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1. Introduction

In the scientific literature concerning the medieval and modern settlement history of Hungary one can find a long, and partly a bitter debate about the origins of the specific farmsteads (in Hungarian "tanya" or "szállás") which are a characteristic part of the landscape of the Great Hungarian Plain, the "puszta" (This debate was reviewed by: Solymosi 1980, 71-96.) Though, the vast majority of the scientists dealing with these questions is deeply convinced about the fact that the nucleated settlement pattern of the present days is a result of the devastation caused by the Ottoman conquest of Hungary, after the battle of Mohács in 1526. Their argumentation is usually based on two, hardly deniable facts. Firstly, there is practically no written source positively proving the existence of the manor house type settlements before the 16th-17th centuries, and secondly the settlement pattern of the "puszta" with "tanya" buildings are a characteristic part of the landscape of the Great Hungarian Plain, where the Turkish raids caused the biggest destruction. (The genesis and the structure of the modern farms of the Great Plain were analysed by: Novák 1986, 90-148, Báth 1997, 11-37. In Western Europe a scholar from Holland dealt profoundly with the problem of the modern dispersed settlements of the Great Hungarian Plain: den Hollander 1947.)

On the other hand one can hardly deny the fact that already during the Árpádian and the Angevin Age (10-14. century AD) the settlement pattern of Hungary possessed a great diversity. The analyses of the medieval chapters carried out by several scholars (Major 1960, 37-39; Szabó 1963, 1-49, 301-337; 1966, 47-51; Maksay 1971, 35-53, 1978, 83-108; Györffy 1977, 262-263, 406-407, etc.; 1984, 969-975.) have emphasised the fact that a variety of settlement types did exist in the investigated period, among others also dwellings of a very small size. The problem of the these small, more or less temporary structures is partly connected with the gradual transformation of the whole habit of the Hungarians' life in the first centuries after their Conquest of the Carpathian basin. The conquering Hungarians had namely led a specific, semi-nomadic way of life, and it took centuries till the last traces of this economic and settlement system disappeared in their new homeland (Makkai 1975, 1-53; Fodor 1998, 26-28, etc.).

According to the analysis of Ferenc Maksay, there were three different types of agrarian settlements already in the Árpádian Age: village, hamlet and farm (Maksay 1978, 88-95). The problem of his argumentation lies in the fact that not only three, but at least five different terms appear for the description of settlement units and/or types in the written sources: i.e.: villa, terra, possessio, locus, praedium (Szabó 1963, 1). Though it is generally accepted that the terms used for the description of the various agrarian settlement structures in Hungarian medieval chapters are not to be understood as strictly used definitions, several attempts were made to distinguish the settlements less inhabited than an average village in the sources. One can find in the chapters from the 12th century onwards data dealing with the so called praedium - in medieval Hungarian written sources regularly with the orthography: predium (Szabó 1963, 13-14, references 33-35, etc.). The argumentation of Máta Belényes was based on the possible connections between the praedium and the modern farm (Belényes 1948, 39-62), though the function of these settlement structures was by far not the same. The praedium was namely a landlord-owned settlement unit used for various productive activities (Szabó 1963, 15; Maksay 1971, 41; Györffy 1977, 262-263; Solymosi 1994, 557), as opposed to the modern
Fig. 1. Mosonszentmiklós - Pál-major: settlement feature No. 469.

Fig. 2. Hegyeshalom - Holdas-szántók: the site with two areas, where medieval settlement features were found.
farm, which was usually a part of an agricultural workshop owned by peasants (Bárth - Szilágyi 1982, 189-195). The above quoted analyses have also emphasised the fact that these praediums are not to be understood as a particular and well defined type of settlement. Usually they were less inhabited than a contemporary village of average size, but there were also praediums, where a large group of servants lived. This example shows us also the confined limits offered by the data collected from the medieval chapters. Mostly only the number and/or names of the servants is quoted. Otherwise, in those chapters where special buildings or settlements structures are named, it is very difficult to identify them with archaeological objects. As a general conclusion we can emphasise the fact that there are unfortunately very few written sources concerning the settlement structure of Hungary of the Árpádian and the Angevin Age, and these sources are regularly too scarce for a detailed description of the features. One should be aware of the fact that in medieval chapters not only specific terms were frequently used in the absence of worked out and strictly defined categories, but many times these terms were not enough detailed either. Therefore the analyses of the above quoted scholars are filled with questions, which had to remain unanswered. In spite of these incertitudes, scholars dealing with the history of Hungarian medieval agriculture agree in the fact that the early farmsteads were used predominantly not as settlement features for grain production but for the purposes of animal husbandry.

A new approach can be based on two facts. Either on a new evaluation of the already collected and analysed written sources, or on the use of a new database as a new starting point. The first attempts to evaluate the archaeological sources in order to investigate the small settlements of the Árpádian Age arouse during the interpretation of the evidences collected by topographical survey. (This branch of archaeological researches was reviewed by: Jankovich 1985, 285-287; Jankovich - Makkay - Szőke 1989, 30-31; Laszlovksy 1986a, 241-246; 1986b, 135-140.) The methodology of this branch of archaeology let only certain conclusions to be drawn. It is namely almost impossible to estimate based only on the surface collection of material remains, whether the low density of pottery shards on a site is caused by a special type of settlement, or it is a result of the lack of modern disturbance of the site. Another way of analysis was pointed out during the investigations of the settlement history of the mountainous area of Borózsnyıı (Nováki - Sándorfi - Miklós 1982, 88-100). Based on a few peculiar sites a hypothesis was formulated about the links between the praediums and the moated sites (Miklós 1985, 238). The question rises whether the hypothesis of Zs. Miklós is to be evaluated only as resulting from the special circumstances of one specific area, or whether it possesses a general value, since the moated sites represent a great diversity also in Hungary. There are among them little forts with ramparts and traces of settlement features, but there are also small ringforts with trenches of a diameter of 10-15 m, without any further settlement patterns (Kubinyi 1990, 290-316; Miklós 1997, 12-16). It is to be noticed that, also according the written sources the praediums were twofold: as a consequence of the presence or absence of the landlord’s seat, the curia (Bolla 1961, 98-99; 1983, 125-129; Szabó 1963, 15-17, 19, etc.; Maksay 1971, 44).

The most important step in the archaeological investigation of small settlements was made in the early 1980s, when Mr. József Laszlovkszy excavated several little sites of the so called Einzelhofsiedlungs-type in the vicinity of the River Tisza, in the Great Hungarian Plain (Laszlovkszy 1986a, 227-255; 1986b, 131-151). And Mrs. Mária Béres analysed two years ago at the Ruraria II. conference in Spa several good examples of small settlements from the southern central part of the Great Hungarian Plain (Béres 1998, 174-175). According to the published features there can be no incertitude as to the existence of small settlements on the Great Hungarian Plain. On the other hand the question rises: whether these small settlements were a sole and exclusive part of the landscape of the Great Plain during the Árpádian Age, or whether we can expect them in the other regions of Hungary, too. It should be pointed out that the landscape of Hungary is characterised not only by one, great plain - there is namely another flatland, the so called Little Plain (in Hungarian Kisalföld), which lies in Western Hungary.

The writer of the present paper was first confronted with the problem of the medieval small settlements in 1986-1988 during the rescue excavations of the site Kajárpeć - Pokolfa-domb, lying on the southern edge of the Kisalföld region. On this site - the sloping right bank of the stream Bakony-ér - mainly Bronze Age settlement features were discovered during the building works of a garage. The archaeological rescue was carried out after the start of the building works and there were no wide and undisturbed areas obtainable. The data concerning the mediaeval settlement structure could be collected in a very little quantity, and therefore the archaeological report of the rescue included no attempt to reconstruct this structure (Takács 1993a, 201-226). Only one conclusion was to be drawn: the density of the Árpádian Age settlement features is much lower than the average.

It is a hardly deniable fact that the structure of an excavated settlement can be analysed precisely when a vast area is being discovered. The big rescues carried out in Hungary in the 1990s, mainly prior to highway buildings, gave us the opportunity for this approach. The aim of the present paper is to evaluate the results of
several rescue excavations led in the 1990s in the region of Kisalföld, mainly on the highway M1 (A detailed overview of these rescue excavations has not been published yet. The most important data concerning the investigation of medieval settlements are presented by: Takács 1998, 181-191). We want to analyse those excavations of this campaign where only few mediaeval settlement features were discovered. It should be pointed out that the above described rescues were all but one led by Mr. András Figler, the archaeologist of the Hanság Museum (Mosonmagyaróvár), who is going to publish the data concerning the Neolithic and/or Bronze Age settlement features concerning the quoted sites.

Fig. 3. Hegyeshalom - Holdas-szántók: settlement area A.

Fig. 4. Hegyeshalom - Holdas-szántók: settlement area B.
2. Brief description of the sites

2.1. Mosonszentmiklós - Pál-major

During the archaeological rescue of the site carried out in 1993-1995 a very large area (more than 9 hectares) was excavated, with round 3577 features (A brief description of the rescue was presented by Figler 1996, 18-19; Figler 1997a, 19-20; 1997b, 19). These features represent a very large range of material cultures from the Stone Age to the Late Mediaeval Period, though their vast majority belonged to the late Neolithic Lengyel-culture. Among others four mediaeval settlement features (two houses an oven and a pit) were also found. These features were lying on two edges of the site and are to be dated to two periods. The first: Pál-major A consists only of one house, containing shards from the second half of the 13th or from the 14th century. The other unit: Pál-major B is a house (Fig. 1), an oven and a round pit. They are to be dated to the 12th or to the first half of the 13th century according to the same source of information (The chronology of the medieval ceramics of the Kisalföld region was overviewed by Takács 1996b, 150-181).

2.2. Hegyeshalom - Holdas szántók (site M15, A/1)

During the archaeological rescue of the site in 1996, more than 6 hectares were excavated, with features mainly belonging to a late Roman cemetery. (A brief description of the rescue was presented by Figler - Vaday 1998, 8-27.) Among the findings of other periods a traces of Árpádian Age small settlements also occurred. These features (trenches and pits) belonged to two, clearly separated little settlement patterns (settlement A and B) (Figs. 2-4). The one on the northern part of the site (settlement A) consisted of a row of little pits (perhaps postholes) and four big pits of irregular shape. The one on the southern part of the site (settlement B) had a structure which consisted of a trench, an oven and 9 pits of round or oval shape.

The chronology of the described features is based on their ceramic findings. According to this data the settlement A existed in the 12th century or in the first half of the 13th century. The settlement B is most likely to be dated to the third, latest phase of the Árpádian Age (second half of the 13th century) or to the Angevin Age (14th century) according to a find of a late cauldron rim in the ob. No. 172.

\[\text{Fig. 5. Lébény - Kaszás-domb: the site with two areas, where medieval settlement features were found.}\]
This site lies in the immediate vicinity of the Lébény - Bille-domb site, where remains of a large scale, village type, Árpádian Age settlement had been excavated - among the features of many other archaeological eras. The two mentioned sites represent two narrow hills on the eastern border of a large swamp-area, the so-called Hanság. These little hills are separated by a tiny, dried out brook. The rescue excavations of the Kaszás-domb site were carried out in 1991-1993. (A brief description of the rescue was presented by T. Németh - Szőnyi - Tomka - Takács 1994, 19-20.) More than 5 hectares were excavated, with more than 1400 settlement features from various eras, mainly belonging to the Late Bronze Age Urnenfels-lynker culture or the early mediaeval Avar period. Parts of three cemeteries were also excavated, among others a graveyard from the 10th-11th centuries. The period of the Árpádian Age is also represented by at least 30 settlement features (Figs. 5-7): two houses of different shape (one of them is presented on the Fig. 8), 16 ovens, 10 pits of various size and shape, one posthole and parts of one trench. These settlement features belong to the 12th or to the beginning of the 13th century according to the chronology of their ceramic findings (Takács 1996a, 150-181). It is to be noticed that on the same site a large amount of Avar settlement features was also discovered (Takács 1996a, 379-382). As in some cases where only little parts of pottery were obtainable, the dating of some features was uncertain, the statistics were made only according to those features where the dating was firm. The settlement features from the 12th-13th centuries were lying beside a cemetery from the 10th-11th century, and they are very peculiar because of their topography, too. These settlement features are to be

Fig. 6. Lébény - Kaszás-domb: settlement area A.
divided in two living units separated by an uninhabited area. According to this, the two little settlement units are marked as Lébény - Kaszás-domb A and Lébény - Kaszás-domb B.

2.4. Abda-Hármasok

This site is a low but large hill in the vicinity of the inundation area of the river Rábca. During its archaeological rescue, carried out in 1992 a vast area of more than one hectare was excavated, with 68 settlement features. (A brief description of the rescue was presented by Figler 1994, 5.) The vast majority of these features belong to a Middle Bronze Age settlement but other periods are also represented. Among others three ovens were excavated on the site, too (one of them is presented in Fig. 9). Their shape is purely mediaeval: parallels to it are to be found in the settlements of the Avar or the Árpádian Age (Takács 1993b, 35-36). During the surface collection of the artefacts on the site prior to the rescue, shards of Árpádian Age pottery were collected (Figler 1994, 5), according to which they most likely belong to this age.

Fig. 7. Lébény - Kaszás-domb: settlement area B.
This site was excavated through a 4 m wide section during the gas pipeline rescue campaign in September and October 1995. (A brief description of the rescue was presented by Figler 1997c, 84-85.) A Grubenhaus-type dwelling, an oven and fifteen pits of various size and shape were found.

These features were filled with mixed soil, containing shards from the 12th or from the beginning of the 13th century.

The detailed description of the site is going to be published by Máté Losonczy.

Fig. 8. Lébény - Kaszás-domb: settlement features No. 259, 651, 652, 882. (the features No. 259 and 651 are medieval).

Fig 9. Abda-Hármasok: settlement feature No. 60.
This site was excavated through a 4 m wide section during the gas pipeline rescue campaign in September 1997. A dwelling of Grubenhaus-type, an oven and two pits were found.

According to the shards these features are to be dated to the 12th or to the beginning of the 13th century.

The detailed description of the site is going to be published by Máti Losonczy.

The most important data concerning the medieval features of the described excavations are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>house</th>
<th>pit</th>
<th>single oven</th>
<th>posthole</th>
<th>trench</th>
<th>chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mos.-Pál. A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1250-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mos.-Pál. B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1100-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegy.-Tíz. A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1100-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegy.-Tíz. B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1250-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léb.-Kasz. A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1100-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léb.-Kasz. B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1100-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abda-Hár.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900-1300(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bez.-Orsz.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1100-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mos.-Hor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1100-1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Conclusions

From the described sites and settlement features the following conclusions can be drawn.

1) It is certain that nucleated and/or dispersed settlements existed in the southern parts of the Little Plain during the Árpádian and the Angevin Age (10th-14th century AD).

2) The analysed small sites are very peculiar, not only because of the low number of mediaeval settlement items, but also due to the fact that none of them represents the whole scale of the variety of settlement features known from contemporary villages (Takács 1993b, 16-40.). This situation can be perhaps described as a result of the temporary use of these small settlements. The two most common feature-types of the analysed small settlement were the pit and the so called single oven, i. e. an oven built outside of the house. Only two exceptions are to be found where these types of features have not occurred. As a counterpart to this, rests of houses were detected only at the half of the analysed sites. But this can be a consequence of the fact that agricultural activity and/or the soil removing prior to rescue could have ruined the floor level of those houses, which were not dug in the soil.

3) In spite of this factor of incertitude, the excavated sites are representing several settlement types. First of all one can find farmsteads of the "Einzelhofsiedlung"-type also in the region of Kisalföld, similar to those of the Great Plain excavated by Mr. J. Laszlovsky. The site of Mosonszentmiklós - Pál-major A and B and of Hegyeshalom A and B (Figs. 2-4) belong most likely to this type. Though it is a fact that according to the argumentation of Mr. J. Laszlovsky the Einzelhofsiedlung-type settlement was a settlement unit consisting of features used for living and of objects built for economical purposes (Laszlovsky 1986a, 227-255; 1986b, 131-151), and it is obvious that absolutely certain traces of settlement features used for economical purposes were not discovered on any of the here quoted, four small settlement units, and some parts of the living features were regularly missing, too. (Only the row of postholes on the site Hegyeshalom A (Fig. 3) can be perhaps considered as a trace of a feature used for animal keeping, but this interpretation does not expand the
limits of a hypothesis.) The lack of certain types of settlement features can be a consequence of the technique of the rescue excavation, too, but we also have to count with factors not enough known yet. The relatively large number of medieval pits on the site of Hegyeshalom B (Fig. 4) can be considered as doubtful, though the appearance of 9 objects of the same type can also be interpreted with their subsequent chronology. We have already quoted the fact that according to our present knowledge the chronology of the medieval shards of the Little Plain region is somewhat frame-like because we cannot date them with a higher accuracy than one and a half century (Tokács 1996b, 135-150). Furthermore, the site of Bezenye and Mosonszentmiklós-Szilas can perhaps also be held as a representative of the Einzelhofsiedlung-type, though the size of their rescue excavations does not allow us to make final conclusions. Further we have to deal with an excavation which cannot be taken as firm examples of special settlement-types. The site of Lébény - Kaszás-dűlő is a kind of less inhabited outskirts of a nearby, regular size village, with two small settlement units (Lébény - Kaszás-domb A and B; Figs. 6-8). It is doubtful whether this site can be understood as a settlement on its own, though it was situated on the other bank of a little stream, which perhaps dried out already in the Middle Ages, and there was also a graveyard lying between the "regular" village and the area with settlement features of dispersed topography. During the rescue excavations of the highway M1 a site was excavated, too, where the discovered few medieval settlement features can perhaps be interpreted as the traces of a temporary dwelling. The three ovens of the site Abda-Hámarsok (Fig. 9) belong most likely to this type of settlements, though their chronology is uncertain.

