INVESTIGATIONS IN THE KERKA VALLEY: FIELD SURVEYS, AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY, ARCHIVAL DATA

The still visible remains of human impact on the landscape (Eszter Bânffy)

A cursory glance at a given landscape shows a few villages, houses and church spires, with the gardens, ploughlands, grazing fields and meadows scattered between them. The parish church at Csesztreg (originally called Felsőcesztreg), for example, dominates the view of the settlement from the north ever since the Middle Ages. At the same time, a closer inspection of many features that appear to be an organic part of the landscape reveals that they preserve traces of one-time human activity.

One of the most conspicuous features of the Kerka Valley is the unique architecture of the nobility’s settlements in this borderland region. A number of porticoed manor houses can still be seen in Szentgyörgyvölgy and Nemesnép, some rather dilapidated, some lovingly renovated by their new, usually Austrian owners. Beside the belfries, such as the one at Nemesnép, the old hamlet settlement pattern is the most distinctive feature of this region; its traces still survive in some places, either appearing as discrete settlement nuclei, as toponyms containing the word szer or in the identification and excavation of these hamlets that were abandoned sometime in the Middle Ages. Examples of still existing hamlets can be quoted from Szentgyörgyvölgy: Alsófarkas, Asszonyfa, Kógyár (formerly known as Kolgyár) and Cilinkő. Destroyed and abandoned hamlets include Csekeszter near Alsófarkas and a settlement nucleus, whose name can no longer be identified, by the hill on which the Catholic church stands. Both of the latter were identified during the field surveys. Although Csekeszter is practically uninhabited, its name has been preserved by the locals. This, then, is a unique feature of the Kerka Valley landscape that has survived unchanged since the Middle Ages.

Countless other relics of medieval man’s impact on the landscape have survived in the investigated area. We discovered the traces of ridge and furrow ploughing in several woods. Owing to the rather wet climate, it was customary in the western borderland region to repeatedly plough 2–5 m wide zones, and the ridges thus created enabled rain and melting snow to flow down into a wide furrow. The fact that many areas that in the Middle Ages had been ploughed in this manner have since been reclaimed by forests indicates that the acidic, poor quality soil was not always worth cultivating. Still, the surviving traces of ridge and furrow ploughing in forests contribute to our reconstruction of the one-time medieval landscape. Such longish ridges were identified north of Szentgyörgyföld-Cilinkó towards Magyarföld, in the forest on the territory of the Szentgyörgyvölgy Nature Reserve, and east of Zalabaksa, near the medieval village of Szentandrás. It seems likely that we can detect the activity of the inhabitants of Szentandrás in the forests of the Medes clearance.

Medieval Szentandrás, one of the villages deserted during the Ottoman period, has remained deserted ever since, this being the reason that its territory was never disturbed by subsequent building activity. Its fishpond can still be made out among the surviving embankments. The rectangular patches with sherds scattered over them indicate that the houses had been aligned perpendicular to the embankment. The location of the one-time church, indicated by a debris of bricks, has been identified on the highest point of the village, on a small hill. It seems likely that the graves of the villagers still lie undisturbed around the church.

2. Vándor 1996 44.
A few years ago, the burials of the cemetery around the medieval church of Csesztneg came to light during the construction of a canal. According to László Vándor, “the one-time medieval terrain and the line of the ditch encircling the cemetery can still be made out north of the church. Its width suggests that after Kanizsa had been occupied by the Turkish forces in the early 17th century, the short-lived Csesztneg fortress had been created by fortifying the church”, providing yet another example for the impact of human activity on the landscape during the Middle Ages and the Turkish occupation period.

Moving backwards in time, it becomes clear that the landscape was shaped not only by medieval man. The centuries of the Migration period left few traces, most likely because at this time the area was practically uninhabited and functioned as a marshland separating the various peoples from each other. The preceding Roman period left two rather distinctive marks. The first, the remains of Roman roads, is less conspicuous. The cobbled surface of the road is sometimes visible under good terrain and light conditions. Ferenc Redő was able to trace a section of the Amber Road passing through the Kerka Valley, as well as another road branching off to the west.

The other characteristic feature cannot be missed and can be noted in several places. In the 2nd–3rd centuries AD, the Romanised population usually erected a small mound, a tumulus over the cremation burials. This burial practice became quite common in a fairly wide zone along the Amber Road throughout Transdanubia. In the Kerka Valley, the cemeteries containing these burial mounds were usually preserved in forested areas, where they were protected from natural erosion and destruction by agricultural cultivation. Some of these burial mounds, such as the ones near Kerkabarabás and Zalabaksa, have been known since the 19th century, and several tumuli have also been reported from Nemesnép. A burial ground containing some sixty tumuli lies in the forest south of Szilvágy; most of these burials are undisturbed, implying that very few have been plundered and that the graves, as well as the grave goods, have remained untouched by grave robbers. Ferenc Redő investigated one of these early Roman period burial mounds near Nemesnép and found that the burial had been robbed in antiquity, probably sometime after the burial.

One might think that prehistoric man did not have a lasting impact on the landscape, given the geographic conditions in Transdanubia. True enough, there are no Neolithic settlement mounds (tells) or Copper Age tumulus burials (kurgans) in Transdanubia. At the same time, we know that the forest clearance begun in the Early Neolithic had a lasting effect. In order to gain new arable land, early agriculturalists had to clear the forested hills in Transdanubia. It is uncertain how intensive this early agriculture was. Still, it is noteworthy that a few distinctive prehistoric radiolarite chipped stone blades were found in almost all of the cultivated fields that were included in the field surveys. Obviously, these scattered stone implements did not mark a settlement, but rather indicated that these fields had also been cultivated during prehistoric times; these implements had probably been lost during harvesting or other agricultural work, or had perhaps been deposited there, when manure from a nearby settlement was spread over the soil.

The transformation of the landscape began when man had taken one of the greatest steps in the history of mankind: instead of simply collecting what he needed, he began to acquire his food by transforming the natural environment, in other words, at the time when hunter-gatherers became food-producing peasants. This process can also be traced in the Kerka Valley: not only did ploughlands encroach on forested tracts, but the foundation of
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3 Vándor 1996 50; L. Vándor: Kanizsa története a honfoglaláskor óta (The history of Kanizsa from the Hungarian Conquest period till the end of the Turkish rule), in: Nagykanizsa 1994 360. Cf. also his study in this volume.

4 Cf. also his study in this volume.

5 Although the tumulus graves of County Zala have been surveyed by László Tábori, the results have not been published for fear that the burials would be looted. Tábori’s map has been published in two studies, although without an indication of the exact findspots: L. Horváth: A magyarszerdahelyi kelta és római temető [The Celtic and Roman cemetery at Magyarszerdahely], ZGY 14 (1979) fig. 19; L. Horváth: Római halomsírok Zalabán (Römische tumuli im Komitat Zala), in: Völker an der Mur 1998 31–40, map.

6 See his study in the present volume.
small hamlets and villages, established on hilltops, was also preceded by forest clearance and thus triggered or contributed to the later erosion of these hills.

Systematic field surveys (Eszter Bánffy)
The systematic field surveys conducted over the area were perhaps the most important part of the research project. Much has been written about the terminology, the theory and the types of surveys, as well as about the advantages and disadvantages of various surveying methods. The number of actual surveys has also increased. We may say that with the spread of processual archaeology, which advocated an analytical approach to archaeology and the inclusion of the natural sciences in fieldwork from the late 1960s, adequately funded, large-scale field survey projects equipped with the most up-to-date surveying instruments were launched one after the other. There is also a vast literature on sampling techniques. The most detailed study on the theory and practice of archaeological surveying was written by Dénes B. Jankovich. In the following I shall briefly describe the disadvantageous and advantageous factors that influenced our survey work.

Two circumstances contributed to the difficulties of the survey. One was the extensive tracts of woodland in the surveyed area since even with the rather scanty shrub level in the area, we could only hope to identify and record traces that left a visible mark on the environment.

The other difficulty was more socio-economic, than environmental in nature. Before the political changes in Hungary, the arable land was usually managed by a local co-operative, and the two earlier investigated micro-regions were no exception. This meant that there were huge fields planted with the same crop. It also meant that in the case of archaeological fieldwork — a field survey, a sounding excavation or an excavation project lasting several years — one only had to reach an agreement with the director of the co-operative for obtaining permissions and usually one paid some symbolic compensation for damages.

This situation changed drastically in the early 1990s. Farming co-operatives disintegrated, their land was distributed or, better said, returned to their original owners. The earlier large fields were carved up into small plots. We had to come to an agreement with each and every owner of these plots individually, and we can call ourselves lucky that we were able to conduct our survey without any major conflicts on these lands. The greatest problem was that the earlier, usual order of field surveys had to be changed by necessity. It is a well known fact that surveys are best conducted in spring and autumn, when cultivated fields are no longer covered with snow or vegetation. When we began our micro-region project in 1995, we already had to face the problem that most of the fields were left fallow, in part owing to the worsening economic climate and the lack of agricultural machinery, as well as to the low profit from cultivation owing to the poor quality of the soil. As a result, our surveys in spring and autumn were not always successful. During our summer excavations, we often saw fields that had been ploughed, but had for some reason not been planted with any crops. We therefore also continued the field surveys in summer. In late summer afternoons, in the low light, we could also survey the meadows left fallow. Only a few plants survived in the weed infested fields that had formerly been ploughed. This is how we identified the Szentgyörgyvölgy-Harasztí erdő site, with its worn sherd and chipped stone implements and the remains of the medieval hamlet at Szentgyörgyvölgy-Katólikus templomdomb, as well as the remains of a small settlement of the Copper Age Balaton–Lasinja culture not far from the latter. We returned to these sites several times in order to gain as much information as possible.

The third difficulty that we faced during the field surveys was the presence of floodplains and floodplain soils. It is rather pointless to survey these low-lying, waterlogged areas since the deposits thicken from year to year after each flood, not to mention the fact that these areas could only have been settled in periods of dryer climate — however, there is no evidence for a substantially drier climate. These areas are almost without exception uncultivated and left fallow.
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7 Renfrew – Bahn 1996 Chapter 3.
9 Jankovich 1993.
It follows from the above that we could use these conditions to our best advantage if we primarily surveyed the low river terraces, hill ridges and the dry sections of the plainland, including the areas along the one-time watercourses. We were fully aware of the disadvantages of this procedure: most Anglo-Saxon archaeologists, who prefer to use block or gridded random sampling techniques, reject the practice of extensive sampling. We nonetheless chose this sampling technique for two reasons. Firstly, if we had only surveyed a certain percentage of each landscape type, the number of known sites would only have been a fraction of what we actually identified. Secondly, it is worth quoting Colin Renfrew’s opinion: “Surveys can be made more extensive by combining results from a series of individual projects in neighbouring regions to produce very large-scale views of change in landscape, land-use and settlement through time – though ... the accuracy and quality of different survey projects may vary widely. ... Alternatively survey can be made more intensive by aiming at total coverage of a single large site or site-cluster – what one might call micro-regional survey.”

Between 1995–98, the surveys in the Kerka Valley were conducted not only in spring and autumn, but also in summer. We surveyed individual sites several times and conducted a total of six excavations. On some sites, such as the Neolithic settlement at Szentgyörgyvölgy-Pityerdomb, we conducted an intensive survey, collecting each and every surface find and mapping these finds according to their find spot. We also paid special attention to so-called ‘off-site’ surveys for identifying traces indicating field use and crop cultivation; we could identify and register these from both the Neolithic and the late Middle Ages. As regards one-time road networks, we gathered new information for the Neolithic, the Roman period and the Middle Ages. We also made a number of aerial photos; in other words, the survey can truly be described as a systematic field survey. We compared the results of the field surveys with the evidence from excavations, earlier archival data and, not least, with the results of similar surveys conducted in two micro-regions of Transdanubia, the Slovenian project in the Mura region and the Austrian project in the Rába region. It is our firm belief that the results wholly corroborate Colin Renfrew’s opinion quoted in the above and, also, that they provide a reliable picture of the settlement history of this Transdanubian region over the past 7500 years.

**Aerial photography (Zsuzsa Miklós)**

On July 3, 1998 I conducted an aerial reconnaissance and took a number of aerial photos in the Kerka Valley. Èszter Bánffy selected the sites to be photographed and marked them on a 1 : 10,000 map, on the basis of which I determined the GPS co-ordinates in order to identify the sites as accurately as possible. Unfortunately, a part of this area was uncharted territory in terms of GPS and we therefore had to rely on 30–40 year old maps for navigation. This greatly hindered our work and we also had to take care not to violate the airspace of neighbouring Slovenia when flying over villages – such as Szentgyörgyvölgy – that lay close to the border.

The cloudy, rainy weather was not particularly favourable for aerial photography. However, we could not afford to be choosy owing to the proximity of the border.

The vegetation cover was ripe wheat – already harvested in some areas – and maize, alternating with forested areas and meadowland, in which archaeological features and remains can rarely be observed. Most of the agricultural land had been carved up into small plots and this was hardly promising for making archaeological observations.

I took the aerial photos from a Cessna-172 airplane, using a Mamiya-645, Practica LTL and Minolta X-700 cameras, and 21 din Agfa optima professional film. I took colour infra photos with the Minolta and I also made a video film. The relative flying altitude was 300–400 m.

---


13. Licence number 2/4 98.

14. We had to obtain a special licence for flying over areas lying close to the border and the dates had to be co-ordinated with the border guards of both Hungary and Slovenia.
The identification and documentation of archaeological features in the course of aerial reconnaissance and from aerial photographs is possible from various 'signs'. In our case, these 'signs' were provided by the vegetation. We know that cereals, and especially wheat, are highly sensitive to changes in the soil. These changes are indicated by colour, differing from its immediate environment, or by the negative or positive growth anomalies. Wheat has a deep green colour in spring if it grows over filled-in ditches and pits, owing to the higher humus content of the soil and its growth is also stronger (positive anomaly). In contrast, the humus content is lower compared to the environment over ploughed-up ramparts, brick and stone walls (negative growth anomaly), and the vegetation is usually sparser or stunted.

Although maize and root crops are usually less sensitive to soil changes, their colour and growth can, in fortunate cases, also indicate the location of buried features.

The best time for aerial reconnaissance and aerial photography is late June and early July in areas planted with cereals. The low light in the early morning and late afternoon is also helpful for the optimum observations. Even so, success is not guaranteed even under optimal circumstances.

Although the days chosen for the reconnaissance were ideal, other circumstances were less fortunate in the Kerka Valley. The cloudy, rainy weather was not favourable for making aerial photos in spite of the fact that we chose a time, when wheat was beginning to ripen, but we could not choose other dates owing to the proximity of the border. We observed very few discoloured patches indicating the possible presence of archaeological features. Only after analysing the photos with a computer could we detect a few discolorations and growth differences in the vegetation that possibly reflected archaeological features, even though this could only be ascertained by excavating the site. Interestingly enough, we also recoded a few such discoloured patches in areas where no archaeological sites had been identified during the field surveys.

The age of the features appearing on these aerial photos cannot be determined unambiguously. One should not rely solely on aerial photos and observations made from the air even in the case of very typical features. It is always necessary to conduct a traditional field survey and, if necessary, an excavation.

Possible archaeological features were observed at the following sites:

*Alsószenterzsébet-Faluhei*

The growth differences in the ripe wheat suggested various rectangular, straight and irregular archaeological features west of the village, on the hill overlooking the southern side of the Kerka Stream (fig. 1).

*Boglár*

The outlines of two rectangular and a more irregular feature could be observed on the western outskirts of the village, on a slightly rising hill on the western bank of the Nagyvölgyi Stream. The rectangular features showed up as a dark stripe, while the irregular feature as a green patch.

Two smaller, slightly irregular patches could also be observed on the edge of Site 38. In contrast, no features could be noted in the area to its north, similarly planted with wheat, on Site 37. The growth anomalies in the maize covering the hill rising slightly above the floodplain in an area called Sötétes-dűlő on the western bank of the Sárberki Stream indicated archaeological features. These anomalies suggested filled-up pits (fig. 2), even though no surface finds were detected during the field survey conducted in this area. Archaeological features were also indicated by the growth anomalies in the ripe wheat in the same area (fig. 3).
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12 MTA RI Negative no. 179.472.
16 MTA RI Negative no. 179.473.
17 MTA RI Negative no. 179.474.
18 MTA RI Negative no. 179.475.
19 MTA RI Negative no. 179.476.
Nemesnép–Első-tag
A roughly 300 m by 350 m large site with prehistoric and Roman Age finds was identified on an elevation rising above the floodplain and the waterlogged area east of the village on the bank of the Völgyi Stream (Site 35). A few irregular lines could be made out in the ripening wheat, although it is uncertain whether these indicate archaeological features.20

Szentgyörgyvölgy–Temető; Szentgyörgyvölgy–Pityerdomb
Dark green patches, perhaps indicating one-time pits, could be noted in the wheat on the top of the hill rising above the waterlogged area on the eastern outskirts of the village. This site is in fact the southern side of the Pityerdomb, the two are separated from each other by a road. The excavation surface is also visible21 (fig. 4, with the excavated area marked by the arrow).

The photos described in the above indicate that archaeological features can be observed using aerial photography even under less than ideal circumstances. It seems likely that considerably more features would have showed up under more favourable circumstances. The general rule that an area should be investigated and photographed several times is also valid for the Kerka Valley since the observations made in different seasons and under different conditions can then be compared and the features in a certain area can be better evaluated.

Archival and documentary evidence on the Kerka Valley (Mária Bondár)
This section offers an overview of the archival and other documentary evidence concerning the villages in the Kerka Valley. Most of these are taken from the archaeological and historical studies discussing this region. As a result of the data and record collection conducted over the past four decades by researchers working in the Archives of the Archaeological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, there is an abundance of data concerning this region. The data pertaining to County Zala were collected in the 1980s in the course of this extensive project (covering the entire Carpathian Basin), as part of the work necessary for the publication of the County Zala volume of the Archaeological Topography of Hungary.

20 MTA RI Negative no. 179.480.
21 MTA RI Negative no. 179.485.
fig. 2. Baglad

The reference cards contain not only the data concerning a particular site culled from various archaeological and historical journals and monographs, but also data on the museums in which finds from sites in County Zala are housed, local history studies, the documentary evidence contained in charters and other records and the archaeological studies published in County Zala. This highly valuable archival material saved a lot of work for the present author, and I would here like to thank István Torma for his kind permission to make use of the records in the Archives.

The first archaeological find from this region, the fragment of an animal headed Celtic belt from Kissziget, was presented to the Hungarian National Museum in 1851.

The first archaeological report about this region dates from 1854: a description of the Roman Age tumulus burials of Kerkabarabás and Zalabaksa published in the yearbook of the Central Commission of National Monuments in Vienna.

Flóris Römér visited County Zala in 1863. He surveyed the various historical monuments in the area and wrote an article about the church in Csesztreg for Vasárnapi Újság.

From 1866, Imre Gózon, a local teacher collected archaeological artefacts in the Szentgyörgyvölgy and Márkkől area, many of which he donated or sold to the Hungarian National Museum (1866, 1875, 1878, 1880). The parish priest of Szentgyörgyvölgy too was in the habit of surveying the area regularly and sending any finds he came across to the museum in Szombathely.

Stone artefacts and pottery fragments from Szentgyörgyvölgy were displayed at the exhibition in the Hungarian National Museum on the occasion of the Eighth International Prehistoric Congress in 1876.

Several medieval churches, such as the ones at Csesztreg, Felsőszenterzsébet, Resznek, Szentgyörgyvölgy and Zalabaksa, are mentioned in various sources.

The systematic archaeological investigation of this area was begun as part of the Kerka Valley Micro-Region Project. Earlier finds from the area were collected unsystematically: these were the artefacts brought to light during earth-moving operations or collected by enthusiastic locals. Preliminary reports of the work done during the micro-region project have
been published by the archaeologists participating in the work.\textsuperscript{22} László Vándor contributed an overview of the region’s settlement history and of the data contained in the medieval sources.\textsuperscript{23} The greater part of the relevant data comes from the Middle Ages, and we may say that there is a wealth of documentary evidence from this period. Seeing that the settlement history of each major period is discussed in a separate chapter, only the data taken from various studies and museum archives will be listed here. The secure identification of the findspot of a find or a find assemblage presented to a museum collection prior to our investigation is indicated in the chapters covering each period and in the chapter on the findings of the field surveys. In this chapter, the various categories of evidence are discussed according to settlements.

\textit{Alsószenterzsébet}

The settlement is first mentioned in a document from 1334 (Poss. Scenth elsebeth).\textsuperscript{24} The \textit{dica} tax register for 1549 lists 7.5 tenant holdings (porta), 1 deserted tenant peasant (iobagio) plot, 1 newly established tenant peasant plot, one landowner (László Bánffy) and an individual in the service of the landowner for \textit{Also Zent ersetbe}.\textsuperscript{25} However, the same register lists 9 tenant holdings, 3 newly established tenant peasant plots, four landowners (István Bánffy, István Sáfár, Mihály Soldos and Péter Bors), two cotters and three craftsmen (without the specification of their craft) for \textit{Also Zent ersetbe} and \textit{Marok ffelde}.\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Csesztreg 1996.
\item \textsuperscript{24} ZO I 278; Csinki 1897 105.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Maksay 1990 934.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Maksay 1990 934.
\end{itemize}
fig. 4. Szentgyörgyvölgy-Temető and Szentgyörgyvölgy-Pityerdomb

Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer contains several field names;\(^{27}\) however, none of these suggests a possible archaeological site.

The volume *Zala megye földrajzi nevei* contains the following passage: “Faluhegy [Faluhegy; “village site”]: the previous site of the settlement” (p. 307).

There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages at Alsószenterzsébet.

**Baglad**
The *dica* tax conscription from 1549 lists 8.5 tenant holdings, 2 deserted tenant peasant plots, 1 newly established tenant peasant plot, six landowners (Mrs Bernát Csete, a widow, György Csete, Sandrin Bakacs, János Csépán, Bertalan Csépán, Ferenc Nagy) and three cotters.\(^{28}\)

The volume *Zala megye földrajzi nevei* contains the following archaeological, historical and art historical information (p. 329): *Miheli tóka*: a former smithy, but now a depression covered with marshland (Site 329/2); *Képi út* [Képi road]: a cross at its end (site 329/37); *Képi föld* [Képi land]: a cross in one of the corners (Site 329/49).

There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Baglad.

**Csesztrreg**
There were several medieval villages on the territory and outskirts of present-day Csesztrreg: *Újfalú*, *Csesztrreg*, *Mihó* or *Mihon*,\(^{29}\) and a *villa* called *Karka* is mentioned in a perambulation charter drawn up in 1334.\(^{30}\) Újfalú is identical with present-day Kerkaújfalu, which was administratively annexed to Csesztrreg in 1942. Judit Kvassay conducted an excavation on the site of medieval Mihon in 1993.\(^{31}\)

Csesztrreg is first mentioned in a charter dating from 1275.\(^{32}\) *Alsócsesztrreg* and *Felsőcsesztrreg* [Upper and Lower Csesztrreg] appear in a charter dated 1381;\(^{33}\) the settlement appears as *poss. Cheztereg* in 1405,\(^{34}\) and as *opp. Chezteregh* from 1469.\(^{35}\) The stone church
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\(^{27}\) Pesty 1864.
\(^{28}\) Maksay 1990 935.
\(^{29}\) Csánki 1897 119; Holub 1933 115, 446, 910.
\(^{30}\) Holub 1933 365.

\(^{28}\) Holub 1933 155.
\(^{30}\) MOL DL 6802.
\(^{34}\) MOL DL 9099.
\(^{35}\) MOL DL 16853, 37006.
dedicated to St. Móric is mentioned in the 1334–1335 tax register. Csesztreg was part of the Bánffy estate and belonged to Lendva Castle.

The dica tax register from 1549 mentions 20 tenant holdings, one landowner (László Bánffy), six cotters and three individuals in the service of the landowner.37

The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contains the following data (p. 307): Ujjalu (present-day Kerkaújfalu), Falurész (Site 307/1), Fővég [Upper end]; village part (Site 307/9), Ávég [Lower end]; village part (Site 307/21) and Mihom erdő [Mihom wood] (Site 307/50).

In a letter to Arnold Ipolyi describing his travels in County Zala, Rómer Flóris also refers to the church of Csesztreg, mentioned in 14th century charters: “The Csesztreg tower is Romanesque, with twin windows and arrow-loop openings. The bricks are quite old. In this region, the glittering gilt tin crosses have been replaced by more natural ones for kindling feelings of devotion. The depiction of St. Móric in the church is rather fine painting. The births register of Csesztreg from 1665.”38 Imre Henschelman quotes Rómer in his description of the Csesztreg church in his study on the monuments of Hungary.39 István Genthon provides a detailed description of the frescoes, including the depiction of St. Móric, painted by István Dorffmeister the Younger.40 A good overview of the church’s architectural history was written by József Németh,41 while László Kostyály has analysed its frescoes.42

The 1909 report on the activities of the Hungarian National Museum mentions a hoard of 95 coins found here; another hoard of 242 coins from Csesztreg is described in Numizmatikai Közlöny, published the same year.44

There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Csesztreg.

**Felsőszenterzsébet**

The settlement first appears in a charter from 1334 (Poss. Sechth elsebeth).45 and the document also mentions its church. It is next known as part of a nobleman’s name (Felsewz enthersebeth).46

The dica tax register from 1549 mentions 9 tenant holdings, 5 newly established tenant peasant plots, two landowners (Magdolna Székely, Miklós Salm), two cotters and one craftsman.47

Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer contains several field names,48 but none of them suggest the presence of an archaeological site.

The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei lists the following data (p. 305): Asuvég [Lower end]; village part (medieval?; Site 305/3), Kasté-mező [Kastélyhelyi-dűlő, “Castle field”], to where a king once banished his unruly daughter (Site 305/42). At the time of the survey, this area was a hilly ploughland.

Imre Gözon, the teacher in Szentgyörgyvölgy, sold a stone macehead and a fragmentary stone axe found at Felsőszenterzsébet to the Hungarian National Museum in 1880,49 together with Dorffmeister pinxit 1803. The activity of István Dorffmeister the Younger in County Zala, with emphasis on the frescoes in Csesztreg, in: Csesztreg 1996:66–114.


P. Harsányi: Eremleletek [Coin finds]. NK 8 (1909) 58.

ZS II 1078; Valter 1905 119.

MOL DL 14539; Csángió 1897 105.

Maksay 1990 972.

Pesty 1864.
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with other prehistoric artefacts he had collected in several different places. The Hungarian National Museum paid 20 Forints for these artefacts.50

Kerkabarabás
Several medieval villages are known from the present-day territory of Kerkabarabás: Hegenföldö,51 whose name is preserved by Hegen, a settlement neighbouring Zalabaksa,52 and Peténye,53 whose location is indicated by the field name Izsóföldö.54
Barabás is first mentioned as poss. Barabás in a charter from 1333.55 The settlement was in the possession of the Reznéki family. It changed owners several times: in 1541, a priest called Mártlan, the custodian of St. Katalin’s altar of the church in Szentandrás received a plot of land here.56
In the dics tax register from 1549, the settlement is listed as being in the possession of György Segéd, Gáspár Szecsödy, Miklós Páris and János Páris. Listed under the name Barabás, the village is lumped together with Szentandrás, Peténye, Izsóföldö and Baksafalva,57 and it is unclear how many plots and how many inhabitants the settlement had at the time.
Remains from the Roman Age were identified in the Kerkabarabás area. In 1854, Johann Gabriel Seidl reported six Roman Age tumuli in the woods, lying some 15 minutes’ walk away from the postal road.58 The same tumuli were later mentioned by Arnold Ipolyi59 and by Flóris Römer in his Műrégészeti Kalauz.60 In his study on the gravel roads (called öttevény in Hungarian) mentioned in medieval and post-medieval charters and depicted on maps, which in his opinion can only date from the Roman Age in view of their construction technique using mud and gravel, Endre Tóth mentions Elfin, Zetefin and Nagyöttevény in the Kerkabarabás area,61 names which have been preserved in various field names.62
A hoard of 11 coins from the 17th century was found in the village.63

Kerkafalva
There were several medieval villages by Kerkafalva: Németkutas (Németfalu), Péntekfalva and Szaza.64
The dics tax register from 1549 lists Német falu, Péntek falva and Also Zatha together with Csöde, Kutasi and Minhe as being in the possession of László Bánfly and István Bánfly.65 and it is therefore unclear how many tenant holdings and how many inhabitants there were to a particular village.

Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer mentions several field names,66 but none of these suggests the presence of an archaeological site.
The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contains the following data: Tusu rend: village part (Site 295/1), Németfalud: village part (Site 295/5) and Barátos, the site of a former monastery (Site 295/19).
There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Kerkafalva.

Kerkaijfalu
see Csesztrég

50 Letters in the File of the Archaeological Department of HNM inv. nos 78/1880 and 190/1880.
51 Csánki 1897 59.
52 Csánki 1897 93.
53 Csánki 1897 64.
54 Csánki 1897 33.
55 ZO I 272.
56 Holub 1933 61–62.
57 Maksay 1990 972.
58 Seidl 1854 128.
59 Ipolyi 1861 281.
61 E. Tóth: Öttevény seu antiqua Romanorum. MNY 73 (1977) 195
62 Zala megye földrajzi nevei 331.
63 P. Harsányi: Eremleletek [Coin finds]. NK 13 (1914) 24.
64 Csánki 1897 93; Holub 1933 446, 622.
65 Maksay 1990 962.
66 Pesty 1864.
Kerkakutas
The village is first mentioned in 1389. In 1469, it is described as an oppidum with a tolling station. The settlement was one of the estates donated to the Bánnfi family of Lendva. In 1524, there was a separate villicatus (economic district) at Kutas, with 1 whole plot, 14 half-plots and 7 cotters forming part of János Bánnfi’s estate.
In the dica tax register from 1549, Kietos was lumped together with Nemetfalva, Péntekfalva, Minhe, Csőde and Alsószatta, all part of László Bánnfi and István Bánnfi’s estate, and it is therefore unclear how many tenant holdings and how many inhabitants there were to a particular village.
Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer mentions several field names, but none of these suggests the presence of an archaeological site. Neither does the volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contain any toponyms indicating a possible site.
There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Kerkakutas.

Kísszigtet
The village is first mentioned in 1426 (Pred. zygeth), appearing as Poss. Zygeth et altera Zygeth in a charter from 1496. It was the possession of the town of Páka; Dezső Csáni suggested that Zygeth can be identified with present-day Kisszigtet.
In 1426, Péter Lendvai Herczeg’s daughter was granted ius regium for her estates.
The dica tax register from 1549 mentions 30.5 tenant holdings, 3 desert tenant peasant plots, 5 newly established tenant peasant plots, two landowners (Péter Erdődy, László Bánnfi), 16 cotters and one craftsman at Karachon zygete.
According to Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer, the settlement was one of the oldest in the area, existing already during the Ottoman period (however, he does not cite any sources confirming this claim).
The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei does not contain any toponyms suggesting the presence of an archaeological site.
Several archaeological finds are known from this area. The archaeological holdings of the Göcsej Museum include Neolithic sherds collected by László Molnár in 1976 at Kísszigtet-Temető. A Celtic belt fragment found in the village was presented to the Hungarian National Museum in 1851. The fragment is 35 cm long and is made up of animal-headed links and rings. The belt was displayed at the exhibition of the Hungarian National Museum.

Márokföld
The village is first mentioned in 1344 as Poss. Markéulde; its church is mentioned even earlier, in 1333. The dica tax register from 1549 lists 9 tenant holdings, 3 newly established tenant peasant plots, four landowners (István Bánnfi, István Sáfrár, Mihály Soldos and Péter Bors), two cotters and three craftsmen for Also Zent ersebet and Márok feldelé.

---
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Frígyes Pesty’s gazetteer mentions several field-names, none of which suggests a possible archaeological site.

The volume *Zala megye földrajzi nevei* contains the following data (p. 315): Középszer: village part (Site 315/5) and Ávig: village part (Site 315/6).

Evidence for prehistoric settlement is provided by the various artefacts collected by Imre Gózon, the local teacher, who sent the finds to the Hungarian National Museum, where they were inventoried in 1880. Some of these finds came to light in neighbouring Szentgyörgyvölgy. The finds inventoried under nos HNM 1880.50.1–22 came from Márokföld, most likely from Záporhegy [Zápor Hill]. József Korek does not specify their exact provenance, and neither does Katalin H. Simon, quoting him. Erzsébet Bácskay describes a few of these finds as having come to light at Szentgyörgyvölgy. The rough pottery fragments made from red clay found on the slopes of the Rinyé Hill were inventoried under nos 1880.50.45–66 in the Hungarian National Museum. Nos 48, 50, 57, 61 and 62 were de-accessioned during the 1958 inventory of the museum’s holdings. The fragment of a pyramidal stone artefact was also found at Márokföld.

**Nemesnép**

The village first appears as part of a nobleman’s name in 1407. The village was settled by so-called one-plot lesser nobles, and its landowners are more often mentioned in the surviving documents than their holdings. Most of the landowners stood in the king’s service. A document from 1441 mentions Nemesnépfalva and Felsőnemesnépfalva. Alsónemesnépfalva is mentioned in a charter from 1493. In 1513, a total of 16 one-plot lesser nobles are mentioned in connection with the settlement.

The settlement is not mentioned in the 1549 *dica* tax register.

Frígyes Pesty’s gazetteer mentions several field names, some of which – such as Simonszer-dülö and Németszer – may preserve the memory of medieval landowners. The toponym Keréktői rét [Keréktő meadow] too goes back to the Middle Ages: a charter of ennoblement from 1573 mentions “Alsó [Lower] and Felső [Upper] Nemesnép alias Keréktő”.

The volume *Zala megye földrajzi nevei* contains the following data (p. 321): Németszer: village part (Site 321/3), Berek: village part (Site 321/7); Göde szőr: village part (Site 321/8); Urca: village part (Site 321/9); Simonszer: village part (Site 321/10), Harnak szőr: village part (Site 321/12), Göde-temető [by Göde’s grave], where a ruffian called Göde was burnt at the stake some two hundred years ago (Site 321/28); Tatárdomb [Mongolian Hill]: the alleged site of Mongolian campsites on a small, perhaps artificial hill (Site 321/78).

There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Nemesnép. The finds presented to the Numismatic Collection of the Hungarian National Museum in 1936 included a 17th–18th century hoard of 50 coins from Nemesnép.

**Ramosca**

The village is first mentioned as *Poss. Ramacha* in 1378. In the 14th century, the settlement was in the possession of the sons of Miklós Lendvai of the Hahót kindred, but it later passed into the ownership of other landowners. In 1513, Jakab Prosznyák owned 3 tenant holdings and István Hegyi had 8.5 tenant holdings.

---
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The *dica* tax register from 1549 lists 8 tenant holdings, 4 landowners (Benedek Hegyi, István Hegyi, Farkas Bucsay and Mátyás Proszniák) and 2 craftsmen for Ramosca. Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer mentions several field names, but none of these suggests the presence of an archaeological site.

The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contains the following data (p. 293): “Pusztaramosca: the site of the settlement during the Ottoman period. Site 22 on the map.” There are no archaeological finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Ramosca.

**Resznek**
The village is first mentioned in 1282 as Poss. Reznuc. In 1426, it appears as Castellum Reznec and as Castrum Reznec in 1441. The settlement was in the possession of the Egervári family. Its church, dedicated to the Holy Cross, is mentioned in charters from 1360 and 1403. There was a castle in the early 15th century, probably built by the sons of Balázs Egervári. The fortress was erected by Herbord in the 14th century; according to a document from 1362, Herbord lodged a complaint to King Charles I that Salamon Vörös had destroyed his fortress and the church. The date and the circumstances of the final destruction of the fortress remain unknown – it probably became ruined during the Ottoman period. In accordance with a decree issued by the Vice-Regal Council in Buda in 1823, the officials of County Zala compiled a report containing a description of the county’s hydrography, a map, together with a “guide-book” of the county’s monuments, the latter containing a few scattered archaeological data. The section on Reznec mentions that “there was a castle here in olden times ... whose site and ditches can still be seen in the meadow.” Genthon mentions the castle ruins and the medieval wall remains based on Gerece’s description.

The *dica* tax register from 1549 lists Reznec together with Jakabjánosfalva and Lőkfalva, and it is therefore unclear how many tenant holdings and landowners there were to Resznek.

The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contains the following data (p. 333): Várhele domhok [Castle Hills]: the location of ancient castles from Turkish times according to local tradition (Site 333/61).

There are few finds pre-dating the Middle Ages from Resznek. In 1880, the Hungarian National Museum purchased a stone axe from Imre Gözon, the local teacher. The holdings of the Göösej Museum too include a stone axe from the village.

**Szentgyörgyvölgy**
The village is first mentioned in 1326 as Poss. Scentgurgyi. It was in the possession of lesser nobles and one-plot nobles. In 1513, there were 22 one-plot lesser nobles. There is only indirect evidence for its church: a charter from 1437 mentions the chapter of the parish priest. There were several medieval villages on the territory of present-day Szentgyörgyvölgy: Farkasi, Kolgyvár, Kerteszszentpéter and Lakos.

The *dica* tax register from 1549 lists 3.5 tenant holdings and the parish priest as the landowner for Zentgerg weigen.

---
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Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer mentions several field names, based on the reports sent by the community, which recorded that a part of the settlement was called Szentgyörgyvászeg. A painted plaque on the wall of the parish church in this settlement part is inscribed with the following text: “Erected in 1202. Destroyed by Protestantism, restored in 1717.” The foundation date of 1202 was accepted by Ilona Valter, according to whom the settlement was mentioned in 1202 and there is also evidence for a church dedicated to St. George from 1273. St. George was a Byzantine saint and the presence of a church dedicated to this saint probably reflects the spread of Byzantine culture in Transdanubia. The bell of the church, made by Florentin Streckfus in 1700, was published by Pál Patay. István Genthon notes that the Reformed church was erected on the site of an earlier one.

