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THE POLISH-RUETHENIAN BORDERLAND IN 1340
AND THE FALL OF THE „ZAMCZYSKO” HILLFORT IN SANOK-BIAŁA GÓRA

Abstract: The author discusses a hypothesis concerning the final stage of functioning of a small, medieval hillfort located on „Zamczysko” hill in Sanok-Biała Góra. Artefacts found during excavations and other stray finds are dated to the second half of the 13th and 14th centuries. Among them over 130 projectile heads were found, which confirms – apart of the traces of fire on the courtyard – that the hillfort was destroyed in the course of a warlike onslaught. The analysis of the political situation in the vicinity of Sanok in this time allows to relate these facts to the military activity of the Polish King Casimir III the Great. This ruler who succeeded to the throne of the Duchy of Galicia after Duke Boleslaw Jerzy II had been poisoned by boyars in 1340, marched with his troops and occupied the western part of the duchy, including Sanok.
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The year 1340 was very important for the political situation in the Ruhenian Duchy of Galicia. In early spring, its last ruler Boleslaw Jerzy II was poisoned by boyars and the Polish King Casimir III the Great succeeded to his throne. In April 1340, the ruler of the Kingdom of Poland passed the Ruhenian-Polish border with his troops and – as recent research indicates – he incorporated the western part of the Duchy, that is, the future region of Sanok. According to the „Annals of Traska”, King Casimir, having gathered an army of 20,000, entered Ruhenia again, where, destroying several fortified towns and strongholds, he took control of them to his advantage. Among these strongholds there was probably Sanok.

In the 12th – first half of the 13th century, Sanok – now situated in south-eastern Poland (Sanok District, Podkarpackie Voivodeship) – was one of the most important centres of the Duchy of Galicia-Volhynia in the south-western border with Poland and Hungary. It was located on a communication and trade route which goes through the valley of the River San from the Carpathian Passes to Przemyśl. The main part of the whole settlement complex was a mighty stronghold located on „Horodyszce” hill in the village of Trepcza. The stronghold was built in the end of the 11th century. This site is identified by scholars with Sanok mentioned in Old Ruhenian chronicles. A smaller stronghold located on today’s castle hill in Sanok played an auxiliary role. This fortress, probably surrounded only by a single wood and earth rampart, existed since the end of the 11th century. This situation changed after the time of the Mongol invasion, when the stronghold in Trepcza ceased to exist. Results of archaeological research indicate that in the second half of the 13th century the stronghold on the castle hill was a seat of local ducal governors. The stronghold had two suburbia. A significant role of this site was confirmed by a grant of the Magdeburg Law in 1339. During archaeological excavations a horizon dated to the end of 11th – mid-14th centuries was found there with remnants of a Christian burial ground. The presence of the stronghold’s garrison is confirmed by a few military artefacts like a hilt of a sword, lead mace heads, arrowheads, as well as numerous spurs, in most cases decorated.

After the Mongol invasion a small hillfort was also built on „Zamczysko” hill in Sanok-Biała Góra. The fortress is
Fig. 1. Medieval settlement complex in vicinity of Sanok in the 9th – the first half of 14th centuries (a – the area over 600 m a.s.l.; b – the area over 500 m a.s.l.; c – the area over 400 m a.s.l.; d – the area over 300 m a.s.l.; e – the area below 300 m a.s.l.; f – strongholds; g – burial mounds; h – settlements) with location and visualisation of strongholds: 1 – „Horodyszcze” in Trepcza, site 2; 2 – „castle hill” in Sanok, site 1; 3 – „Zamczysko” in Sanok-Biała Góra, site 1. Drawing P. N. Kotowicz and R. Mrozowski.
situated 2.5 km away from today’s town, on the other side of the River San, in the Słonne (Salt) Mountains\textsuperscript{11}. It served a completely different purpose. In local legends this place was connected with Queen Bona Sforza (wife of the Polish King Sigismund I the Old) but in fact it was a small medieval sentry post. „Zamczysko” was located in an inaccessible site, on the top of one of the hills, approximately 195 m above the valley floor of the River San. It consists of a triangular flat and high courtyard, surrounded by a dry moat and a single strong rampart. From the entrance (the north-eastern part) the hillfort was additionally secured by a transversal ditch and a second rampart. The fortress encompassed the area of about 0.5 hectare (Fig. 3). Excavations were held there several times – for the first time in 1954, and later in 1973. Unfortunately, there is no documentation from these excavations. The Historical Museum in Sanok keeps artefacts which were discovered during these works\textsuperscript{12}. Due to an increase in the activity of illegal treasure hunters in recent years, I was forced to undertake further research in 2014-2015. The aim was to explain the stratigraphic situation on the hillfort, as well as to salvage artefacts deposited shallowly in the ground (Fig. 3:3).

The recent excavations demonstrate that the central part of the hillfort was intentionally flattened and only rock was found below the humus layer. More interesting data was obtained during excavations carried in the outer part of the courtyard. Works in this area are still unfinished. Distinct traces of more than 1 m thick burning layer observed in this area (cf. Fig. 4) suggest that a wooden defensive construction, probably of a palisade type, was burnt up there. Two small unspecified stone and wood features were discovered there, too. In addition, the entire area of the courtyard was searched through with metal detectors. This survey yielded over 500 metal artefacts. The foregoing discoveries will allow to take a broad view at the chronology of the hillfort and reasons of its fall.

In earlier literature the hillfort was believed to be early medieval and was dated mainly to the 12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} centuries\textsuperscript{13}, although some researchers suggested that it could have also existed later\textsuperscript{14}. This view was formulated mainly on the basis of the analysis of fragments of vessels, which were mostly made in traditional early medieval techniques. Among these artefacts there were also fragments typical for the 14\textsuperscript{th} century – mainly glazed jugs. Between them is a unique fragmentarily preserved find – its surface is decorated with convex royal eagles placed in round lockets (Fig. 5:1)\textsuperscript{15}. This artefact has a direct formal analogy in finds discovered at the pottery making settlement in Przemyśl which existed in the second half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} and in the 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries\textsuperscript{16}. At this settlement a clay tile with the same representation of an eagle as that from Sanok-Biała Góra

\textsuperscript{11} Ginalski and Kotowicz, forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{12} Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{13} Parczewski and Pohorska-Kleja 1995, 86-87; