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The paper presents some remarks on the chronology and spatial distribution of the Late Avar, Carolingian, and Great Moravian finds in selected areas of the Western Slavic Territories. The main subject of this paper is to analyse a particular item found in Haliczany, Chełm County in Poland. The fitting from Haliczany has already been subjected to typological and chronological analyses twice. In each case, however, it led the authors to entirely different conclusions and since the space for its interpretation remains broad, it requires some clarification. The purpose of the study is to indicate possible origins of the fitting from Haliczany in terms of both typology and the route it travelled to finally reach the areas of today Eastern Poland. There are two competing explanations that are examined in this paper concerning either Carolingian or nomadic origins of the item in question. In the methodological dimension the paper provides arguments in favour of considering even single finds in a context broader than only stylistic speculations, including also cultural, historical, and when possible also ‘geopolitical’ determinants.
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INTRODUCTION

The paper presents some remarks on the chronology and spatial distribution of the Late Avar, Carolingian, and Great Moravian finds in selected areas of the Western Slavic Territories. Some of these comments have already been presented in a monographic study (Robak 2013b; 2014), but most of them have not been included there. The main subject of this paper is to indicate possible origins of the item in terms of both typology and the route it travelled to finally reach the areas of today Eastern Poland. In the methodological dimension the paper provides arguments in favour of considering even single finds in a context broader than only stylistic speculations, including also cultural, historical, and when possible also ‘geopolitical’ determinants. The paper is organised as follows: the subsections below describe the artefact itself and provide an overview of previous analyses of the item. Second and third section investigate two hypotheses about possible contexts of the artefact, nomadic and Carolingian, respectively. Finally, the conclusion summarises results and provides some general remarks on the chronological and geographical distribution of early medieval finds in selected areas of Western Slavic Territories.

THE FITTING FROM HALICZANY

The artefact from Haliczany is a small strap fitting, resembling a head of a sheep seen from the front (Fig. 1: 1). The fitting is 2 cm high and 2.2 cm wide. It was made of copper and in its lower part we can still see traces of gilding. The surface of the fitting is filled with an ornament executed with pseudo-granulation or rather small, roughly made knobs, about 1 mm in diameter, arranged linearly. Edges of the fitting smoothly turn into a central rib dividing the upper part of the fitting into two. From the bottom, the surface of the fitting is concave. The entire fitting was mounted with three rivets. It has been found in a mound of a kurgan attributed to the Trzciniec culture, right at the border between humus and the original surface of the kurgan. Since the very beginning, however, features of the fitting does not exclude that it could be attributed to the Bronze Age or directly linked with the burial mound. Both the kurgan and its vicinity was used as a burial ground in modern times and the accumulation of early medieval (pottery) as well as single late medieval finds suggests intense human activities in this area throughout the Middle Ages, particularly between the 8th and 10th c. It seems, thus, that the space for the interpretation of the find was (and still is) wide. It cannot be ruled out that the kurgan served as a burial ground also in the early Middle Ages (Bronicki/...
Michalik/Wołoszyn 2003, 221–230). Naturally, therefore, there aroused questions as to where from, which way, when and what for the item was deposited in the kurgan. Because, however, the sources are insufficient, answers to these questions may not be always unambiguous, although the analysis of available sources may at least make some hypotheses more probable and falsify some others.

Two hypotheses

The fitting from Haliczany has already been subjected to typological and chronological analyses twice (Bronicki/Michalik/Wołoszyn 2003; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2005), although in each case it led the authors to entirely different conclusions. In one case the authors highlighted the nomadic context of the find, whereas the other one stressed its Western European connotations. The authors of the first publication of the find (Bronicki/Michalik/Wołoszyn 2003) looked for its analogies among artefacts typical for the Eastern European nomads, mainly the Hungarians. This direction was supported by another find from this kurgan, namely an Old Hungarian lyre buckle. As the authors have, however, admitted themselves, they could not find an exact analogy for the fitting. On the other hand, M. Schulze-Dörrlamm in a paper of 2005 formulated a presumption that the artefact from Haliczany has Carolingian origins (Schulze-Dörrlamm 2005, 131, 132). An argument justifying this hypothesis was a find of a similarly decorated fitting at the cemetery in Mockersdorf, Lkr. Neustadt an der Waldnaab, located in the area of the Upper Palatinate (Fig. 1: 7; Stroh 1954, pl. 15: 20). Further arguments substantiating the hypothesis were provided by other finds of strap fittings of the Carolingian type decorated with pseudo-granulation on a symmetrically divided plate.

Analysing the fitting from Haliczany, however, we should ask a question, whether the method of decoration itself (as in this case we cannot speak of any particular style that could significantly facilitate the process of determining cultural affiliation of the item) is a feature sufficient to establish origins of the artefact. The technique of decoration, pseudo-granulation or knobs, is, unfortunately, nothing uncommon in the Early Middle Ages. Of course it can be found on fittings of the Carolingian type (Robak 2013b, 162; Wamers 1985, 75), although it was not very popular in this culture. More often this manner of decoration of the background can be found on fittings linked with cultures of early medieval nomads. A punched or knobbed background is one of specific determinants of the ornamentation of late and decline Avar periods (Szenthe 2013b). This method of filling the ornamentation space, however, was known also in other early medieval European
cultures. M. Schulze-Dörrlamm, for example, refers to the Longobardian fittings decorated with granulation and dated back to the 7th c. (Schulze-Dörrlamm 2005, fig. 6: 1). And thus, drawing definite conclusions relying solely on the decorative pattern is at best too hasty. The main trouble with proving the Carolingian origins of the fitting from Haliczany is linked, however, with the fact that none of the fittings quoted by M. Schulze-Dörrlamm provides a typological analogy for this artefact. Furthermore, in the aforementioned monograph I could not find such an analogy among over 2000 fittings from the entire Europe that typologically or indirectly through the context of the find could be attributed to the Carolingian cultural milieu (Robak 2013b; 2014).

Among strap fittings of the Carolingian type, both early and late Carolingian decorated applications of straps, there are no items in a shape similar to the one of the fitting from Haliczany. This observation inclines us to be rather cautious or even sceptical about the hypothesis of the Carolingian origins and to return to exploring other directions. Decorations similar both in terms of shape and dimensions are common equipment of Avar graves in the area of the Carpathian Basin. I refer here to small heart-shaped applications known from grave 24 from Balmazúváros-Hortobágy-Árkus (Fig. 1: 4; Meier-Arendt 1985, fig. 87; Szentpéteri 1993, fig. 4: 4), grave 1 from Kehida Tsz-major (Fig. 1: 3; Heinrich-Tamáska/ Kiss 2009, pl. XV: 1; Szőke 1994, 157; pl. 2), grave C from Keszthely-Dobogó (Fig. 1: 5; Hampel 1894, pl. Cl: 3) or Loretto-Krainäcker (Fig. 1: 2; Winter 1997, pl. 40: 2). Each of these fittings is decorated in a different manner – embossed specimens could be dated back to the Middle Avar period, while casted items should be attributed to the Late Avar period III or IV (Csathy 2015, 183, 184). The fitting from Haliczany placed within such context appears to fit typologically and stylistically – the intuition of the authors of the first publication seems to be correct, although this is far from being a sufficient argument to dispel the doubts. Paradoxically, however, the hypothesis of the Avar origin of the fitting from Haliczany could be supported by the finds referred to by M. Schulze-Dörrlamm – particularly if we look at them in a slightly modified context.

**A cumbersome analogy**

The alleged proof of the Carolingian origins of the fitting from Haliczany was its similarity to the fitting found in 1921 at the cemetery in Mockersdorf, Lkr. Neustadt an der Waldnaab in the Upper Palatinate (Fig. 1: 7; Brundke 2013, 72–74, 103, pl. 11: 20; Stroh 1954, pl. 15: 20). It is a small, flat, gilded bronze U-shaped plate with indentations on the sides and a broadened upper part resembling a volute. The fitting is plastically decorated with pseudo-granulation and knobs placed on the upper edge. Unfortunately the context of the find was lost. According to the most recent research, the entire cemetery, as confirmed by the finds, should be dated back to the period from the second half of the 8th c. to the beginning of the 10th c., with a particular emphasis on the turn of the 8th and 9th c. (Brundke 2013, 69). The fitting was considered to be Carolingian, I presume, based solely on the general assumption that the cemetery belongs to the Carolingian–Ottonian row-grave-cemeteries (Stroh 1954).

Indeed, the decorative manner used to decorate the fitting from Mockersdorf is relatively close to the one used to decorate the one from Haliczany. The more careful analysis of the find, however, together with considerations for a wider context of the find, raises significant doubts about its Carolingian origins. Most of all, the fitting from Mockersdorf (similarly as the one from Haliczany) has no analogies among thousands of known fittings of the Carolingian type. Apart from the untypical shape of the item, the Carolingian stylistics did not apply knobs on upper edges of strap fittings. On the contrary, this type of decoration is characteristic of the Late Avar strap fittings – from simple, semi-circular forms to stylised animal heads (see Stadler 1985, pl. 3; 8; 9; Zábojník 1991, pl. 12–19). In most cases rivets mounting a fitting to a strap were placed inside knobs. There are, however, known series of (most often) smaller fittings where knobs had only decorative functions. This applies mainly to heart-shaped fittings extremely popular in the Late Avar period (see Zábojník 1991, pl. 33: 20–24). Identically punched backgrounds can be also found on many Late Avar ornaments and strap fittings (see Trugly 2008). We should, however, note that this similar type of fitting is not singled out by researchers working on the issue and typology of Avar fittings.

Is it, therefore, possible that the fitting from Mockersdorf travelled to the area of the Upper Palatinate from the territories of the Carpathian Basin? Well, it seems to be highly probable. The cemetery in Mockersdorf is located at the borders of the Upper Palatinate, only about 50 km to the west from the Cheb. In the second half of the 8th c. and in the 9th c. this area was a border zone between territories inhabited by the Slavic Czech tribes and territories administrated by the Duchy of Bavaria and since 788 by the Kingdom of the Franks. At least up to the end of the 10th c., it was characterised with a mixed, German–Slavic settlement with a dominant Slavic component (Losert 2007–2008; 2009). This fact alone proves that Avar decorations from the areas of the
Carpathian Basin could get to the areas of the Upper Palatinate, where they are found in large numbers (Profantová 2010; Zábojník 2011). Cultural relations between the Upper Palatinate and the Middle Danube Basin, however, seem to be much stronger. Numerous artefacts, particularly decorations, coming from the entire north-east Bavarian area inhabited by the Slavs between the half of the 8th c. and the beginning of the 10th c. indicate convergences with artefacts attributed to cultures of peoples that inhabited the Middle Danube Basin (Losert 2007–2008, 317–335). As one of the most recent finds in this context we should mention a burial containing a complete, Late Avar (IIIrd period) set of belt fittings coming from the cemetery in Ifleldorf, Lkr. Schwandorf (Lampl u. a. 2014; Losert/Szameit 2014). It almost automatically arouses associations with skeletal burials known from the areas of Eastern Alps containing Avar strap fittings and pieces of Western European weaponry interpreted as graves of the Slavic elites living at the German-Avar borderland (Eichert 2012, 340–346; Szameit 1996). Strong cultural relations between the Slavic north-eastern Bavaria and the Middle Danube areas are also confirmed by finds of buttons or other decorations (Lampl u. a. 2014, fig. 2–4; Losert 2007–2008, fig. 15; 16) that we commonly find in burials dated back to the second half of the 8th c. and the 9th c. from territories of Bohemia, Moravia, Pannonia, and the Eastern Alps areas (see Boháčová/Profantová 2014, fig. 3; Brundke 2013, 70; Eichert 2010, 166; Galuška 2014; Kouřil 2014, 451, Szőke 2014, 105). Among such items also the fitting from Mockersdorf could find its place.

The fact that the fitting from Mockersdorf has no analogies among Carolingian artefacts does not mean that there are no analogies at all. In looking for similar items, a find of a fitting from the cemetery in Zalaszabar-Borjúállás by the Kis-Balaton proves to be very helpful (Fig. 1: 6; Szőke 2014, fig. 53). It is a strap fitting very similar to the one from Mockersdorf, differing, however, in terms of quality, presence of an openwork opening. Knobs of the fitting are arranged in a shape resembling a crown and decorated with punching. This fitting, similarly as the fitting from Mockersdorf, was made of bronze and gilded. In the picture of the fitting we can also clearly see that the ornament was made with a punch, not casted from a mould.

Unfortunately the way the cemetery from Zalaszabar was published (or rather remains unpublished) makes a closer analysis of this find impossible. The fitting was published as a kind of rarity without any piece of information that could clearly indicate whether it comes from a grave, and if yes in what context it was found (Müller 2014, 74). The origins of the cemetery are associated with construction of a wooden church in 845 during the settlement action in the western Pannonia initiated by a newly appointed administrator of the area, dux Pribina. As we can judge from the equipment of graves, the cemetery was abandoned in the first half of the 10th c., which gives about 80-years long period of operation, allowing determining the chronology of burials relatively precisely. Nevertheless, also older items, characteristic of the culture of the late Khaganate were found in backfills of graves and even among equipment of burials (Müller 1995, 94). Taking, however, into account the location of the cemetery it cannot be surprising. The areas on the west bank of Lake Balaton, ever since the Roman colonisation, were in the early Middle Ages still inhabited by various groups of people, particularly the Avars. In the immediate vicinity of the Zalasza­bar at least several cemeteries dated back to the late and decline Avar periods were identified (Heinrich-Tamáska 2014). Even at the beginning of the 9th c., in a period of the decline of the Khaganate, we record no settlement hiatus in this area (Köllo et al. 2014; Szőke 2008, 52, 53; 2014, 33). The remaining popula­tion probably became inhabitants of the later politi­cal and economic centre established in the vicinity of Zalavár by Pribina. Items of the Late Avar type could thus remain in this area for a long period of time during the 9th c., at least as long as the genera­tion of those last users or their closest relatives lived. It remains a mystery, however, how, after the decline of the Khaganate at the beginning of the 9th c. and before the Carolingian administration took actual control over these areas establishing the political and economic centre in Zalavár around 840, the craft production in the area of the Great Hungarian Plain looked like (Szőke 2014, 38–51).

The pieces of information we possess about the place where the items were discovered do not exclude the possibility that the fitting from Zalasza­bar, similarly as the analogous fitting from Mockersdorf, is Avar (respectively ‘post-Avar’?). This hypothesis is additionally supported by the fact that the fitting from Zalasza­bar has an openwork ornament – only rarely present on fittings of the Carolingian type, although characteristic of the Late Avar decorations. Therefore, apart from the fact that they make only remote and loose analogies (decorative manner), quoting them as such for the fitting from Halicz­any, paradoxically, makes the hypothesis about the Avar origins of the latter fitting even more probable.

---

2 As an example we can recall here the cemetery in Vörs-Papkert B located only 9 km from Zalasza­bar used constantly since the end of the 8th c. until the 11th c. (Köllo et al. 2014).
LATE AVAR ARTEFACTS OUTSIDE THE KHAGANATE

An axis around which all presented here debates concentrate, is the fitting from Haliczany and thus we should take a closer look at the fitting itself in its direct cultural and geographical context. A little more light on the issue may be thrown by placing the find from Haliczany in the context of other finds of Late Avar items from territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes, and Ore Mountains – that is in the area covering territories of today Poland, Germany to the east of and ore Mountains – that is in the area covering the find from haliczany in the context of other more light on the issue may be thrown by placing its direct cultural and geographical context. a little we should take a closer look at the fitting itself in the elbe and Saale, and a small fragment of today western Ukraine located in the Bug River Basin. The comparative analysis is founded on a collection of finds that are defined as specimens typical for the Late Avar culture (List 1). That is why I did not included here items present in the culture of the so called early and middle Khaganate (being a diverse, also ethnically, cultural formation) that we can trace also in many other cultures inhabiting territories of Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe, including even Byzantium. While such items found in the Carpathian Basin, within the area delineated by the scope of early Avar cemeteries, could be easily linked with the culture of the early Khaganate (although often it is impossible to determine, beyond any doubts whether a particular item was produced locally or imported), in the areas located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains we need to consider also direct and indirect relations between the Slavs inhabiting these areas with other cultural forma- tions occupying the Dnieper River Basin, Dniester Basin, the Black Sea and Azov steppes, and the Byzantine culture present in the Crimea. The Avar mediation in import of such items in such cases is only hypothetical and not better substantiated than other hypotheses (Szymański 1995, 139–141). In the case of items characteristic of the culture of the late Khaganate (8th c.–first quarter of the 9th c.), particularly metal finds, we observe a crystallisation of stylistics that could be easily and unambiguously attributed to particular time and space. Although the craft and the art of the late Khaganate widely and extensively borrowed motifs from the Mediterra- nean, Byzantine, and Sassanian craft and art, it also developed own specific concepts and stylistic canons that could be identified with the culture of nomads living in the Carpathian Basin. The main carriers of these schemes were sophisticated and expanded sets of strap fittings (Szenthe 2013a; 2013b).

Once the hypothesis about the Avar origins of the fitting from Haliczany is preliminary substantia- ted, there still remains a much more complex and speculative issue to be settle. Let us try, however, to identify arguments allowing us to answer the question of the time and routes of import of Late Avar products to the Western Slavic Territories located outside the zone of direct influences of the Khaganate – to the north of the Carpathian Moun- tains, Sudetes, and Ore Mountains. The analysis will cover only Late Avar items, whose origins raise no significant doubts. Following the path of reason- ing suggested by W. Szymański (1995, 141, 142), this operation eliminates items that could have been present in the culture of the late Avar Khaganate, but appeared also in other cultures, not necessarily even synchronous. As relatively functional items, despite their stylistics, they could have been used for quite a long period of time. This applies mainly to three-leaf arrowheads with a pivot, decorations of horse tacks, stirrups or spindle whorls decorated with a zigzag line that, although were characteristic of the culture of the late Khaganate, are found also in archaeologically younger contexts attributed, for example, to the Great Moravian culture4 (see Poleski 2013, 167–169).

Finds of Late Avar items concentrate around several centres, nearly solely in southern Poland and, interestingly, in a small cluster in Mecklenburg (Map 1; List 1; Fig. 2–5). As for the latter, however, it is difficult to say anything more definite. First of all, the finds are located in seaside trade centres (Seehandelsplätze), for example in Menzlin, Rals- wieck, Gross Strömkindorf (Bogucki 2004, fig. 1) or in

---

3 Examples include, among others, Byzantine buckles from Neuenkirchen, Lkr. Mecklenburg-Strelitz dated back to the 7th c. (Eger/Biermann 2009, fig. 7) and other coming from unspecified closer areas of Gdańsk (Eger 2010, pl. 15; Wołoszyn 2001, 52, fig. 2) – known also from areas of Pannonia occupied by the Avars (where they could be produced or imported from Byzantium) and extensive stretches of the entire Byzantine Empire and its borders, but also Western Europe and even the British Isles. There many possible routes through which they got to the coast of the Baltic Sea. Similar doubts apply, for example, to an earring from Usti, Ternopil region (Petchyryc 2007, fig. 5: 1) for which analogies can be found both among finds from the Carpathian Basin (Bálint 2010, fig. 22; Garam 2001, pl. 10), burials of Eastern European nomads (Komar 2006, 101, 102, fig. 24: 1, 306), and in Byzantium (Garam 2001, 29).

4 In this context, the term ‘Great Moravian’ is used only to describe the material culture characteristic of the Slavs inhabiting what are now areas of Moravia and Slovakia between the turn of the first and second quarters of the 9th c. and the first half of the 10th c., and avoiding unnecessary debates about whether it should be categorised under the early or late period (see Robak 2013b, 199; 2017b). I accept that although it is a common derivation of the historical term ‘Great Moravia’, which designates a political entity that existed between 833 or 846 – depending on the perspective – to 907 or 924, it is not an adequate term, as the lifespan of ‘Great Moravian’ material culture does not exactly match that of the political entity.
Map 1. Finds of artefacts linked with the culture of the late Avar Khaganate in Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains (list 1). Legend: h – Haliczany; a – late Avar finds; b – find with uncertain localisation; c – reach of the Late Avar in-ritual burial grounds (territory of the Khaganate); d – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803–828; e – areas of high concentration of the Late Avar metalwork outside the territory of the Khaganate; f – single finds of the Late Avar metalwork.
their direct vicinity. Apart from the Avar products, we can find there also a series of late Merovingian, Carolingian, Scandinavian, Baltic, Anglo-Saxon, and Hiberno-Scottish imports (Brather 1996; Klein-gärtner 2014, fig. 21; Robak 2013b, 60). The Avar decorations could travel there at any time, either as an ornaments or as a scrap material. On the other hand it is probable that in addition to the Saxons and the Frisians, also the Czechs and maybe even the Polabian Slavs (allied then with the Franks) participated in the expeditions of Charlemagne against the Avars in 791 (Třeštík 2009, 82). They could bring the Avar products acquired as loot during such expeditions⁵ to Mecklenburg at that time.

In areas located far from the Khaganate, richly decorated Avar belts could be considered an exotic and thus very attractive gift of object of exchange. In 796 Charlemagne himself, for example, gave “unum balteum et unum gladium Huniscum” to Offa, king

---

Fig. 2. Late Avar artefacts. 1 – Biskupin; 2 – Bolesławiec; 3 – Ostrów Lednicki; 4 – Żulice; 5 – Chorula; 6 – Syrynia; 7 – Warszawa (okolice); 8 – Kraków-Kopiec Kraka; 9 – Vino; 10 – Janów Pomorski (Truso).

---

⁵ In areas located far from the Khaganate, richly decorated Avar belts could be considered an exotic and thus very attractive gift of object of exchange. In 796 Charlemagne himself, for example, gave “unum balteum et unum gladium Huniscum” to Offa, king
territories of today Poland, finds of Late Avar products concentrate in Lower Silesia, south-western part of Lesser Poland (particularly around Cracow) and in its north-eastern part. Even a maximising approach to this category of items attributed to the Avar culture proposed by H. Zoll-Adamikowa (1992, fig. 6), and criticised by W. Szymański (1995, 131–139), cannot change the picture.

It would be rather bold to assume that the Avars, with their political centre located in the Great Hun-
Hungarian Plain, could actually control territories located in the Vistula or the Oder Basins. In the second half of the 8th c., the northern border of the Khaganate, marked by the scope of skeletal and bi-ritual cemeteries (Fig. 6; Zábojník 2009, fig. 1), was located only 100 km from the closest existing then strongholds (see Parczewski 2005, fig. 1; Poleski 2013, fig. 102) placed on the northern side of the Carpathian Mountains (Trepcza, Trzcinica, Wietrzno-Bóbrka, Naszacowice). Thus, it cannot be ruled out that the Avar bronzes could be brought to territories of today south-eastern Poland already in the second half of the 8th c., directly from areas of the Khaganate. The character of relations between inhabitants of these lands and the Khaganate remains, however, so far unrecognised. On the one hand these territories were located within the direct operational range of the Avar troops and it cannot be excluded that at least some of the strongholds located in south-eastern Poland, including those where Late Avar items have been found, were erected in reaction to this threat (Parczewski 2005, 30–33; Poleski 2013, 168).

Fig. 4. Late Avar artefacts. 1, 2 – Swaryczów; 3 – Czermno; 4 – Lubomia; 5 – Trepcza-Horodyszcze; 6 – Arkona-Puttgarten; 7 – Anklam; 8, 9 – Klempenow.
Fig. 5. Menzlin. Urn (size reduced, without scale) and fittings from grave 32.

Fig. 6. Early Carolingian strap-ends decorated in Tassilo Chalice Style. 1 – Kraków-Wawel Hill; 2 – Petronell (Stadler 1989); 3 – Cristuru Secuiest; 4 – unknown localization.
and the finds themselves were imported there during warfare activities. On the other hand, however, scarce written sources suggest that in the period of the late Khaganate, the Avars eagerly engaged in a long-distance trade, controlling in the same time the trade route connecting Western Europe with Kiev, passing along the Danube to its bend, and further to the east, towards the passes in the eastern Carpathian Mountains (Čaplovič 1997, 44; Treštík 2009, 72, 73).

It seems, however, that the most probable hypothesis is the one claiming that the import of Avar products to the areas located in the Vistula and Oder Basins was mediated by the immediate southern neighbours. There is a series of tribal strongholds from Moravia, Bohemia, and Slovakia (in Moravia and Slovakia commonly referred to as ‘pre-Great Moravian’), where we found Late Avar artefacts (Map 1), often counted in dozens (for example at Bohemian strongholds: Rubín-Dolánky, Praha-Šarka, Tismíce, Moravian: Brno-Lišeně, Uherské Hradiště-Ostrov Sv. Jiří, Mikulčice6, Olomouc-Povel, and Slovak: Horné Orešany-Rekomberek)7. We cannot be sure, however, neither when these strongholds were abandoned nor whether they were erected already during the times when the late Khaganate still existed or later, during its decline8. Unfortunately, the strongholds are dated only generally back to the 8th–9th c. The fact that on these strongholds the Late Avar bronzes and hooked spurs (and sometimes also quasi-looped) are accompanied by rare items of the early Carolingian type (Robak 2015) seems to contribute to the hypothesis that the Slavic elites showed an increasing demand for luxury goods, associated probably with their gradual emancipation. It could take place still with the consent of the Khaganate or in opposition to its politics. The fact, however, that most of finds could be dated back to the loosely understood turn of the 8th and 9th c. (Late Avar bronzes are mostly dated back to the Late Avar III and IV periods, while the early Carolingian items to the last third of the 8th c. and the first third of the 9th c.) greatly hinders placing the process in the exact context of historical events. It could take place already in the period of prosperity of the late Khaganate, with its consent, during the Frankish-Avar wars (782–805), when the Slavs inhabiting the Middle Danube Basin attempted to turn the situation to their advantage or after the ultimate political collapse of the Khaganate (805), when it no longer presented an obstacle.

The Late Avar products, therefore, could be brought to areas located in the Vistula and Oder Basins either directly from the Khaganate or through Moravia (and maybe even Bohemia?) both in the second half of the 8th c. and later, in the period immediately after the collapse of the Khaganate or even during expansion of the Great Moravia (second half of the 9th c.). It is likely that, as a scrap material, the Avar bronzes were in trade still in the 9th c. (Galuška 2013, 60; Profantová 2010, 231, 232, 255; Ungerman 2007, 222, 223; Žabojník 2005, 104). It is no big surprise that in Polish territories these items concentrate around early medieval tribal centres in Silesia and Lesser Poland, respectively in strategically located points at the outlets of Carpathian passes, which in itself indicate the direction where they were imported from (Map 1). A natural route of import of most of these items seems to be the Moravian Gate, through which items traded in Moravia could get to Silesia and western parts of Lesser Poland.

It should be noted, however, that researches performed in Silesia by K. Jaworski (Jaworski i in. 2012, 42, 43) revealed that on none of the sites where the Late Avar bronze products were discovered, these artefacts were accompanied by contemporary ceramics. On the contrary, there are ceramic items dated back to the second half of the 9th c. and even the 10th c. It is thus highly probable that also items dated back to the 8th c. or the beginning of the 9th c. were brought there together with the Great Moravian products found in Lower Silesia dated, based on stylistic features, back to the second half of the 9th c. and the beginning of the 10th c. A similar scenario can be assumed in the case of two Late Avar finds from Greater Poland (Ostrów Lednicki, Biskupin), where these items were probably imported through Lower Silesia. The attractiveness and thus longevity

---

6 This, of course, applies to the so called ‘pre-Great Moravian phase’ of Mikulčice (Galuška 2013, 43–48).
7 Profantová 2010; Žabojník 2011. In the neighbourhood of the Rekomberek stronghold a large deposit (86 items) containing mainly Late Avar bronzes was found (Pieta 2015; Pieta/Ruttkay 2017).
8 The fact that many ‘flagship’ strongholds linked with the so called Nitra Principality (Nitra, Bojná, Pobedim, Majchiov), whose origins for many years were dated back to the turn of the 8th and 9th c. – allegedly as a consequence of rapid social and economic changes that took place among the ’liberated’ Slaves after the first defeat of the Khaganate in 795–796 – in fact were erected closer to the middle of the 9th c. (Henning/Ruttkay 2011), gives credence to the assumption that strongholds considered as older (tribal) could be used longer than only to the end of the 8th c. Recently, his doubts concerning this issue were openly expressed by P. Šalkovský (2015, 102), although I strongly believe that this traditional view will soon be abandoned. In the Carpathian Basin tribal strongholds could function, more or less, undisturbed still throughout the 9th c. (Beranová/Lutovský 2009, 65–95).
of the Avar decorations is confirmed by a find of a fitting from Trepcza that was later remodelled into a pendant (Ginalska/Glinianouicz/Kotowicz 2013, fig. 5: 1). Similarly remodelled items are present also in Great Moravian burials (Galuška 2013, 60).

In order to better understand faintness of the Avar-Slavic relations in the discussed here part of Europe, we should realise the contrast that arises when we try to reconstruct these relations based on archaeological sources and compare them with the situation at the southern side of the Carpathian and the Sudetes. Already the number of Late Avar artefacts found so far in territories located to the north from the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes, and Ore Mountains and its mere comparison with the number of similar finds from those parts of Slovakia, Moravia, and the Bohemian Basin (when we have hundreds of items) where there are no skeletal and bi-ritual cemeteries characteristic of the culture of the Khaganate (Map 1; Profantová 2010; Zábojník 2010, fig. 6; 2011, fig. 1), reveals profound differences reflecting distinct cultural situations. There is no doubt that the Slavs inhabiting areas of today Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia had strong relations with the culture of the Khaganate, directly adjacent to the lands they occupied, while to the north from the Carpathian Mountains the number of finds seems to confirm the hypothesis that mutual contacts between these cultural formations were only incidental and selective.

In the case of territories of today Slovakia and Moravia we can even talk about direct political dependence on the Khaganate, which borders in the 8th c. were delineated by the scope of cemeteries nearly reaching ramparts of local strongholds in the area of Nitra9. The character of these interactions is, however, difficult to verify using only archaeological methods. The lack of skeletal burials makes it impossible to determine to what extent (and even if at all) the Slavs inhabiting the aforementioned areas of Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia were subjected to cultural ‘avarisation’. The fact that such process in the 8th c. took place in some areas of today Southern Slovakia and Moravia is confirmed by an increasing scope of (early and middle) Avar skeletal and bi-ritual cemeteries, replacing in some places typical Slavic crematory burial grounds (Zábojník 1996; 2009, fig. 2). The nomads themselves were not focusing on forced cultural subordination of the settled society. We should rather assume that this process was voluntary and that the Slavs simply adjusted to new circumstances and adopted the culture (together with its ideological background) of the stronger neighbour they were forced to cooperate with. It cannot be excluded that such a progressive ‘avarisation’ of the Middle Danube Slavs, interrupted at the beginning of the 9th c. by the Franks, would finally reach also upland territories, unattractive for the nomads themselves.

Hundreds of Avar decorations found both loosely and in deposits at Bohemia, Moravian and to slightly lesser extent also at Slovak (mainly in Western Slovakia) strongholds and in their vicinity provide a vast space for interpretation. One of possible options is a situation, when the Slavs (or their elites), similarly as their southern cousins inhabiting areas of the Eastern Alps, who in the 8th c. remained under political influences of the Khaganate, applied Avar attire or its elements in order to manifest their social position, possibly also cultural identity and adherence to a given group (Daim 1998; Eichert 2013)10. In a situation of forced but long-term (smaller or

---

9 The unpublished cemeteries – skeletal in Nitra-Selenec (Ruttkay/Bielich/Daňová 2015), Nitra-Mikov dvor II (Ruttkay a i. 2016, 47) dated back to the first half of the 8th c. and the second half of the 8th c., respectively, and bi-ritual in Nitra-Dolné Krškany Biveta (Zábojník 2009, 104, 105) – are located about 3 km from the stronghold on Zobor that, as suggested by archaeological sources, was used already in the older phases of the Middle Ages (Pietá 2011, 203, 204; Ruttkay 2015). The existence of strongholds on Hradný Kopec and Martinšky Vrch located in today Nitra before the 9th c. is not sufficiently confirmed in sources. Nevertheless, it seems that the scope of Late Avar cemeteries meets here a culturally different (Slavic) and densely populated area of the Middle Nitra Basin with its centres (in 8th c.) located about 40 km from Nitra in Bojna-Záhlavnik, district Topoľčany and Klatova Nová Ves, district Partizánske. We can observe a very similar situation in the area of the Lower Váh Basin (between Nitra and Bratislava), Košice Basin, and in southern Moravia. I thank J. Zábojník, M. Ruttkay, and M. Bielich for the information about the cemeteries.

10 This is substantiated by a series of elite burials from the second half of the 8th c. containing Avar sets of belt fittings. These burials are located far to the west, outside the scope of Avar skeletal and bi-ritual cemeteries, in areas of Eastern Alps, to the east of Enns (Hohenberg, Krungl, Kremsdorf) – that is in areas inhabited by the Slavs, although then considered rather to be a political domain of the Avars (Eichert 2013; Szameit 1994; 1996; Szameit/Stadler 1993). The hypothesis that the Avar attire was attractive to the Slavs receives further support from recent discoveries of burials with Avar belts from Illefsdorf in eastern Bavaria (Lampl u. a. 2014; Losert/Szameit 2014) and Menzlin in Pomerania (Fig. 5; Kleingärtner 2014, 379) with elements characteristic of the decline of the Late Avar period (see Trugy 2008, pl. 19: 36, 37; Szenthe 2013a, fig. 3). Another example is provided by graves from Dalmatia and borderlands of today Slovenia and Croatia containing fragments of Late Avar strap fitting sets (Petrinec 2009, 172–183). It is also worth noting that the Late Avar fitting was found also in the Krak Mound (Fig. 2: 8), believed to be a kurgan. On the other hand the ‘nobleman burial’ from Blatnica in Northern Slovakia quoted many times in the literature is only a collection of stylistically mixed and incoherent items that it hardly could be referred to as an assemblage. Most likely these items were parts of an amateur collection of baron F. Révay complemented in the 19th c. with a dubious story about a nobleman grave (Robak 2017b).
greater) collaboration of the Moravian or ‘Slovak’ Slavs with the Khaganate, that would be a definitely favourable move and to some extent even a natural strategy in relations with a stronger neighbour they needed to cooperate with.11 This hypothesis is substantiated by the fact that soon afterwards elites of the Moravian Slavs began mimicking the attire of the Frankish aristocracy, particularly the tendency to use straps decorated with metal ornaments in a particular (Carolingian) type, previously unknown (or unappealing) to them. The acquisition of the Carolingian ways of dressing up was probably supported by the same mechanisms as the decision to adopt Christianity and was dictated both by the mere necessity and aspirations that could be satisfied only with the help of western partners dominating over their Slavic neighbours militarily and culturally. Adjusting to the Carolingian patterns of manifesting social status increased chances of the Slavic aristocracy and warriors to be accepted by their Carolingian counterparts and simultaneously proved their willingness to become a part of a given society (just like in the case of comitatus christiana). Only 80 years later, in the era of invasions and conquest of the Carpathian Basin by the Hungarians, the Bavarian bishops complained to the Pope that the Moravians who mingle with the Hungarians “shave their heads in the Hungarian way” and assault the Christians (Havlík 2013, 286). As we can see, therefore, identification with a dominant or currently stronger neighbour, particularly through imitating as important determinants of identity as attire and appearance, and immediate obliteration of any links with the defeated party was, at that time, a popular survival strategy. Was it applied also during the dominance of the Avar Khaganate?

Lack of skeletal graves from the 8th and the beginning of the 9th c. in areas discussed here does not allow, at the moment, to verify this hypothesis. The hypothesis about the common application of Avar decorations in the 8th and at the beginning of the 9th c. by the Slavic elites (men) inhabiting areas directly neighbouring the Khaganate (today Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia) remains, however, probable also due to the fact that those are generally the only types of decorations (dated back to this period) of the male attire found in large numbers at strongholds and in their vicinity (Galuška 2013, 41–91; Profantová 2010, 230; Zábojník 2011). By comparison – contemporary early Carolingian imports (of any type) from territories of today Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia could be nearly counted on the fingers of one hand (Profantová 2016; Robak 2013b, 192; 2015). Most of these items (if we can talk about a majority in the case of only few specimens) come from areas of the Bohemian Basin, the land that directly bordered Carolingian territories and at the end of the 8th c. and the beginning of the 9th c. repeatedly became an arena of the Carolingian military operations (791 and 805–806).

Another possible explanation of the phenomenon of this common presence of Late Avar artefacts in areas of today Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia is provided by a hypothesis that such products were brought in mass (in many different ways: as loot, trade items or raw material)12 to lands located to the north of the borders of the Khaganate mainly during the period of the political decline of the Khaganate and the Frankish-Avar war (after 791) or even later, but mainly as a scrap material used in production of other items. Application of single items in accordance with their original function was only incidental. As an argument supporting this hypothesis we can mention here an observation that the vast majority of these items are typical only for the stylistics of the late and decline Avar periods (Galuška 2013, 88; Zábojník 2011, 208) and the fact that most of them bear traces of long-term use – they are often damaged or defective castings. As a consequence, they could have remained in circulation as a valuable raw material for a considerably long period of time, namely even throughout the first half of the 9th c. Occasionally, Avar fittings are found in skeletal graves – both belonging to the horizon of the oldest skeletal graves in Moravia (for example Mikulčice, grave 108/II; Modrá, grave 22)

---

11 In the Frankish written sources from the time of Frankish-Avar wars (782–805), the Avars as well as the Slavs are generally mentioned jointly, as a single enemy. This, however, shows also that the Franks made no effort to distinguish them, particularly when they were not easily distinguishable. According to the proverb, fine feathers make fine birds, and in the Middle Ages the attire, including a hairdo, was a primary determinant of ethnic and cultural identity and group affiliation (while today it is the language that serves as such a cultural determinant), and based on those features people attributed ethnicity to a given person. This procedure, however, had a series of consequences – particularly legal – as an individual was subject to laws of his own people. All this should make us ask, how many people labelled by the contemporaries (particularly the Franks) as the Avars, were Avars indeed, and how many were simply Slavs wearing Avar attire. Another question is how many of those Slavs quickly changed their appearance, when being ‘an Avar’ was no longer desirable (once the Avars became conquered people).

12 Robbery dig-ins discovered during exploration of burials of most cultures and epochs contributes to the conclusion that robbing was a common method of acquiring valuable items. Late Avar burial grounds were not spared this fate – the practice is there widely widespread, particularly in the area of Komárno (Zábojník/Béreš 2016, 61, 62). There remains, of course, an open question of whether the Avar graves were robbed by the ‘vengeful’ Slaves or ‘greedy’ tribesmen.
and those dated back to the second half of the 9th c., corresponding already to the Great Moravian period (e.g. Břeclav-Pohansko, grave 17/ŽP). Usually, however, such items do not reproduce their original function, serving, at best, as fittings of saddlebags (Staré Město, grave 291/AZ; Ducové, grave 1205) or pendants (Břeclav-Pohansko, grave 17/ŽP) and only in few cases (Modrá, grave 22; Staré Město, grave 307/AZ) as belt fittings although without the entire set (Galuška 2013, 54–70).

With the current state of knowledge, however, the first hypothesis (gradual ‘avarisation’) does not exclude the second one (import of scrap material). The mere fact that we find items nearly solely dated back to the late and decline Avar periods (generally the second half of the 8th c. and the first quarter of the 9th c.) is consistent with the propagation of the Avar cultural model (or its selected elements) from the south to the lands located to the north of the Middle Danube. The process itself is perceptible thanks to the presence of skeletal and bi-ritual burial grounds containing pieces of equipment typical for Avar burials from the Transdanubian areas (Zábojník 1996). In this case it is not important whether we deal here with an actual migration of the population from the south or rather propagation of the Avar cultural model in a previously Slavic environment. It is, however, important, that in such areas Avar strap fitting sets were applied and that such items could get to the north, to the lands of Moravia and Slovakia or Bohemian Basin still in the period of their primary use. On the other hand, however, the social decline of the Khaganate and its elites at the beginning of the 9th c. certainly ‘freed’ large groups of craftsmen who had previously worked for the Avars and who then needed new customers. Natural recipients of their services were the newly formed Slavic elites, who in the first half of the 9th c. inhabited Moravia and Western Slovakia (Zábojník 2005, 104). Migrating craftsmen took their tools and valuable raw materials (such as scraps of nonferrous metals) with them. Somewhat in parallel to these processes, Avar items were brought in to these territories also as loot plundered at the turn of the 8th and 9th c. during the wars – either by the Franks or the opportunistic Slavs – and then put into circulation.

As mentioned above, the lack of skeletal graves outside the Khaganate does not allow us to provide an unambiguous answer to the question of whether the Slavic elites inhabiting areas of Moravia, Slovakia, and Bohemian Basin in the 8th c. and at the beginning of the 9th c. applied the ‘Avar type’ attire. Single skeletal graves in Moravia and Slovakia do contain Late Avar strap-ends, but we should not overlook the fact that even the oldest among them (Mikušice, grave 108-II; Modrá, grave 22) come from the period when the Moravians had already changed their political orientation to the west (turn of the first and second quarters of the 9th c. or the beginning of the second quarter of the 9th c.) and such single Avar fittings are usually already accompanied by late Carolingian fittings. What was the prevailing fashion before that period, for example in the second half or at the end of the 8th c., remains unknown. It is equally possible either that the Slavs commonly applied single Avar fittings to decorate straps (Profantová 2010, 230–232), they did that only incidentally and in their own, unique way (Galuška 2013, 85, 86) – as for example in the case of skeletal graves 291/AZ or 307/AZ from Staré Město and grave 17 and 20 from Dubovany dist. Piešťany13 – or that they used belts in a typical Avar form with more or less elaborated sets of fittings in order to highlight their social position. They did not have to produce them – imports from the Khaganate were sufficient enough (Ungerman 2007, 223). The fact that the Avar bronzes were used as a source of raw material long in the 9th c. does not exclude any of these hypotheses.

Contrary to previous speculations (e.g. Klanica 1972, 65–67; Poulík 1960, 159; 1975, 29; Szymański 1995, 129) there is no evidence that could confirm that the Slavs inhabiting areas of today Moravia or Slovakia, located outside the borders of the Khaganate, produced belt decorations in the Avar type themselves (Galuška 2013, 46, 47, 87; Zábojník 2011, 210).

Finally, it would be useful to make here some reservation, namely that if not for the burial assemblages of the Grabelsdorf type from the areas of the Eastern Alps (Hohenberg, Krungl, Kremsdorf) or the find from Ifelsdorf in the Upper Palatinate14, none of the researchers, relying only on loose finds, would reasonably venture to assume that also in these areas some elites (either Slavic or Avar residents) used a complete set of strap fittings of the Avar type in order to express their privileged social position. Following an analogical observation we should conclude that if not for the hundreds of burials of Great Moravian warriors containing the equipment, based on the loose finds coming nearly solely from Great Moravian strongholds, we could successfully claim that in Moravia and Slovakia only single, selected components of strap fittings of the late Carolingian type were used – and not the entire sets. What is more, perhaps we would not even know how those original Carolingian sets

---

14 See footnote 10.
looked like. From the Western Europe we know complete sets nearly only from finds of the Vikings’ deposits and iconographic sources from the epoch. Faced with the custom of not placing the equipment in graves adopted at the turn of the 8th and 9th c. in the Carolingian State, we would be unable to complete even a single late Carolingian sword set relying only on loose finds from the former Carolingian Empire. Even the design and the composition of early Carolingian sword sets was confirmed (still partially) only recently by a find of a deposit from Aggbichl near Marquartstein, Lkr. Traunstein in Bavaria (Helmbrecht 2008). In this situation a find of the only complete (or nearly complete) belt set of the Avar type from Moravia (near Zlín) in a deposit (Galuška 2013, 80–84) does not necessarily mean that prior to the deposition the belt was not used by some local warrior. Simply we have so scarce and scattered data that each new find can radically change our perspective. Regardless of their position on the causes, however, researchers are unanimous that the greatest inflow of Avar imports to the territories of today Moravia, Slovakia, and Bohemia took place at the turn of the 8th and 9th c. (Galuška 2013, 91; Zábojník 2005, 104).

CAROLINGIAN IMPORTS

Locations of finds of Carolingian-type imports on a map nearly precisely copy the distribution of clusters of Late Avar imports in the discussed here European areas (Maps 2–4). This, probably, is a consequence of two simple facts. First of all, various imported and luxury goods naturally concentrated around centres occupied by elites for whom they were imported or locally produced (using imported raw materials, for example scrap metal). At most of those sites or in their vicinity also, not only Avar or Carolingian, luxury goods and decorations were found. Secondly, it is linked with the state of research, particularly long-term excavations at a series of Lesser Poland tribal strongholds during which these items were acquired. It cannot be denied that the number of finds significantly correlates with the intensity of researches performed in a given area.

When I write here about items of the Carolingian type, I focus on types of items characteristic of the Carolingian material culture, particularly components of the male attire and weaponry, but also those that could be considered as foreign, that is imported from a foreign cultural circle and those that were not popularised enough so the local cultural environment did not initiate a mass production of their copies (respectively, from various reasons, for example linked with technology or resources, they could not be produced locally). Wearing them was thus a good strategy to distinguish oneself from a given social group and could be used to manifest an actual social position or an ambition to belong to some group. Therefore, the category of items of the Carolingian-type on lands located in the Oder and Vistula Basins generally covers Great Moravian items, because it is Moravia and Slovakia where we find their closest and most accurate analogies. In some cases we can even indicate places where such items were presumably manufactured. In terms of a warriors’ (and particularly members of the elites) attire and equipment, the material culture of the Slavs inhabiting territories of today Moravia and Western Slovakia until the turn of the first and second quarter of the 9th c. was highly parallel to the trends coming from the Carolingian State. Until the mid-9th c. such items are practically indistinguishable from the Carolingian originals (probably most of them are imports indeed). Only in the second half of the 9th c. items of the Carolingian type, particularly strap fittings, gained local features in Moravia and Slovakia, although they still followed general trends borrowed from the West (Robak 2013b, 171–185, 213–215). This, however, after a detailed analysis, makes these artefacts relatively good independent chronological determinants.

Generally, on lands located in the Oder and Vistula Basins, only a few items could be considered as the Carolingian (western) originals (List 2)16. These include, among other, a fitting of a small strap (judging from its size most likely a spur strap) from Kraków-Wawel Hill (Fig. 6: 1; Zoll-Adamicowa 1998).

---

15 One of such places could be the stronghold in Bojná, district Topoľčany in Slovakia, where we have discovered hundreds of strap fittings of various types dated mainly back to the second half of the 9th c. and the beginning of the 10th (Robak 2013a; 2013b; 2014; 2015). Single items strikingly similar to those from Bojná are found in Western Slovakia and one comes from Kraków-Dębinki (Robak 2013b, 73, 176). The general picture drawn by Great Moravian imports in southern Poland resembles rather reception of the Great Moravian culture in today Slovakia than in Moravia. Most of weaponry found in Slovakia is made of precious and non-ferrous metals. This is particularly evident when we compare equipment of graves with warriors’ graves, which are relatively scarce in Slovakia. There is also a noticeable over-representation of items dated back to the second half of the 9th c.

16 The spur from Kraków-Gródek dated sometimes back to the first half of the 9th c. (recently, for example, discussed by Strzyż 2006, 108) represents the type of spurs with the so called chalice-like prick, referred to as the York and Menzlin types (Kind 2002, 289–292). Spurs of the latter type are dated back to the 10th c. A very similar specimen has been found in a settlement in Obisów (Rzeźnik 2006, 185).
Map 2. Finds of Carolingian items (second half of the 8th c.–turn of the 9th and 10th c.) in Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains (List 2). Legend: a – Carolingian spurs; b – other Carolingian finds; c – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803–828; d – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 828–906; e – areas of high concentration of the Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds: 1 – Bohemian Basin > 100 items; 2 – Moravia and Slovakia > 1000 items; 3 – Scandinavia > 100 items.
Map 3. Finds of items of the Carolingian type, most likely imports from Great Moravian territories in Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains (List 3). Legend: A – burial ground in Stěbořice; B – burial ground in Hradec nad Moravicí; C – stronghold in Chotěbuz-Podobora; a – Carolingian-type finds; b – skeletal cemeteries with Great Moravian warrior burials; c – Great Moravian stronghold; d – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803–828; e – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 828–906; f – areas of high concentration of the Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds: 1 – Bohemian Basin > 100 items; 2 – Moravia and Slovakia > 1000 items; 3 – Scandinavia > 100 items.
Map 4. Finds of plate spurs (various types), most likely imports from Great Moravian territories in Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains (list 4). Legend: A - burial ground in Stěbořice; B - burial ground in Hradec nad Moravicí; a - plate spurs (considered as Great Moravian); b - skeletal cemeteries with Great Moravian warrior burials; c - Great Moravian stronghold; d - eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803–828; e - eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 828–906; f - areas of high concentration of the Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds: 1 - Bohemian Basin > 100 items; 2 - Moravia and Slovakia > 1000 items; 3 - Scandinavia > 100 items.
decorated with a stylistics linked with the Tassilo Chalice Style and a slightly larger fitting, decorated with an end-knob, found in Kraków-Nowa Huta-Mogila (Fig. 7; Poleski 2013, fig. 97: 6). Items of this type are very typical for the elite culture of the early Carolingian period (second half of the 8th c. or, more likely, the last third of the 8th c. and the first third of the 9th c.) in the Carolingian State (Robak 2015, 312–315). Outside the central area of the Carolingian State such items are present mainly in territories covered at the beginning of the 9th c. by the Carolingian expansion, or speaking more generally, wherever at the end of the 8th c. and at the beginning of the first third of the 9th c. the army of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious operated, particularly in Dalmatia and southern Pannonia. Recently, more and more similar items are found also in western parts of Bohemia (Prohászka 2016). While in today Moravia and Slovakia these are as rare items as in the entire western Slavdom, but of course at least until the first quarter of the 9th c. we cannot speak about any intense Carolingian cultural influences in this areas. The earliest wave of Carolingian imports (manifested, for example, by a presence of complete sets of a warrior’s equipment in the Carolingian type) reaches Moravia and Western Slovakia at the end of the first quarter of the 9th c. (Robak 2013b; 2014; 2015). We cannot exclude, of course, incidental imports also in the earlier period, just as we cannot exclude that these items were imported later, already as a scrap mate-
rial. Taking into account cultural relations between Southern Poland and Moravia or Western Slovakia in the 9th c. (Wachowski 1994; 1997; Poleski 2013, 170–185), it seems that the most probable route along which these two early Carolingian fittings were imported to western Lesser Poland goes through Moravia (similarly as in the case of Late Avar fittings). This is much more probable than any form of direct import from Western Europe or the Bohemian Basin, although these options cannot be completely ruled out. Similarly as in the case of Avar artefacts, they could be imported as already out-dated items used only as a source of raw material.

I have already discussed the issue of the small strap-end from Kraków-Wawel and a very similar specimen from Petronell (Robak 2015, 317) including them into a group of items decorated with the manner of the so called twisted animal silhouettes (winklig verknotete und verschränkte Struktur). Recently, however, two nearly identical but much better preserved artefacts have been found that called my hypothesis into question (Fig. 6)17. Deciphering the image on fittings from Wawel and Petronell according to the pattern depicted on the item kept in a private collection, forces us to ask whether it is an animal silhouette at all and not only an abstract bundle of twisted lines mimicking the Tassilo Chalice Style. A simplistic imitation of the visual effect produced by animal or plant ornaments characteristic of the Tassilo Chalice Style, instead of a sophisticated image, was sometimes a measure used by craftsmen, particularly in the case of small fittings or fibulae (Robak 2015, 314). Although such items were not entirely common products (as there are also gilded specimens), they are quite dissimilar to items of the highest quality represented by most of goods decorated with the aforementioned stylistics.

The second fitting (from Kraków-Nowa Huta-Mogila) that could be considered also as an early Carolingian specimen is known only in a form of a schematic drawing (Fig. 7; Poleski 2013, fig. 97: 6). It seems that this item is larger than the first one, possibly a fitting of a larger strap. Similar fittings are known from elite skeletal burials belonging to the so called Biskupija-Crkvina Horizon being the earliest horizon of Carolingian finds in territories of today Croatia, mainly its Dalmatian part. The horizon is defined based on finds coming from abundantly equipped skeletal graves dated rough-

---

17 The first one is a fitting from Cristuru Secuiesc, jud. Harghita in Transylvania (Prohászka/Nevizánsky 2016). Unfortunately the second item (together with another strap-end) has been located at an auction in one of Munich antique shops. Despite intense attempts, it was impossible to determine its origins. The Author understands that the way the artefact was published is unscientific, but it could be the only opportunity to approximate how the ornament on the fitting found at Wawel Hill could look like.
ly back to the range between 790 and 850 (Giesler 1974, 532, 533; Kleemann 2010; Robak 2013b, 17–22, 192, 193, 207, 208; pl. LXVI: 4, 5; LXXVI: 1a, 1b, 2). This, however, does not mean that large strap-ends with an end-knob were characteristic solely for those areas. Items used as determinants of the Biskupija-Crkvina Horizon are typical Carolingian products and have their counterparts among finds from Western Europe.

In addition to the two aforementioned early Carolingian we should remember here also about a strap-end from Będzin (Fig. 17: 12; Kouřil/Gryc 2011, fig. 14: 11; Rogaczewska 2002, 286, fig. 4: a). As it is difficult to unambiguously determine its origins and purpose it was supposed to serve, I intentionally do not label it a ‘Carolingian import’. The item was made of lead and was never used (openings for rivets are not pierced). Generally, it seems that it served rather as a model to be reproduced using other materials, bronze for example. The fitting can be dated relatively well based on its stylistics. The ornament decorating the fitting is a typical example of still undeveloped Carolingian plant ornamentation, characteristic particularly for the second quarter of the 9th c. (Robak 2013b, 161) and thus there is little doubt as to the cultural environment it should be assigned to. Items decorated in this style are known from Western Europe in relatively large numbers. There is, however, one obstacle that makes it difficult to assume beyond any doubt that the fitting from Będzin was manufactured in the West and then directly imported, namely the fact that the first wave of Carolingian imports to the territories of Moravia and Slovakia included also products decorated with the early plant style (Robak 2013b, 166, 193, 194, 209). The distinction between items ‘of the Carolingian type’ manufactured in Western Europe and those produced in Moravia is, in many cases, impossible. This applies particularly to the early period of Carolingian influences (first half of the 9th c.), when the ‘local’ style of decorating items of the Carolingian type (spurs, strap fittings) had not yet crystallised and thus craftsmen simply copied decorative patterns or entire products imported directly from Western Europe (Robak 2016). It is possible that the fitting found in Będzin was indeed a copied Carolingian original that was supposed to serve as a model for further duplication. It will be very difficult to determine where it was produced, although it seems clear that most likely it travelled to Lesser Poland from Moravia. Including this item among imports from this area, substantiated at least by the territorial proximity, seems to be more legitimate than assuming that it was imported directly from the west of Europe. And in the absence of evidence confirming production of any decorations inspired by the Carolingian craft in lands located in the Oder and Vistula Basins, it would be rather difficult to consider the fitting as a local product.

In the areas of the Polabian Slavs, particularly today Mecklenburg and Western Pomerania the situation is utterly different than in today southern Poland. Carolingian products could be, and most likely were imported there directly from the Carolingian Empire either through trade activities or military and diplomatic actions intensely performed in Elbe region and Western Pomerania, particularly during the times of Charlemagne and the early years of reign of Luis the Pious (Brother 1996, 73–81; Polek 2007). The accumulation of items, mainly strap fittings and spurs, dated back to the first half of the 9th c., is legible particularly in the vicinity of the political and economic centre of the Obotrites located in Starigard/Oldenburg (Brother 1996, 61; Gabriel 1988). At that stronghold, in addition to other artefacts confirming intense contacts with the Carolingian State, archaeologists have also found traces of a palatium (Gabriel 1986), which makes this centre exceptional in scale of the entire north-western Slavic Territories. Some (possibly even a majority) of the Carolingian items could get to these territories through the Scandinavians (Brother 1996, 61; Wachowski 1992, 110). In the 9th c. they brought Carolingian and Hiberno-Scottish decorations made of non-ferrous and precious metals in large numbers to Denmark, Norway, and Sweden (Fig. 8). This particularly applies to coastal

---

18 One thing is, however, certain – in no case the fitting is an item of the ‘Blatnica-Mikulčice style’. The style (sometimes referred to as a ‘horizon’) simply never existed and the appearance of the term in the literature in the ’60s and ’70s of the previous c. is a consequence of a series of unfortunate coincidences mixed with carelessness (for details see Robak 2013b, 22–25; 2017b; Ungermann 2011). Fittings that for decades were assigned to the so called ‘Blatnica-Mikulčice style’ are simply of Late Avar or Carolingian types (or neither of the two, but researchers do not know how to label them). Craft and art of both these cultures freely drawn from Byzantine and oriental sources (independently and from various reasons), particularly in the second half of the 8th c. and at the beginning of the 9th (Daim 2000; 2001; Wamers 2015, 75, 76). Fittings of the Carolingian type from the Slavic Territories have their analogies (sometimes even perfect matches) among Carolingian originals from Western Europe, only nobody has sought them. Similarly, late and decline Avar fittings, as for example the fitting from Boleslawiec, in the Polish literature are referred to as ‘Blatnica-Mikulčice’ (e. g. recently: Jaworski i in. 201, 42; Poleski 2013, 171; 2014, 152, 153). The fitting from Boleslawiec is a beautiful example of the late and decline Avar craft with features of the Italo-Byzantine style. Similar items can be found in the entire Central and Eastern Europe, from the Alps through the Balkans, Crimea, to the Azov steppes (Daim 2000, 185, fig. 112, map 3, 2010, 67–70; Szenthe 2013b, 316, 317).
trade settlements, including those located in Polish parts of Pomerania (Wolin, Truso). Possibly Scandi-
navians even produced some of the items of the Carolingian type themselves. Occasionally, we
found also Carolingian coins in these areas, whose occurrence is linked with the Scandinavians’ activi-
ties as well (Bogucki 2006). Although the number of Carolingian imports in the territories occupied
by the Polabian Slavs and in Pomerania (which eastern parts were inhabited in 9\textsuperscript{th} c. by Prussian tribes), when compared to Moravia and Slovakia, is relatively small (comparable for example with today Southern Poland), the finds concentrate in a much smaller area and, unlike in the case of lands located in the Oder and Vistula Basins, are more diverse (Fig. 9–14).

Fig. 8. Distribution of Carolingian metalwork in Scandinavia and Pomerania. Legend: a – one
find; b – two and more finds; c – borders of the Carolingian state in the 9\textsuperscript{th} c.

\[\textsuperscript{19}\] This applies particularly to elements of spur fastenings (decorated loops in particular) adopted by the Scandinavians in the 9\textsuperscript{th} c. from the Carolingians together with buckle spurs. Loops of the Carolingian type, sometimes identical as those found on the continent, are discovered in Scandinavian burials and in settlements on the British Isles and in Scandinavia (Bersu/Wilson 1966, 35–41; Paterson et al. 2014, 87, 88; Wamers 2011, 72–74). There is no reason, however, to believe that they were all imported from the continent. What is more, the period when they were used is dated from the mid-9\textsuperscript{th} c. to the end of the 10\textsuperscript{th} c. – that is long after strap fittings of the Carolingian type ceased to be used on the continent. In this context, loops from the kurgan 3 in Świelubie (Łosiński 1966, 167, 168) are most likely Scandinavian products although mimicking the Carolingian type. They are accompanied by strap fittings in a form of a bended plate, also typical for Scandinavia and the British Isles. I thank to A. Janowski from IAI\text⃣ PAN in Szczecin, who drew my attention to the assemblage from Świelubie.
Fig. 9. Carolingian-type finds. 1, 2 – Arkona-Puttgarten; 3 – Schwerinsburg; 4 – Hammersburg; 5 – Mittenwalde-Pennigsberg; 6 – Neukalen; 7 – Sukow-Marienhof.
Fig. 10. Carolingian-type finds. 1–7 – Starigard-Oldenburg; 8 – Teterow; 9 – Luckenwalde.
I deliberately did not put on the map finds of imported weaponry, such as heads of pole weapons and axes. In the case of these items their popularity, or even their mere acceptance, was not conditioned by visual attractiveness or cultural meaning they inferred (as in the case of warrior's attire), but simply by their usefulness that users would probably accepted without much regard for ornamentation or origins of the item. Such items could be (and were) used for a very long time, even passed on from one generation to another.\footnote{See Ahmad ibn Rustah Book of Precious Records, chapter 12, line 252, who wrote about a custom popular among the Rus' to pass a sword on to a newly born son (Labuda 1999, 120).} Their typological variability is, as for the needs of archaeological research, insufficient. The latter comment applies particularly to axes and heads of pole weapons that could hardly be considered status determinants or a measure of manifesting own social position – at least as long as they were not ‘parade’ specimens. Unlike decorations or elite (precious) weaponry their dispersion does not necessarily reflect actual economic and cultural relations between given areas of production and occurrence. Another issue that eliminates similar items from this analysis is the fact that most of them cannot be assigned to a single cultural milieu (as for example three-leaf or rhomboidal arrowheads). Carolingian swords provide a good example: it is commonly known that they were often distributed by the Scandinavians and thus their geographical distribution reflects the scope of rather Scandinavian not Carolingian influences (Łosiński 2008, 153).

Fig. 11. Carolingian-type finds. 1, 2 – Janów Pomorski (Truso); 3 – Wolin; 4 – Radacz; 5 – Stargard; 6 – unknown place in Sambia.
If, however, we decide to include in the analysis types of swords that could be unambiguously dated back exclusively to the Carolingian period (Manheim type, special type 2, types B, G, H, I, K), then except for the swords from Machów and Strzegocice in Lesser Poland (Strzyż 2006, 17–21) and the one from an unknown location in Silesia (Marek 2004, 114), remaining finds come from Polish and German parts of Pomerania, mainly from the area of Wolin and Truso (Dulinicz 2001, 95–97; Jagodziński 2013, fig. 19; Marek 200421; Messal 2015, 137–139; Pudło 2012; Świątkiewicz 2002). It seems thus highly probable that their import was mediated by the Scandinavians (particularly in the case of swords of type G), much more probable than direct import of these products from Western Europe by the Slavs themselves.

Furthermore, I have not included to the group ‘items of the Carolingian type’ in the studied area finds of spurs, commonly referred to as ‘loop spurs’. In the Slavic Territories long-yoke Carolingian loop spurs (Schlaufensporen) with characteristically bolded edges of the eyelets, identical as those known from Western Europe, are present in Croatia, Slovenia, and also north-western Bulgaria from where we know a small number of specimens with knee-like bolded yokes around eyelets (Milošević 2006; Yotov 2004, 161–163). A fragment of one is known also from Bohemia (Profantová 2016, fig. 7b). Spurs found in the Western Slavic Territories

---

21 The quoted study mistakenly places swords from the area of Dithmarschen around Dresden, while in fact the village is located in Schleswig-Holstein.
(outside borders of the Carolingian State) although commonly referred to as ‘loop spurs’ are, in fact, nearly solely items that should be labelled as ‘quasi-looped’, as eyelets are made simply of a tip of a yoke that was bent and hammered with an arm, respectively flatten and pierced. These items could be manufactured either in areas located in the Oder and Vistula Basins or in territories of today Moravia, Slovakia, and Bohemia. They were a Slavic variation of loop spurs, most likely produced as a consequence of impulses inflowing from the West, from the Merovingian cultural milieu – it would be rather doubtful, if items so simple in form and design were imported. These spurs are known from areas of today Poland, Moravia, Slovakia, Germany, and Bohemia (Kavánová 1976, 16, 17; Poleski 2004, 15; Strzyż 2006, fig. 27: 12) where they appear already in the first half of the 8th c., and most of them are dated back to its second half and possibly even the beginning of the 9th c. (Bialeková 1977, 122–124; Bräther 1996, 55; Ginalska/Kotowicz 2004, 221; Kotowicz/Michalak 2007–2008, 362–364).

The issue, however, still requires thorough studies. The current state of knowledge about looped and ‘quasi-looped’ spurs provides no grounds to restrict the chronology of their disappearance from assemblages and finds from Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia exclusively to the beginning of the 9th c. that is the time when Carolingian loop spurs disappeared (Kind 2007, 554). There is a possibility that quasi-looped spurs, similarly as in other Slavic areas (Kotowicz 2005, 68; Kotowicz/Michalak 2007–2008, 362), were manufactured and used there throughout the entire 9th c. (Profantová 1994, 71; 2016, 32; Robak 2013b, 28), not only in the 8th c. and at the beginning of the 9th c. This puts a question mark over accepting specimens with a riveted prick as imports from the West (Ginalska/Kotowicz 2004, 221). Particularly when we know that since the mid-9th c. plate spurs with a riveted prick were simultaneously manufactured in Moravia and Slovakia. Therefore the technique was known there and cannot be considered a decisive factor in a debate about origins of a given item.

22 Confer a find from grave 788 from Čakajovce, where a quasi-looped spur was accompanied by a fastening set of the late Carolingian type (Robak 2013b, 28; 2014, 54). In the literature, however, the assemblage is dated back to the beginning of the 9th c., precisely due to the attachment of researchers to the traditional chronology of looped and quasi-looped spurs. This is also the only known example of using a set of spur strap fittings with a quasi-looped spur. It should be noted here also that the drawing in a publication by M. Rejholcová (1995, pl. CXXVI: 1, 2) is inconsistent with the actual appearance of the artefact. Furthermore, what is not a common knowledge, but I had a chance to witness it for myself, the present appearance of eyelets (see Kouřil 2014, 312) is a consequence of rather artistic modelling activities of a conservator, who shaped them of plastic.
Fig. 14. Carolingian spurs. 1 – Recz; 2–4 – Glienké; 5 – Starigard-Oldenburg; 6 – Menzlin; 7 – Sternberger Burg; 8 – Arkona-Puttgarten.
A characteristic feature of ‘quasi-looped’ spurs, particularly those with a long yoke, is the fact that they seem to be poorly done. In Moravia, for example, where more technologically advanced items (plate spurs of various types) were available, we are entitled to assume that although the quasi-looped spurs were only a substitute, the substitution was satisfactory, particularly when it was impossible (due to financial or technical reasons) to acquire other, better products. It cannot be excluded that some quasi-looped spurs found in Southern Poland could be imported from the South. It is possible, for example, that a well-made spur from Barkowice Mokre (Sikora 2009, 147, fig. 11) has Great Moravian origins. A find of a bearded axe at the same site makes this hypothesis even more probable.

Among items that could be considered to be early Carolingian originals, we should include a looped spur from Jedlina-Kamieńsk in Lower Silesia (Fig. 15: 5; Petersen 1939, fig. 95; Wachowski 2001, fig. 5). Since such items are absent in Moravia and Slovakia, this specimen was imported to Silesia most likely from Western Europe through

Fig. 15. Carolingian spurs. 1 – Scharstorf; 2 – Kreitzschau-Groitzchen; 3 – Baderitz (Oschatz); 4 – Friedland; 5 – Jedlina-Kamieńsk.
Lusatia or Bohemia, where recently researchers have found a fragment of a similar item together with a loop decorated in a similar style (Profantová 2016, fig. 7b; 10: 2). Spurs of this variation, with two knee-like thickenings on eyelets, are common at Western European cemeteries, in assemblages dated back to the second half of the 8th c. They disappear at the beginning of the 9th c. (Kleemann 2002, 126; Robak 2013b, 27; Stein 1967).

Apart from the weaponry, spurs are virtually the only element of an elite (or military) Carolingian (and previously Merovingian) culture that was accepted by the Western Slavs without much regard for stylistics or types of the items. This, most probably, was associated with their obvious usefulness. When in the 9th c. new types of spurs, namely plate spurs, started to appear in the Carolingian State and Moravia, they got also to the territories of today Southern Poland. There are a couple of arguments found there that lend support to the hypothesis about Great Moravian mediation in the import of spurs in the 9th c.: first of all the presence of types known nearly solely from Moravia and Western Slovakia (spurs with a heart-shaped plate), lack of older types of Carolingian spurs that are absent also in Moravia (buckle spurs), and finally the fact finds concentrate mainly in southern and south-western Lesser Poland and western part of Upper Silesia (Map 4). Unlike in the case of hooked and quasi-looped spurs, nothing allows us to assume that these new types of spurs were manufactured there.

Therefore, a vast majority of imports of items of the Carolingian type found in the Oder and Vistula Basins are goods brought from territories of Moravia and Western Slovakia (List 3; 4) and not Carolingian (Western European) originals. It is worth noticing that in addition to plate spurs of various types (Fig. 16; 17: 1–7)23, nearly all other artefacts are loops or small strap-ends matching the spurs (Fig. 18–20). The patterns of dispersion of finds of Great Moravian spurs and loops coincide. In other words, they are present at the same sites or concentrate in the same areas (Maps 3–5). It is difficult to date such items precisely, particularly if they are not accompanied by other, more characteristic elements of a set or decorated in some specific manner. We should notice, however, that nearly all loops found in today Poland are very small (about 2 cm long) specimens with oval or corrugated at edges plates. An interesting observation follows from a comparison of dimensions of these elements, particularly their width, with fittings they accompanied in Great Moravian graves. It seems that we are entitled to conclude that dimensions of loops found in territories of today Poland reflect a tendency initiated about the middle of the 9th c. to miniaturise spur-strap fittings of the Carolingian type. The process was a consequence of the fact that plates with side rivets, where rivets were placed at both sides of a yoke, were replaced by smaller plates with a transverse row of two–three rivets (Robak 2013b, 59, 68, 79, 204, 205). It is, therefore, possible that most of such imports (plate spurs with fasteners containing loops) were brought to Lesser Poland and Silesia (and also southern Greater Poland) after the middle of the 9th c. In comparison with the ‘Mecklenburg-Pomeranian agglomeration’, where the chronology of items of the Carolingian type (and most likely Western European originals) falls within the range between the final third of the 8th c. and the beginning of the 10th c. – with a significant over-representation of the turn of the 8th and 9th c. and the first half of the 10th c. (Maps 6–8) – this constitutes a major difference. This difference is a reflection of profound interests of the Carolingians in these areas that were abandoned during the dynastic crisis at the turn of the ‘30s and ‘40s of the 9th c. Later, as we can judge from the written sources (or more precisely from their absence), these interests significantly lessened (Třeštík 2009, 205, 206).

Contrary to popular beliefs about the conquer of territories of today Poland by the Great Moravian state in the second half of the 9th c., there are no indisputable and direct evidence of the permanent presence of the Great Moravian army in Lesser Poland or Upper Silesia, although since about the middle of the 9th c. we, indeed, observe a significant expansion of the Great Moravian state to the north (Kouřil/Gryc 2011). In the second half of the 9th c. this expansion focused on areas outside the Moravian Gate, occupied then by the Golenizsi. It was the time, where Great Moravian skeletal cemeteries containing burials of Great Moravian warriors started to appear in Stěbořice and Hradec nad Moravicí and further in Opava-Malé Hostice, and Hněvošíce. Probably the stronghold in Chotěbuz-Podobora was conquered and incorporated into the network of strongholds of the Mojmír dynasty in the last quarter of the 9th c. (Kouřil/Gryc 2011, 239; Kouřil/ Týmovský 2013, 155–159). The area of Cieszyn Silesia is the only region where archaeological artefacts confirm that Great Moravia actually crossed the Carpathian Mountains and the Sudetes. Maybe, if not for the political decline of the Great Moravian statehood, in the first half of the 10th c. the Mojmír

23 And possibly also a looped specimen from Barkowice Mokre (Sikora 2009, fig. 11: 1).
Fig. 16. Carolingian-type spurs. 1 – Piechocice; 2 – Kraków-Nowa Huta-Mogila; 3 – Zawada; 4 – Kraków-Bieżanów; 5 – Wietrznio-Bóbrka; 6 – Szczaworyż; 7 – Zawada Lanckorońska; 8 – Tuligłowy.
Fig. 17. Carolingian-type spurs. 1 – Trepcza, st. 25; 2 – Bruszczewo; 3 – Niemcza; 4–6 – Gilów; 7 – Jaroszowice. Carolingian-type strap set elements. 8 – Gostyń; 9 – Naszacowice; 10 – Kraków-Dębniki; 11 – Chodlik; 12 – Będzin. Scale: a – 1–7; b – 8–12.
dynasty would have subdued also Upper Silesia and Lesser Poland. On the other hand, in the case of Upper Silesian Gilów it still remains controversial whether the settlement was conquered when the Great Moravian statehood existed or already after its decline, for example by a group of refugees (Poleski 2014, 154), or maybe even there was no conquest at all, only a group of migrants or contractors who looked for a job? Ramparts in Gilów resemble constructions of fortifications typical for Great Moravian strongholds (Jaworski 2005, 270–285) and the significant number of sets of strap fittings known from this site was most likely left by a group of Great Moravian warriors stationing there. We can thus assume that a foreign team spent there some time. This is the only site located in territories of today Poland, from which we have a significant number of strap fittings of the Carolingian type other than spur-strap fittings. We could presume, however, that a permanent incorporation into the domain of

Fig. 18. Carolingian-type loops. 1 – Bruszczewo; 2 – Będzin (Rogaczewska 2004); 3–5 – Naszacowice; 6 – Obiszów; 7 – Złoty Potok; 8 – Trepcza-Horodna; 9, 10 – Trepcza, stan. 25; 11 – Wietrznio-Bóbka; 12 – Żyraków; 13 – Stradów.
Fig. 19. Carolingian-type strap set elements from Gilów.
Zbigniew Robak

The Mojmír dynasty would result in a presence of representatives of Great Moravian elites and thus we should observe there finds of weaponry and horse tack of a highest quality – and those are still missing. Unlike in the case of Cieszyn Silesia, there are no skeletal cemeteries in Lower Silesia that could lend some credence to the hypothesis that the area remained under control of the Great Moravian State for a significant period of time. It is possible that the skeletal cemetery in Niemcza was exactly such a burial ground, it requires, however, new studies that will confirm or disprove the hypothesis about its links with ‘Great Moravian’ Gilów (Jaworski 2011, 46). Meanwhile, regardless results of such re-examinations, the process of fortifying northern and north-eastern borders of the Mojmír dynasty domain in the second half of the 9th c. is confirmed in the archaeological material. The material clearly contains an increased number of finds of weaponry dated back to the second half of the 9th c. and the beginning of the 10th c., particularly in the area of Turiec, Liptov, Orava, many mountainous valleys in the Fatra-Tatra region and also in Czech part of Silesia and Eastern Slovakia (Čaplovič 1997; Fusek, in print, fig. 10; Kouřil 2004, 70, 71; Kouřil/Tymonová 2013, 157; Pieta 2016; Robak 2013, 205; Schreiber 2015). The process was obviously linked with an expansionist policy of Moravian rulers, particularly during the times of Svätopluk. It was caused by the need to integrate already controlled areas, protect extending borders and provide a secure background for further expansions (Čaplovič 1997; 1999). Therefore, the fact that most artefacts of the Carolingian type from territories of Southern Poland are dated back to the second half of the 9th c. and that these artefacts concentrate mainly in Upper Silesia and western Lesser Poland (natural ‘outlets’ of the Moravian Gate and smaller Carpathian valleys) cannot be a

Fig. 20. Carolingian-type loops from Gilów.
Map 5. Finds of late Avar items and items of the Carolingian type in Western Slavic territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains.

Legend: a – late Avar finds; b – Carolingian-type finds; c – plate spurs (Great Moravian); d – skeletal cemeteries with Great Moravian warrior burials; e – Great Moravian stronghold; f – areas of high concentration of the Khaganate and Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds; g – reach of the late Avar bi-ritual burial grounds (territory of the Khaganate); h – eastern border of the Carolingian empire administration ca. 803–828; i – eastern border of distribution of Carolingian and Carolingian-type metalwork in Europe.
Map 6. Carolingian and Carolingian-type items dated back from the second half of the 8th c. to the middle of the 9th c. (List 5). Legend: a – one item; b – two and more items; c – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803 – 828; d – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 828 – 906; e – areas of high concentration of Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds: 1 – Bohemian Basin > 100 items; 2 – Moravia and Slovakia > 1000 items; 3 – Scandinavia > 100 items.
Map 7. Carolingian and Carolingian-type items dated generally back to the 9th–10th c. (List 6). Legend: a – one item; b – two and more items; c – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803–828; d – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 828–906; e – areas of high concentration of Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds: 1 – Bohemian Basin > 100 items; 2 – Moravia and Slovakia > 1000 items; 3 – Scandinavia > 100 items.
Map 8. Carolingian and Carolingian-type items dated back from second half of the 9th c. to the middle of the 10th c. (List 7). Legend: a – one item; b – two and more items; c – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 803–828; d – eastern border of the Carolingian Empire administration ca. 828–906; e – areas of high concentration of Carolingian and Carolingian-type finds: 1 – Bohemian Basin > 100 items; 2 – Moravia and Slovakia > 1000 items; 3 – Scandinavia > 100 items.
Moravia at the beginning of the 10th c. without much turmoil and could continue its political and administrative activities still in the first half of the 10th c. (Kouřil 2014, 170; 2016, 120–122). The inflow of Great Moravian imports through the Olomouc region (also items of the Carolingian type) could have continued uninterrupted at least for some time.

In contrast to the territories of Silesia and Lesser Poland, apart from a spur and a loop from Bruszczewo (Fig. 17: 2; 18: 1; Brzostowicz 1997; 2002, 96), in Greater Poland we have no evident traces of any contacts between local people and Great Moravia. Most likely the items from Bruszczewo and nearby Obiszów and Gostyń (Fig. 17: 8; 18: 6), geographically located already in Lower Silesia, are reflections of the same wave of imports from the south. A nearly complete lack of finds of the Carolingian type in western Greater Poland, Lubusz Land as well as Upper and Lower Lusatia – except for two items, one in the early Carolingian type and the other in the so called transition style (Robak 2013b, 158) from Teltow-Fläming area (Fig. 9: 5; 10: 8) – speaks against the western route of import of these items, directly from the Carolingian Empire. Similarly, the area of the interfluve of the Saale and middle Elbe rivers does not abound in finds of this type (3 items)²⁴.

Compared with other discussed here areas, Mecklenburg and Wagria clearly stand out. The inflow of Carolingian imports between the second half of the 8th c. and the beginning of the 10th c. is constant, although artefacts dated back to the turn of the 8th and 9th c. and the first half of the 9th c. seem to dominate. The items are varied, but most of them are spurs and various strap fittings. Among those fittings we can, however, find one from a late Carolingian sword set (Fig. 13: 5; Schanz 2015) and a cross fibula (Fig. 12: 6; Meier 1990, pl. 25: 4) – elements characteristic of the Carolingian warrior’s attire (Robak, in print) – items unparalleled in the Oder and Vistula Basins. It is surprising, however, that there are virtually no finds of loops associated with spur-fasteners – although spurs themselves are relatively common – but this may be simply a consequence either of the current state of research or corrosion of small items in humid soil typical for the aforementioned areas.

Conclusions

The entire seemingly digressive core of this paper serves the aim of presenting the artefact from Haliczany in a much more diverse context, both cultural and historical. From the methodological perspective, on the other hand, it proves that changing the perspective to a broader one can significantly affect conclusions – even those concerning individual finds. We should note here, therefore, that the concentration of finds of weaponry and equestrian’s attire and equipment at strongholds can hardly be surprising. The elites always tended to highlight their own social status ostentatiously, wearing exquisite attire and weaponry. Artefacts of the Carolingian

²⁴ We are unable to typologically distinguish most of the items, such as strap fittings, some types of spurs or loops dated back to the second half of the 9th c. from those that were actually manufactured at the turn of the 9th and the 10th c. or maybe even in the first half of the 10th c. (Robak 2013b, 202). The ‘post-Great Moravian culture’ burning out in the first half of the 10th c. still exploited earlier civilisation achievements for some time. We can observe then decline or rather a gradual destruction of great strongholds, mainly in southern Moravia, that often served as cemeteries and the re-ruralisation of settlement (Kouřil 2003, 134–136; 2016, 126; Macháček 2007, 347). The Olomouc agglomeration, for example, survived the crisis (Kouřil 2008, 127; 2016, 120–122). Is it, however, still unclear, how the cultural situation in the first half of the 10th c. looked like in mountainous areas of today Slovakia. It could be assumed that smaller local political centres located in northern and eastern Slovakia were not liquidated by the Hungarians at the beginning of the 10th c. and continued their previous line of development (Čaplovič 1997; 1999). Still in 942 Hungarian captives in Andalusia claimed that from the north their country is bordered by Morabija (Měřinský 2012; Rutkay 1985, 145). The chronological division (second half of the 9th c.) of Great Moravian items is artificial and is probably only a consequence of some psychological prejudices against dating obviously Great Moravian items back to the 10th c., because ‘there was no Great Moravian statehood any longer’. Although there was no significant political organisation, the items and people using them did not suddenly disappear in 906 or 907. As an example we can refer here to items attributed to the last horizon of the stronghold in Bojná, where the youngest fragment of ramparts was dated back to around/after 908 (Henning a i. 2015, 341). Most likely some of people inhabiting then the stronghold lived longer. Dating finds from Gilów (Jaworski 2005, 83) and Bruszczewo (Brzostowicz 2002, 96) back to the end of the 9th c. or the beginning of the 10th c. (after 895) or the settlement in Obiszów to the 10th c. (Rzeźnik 2006, 190, 191) suggests that in the case of Lower Silesia and Greater Poland this indeed was a very late inflow of Great Moravian imports. And thus there remains a question whether it was also possible in the case of Lesser Poland?

²⁵ In the case of a loose find from Weltwitz (Fig. 13: 7), a part of an early Carolingian sword set, it is not certain whether it should be linked with the Sorbian settlement in the area (Hardt 2005, fig. 1; Schmidt 1984, fig. 2). Although throughout the 9th c. the Saale remained a conventional border of the Carolingian State (or more precisely a border between Thuringia and the Sorbian land), it should be rather referred to as a starting point for regularly undertaken attempts to subordinate the Lusatians by the Carolingians (Bruchmann 1991, 179). The presence of the Carolingian finds in this area most likely should be linked with military actions undertaken by the Franks mainly in the first half of the 9th c.
type (western originals or Great Moravian imitations) as well as scarce Late Avar artefacts naturally concentrate in areas that could be identified either as central (in terms of their significance, not location) for given tribal groups inhabiting the Oder and Vistula Basins in the 8th – 10th c. or on the strategic borderlands (Map 5). In Mecklenburg and Wagria the situation was similar. Most of finds of the Carolingian type from the Oder and Vistula Basins are spurs and loops that as parts of fasteners, most likely, originally complemented plate spurs imported from the south. It should be noted, however, that apart from only three exceptions, strap fittings and spurs found in territories of today Poland are poorly made and stylistically relatively simple specimens. In Great Moravian assemblages (graves) such items could be linked only with a class of ‘common’ warriors, in no case with the elite, whose members possessed items made of non-ferrous and precious metals decorated with sophisticated techniques. The picture outlined here is completely different than the one in Mecklenburg and Pomerania, where finds are typologically diverse and often made of non-ferrous metals. Their presence there should be linked rather with direct imports from the west or, which seems even more probable, with activities of the Scandinavians in these areas. The same presumably applies to the area of Janów Pomorski (Truso), whose surroundings were inhabited by the Prussian tribes.

It seems that despite relatively intense contacts between tribes inhabiting areas of today southern Poland with the Moravians (Boroi/Foltyn 2011; Jaworski 2011; Poleski 2014; Wachowski 1981; 1992; 1997), members of these tribes were not interested in the elite Carolingian culture26 that in Moravia and Western Slovakia found such a fertile soil for development (Robak 2013b, 191–203). We can, therefore, speculate that following general European trends was of no special significance to the Slavs inhabiting in the 9th c. the Oder and Vistula Basins. They nearly required the most essential items and focused on their functionality (swords, spurs and axes). The fact that simple hooked spurs were used for so long, lends further credence to this conclusion. It is also symptomatic that despite significant popularity of looped spurs (or as in most cases quasi-looped) whose models must have been acquired from the west, there are virtually no components of sets of their fasteners that, as it seems, were not interesting to the local people27. We can draw similar conclusions, when we analyse the dispersion of imports of Carolingian swords concentrated mainly in Pomerania, although there are also some finds known from the territories of Lesser Poland and Silesia. Although there are many such artefacts, in Polish territories, so far, not even a single component of a sword set of the Carolingian type or its Great Moravian variety was found28. There are also no finds of such characteristic Carolingian items as fittings with a neck that were parts of both sword sets and horse tack that at the Great Moravian strongholds are nearly common (Robak 2013b, 122–140). This puts a question mark over (or rather disproves) recent hypotheses about the alleged “predilection for Great Moravian patterns” expressed by „milites from territories of today Southern Poland at the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century”, who supposedly mimicked the Moravians and used late Carolingian belt fittings and parade plate spurs (Kara 2009, 309; Urbaniczky 2012, 151, 152). Items found in areas of the Oder and Vistula Basins, mainly in Southern Poland, come far from being elite. So far, to the north of the Carpathian Mountains and the Sudetes there are no specimens at least comparable with those

26 For this reason I am rather sceptical of speculations claiming that small strap fittings and loops found in areas located in the Oder and Vistula basins, are remains of puttees fasteners. Puttees were typical for Frankish warriors and were adopted generally only in Moravia together with the fashion for other sets of strap fittings of the Carolingian type – and even there only to a limited extent (they were found in around 40 graves). It was only a matter of mimicking the attire of western, Carolingian elites. Fittings of puttees themselves are not very functional (at least not more than straps without fittings). We should also note that in the 8th c. the Slavs used no loops or strap fittings for loop and hooked spurs, although in Western Europe such items constituted a standard set together with a spur and a loop, and most likely were known to the Slavs. But apparently they were not necessary. Spur straps with fittings began to be used in Moravia only in the 9th c. under the western influences and together with the fashion for mimicking the attire of Carolingian warriors. To the north of Moravia plate spurs were imported probably as sets with straps and no one tried to break them up. In the same time, locally produced hooked and quasi-looped spurs were not equipped with fittings or loops.

27 A similar phenomenon can be observed when we analyse finds characteristic of the so called pre-Köttlach horizon in areas of the Western Alps in the second half of the 8th c. and at the beginning of the 9th c. – the local Slavs were interested only in weaponry and spurs, not components of the attire such as fasteners or strap decorations – those they modelled on the Avar originals.

28 A single find of a cross fittings from Wolin (Fig. 11: 3; Stanislawski 2013, fig. 42) should be considered to be an element of a horse tack or some other decorative application. Contrary to previous beliefs (e. g. Wachowski 1992) such elements were not parts of sword sets of the Carolingian type (Robak 2013b, fig. 35). P. Świątkiewicz (2002, 29; pl. II: 6) allegedly following K. Wachowski (1992) claims that there is also a matching fitting with a neck from Wolin (labelled as ‘fitting with a loop’), but this is not true – at least such element was never published and K. Wachowski never mentions it. Most likely this is some kind of misunderstanding.
known from Mikulčice, Stará Kouřim, Kolin, Staré Město or even Bojná and Ducové. A fragment of the only decorated plate spur that could be ‘of superior quality’ paradoxically comes from Recz in distant Western Pomerania (Fig. 14: 1), which only confirms observations about different factors stimulating the inflow of Carolingian imports to the north-western Slavic Territories and sources of the imports themselves (see Brather 1996, 61; Wachowski 1992, 109–112).

If, therefore, those people had a predilection for one fashion of components of horse tack of the Carolingian type, it seems that it was only a consequence of the availability of particular types of items that were simply imported from their closest sources (Map 9). And thus, it should not surprise us that the densest distribution of Carolingian weaponry in its Great Moravian variety occurs in the territories of Southern Poland, while in the north-western Slavic Territories we found rather Carolingian originals or items of the Carolingian type produced in Scandinavian workshops (swords and possibly also loops). This correlation is revealed also by a simple qualitative comparison of imports – active contacts between the Carolingians and the Scandinavians (military, trade, and diplomatic) resulted in the presence of many Carolingian products of various, although mainly valuable types on the Scandinavian coast. And in the coastal areas of the Slavic Territories influenced by the Scandinavians or even occupied by the Scandinavian settlement this process is reflected in archaeological finds as well. Furthermore, it was possible that items of various quality were imported directly from the Carolingian State – the choice depended only on preferences and capacities of the client and possibly also his openness to foreign cultural impulses. Items found in territories of Southern Poland are only a fragmentary reflection of a mass of products used in the 9th c. and the first half of the 10th c. in areas of today Moravia, Slovakia, and Bohemia. This applies both to items of the Carolingian type and the Late Avar scraps that, although useless, could still serve as a decoration or a material for re-melting. Therefore, a nearly complete lack of finds of items of the Carolingian type in territories of today Central Poland can be explained as a consequence of isolation from both cultural impulses and immediate sources of imports.

The picture of the material culture of the Slavs who in the period between the 8th c. and the first half of the 10th c. inhabited areas of today Poland seems to be relatively modest, particularly when compared with their cousins from the other side of the mountains. Simple, although solidly made and convenient iron plate spurs or other pieces of weaponry that in Moravia or Slovakia were merely ‘standard’, in Lesser Poland or Silesia could serve as a specific distinctive feature, particularly in comparison with local products. The basic reason for their import was most likely only their usefulness. If, despite all this, we would like to see some reflection of a migration from Moravia or Western Slovakia in Great Moravian artefacts found in the Oder and Vistula Basins, then, as the finds are relatively simple and cheap, we must accept that the migrants were only common warriors, not the elites, who certainly would manifest more ostentation in their attire and equipment. In such a case we can accept the assumption that some of the items travelled to territories of today Poland ‘on legs’ of their owners. We should note here that the character of Great Moravian imports in Polish lands resembles the cultural situation in territories of today Western and Northern Slovakia29. These areas were distant from centres inhabited by the members of aristocracy (including high Church dignitaries), who were natural recipients of luxury goods. Even a cursory comparison of artefacts from Slovakia with those from Moravia and the Bohemian Basin (Robak 2013b, 201), where most important political centres were located and where most elite finds were found, reveals the difference. It seems, therefore, that we are entitled to assume that the presumed migration of members of the Moravian elites to territories of today Poland would leave some archaeologically perceptible traces.

One more observation seems to be important, possibly even the most important, in this context – the distribution of artefacts of the Carolingian type in Lesser Poland nearly perfectly coincides with the Vistula and San rivers. Outside these conventional borders there are, so far, no similar finds (Map 5)30. What is more, this applies not only to items ‘of the

29 Bojná may be a misleading but in fact the only exception abound in finds of the Carolingian type – still however when compared with Moravia and Bohemia, the quality of finds cannot be equalled with aristocratic burials from Mikulčice, Stará Kouřim or Kolin.

30 Interestingly, this does not apply solely to the territories of today Poland, but, despite extremely strong and well documented relations between Rus’ and Scandinavia in the 9th c., also to the entire eastern part of the Slavic Territories. The abundance of Carolingian imports in Scandinavia, whose inflow is dated back mainly to the second and last third of the 9th c. (Wamers 2011, 70) was not paralleled in Rus’. Despite the large number of swords, coming mainly from Scandinavian graves in Rus’, there are no components of Carolingian sword sets nor other sets of fittings of the Carolingian type (while there are Scandinavian). It is thus very likely that once Carolingian imports got to Scandinavia, they never left. Probably the main aim of their import was to deposit them, many were also remodelled and used as pendants. This seems to support the hypothesis that they were imported due to their material value and design, not their functions.
Map. 9. Hypothetical routes of direct imports of Late Avar (white and white/black arrows) and Carolingian artefacts (black and white/black arrows) to Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains. Legend: see Map 5.
Carolingian type’ – there are no other artefacts, including those that could be directly linked solely with the Great Moravian culture. This covers imports or imitations of various items, not necessarily pieces of equestrian attire. The analysis of finds of axe-like iron bars31 (Fig. 21; Liwoch 2013, fig. 2; Rozmus/Szmoniewski/Troncik 2006, fig. 6; Wachowski 1992, 110) lends further credit to the hypothesis that the actual reach of Great Moravian influences ended at the line indicated by the Vistula and San rivers. Iron bars are found at the same sites, or in their vicinity, as other items of the Carolingian and Great Moravian types. The only exceptions, proverbially proving the rule, are single finds of so universal, simple, and useful items as bearded axes that wandered off far to the east (see Poleski 2014, fig. 1)32. Relying on archaeological data, we are able to determine a line beyond which Carolingian artefacts do not appear. The line goes longitudinally, roughly from Birka in Sweden to Rusanovići in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the east of it there are, so far, no known examples of the Carolingian metalwork, except for a single small cluster in salt mine areas of Transylvania (Map 5; Robak 2013b, 31; Fig. 21. Distribution of finds of axe-like iron bars in central Europe. Legend: a – Lesser Poland type; b – Piotrawin type; c – Great Moravian type (Liwoch 2013; Rozmus/Szmoniewski/Troncik 2006).

31 Regardless of whether we consider them to be commodity money or generally standardised form of semi-finished products (which was virtually the same in the reality of a non-monetary economy) their presence confirms that western parts of Lesser Poland in the 9th c. were included in the economic circle of Great Moravia. This, however, does not confirm direct political dependence or inclusion of Lesser Poland into the Mojmír dynasty domain.

32 Although this type of axe is associated mainly with the equipment of Great Moravian warriors (as a ‘standard’ weapon present at Great Moravian cemeteries), it is present in nearly the entire Central-Eastern Europe – from Oldenburg in the west to Gnezdovo in the east and Albania and Bulgaria in the south (Kotowicz 2009, 384). Finds of bearded military axes in Europe only confirms the observation that some types of weapons were universal and constantly demanded. Bearded axes are ceased to be widely used already around the mid-10th c., but occasionally they could have been used longer – they were even found among artefacts acquired from the Lednica Lake during underwater exploration of bridges leading to the stronghold on Ostrów Lednicki (Kotowicz 2009, 391).
This line indicates the scope of influences of the Carolingian craft in Europe, and thus also the Carolingian culture itself, either in its original form or its Great Moravian variation.

Despite the fact that the Carolingian culture and its Great Moravian variation lasted for a relatively long time (second half of the 8th c.—the beginning of the 10th c.), it has little influence on communities inhabiting territories of today Poland in the early Middle Ages. It is relatively well legible in the source material, but its local reception can be seen only in Silesia and south-western Lesser Poland, mainly through new types of equestrian equipment. It is worth noticing that cultural impulses never run directly between the Carolingians and cultures occupying Polish lands. The area of today Poland was isolated by ‘buffer zones’ consisting of Slavic communities inhabiting territories of today Eastern Germany (also relatively resistant to the novelties from the west), Bohemia and Slovakia, and the Baltic Sea basin dominated by the Scandinavians. Furthermore, the area of Central Poland was additionally ‘filtrated’, as we have virtually no finds of the Carolingian type there, except for a single and still uncertain artefact (the already mentioned spur from Barkowice Mokre). In the north-eastern part of Lesser Poland the situation seems to be similar. Comparing it with areas of southern Lesser Poland and Silesia, we are entitled to conclude that archaeological traces of Carolingian influences there are virtually non-existent. Contrary to the inter-Carpathian areas, Slavic people inhabiting lands of today Poland were not interested in cultural patterns coming from territories dominated by the Carolingian culture. We may speculate that these patterns found no fertile soil to be locally transformed – as for example in the case of the Slavs inhabiting then territories of today Slovakia, Moravia, and Bohemia. Single Carolingian impulses were received mainly in their Great Moravian version and only in a form of imports of selected categories of items. Their recipients were mainly communities directly bordering domains of the Mojmír dynasty. And even with all the best will in the world we cannot consider the location of Haliczany as close to it.

In the case of lands located in the Oder and Vistula basins, ranges of artefacts of the Carolingian, Great Moravian, and Late Avar types coincide (Map 5). Only the cluster in the Bug River Basin remains isolated. There are no imports of items of the Carolingian and undoubtedly Great Moravian types (e.g. jewellery), although there is a significant (relatively to local conditions) concentration of Late Avar items. And here we should get back to the beginning of this paper, namely to the issue of possible origins of the fitting from Haliczany, which being a Carolingian would not only be stylistically utterly untypical for this culture (either in its Western European or ‘peripheral’ Great Moravian variation), but also its presence in this region would be a sensation. On the other hand, contacts between areas located close to the Bug River with early medieval cultures occupying lands between the Lower Dnieper and the Lower Danube are well documented in archaeological and historical sources already since the earliest phases of the Middle Ages (Petehryč 2007; Szymański 1979, 43–46; 1995, 127, 128). This applies both to the nomads controlling Eastern European steppes and the Avars, who since 568 lived in the Carpathian Basin.

The lack of Carolingian and Great Moravian imports in the Bug region and further to the east, supports the assumption that already during the existence of the Avar Khaganate contacts between this region and the Avars were direct and that the routes run through eastern Carpathian passes bypassing south-western Lesser Poland. These contacts could have been much easier thanks to the already mentioned trade route (controlled by the Avars) that passed through the Tisza region and eastern Carpathians to Kiev and further to the east (Čaplovič 1997, 44). In the area of the Podolian Upland the route connected with the Bug trade route running from the west coast of the Black Sea to the Baltic Sea (Map 9). The fact that the latter was intensely used is suggested by a large number of artefacts with analogies among items found in the Danube, Dniester, and Dnieper regions and also those attributed to the Olsztyn group found at the stronghold in Szeligi near Płock (Curta 2007, 247–275; Rudnicki, Mi. 2011; Szymański 1962, 357, 358). Therefore, the fitting from Haliczany as a strap decoration of the nomadic type, would be well embedded in a context of numerous finds of the nomadic character found in the Upper and Middle Bug region (Mylian 2012; Petehryč 2007) with the greatest concentration on neighbouring strongholds in Zimne (Aulich 1972) and Gródek nad Bugiem (Poleski 2013, 163).

The reasoning presented here, being a form of reductio ad impossibilem, aimed at substantiating an observation that the fitting from Haliczany is stylistically very distant from all types of Carolingian fittings known so far to the researchers. The current state of art and primarily the geographical distribution of Carolingian finds, force us to put a big ques-

---

33 The route leading from Kiev through Moravia and Lesser Poland became important in the second half of the 9th c., after the route from Kiev to Scandinavia passing along the Bug River and the Lower Vistula bypassing north Ruthenian centres started to be used (Losiński 1993, 30, 31).
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tion mark over the hypothesis about the Western European origins of the find from Haliczany. Otherwise, it would be in fact the only such item known from the region where it was found. Of course this, itself, is not a sufficient counterargument, but, as it often happens in archaeological studies, also in this case we need to use materials and sources that do not verify the hypothesis – they make it only more probable. We should not forget that inductive reasoning is naturally distorted or biased by the availability and frequency of contacts with certain types of items. Consequently, we much easier notice formal similarities between well-known, easily accessible products, although perhaps it would be better to keep one's mind open for other possibilities. Certainly, some stylistic similarities with Western European fittings, particularly combined with the geographical proximity of the Carolingian border, had to cast a shadow on the debate about the fitting from Mockersdorf and thus, indirectly, also on the artefact from Haliczany. First of all, however, we should ask a question whether the fitting from Mockersdorf is the best analogy for the fitting from Haliczany. It seems that we could easily find more accurate and visually closer analogies for this item among the Avar artefacts. Then we can pose a question whether the possibility that the fitting from Mockersdorf is, after all, an Avar fitting was ruled out beyond all doubts? It seems that the analysis presented in this paper provides a negative answer to this controversy. But even as an Avar product, it would not be the best answer to our typological questions about the fitting from Haliczany. Consequently, the third important question is whether the fitting from Haliczany would be attributed to the Western European cultural circle, if the artefact from Mockersdorf was not included in the analysis? And, again, it seems that the answer is no. If we forget about the archaeological and historical context, a cursory analysis of so ambiguous features of items as quasi-granulation or punching could lead us astray. And furthermore, seemingly straightforward and natural decisions such as linking a given area with a sphere of influence of one rather than another cultural formation can significantly affect final conclusions about classified items. The spatial distribution of Late Avar artefacts, in comparison with Carolingian or Great Moravian finds lends credit to the hypothesis about the Avar origins of the find and supplements stylistic observations. It seems, thus, that in such a broad and adjusted context we can at least partially answer the questions posed at the beginning. First of all, stylistically the fitting seems to be closer to the circle of Avar items. Secondly, the mere fact that it was found in an area with a legible concentration of such finds (in the absence of Carolingian/Great Moravian products) makes the hypothesis even more probable. The fitting could be imported to eastern Lesser Poland through eastern Carpathian passes, along trade routes controlled by the Avars still during the times of the Khaganate. It could, of course, travelled there later, through the Moravian Gate or territories of today Slovakia, but then the complete lack of Great Moravian finds in this area would be more than surprising. Having only scarce sources it is difficult to determine whether the fitting was imported still as an ornament or already as a scrap material that for some reason was not melted down.

In the methodological dimension the paper attempted to show that too hasty attribution of artefacts to cultural circles based solely on a cursory analysis of visual features of an item, may lead to serious complications and confusion. In this context, as a specific curiosity, we could mention a fitting resembling a clover leaf found in Eissel bei Verden (Fig. 22: 2; Precht 2016). The author directly refers to the publication by M. Schulze-Dörrlamm (2005) and even attributes the fitting (without any merit) to a Carolingian type Haliczany she introduced herself, although there are distinct visual differences between these two items (not to mention that the fitting from Mockersdorf is completely different). Unfortunately, the fitting from Eissel bei Verden has no context and it would be difficult to say anything more specific about it. There

Fig. 22. Strap fittings. 1 – Gnezdovo; 2 – Eissel bei Verden.
is no denying, however, that it is nearly identical as a fitting found in feature 28 (backfill of a pit linked with metallurgical production) in the settlement in Gnezdovo (Fig. 22: 1; Murasheva/Enisova/Fetisov 2007, 44; fig. 22: 7). In this case, founding no precise analogies for the item, the authors assumed that this is a trefoil fitting of the Carolingian type from a sword set. The analogy they referred to was a trefoil fitting from Haithabu similarly decorated with quasi-granulation. As we can see, two nearly identical items were attributed to the Carolingian culture in two different ways, although the culture itself, for all we know, did not abound in fittings decorated in this manner – Carolingian fittings decorated with quasi-granulation can be literally counted on one hand. But once the fitting from Mockersdorf, and analogically also the one from Haliczany, had been accepted as Carolingian, the way to use them as ‘Carolingian’ analogies for other artefacts was left clear. This, however, is precisely the area, where we should be particularly cautious, because our multi-level comparisons can fix and duplicate errors. As Aristotle once said, and many repeated after him: a small error in the beginning (erroneous attribution of a fitting) grows enormous at the end (introduction of artificial types). All the more so as nearly everything speaks against the recognition of the item from Gnezdovo as a trefoil fitting of the Carolingian type – fittings from Carolingian sword sets were at least two-three times larger, had different form, and finally their straps were always mounted in several points (Robak 2013b, 106, 107, fig. 23)34, while the fitting from Gnezdovo has only one centrally placed opening for a rivet on each of the ‘leaves’. It could, of course, serve as a strap divider, but the straps themselves would have to be very narrow and fastened with a single rivet they could not hold anything heavy. It seems more probable that it was a decorative ornament fastened to a wide strap. The same reasoning, analogically, applies to the fitting from Eissel. In both cases, however, the form of fittings differs from the fitting from Haliczany. Similarly, the ornament – surprisingly convergent on the German and Russian finds – is different. Probably, it is a yet unknown type of fitting. The lack of unambiguous context of these finds, however, makes it impossible to analyse them more precisely and particularly to determine their chronology or origins. In the current state of knowledge (or rather our ignorance) it cannot be excluded that fittings from Gnezdovo and Eissel are indeed Carolingian – although that would be a sensation, since to the east of San and Vistula rivers there are absolutely no finds of Carolingian fittings – but at a very first glance we must also admit that the fitting from Haliczany is different and definitely closer to the Avar fittings.

CATALOG

List 1. Items linked with the late Avar Khaganate culture (ca. 700–825) from Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains. Map 1.

1. Biskupin, pow. Żnin, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 1; Rajewski 1939, pl. LXV: 2).
2. Bolesławiec, pow. Bolesławiec, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 2; Langenhetin 1937, fig. 4: 4a; Szymański 1962, 300–303).
3. Chorula, pow. Krapkowice, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 5; Szymański 1962, 303; Zoll-Adamikowa 1992, fig. 1: f).
4. Damice, pow. Kraków, strap fitting (Fig. 3: 1; Poleski 2013, fig. 99: 14).
5. Dobrzeń Mały, pow. Opole, strap fitting (Fig. 3: 2; Zoll-Adamikowa 1992, fig. 1: k).
6. Głów, pow. Dzierżoniów, strap fitting (Fig. 3: 3; Jaworski/Paternoga 2002, fig. 1: 7).
8. Kraków-Kopiec Krak, pow. Kraków, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 8; Szymański 1962, 303, 304).
9. Kraków-Novia Huta Mogila, pow. Kraków, strap fitting (Fig. 3: 4; Poleski 2013, fig. 99: 3).
10. Kraków-Wyliczaj, pow. Kraków, strap fitting (Fig. 3: 5; Poleski 2013, fig. 99: 6).
11. Lublin-Zembrzyce, pow. Lublin strap fitting (Fig. 3: 6; Poleski 2013, fig. 99: 8).
12. Naszaszowice, pow. Nowy Sącz, 3 strap fittings (Fig. 3: 7–9; Poleski 2013, fig. 99: 4, fig. 99: 5, fig. 99: 7).
13. Pelczyska, pow. Pińczów, strap fitting and buckle plate (Fig. 3: 10, 11; Rudnicki, Ma. 2009, fig. 11, fig. 12: a).
14. Ripniec, maj. Busk, strap fitting (Fig. 3: 12; Petehyryč 2007, fig. 5: 3).
15. Swaryczów, pow. Zamość, 2 strap fittings (Fig. 4: 1–2; Kokowski 2010, 126–128).
16. Syrynia, pow. Wodzisław Śląski, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 6; Szymański 1962, 307, 308).
17. Trepcza-Horodyńce, pow. Sanok, strap fitting (Fig. 4: 5; Ginalska/Glinianowicz/Kotowicz 2013, fig. 5: 1).
18. Warszawa-okolice, okucie rzemienia (Fig. 2: 7; Szymański 1962, 304, 305; Zoll-Adamikowa 1992, fig. 1: l).
19. Żulice35, pow. Tomaszów Lubelski, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 4; Kłosińska 2009).
20. Anklam, Kr. Ostrovommern, propeller fitting (Fig. 4: 7; Wegner 2011, 341).

34 There is a mistake on a fig. 23: D in the quoted publication – the middle rivet ‘disappeared’.
35 The information obtained from a ‘treasure hunter’. There is no certainty as to where the item has been found and where it comes from.
List 2. Carolingian items from Western Slavic Territories

28. Janów Pomorski (Truso), pow. elbląg, broken propeller

24. o strów lednicki, pow. gniezno, strap fitting (Fig. 2: 3; Parczewski 2002; Szymański 1962, 306, 307).

26. c zermno, pow. Tomaszów lubelski, strap fitting (Fig. 3; Wołoszyn et al. 2016, fig. 4).

27. t lempenow, lkr. Meckelnische Seenplate, 2 strap fittings (Fig. 5; Kleingärtner 2014, 379, pl. 1: 3, 4).