We know from Frigyes Pesty’s gazetteer that the various parts of the settlement have preserved the names of medieval families: Domjánfalvai, Tiborszer, Asszonfa, Cséblak, Kolgyár. The report sent by the community also mentions a certain Töröktemetési-dűlő, where – according to local lore – the struggling soldiers of the retreating Turkish armies were beaten to death and buried.

The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contains the following data (pp. 313–314): Küsten Cséblak: village part (Site 313/1), Cikinkü [Cilinkó]: village part (Site 313/2), Fősiúl Farkasi [Upper Farkasi]: village part (Site 313/3), Fősiúl Kógyár [Upper Kógyár]: village part (Site 313/4), Asu Kógyár [Lower Kógyár]: village part (Site 313/5), Asu Farkasi [Lower Farkasi]: village part (Site 313/6), Domgyán szög. Tipor szög: village part (Site 313/12), Szentgyörgyvölgy: village part (Site 313/13), Asszonfa. Öszonfa: village part (Site 313/14), Török temetés [Turkish burial]: three Turks were buried here, when the Turks fled the area (Site 313/125), Török temető [Turkish graveyard] (Site 313/129).

A number of pre-medieval archaeological finds and assemblages have come to light at Szentgyörgyvölgy – most of these date from prehistoric periods.

Imre Gózon, a local teacher was the first to regularly collect and send archaeological finds to the Hungarian National Museum. The first report on his activity comes from 1866, when the Archaeological Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences noted that Imre Gózon offered a bowl and several old documents to the Hungarian National Museum. Unfortunately, the exact date of the bowl remains unknown. In 1875, the National Museum acquired twelve prehistoric and medieval finds from this area. The prehistoric finds included stone axes, stone blades and flat adzes, while the medieval ones were weapons: a 15th century iron mace, a ball and chain mace and a Hackenbüschke (hook or hackbutt gun).

Stone tools and coarse pottery fragments from Szentgyörgyvölgy were among the objects displayed at the exhibition organised on the occasion of the Eighth Prehistoric Congress held in Budapest. In his study on the European context of the lithic finds from Hungary, Tivadar Ortvay also quoted the finds from Szentgyörgyvölgy.

In March, 1878, the report of the Department of Antiquities of the Hungarian National Museum noted that Imre Gózon had donated four Roman bronze and silver coins, two Roman bricks and the fragments of two lead water-pipes to the department.
In May, 1880, Imre Gózon sold various objects to the Hungarian National Museum, most of these originated from Szentgyörgyvölgy, with a few coming from Márkoföld and Felsőszenterzsébet and one piece from Resznék. These included polished stone adzes, perforated stone axes, broken stone axes with traces of drilling, finely carved globular maceheads, stone flakes, stone blades and coarse pottery fragments, as well as Roman pottery. According to the inventory book of the Hungarian National Museum, these were found in an area called Szél-dűlö. These finds are mentioned by József Korek and Katalin H. Simon, who listed the site as the findspot of stone artefacts, whose cultural attribution was not possible. In her study on the chipped stone implements from Hungary, Erzsébet Bácskay noted that some of the lithics from the site can be assigned to the Transdanubian Linearbandkeramik (LBK) culture.

Finds from Szentgyörgyvölgy can also be found in the collection of the Szombathely museum. A polished, perforated stone axe, a black stone adze and six axes made from hard limestone came to light in the garden of the Catholic priest in 1872. Vilmos Lipp also mentions stone artefacts and pottery sherds found at Szentgyörgyvölgy in later years.

The report of the Archaeological Society of County Vas mentions six stone adzes and other finds found in the village in 1884.

Dr. Ignác Berger, the parish priest, also collected various finds which he presented to the museum in Szombathely. Most of these were stone artefacts.

The single Roman period find known from Szentgyörgyvölgy is a Roman oil lamp.

Zalabaksa
There were several medieval villages on the territory of present-day Zalabaksa: Cup, Baksafalva, Szentandrás and Györgyfalva.

The settlement is first mentioned in 1341 as Poss. Boxafalva. Cup first appears as villa Chup in 1334. The chapel in the village of Szentandrás is first mentioned in 1287, the stone church dedicated to St. Andrew appears in a charter from 1344. Györgyfalva is first mentioned in documents from the 15th century; its name is preserved by Győrfa.

The 1549 dica tax register lists Szentandrás, Peténye, Iszóföld, Barabás and Baksafalva together.

The volume Zala megye földrajzi nevei contains the following data (p. 323): Cup: village part (Site 323/1), Fősző Győrfa [Upper Győrfa]; village part (Site 323/8), Alsó Győrfa [Lower Győrfa]; village part (Site 323/11), Szentandrás: the site of the village of Szentandrás, destroyed by the Turks (Site 323/55).

Several archaeological finds and assemblages are known from this area. The 1854 yearbook of the Central Commission of National Monuments in Vienna published a report on the tumulus burials by the village. These tumuli were also mentioned by Arnold Ipolyi.

---
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According to the 1884 report of the Archaeological Society of County Vas, the Szombathely museum acquired a Roman brick fragment bearing the inscription QUENN M F, an oil lamp, two horseshoes, a sabre and pottery fragments from Zalabaksa.\textsuperscript{144}

The best-known archaeological find from Zalabaksa is the Roman tombstone found during the construction of the Kerka bridge in 1952, now exhibited in the Zalalővő museum. The first report on this find was written by Tamás Pekáry, the archaeologist who surveyed the site after the find was reported.\textsuperscript{145} The large tombstone lifted from the Kerka is one of the most magnificent stone carvings from Pannonia, decorated with dolphins in the corners, a medusa head in the pediment and a hunting scene in the main panel.\textsuperscript{146} An iron artefact, found at the same time, was inventoried as dating from the Roman Age. However, Róbert Müller later demonstrated that this artefact was in fact a medieval reed cutter.\textsuperscript{147}

The single prehistoric find known from Zalabaksa is a stone axe.\textsuperscript{148}

**Breakdown of sites\textsuperscript{149} according to archaeological and historic periods (Mária Bondár)**

**Prehistoric (without a more precise date)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baglad-Völgyi patak</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.18.1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztnegy-Lenti út</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztnegy-Petőfi tsz</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.31.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Első-tag</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.16.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramocska-Két út köze</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.21.1–62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Belterület</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age ('1'), Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.43.1–14, 2000.46.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Nagyréti dülő</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.35.1–7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{144} Gy. Rezsőy: Titkári jelentés. VREJ 10–11 (1884) 154; B. Lőrincz: Római kori belyeges teglárok Zala megyében (Gestempelte römische Ziegenl im Komitat Zala). ZGY 12 (1979) 25.