4) Only further excavations and analyses can solve the problem whether this settlement pattern of the Kisalföld region of the Árpádian Age is connected with the fact that the vast majority of the described sites are in the inundation area of Rába, Rábca or Danube, or with the fact that the Kisalföld region is situated in the vicinity of the western border of Hungary. It is also impossible to judge, whether these small settlements are the traces of summer camps connected with the semi-nomadic way of life, brought from the Eastern European steppe region, or whether they represent a kind of secondary dispersion, which begun only after an agrarian settlement pattern, with more or less constant villages had already been formed. Furthermore, for the time being traces of structural changes among the analysed small settlement of the Kisalföld region cannot be observed, not even if scholars dealing with medieval written sources generally agree in the subsequent transformation of the whole settlement pattern Hungary during the 13th-14th centuries (Maksay 1971, 51-53). Perhaps a more detailed chronological framework can bring a new approach to the possibility of an archaeological analysis of this question.

5) At the moment, archaeologists dealing with the medieval settlements of Hungary are not able to identify the various small settlement structures with the terms used by the contemporary written sources. There is only one way which can perhaps amend this lack: the further discovery of small settlements.

HUFENARTIGE UND/ODER ZERSPLITTerte Siedlungen
DER ÁRPÁDEN- UND ANJOUZEIT DER WESTUNGARISCHEN REGION KISALFÖLD


Aufgrund dieser Quellenbasis sind in der Studie die folgenden Schlussfolgerungen formuliert.

1) Schon für die Árpáden- und Anjouzeit steht die Existenz der kleinen, hufenartigen und/oder zersplitterten Siedlungen in der untersuchten Region außer Zweifel.

2) Die untersuchten kleinen Fundorte scheinen sehr einzigartig zu sein, nicht nur wegen der kleinen Anzahl der mittelalterlichen Siedlungseinheiten, aber auch wegen der Tatsache, daß keiner von ihnen das ganze Spektrum der mittelalterlichen Siedlungsformen darstellt. Diese Situation kann vielleicht als eine Konsequenz der temporären Benützung der kleinen Siedlungen interpretiert werden. Die meist vertretenen Objekttypen der analysierten kleinen Siedlungen sind die Vorratsgrube und die alleinstehenden, d.h. außer dem Hause gebauten Ofen. Nur zwei solche Ausnahmen sind zu finden, wo an Fundort dieser Objekttypen nicht auffindbar waren. Im Gegensatz wurden Reste von Wohnhäusern nur in der Hälfte der analysierten Siedlungen freigelegt. Das kann aber auch die Folge jener Tatsache
seine, daß die landwirtschaftliche Aktivität und der die Technologie der Humushäufung während der Rettungsgrabung das Fußboden niveau jener Häuser zerstören konnte, die nicht tief in die Ehe eingegraben waren.


4) Nur aufgrund weiterer Grabungen und Analysen ist die Frage zu beantworten, ob das beschriebene Siedlungssystem der Kleinen Tiefenbene mit jener Tatsache verknüpft ist, daß diese Region im Innungungsgebiet der Flüsse Rába, Raab und Donau ist, oder mit der Tatsache, daß die Kleine Tiefenbene in der Nähe der Westgrenze von Ungarn liegt. Man kann zur Zeit auch nicht beurteilen, ob die analysierten Siedlungsspure mit der halbnomadischen, osteuropäischen Lebensform verknüpft sind, oder ob diese eine sekundäre Siedlungszer- splitterung darstellen, die nur noch der Stabilisierung des Dorfsystems bedurfte.

5) Zur Zeit sind die Archäologen, die die mittelalterliche Siedlungsstruktur Ungarns behandeln, noch nicht in der Lage, die verschiedenen kleinen Siedlungsspure mit der Terminologie der spätmittelalterlichen Quellen identifizieren zu können. Es gibt nur einen Weg, der vielleicht diese Lücke füllen kann: die weitere archäologische Aufdeckung von kleinen Siedlungen.

L’HABITAT GROUPÉ ET/OU DISPERSE À L’ÈPOQUE DES DYNASTIES ARPAD ET D’ANJOU DANS LA RÉGION DE KISALFÖLD À L’OUEST DE L’HONGRIE
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