29. Schwerinsburg, lkr. vorpommern-greifswald, strap (Fig. 6: 1; Zoll-Adamikowa 1996).

22. k lempenow, lkr. Meckelnische Seenplate, 2 strap fittings (Fig. 10: 8; Hammersburg – Schirren 2013, pl. 36: e).

32. Schlagbrügge, lkr. nordwestmecklenburg, cross fitting (Fig. 13: 14; Herrmann 2005, 118, 119).

11. Friedrichsruhe, lkr. ludwigslust–Parchim, strap-end, last third of the 9th c. (Fig. 12: 9; Kind 2016).

13. Groß Strömendorf, lkr. nordwestmecklenburg, 2 strap-ends, first half of the 9th c. (Fig. 13: 3, 4; Wollschläger 2011a, 352, fig. 119: 7; 2016, fig. 163).

14. Hammersburg, Kr. Herzogtum Lauenburg, cross fitting, 9th c. (Fig. 9: 3; Kersten 1951, 111).

15. Ilow, Lkr. Nordwestmecklenburg, strap-end, about mid of the 9th c. (Fig. 13: 1; Wollschläger 2011b, 397).

16. Klempnów, Lkr. Demmin, fitting with loop, first half of the 9th c. (Fig. 13: 5; Schanz 2015, 295).

17. Kreitzschau-Groitzsche, Lkr. Burgenlandkreis, plate spur (type 6), 9th c. (Fig. 15: 2; Brachmann 1978, fig. 31: a).

18. Luckenwalde, Lkr. Teltow-Fläming, strap-end, early 9th c. (Fig. 10: 9; Werner 1969, pl. 26: a).

19. Menzin, Lkr. Vorpommern-Greifswald, strap-end, first quarter of the 9th c.; broken plate spur (type 6), 9th c. (Fig. 13: 2; 14: 6; Schirren 2011, 362, 363; Schoknecht 1987, pl. 44: 5).

20. Mittenwalde-Penningberg, Lkr. Dahme-Spreewald, strap-end, last third of the 8th c.–first third of the 9th c. (Fig. 9: 5; Bieermann 2003, 105; fig. 5).

21. Neukalen, Lkr. Mecklenburgische Seenplatte, fitting with neck and loop, 9th c. (Fig. 9: 6; Schanz 2005, 674).


23. Scharstorf, Kr. Plön, plate spur (type 6), 9th c.; fitting or cross brooch, 9th c. (Fig. 12: 6; 15: 1; Gabriel 1984, fig. 45: 31; Kind 2007, 589; Meier 1990, pl. 23: 1; 25: 4).

24. Stargard-Oldenburg, Kr. Ostholstein, cross fitting, 9th c.; three-leaf fitting, 9th c.; strap-ends, probably first half of the 9th c.; fitting, last third of the 8th c.–first third of the 9th c.; fitting with neck and loop, 9th c.; 2 plate spurs, 9th c. (Fig. 10: 1–7; 12: 15; 14: 5; Gabriel 1984, 146, 1988, 116–126).

25. Sternberger Burg, Kr. Sternberg, plate spur (type 4), 9th c. (Fig. 14: 7; Schultl 1983, fig. 37: c).

26. Sukow-Marienhof, Lkr. Rostock, strap-end, first half of the 9th c. (Fig. 9: 7; Schanz 2009, 402, 403).

27. Teterow, Lkr. Rostock, fitting with neck and loop, 9th c. (Fig. 10: 8; Unverzet 1963, pl. 36: e).

28. Radacz, pow. Szczecinek, loop, 9th c. (Fig. 11: 4; Siuchniński 1964, tab. VI: j).

29. Schwerinsburg, Lkr. Vorpommern-Greifswald, strap fitting, last third of the 8th c.–first third of the 9th c. (Fig. 9: 3; Hammersburg Ruchhöft/Schirren 2013, fig. 9).

30. Weltwitz, Kr. Saale-Orla, fitting with loop, turn of the 8th and 9th c.–first third of the 9th c. (Fig. 13: 7; Neumann 1964, 236).

31. Stargard, pow. Stargard, loop, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 11: 5; Janowski 2016).

32. Schlagbrügge, Lkr. Nordwestmecklenburg, cross fitting, 9th c. (Fig. 12: 2; Haß 2010, 43, fig. 10).

33. Ganschendorf, Lkr. Demmin, cross fitting, 9th c. (Fig. 12: 1; Messal 2015, fig. 84: 2).

34. Schwerin, Landeshauptstadt, rectangular brooch, 9th c.; enamel brooch 9th–10th c. (Fig. 12: 7; 8; Konicz 2016, 321, fig. 192: 2, 10).

35. Greifswald, Lkr. Vorpommern-Greifswald, fitting, first half of the 9th c. (Fig. 12: 9; Robak 2017a; Samueller/Rütz/Albrecht 2016, fig. 265: 4).
36. Unknown place in Sambia, cross brooch or cross fitting, 9th c. (Fig. 11: 6; Kulakow/Valuec 2001).

List 3. Items of the Carolingian type, most likely linked with the Great Moravian culture from Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains. Map 3.

1. Będzin, pow. Będzin, strap-end, first half of the 9th c.; loop, first half of the 9th c. (Fig. 17: 12; 18: 2; Kouřil/Gryc 2011, fig. 14; 11; Ryczewszka 2004).

2. Bruszczewo, pow. Kościan, loop, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 18: 1; Brzostowicz 1997, 137, fig. 26: 4).

3. Chodlik, pow. Opole Lubelskie, small belt set: strap-end, loop, buckle, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 17: 11; kind information of L. Miechowicz).


5. Gostyni, pow. Gostyni, cross fitting, 9th c. (Fig. 17: 8; Petersen 1939, 65).

6. Kraków-Dębniki, pow. Kraków, strap-end, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 17: 10; Firlet 2006, 412).

7. Naszacowice, pow. Nowy Sącz, 3 loops, second half of the 9th c.; strap-end, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 17: 9; 18: 3–5; Polecki 2013, fig. 98: 6, 8–10).

8. Obiszów, pow. Polkowice, loop, turn of the 9th and 10th c. (Fig. 18: 6; Rzeczinky 2006, fig. 7: a).

9. Stradów, pow. Kazimierza Wielka, loop, 9th c. (Fig. 18: 13; Zoll-Adamikowa 1988).

10. Trepcza-Horodna, Trepcza, st. 25, pow. Sanok, three loops, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 18: 8–10; Glinianowicz/Kotowicz 2013, fig. 12: 2–4).

11. Wietrzno-Bóbka, pow. Krosno, loop, second half of the 9th c. (Fig. 18: 11; Żuki 1957, 20; fig. 16: 5).

12. Złoty Potok, pow. Częstochowa, loop, second half of the 9th c.–first half of the 10th c. (Fig. 18: 7; Tyniec 2016, 80).

13. Żyraków, pow. Dębica, loop, first half of the 9th c. (Fig. 18: 12; drawing thanks to the courtesy of M. A. M. Mazurek).

List 4. Plate spurs (different types) most likely linked with the Great Moravian culture from Western Slavic Territories located to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, Sudetes and Ore Mountains (second half of the 9th c.–first half of the 10th c.). Map 4.

1. Bruszczewo, pow. Kościan, plate spur, probably type 8 (Fig. 17: 2; Brzostowicz 2002, 58, fig. 25: 8).

2. Głów, pow. Dzierżoniów, 3 plate spurs: type 6, type 8, type 8 (Fig. 17: 4–6; Jaworski 2005, fig. 145: f–h).

3. Jaroszowiec, pow. Ołkusz, plate spur, type 8 (Fig. 17: 7; Wojenka 2017).

4. Kraków-Bieżanów 21, pow. Kraków, plate spur, type 8 (Fig. 16: 4; Polecki 2013, fig. 98: 4).

5. Kraków-Nowa Huta Mogiła 1, pow. Kraków, plate spur, type 6 or 8 (Fig. 16: 2; Polecki 2013, fig. 98: 1).

6. Niemcza, pow. Dzierżoniów, plate spur, type 6 (Fig. 17: 3; Jaworski 2005, fig. 27: a).

7. Piechocice, pow. Nysa, plate spur, type 9 (Fig. 16: 1; Fotyna 2013, fig. 5: b).

8. Szczaworyż, pow. Busko-Zdrój, plate spur, late type 6 (Fig. 16: 6; Polecki 2013, fig. 98: 7).

9. Tuligłowy, pow. Jarosław, plate spur, type 4 (Fig. 16: 8; Cabalska 1979, 268; Strzyż 2006, fig. 31: 9).

10. Wietrzn-Bóbka, pow. Krosno, plate spur, late type 6 (Fig. 18: 11; Polecki 2013, fig. 98: 3).

11. Zawada, pow. Tarnów, plate spur, unknown type (Fig. 16: 3; Strzyż 2006, fig. 29: 3).

12. Zawada Lankorońska, pow. Tarnów, plate spur, unknown type (Fig. 16: 7; Polecki 2013, fig. 98: 5).

13. Trepcza, st. 25, pow. Sanok, plate spur with 2 rivets (Fig. 17: 1; Kotowicz 2016).

List 5. Carolingian and Carolingian-type items dated from second half of the 8th c. to the middle of the 9th c. Map 6.

1. Starigard-Oldenburg.

2. Arkona-Puttgarten.


4. Ilow.

5. Sukow-Marienhof.


8. Menzlin.


10. Recz.

11. Luckenwalde.

12. Mittenwalde-Pennigsberg.


15. Będzin.


17. Kraków-Nowa Huta Mogiła 62A.

18. Żyraków.

38 The artefact published and referred to as a plate of a spur. The item, however, is too large and thick for a fastener of a plate spur of type 9.

39 In the literature, based on its attribution to the type II.1 according to Z. Hilczerówna, the spur is dated back to the 10th–12th c. (Cabalska 1979, 268). In my opinion, however, the spur differs significantly from examples of type II.1 which are characterised by a cone-shaped rowel and a small plate (see Hilczerówna 1956, 34). Even the Author of the research in Tuligłowy herself noticed that the shape and dimensions of the spur resemble spurs known from the Great Moravian hill fort in Pobedim (Białekowski 1977). The only difference was the type of fasteners. Early medieval plate spurs of the Carolingian type, mounted with a single rivet, could be at that time unknown to the Author. Nowadays we know several examples of such products, both from territories of the Carolingian Empire and the Slavdom (Robak 2013b, 29, 30). As the closest analogy we should indicate a spur from grave 1347 in Mikulčice (Klićna 1985, 513). Despite the already mentioned spur, the hill fort in Tuligłowy provided also a series of artefacts with analogies in the Great Moravian cultural milieu (Poleski 2004, 439, 440). Although the hill fort in Tuligłowy is generally dated back to the 11th–12th c., there are some hints suggesting that the chronology could, in fact, be earlier (Parczewski 1986, 194, 199).

1. Scharstorf.
2. Starigard-Oldenburg.
3. Arkona-Putgarten.
4. Ralswiek.
5. Hammersburg.
7. Schwerin.
8. Friedrichsruhe.
10. Dahmen.
11. Teterow.
15. Friedland.
17. Wolin.
18. Radacz.
20. unknown place in Sambia.
22. Gostyn.
23. Stradów.

List 7. Carolingian and Carolingian-type items dated back from second half of the 9th c. to the middle of the 10th c. Map 8.

1. Glienke.
2. Stargard.
4. Baderitz (Oschatz).
5. Obiszów.
7. Gilów.
12. Szczaworyź.
17. Zawada Lanckorońska.
19. Tuliglowy.
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Karolínske alebo nie?  
Analýza kovania z Haliczian v kontexte iných včasnostredovekých nálezov z vybraných oblastí západoslovanských území  

Zbigniew Robak  

SÚHRN


Kovanie z Haliczian bolo už niekoľkokrát predmetom typologickej a chronologickej analýzy (Bronicki/Michalik/Wołoszyn 2003; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2005), ktorá v každom z prípadov viedla autorov k odlišným záverom. V prvom prípade bol zdôraznený kočovnícky kontext, zatiaľ čo v druhej analýze bolo poukázané na západoeurópsky pôvod predmetu. Prípadom preukazovaním karolínskeho pôvodu kovania z Haliczian spočíval v tom, že žiadan z citovaných predmetov v diele M. Schulze-Dörrlamm (2005) nie je presnou analógiou kovania z haliczian. Medzi karolínskymi kovaniami typologicky podobné predmety jednoducho neexistujú. Táto poznámka núti k úvahе, či by sa nemalo k hypotéze o karolínskom pôvode kovania z Haliczian pristupovať skepticky a zvážiť rôzne možnosti. Ozdoby podobného tvaru a veľkosti sa nachádzajú vo výbave avarských hrobkov v oblasti Kar-patskej kotliny. Medzi kovania avarského pôvodu treba zaradiť kovanie z Mockersdorfu (Lkr. Neustadt an der Waldnaab), ktoré je v literatúre často označované ako karolínske a kovaniu z Haliczian je štylovо blízke. Viac svedca na túto problematiku prinaša zasadenie nálezu z Haliczian do kontextu nálezov neskoroavarského a karolínskeho typu z oblasti severne od Karpát, Sudet a Krušných hôr.

Nálezy neskoroavarských predmetov sa sústredzujú do niekoľkých zoskupení takmer výhradne v južnej a juhovýchodnej časti Poľska, ako aj na malom území v Meklenbursku (mapa 1; 6). Tieto neskoroavarské výrobky sa môžu dostat do krajin v povode Visly a Odry tak z územia kaganátu, ako aj cez Moravu (a možno aj cez Čehy?) ešte v druhej polovici 8. stor., ale aj neskôr, v období bezprostredne po páde kaganátu a dokonca aj v čase veľkomoravského expanzie v druhej polovici 9. stor. Ich rozptyl v skúmanej oblasti sa taktiež presne zohoduje s nálezmi výrobkov karolínskeho typu (pôvodných západoeurópských, ale aj štyrajúých s veľkomoravskou kultúrou). Rozptyl nálezov predmetov karolínskeho typu však nepresahuje hranicu riek Visla a Śan (mapa 5). Táto línia je v skutočnosti úsekom dlhej demarkačnej hranice, ktorá vedie od Birky vo Švédsku po južnú Bosnu a Hercegovinu, a za ní na južnom území sa už karolínske výrobky (okrem Sedmohradska) nenachádzajú. Do určitej miery práve tieto hranice určuje rozsah vplyvu karolínskeho remeselnictva v Európe, a teda aj rozsah karolínskej kultúry či už vo svojej pôvodnej podobe, alebo dokonca vo veľkomoravskéj forme. Kovanie z Haliczian bolo nájdené v oblasti východne od demarkačnej linie, kde sa doposiaľ neobjavil žiadny predmet karolínskeho typu. Nedostatok karolínskych a veľkomoravských importov v oblasti povodia Bugu dovoluje predpokladať, že kontakty tohto regiónu s Avarmi bol udržiavaných priamo cez východokarpatske priesmyky, a to ešte počas existencie avarského kaganátu (mapa 9). Argumentácia uvedená v predloženom príspevku je založená na preukázaní, že z hľadiska štylových aspektov je kovanie z Haliczian pomerne vzdialené od všetkých typov karolínskych kovaní, ktoré sú bádateľom v súčasnosti známe. Aktuálny stav poznania a predovšetkým geografické rozmiešknenie karolínskych nálezov spo-chybňuje možnosť západoeurópského pôvodu kovania z Haliczian. Bolo však nájdené v jednom zo zoskupení neskoroavarských nálezov (mapa 5), čo prispieva k hypotéze o jeho nomádskom pôvode.