\textsuperscript{145} T. Pekáry: Ertékes római lelet Zalabaksán [A remarkable Roman find from Zalabaksa]. Zala 8:288 (1952. dec. 9).


\textsuperscript{148} ZGM 54:7.13; Korek 1960 72; Simon 1990 50.

\textsuperscript{149} Key to the Hungarian words: "domb, hegy" = hill, "erdő" = wood, "templom" = church, "út" = road, "telek, dülő" = field, "kert" = garden, "réz, mező" = meadow, "patak" = stream, "part" = stream or river bank.
### Neolithic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csesztrreg-Felsőerdei-dűlő</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkabarakás-Barabási háromszög</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.33.1–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkafalva-Agyag</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.25.1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márokföld-Pityerdomb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Copper Age</td>
<td>2000.45.16–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Külső Micske</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.15.1–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rámocska-Tölgyeserdei-dűlő</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.23.1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Haraszi erdő</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.2.1–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Pityerdomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copper Age</td>
<td>2000.45.1–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cupí patakpart</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Copper Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.35.1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Győrfa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age (?), Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.41.1–9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Copper Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csesztrreg-Sarjas kertek, déli vég</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.32.16–25, 37–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkakutas-Cupí patak</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.26.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márokföld-Pityerdomb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.45.16–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Harmadik-dűlő</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bronze Age, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.17.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Kövecses-dűlő</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.9.1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rámocska-Cikkelyes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.24.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Katolikus templomdomb I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.4.1–2, 13–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Pityerdomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.45.1–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cupí patakpart</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Neolithic, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.35.1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Zsidotemető</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.37.1–14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bronze Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissziget-Temetődomb</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Arpadian Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Harmadik-dűlő</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Copper Age, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.17.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rámocska-Két út köze, betongyűrű</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.22.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Belterület</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.43.1–14, 2000.46.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Győrfa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neolithic, Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.41.1–9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Celtic period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felsőszentkeresés-Benő</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerka barabás-Orfeli-dűlő</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.34.21–24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roman Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baglad-Kis mező I</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.19.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baglad-Völgyi patak</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg-Berek melléki rét</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.18.1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Alsó telek</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.13.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Egresi út</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.12.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Első-tag</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.16.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Harmadik-dűlő</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Copper Age, Bronze Age</td>
<td>2000.17.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Jakabfi erdő</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Kúlsó Micske</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Neolithic, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.15.1–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Vágás</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.10.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Cilinkó</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.5.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Belterület</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Late Bronze Age (?), Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.43.1–14, 2000.46.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cupi patak, hidfő</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.39.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cseri-dűlő, víztorony</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.44.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Győrfa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neolithic, Late Bronze Age (?), Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.41.1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Iksala udvar</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Kerka patakpart</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Árpádian Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.38.1–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Nagyréti-dűlő</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>2000.35.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Szentandrás-Sáncvár</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Árpádian Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg-Sarjas kertek</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000.32.1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg-Kerkajfölüt határa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.30.1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissziget-Temetődomb</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bronze Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Kerka patakpart</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Roman Age, Middle Ages</td>
<td>2000.38.1–18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Middle Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alsőszerencesébet-Cser-hegy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.29.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baglad-Kis mező I</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Roman Age, Prehistoric</td>
<td>2000.19.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baglad-Völgyi patak</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.18.1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg-Mihomi erdő</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>2000.31.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg-Petőfi tsz</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>2000.31.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg-Szaras kertek, déli vég</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Copper Age</td>
<td>2000.32.16–25, 37–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csesztreg – Kerkaújfalú határa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Arpádian Age</td>
<td>2000.30.1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsőszerencesébet-Alsó nyároska</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Celtic period</td>
<td>2000.28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkabarabás-Ötelki-dülő II</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.34.1–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkafalva-Agyag</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.25.1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkakutas-Patakpart</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.27.1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissziget-Temetődomb</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bronze Age, Arpádian Age</td>
<td>2000.8.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Arkon belüli dülő</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.16.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Első-tag</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Neolithic, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.15.1–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Külső Micske</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Neolithic, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.14.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesnép-Ukereszteződés</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.21.1–62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rámócsa-Két út köze</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>2000.21.1–62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resznék-Földvár</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.7.1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Alsófarkasi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.4.3–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Csekeszer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.1.1–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Katolikus templomdomb II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.3.1–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Kögyár</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.3.1–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentgyörgyvölgy-Kögyár-Szentgyörg patak</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.6.1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Belterület</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Late Age?, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.43.1–14, 2000.46.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cup-“Eichenhof”</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Neolithic, Copper Age</td>
<td>2000.36.1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cupi patakpart</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Neolithic, Copper Age</td>
<td>2000.35.1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cupi patak, hidőf</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.39.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Császáritás</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.44.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Cseri-dülő, víztornya</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Neolithic, Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.41.1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Györfa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age (Ⅱ), Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.38.1–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Kerka patakpart</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Roman Age, Arpádian Age</td>
<td>2000.42.1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Medesi patak, nyiladék</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Roman Age</td>
<td>2000.40.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Szentandrás-templomdomb</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>2000.37.1–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalabaksa-Zsidótemető</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Copper Age</td>
<td>2000.38.1–18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The excavated sites (Eszter Bánffy)

We investigated a total of six sites during the micro-region project. These are the following:

Szentgyörgyvölgy-Pityerdomb. Neolithic, earliest LBK. The excavation was conducted over four seasons (1995–98), the investigated territory totalled roughly 1000 m². Excavation director: Eszter Bánffy.

Zalabaksa-Zsidőtemető. Middle Copper Age, Balaton–Lasinja culture. The excavation was conducted for two seasons (1996–97), the investigated territory totalled roughly 216 m². Excavation director: Mária Bondár.


Zalabaksa-Iksia udvar. Roman period, 2nd–4th centuries. The excavations are still in progress (1997–2000). A total of 70 m² has been excavated to date. Only a preliminary report of the findings has been included in this volume. Excavation director: Ferenc Redő.

Resznák-Földvár. Late Middle Ages. The excavation was conducted for one season (1996) and the main goal was to cut through the medieval rampart. Excavation director: László Vándor.

Csesztreg–Mihoml erdő. Late Middle Ages. The excavation was conducted for one season (1995). Excavation director: Judit Kvassay.
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