods (Skutil 1941, 112). The same can be said about the side-scraper which is the subject of the present report. There were not reported clear Middle Paleolithic sites in the vicinity of Jevišovice. The surface collection of possibly MP artifacts made of local weathering products recently published by Oliva (2012) cannot necessarily be really Middle Paleolithic and the same can be stated about isolated surface finds. The site was intensively surveyed and excavated what resulted in a collection of several Paleolithic artifacts. We can conclude that even if isolated Paleolithic artifacts were found, no real Middle Paleolithic site was documented and a find of side-scraper made on imported rock (a similar artifact was not published from Moravian MP sites) looks questionable.

When testing the Eneolithic import hypothesis, we have to note results petrographic analysis of lithic materials from Eneolithic layers C2 and B, and possibly also from layer C in general. The first is related to the Funnel Beaker culture, the second to the Jevišovice culture. Artifacts from the layer D are lost, while layer C1 yielded only two stratified pieces of lithic chipped industry linked with the Baden culture (Medunová-Benešová 1981, 93), both of chert of the Krumlovský les type (Šebela et al. 2015, 101).

Petrographic examination of the collection of lithic materials from the Eneolithic hillfort Starý Zámek near Jevišovice (ca. 300 pieces) reveals the presence of five non-patinated artifacts of the Jurassic silicite from the Cracow-Częstochowa Upland. Two of them (inv. nos. 945 and 950) are not stratified (Fig. 3:1, 2). Artifacts with inv. nos. 954 (Fig. 3:3) and 7012 (Fig. 3:4) are generally linked with layer C (the Funnel Beaker culture). The last artifact (inv. no. 5026), found in layer B (the Jevišovice culture), is of Jurassic silicite from the Cracow-Częstochowa Upland, variety Gojšć (Kopacz, Přichystal, Šebela 2014, 55, Plate XXVII:6). We can conclude that imports of rocks from the Cracow-Częstochowa Upland during the Eneolithic were well documented.

Absence of any visible inventory number on the artifact under discussion suggests that it was found on the surface of the site rather than excavated.

1 Literally: “thick, originally double, irregular drupe-shaped ... bifacially fashioned point made of West-Moravian local material (white in color)”.

muzejního spolku v Olomouci (Journal of the Patriotic Museum Association in Olomouc; Skutil 1941, obr. 1).
Fig. 3. Hillfort Starý Zámek near Jevišovice. Artifacts of the Jurassic silicite from the Cracow-Częstochowa Upland (south Poland). 1, 2 — not stratified finds (inv. nos. 950 and 945); 3, 4 — layer C (inv. no. 954, 7012), 5 — from the surface (Pa 14/24-156); after Šebela et al. (2015)
from settlement layers. Although such an interpretation seems to be very probable, we cannot entirely exclude the third hypothesis predicting inventory numbers mishmash, e.g. that the artifact purchased J. Palliardi somewhere else or obtained as a gift.

V. CONCLUSION

The presumption of J. Skutil is not unfounded, as the hillfort Starý Zámek (Fig. 1) does not appear to be a typical Middle Paleolithic habitat, in contrast to caves (e.g. the already mentioned Kůlna cave and the Pekárna cave, both in the Moravian Karst; cf. V a l o c h a kolektiv. autorů 2011). The question arises: when the Middle Paleolithic sidescraper was brought to the hillfort Starý Zámek and when it was reutilized? Certain clues for solving this problem gives the presence of Cracow-Częstochowa Upland silicites within Eneolithic collection. When analyzing all information currently available we support the second hypothesis: the artifact in question was imported to Starý Zámek together with raw material from Cracow-Częstochowa Upland in the Eneolithic period.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors have a pleasure to acknowledge the valuable contribution of Dr. hab. Krzysztof Sobczyk and Dr. hab. Jerzy Kopacz in elaborating this paper.

VII. NOTE

The present study has been framed into project Program výzkumné činnosti Archeologického ústavu AV ČR, Brno, v.u.i. na léta 2012–2017 (L. Šebela, P. Škrdlá). This article appears through financial support provided to the Moravian Museum (A. Humpolová) by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic as a part of its long-term conceptual development program for research institutions (ref. MK000094862). The petroarchaeological analyses of A. Přichystal were supported by grant of the Institute of Geological Sciences, Masaryk University (Institutional support No. 2222/315010).

REFERENCES

Červinka I. L. 1896 Pravěká hradiska na Moravě, Kroměříž (J. Slovák).
Čížmář M. 2004 Encyklopedie hradíšť na Moravě a ve Slezsku s leteckými záběry hradíšť Miroslava Bályky, Praha (Libri).
Kopacz J.

Kopacz J., Přichystal A., Šebela L.
2014 Lithic Chipped Industry of the Young Eneolithic in Moravia and Czech Silesia, Brno (Archeologický ústav AV ČR, Brno, v. v. i.).

Kopacz J., Skalski A. W.
1976 Excavations of the Cave System in the Towarne Mountains near Częstochowa, Archaeologia Polona 17, p. 163–175.

Kozłowski J. K.

Medunová-Benešová A.

Oliva M.

Palliardi J.
1888 O provrtných nástrojích kamenných na Znojmsku nalezených, Časopis Vlasteneckého muzea v Olomouci 5, p. 27–36.

Pleiner R., Rybová A. (eds.)

Přichystal A.
2009 Kamenné suroviny v pravěku východní části střední Evropy, Brno (Masarykova univerzita/ Munipress).

Skutil J.
1941 Paleolitické nálezy z mladších předhistorických prostředí moravských, Časopis Vlasteneckého muzea v Olomouci 54, p. 111–112.

Šebela L., Přichystal A., Škrdla P., Humpolová A.

Valoch K.

Valoch K.

Valoch K. a kol.

Vértes L.
Address of Authors
Lubomír Šebela
Petr Škrdla
Archeologický ústav AV ČR. Brno v. v. i.
Čechyňská 363/19602 00 Brno
CZECH REPUBLIC
e-mail: sebela@arub.cz
e-mail: skrdla@arub.cz

Antonín Přichystal
Ústav geologických věd Přírodovědecké fakulty
Masarykovy univerzity
Kotlářská 267/2
611 37 Brno
CZECH REPUBLIC
e-mail: prichy@sci.muni.cz

Alena Humpolová
Archeologický ústav
Moravského zemského muzea v Brně
Kapucínské náměstí 8, 659 37, Brno
CZECH REPUBLIC
e-mail: humpolova@mzm.cz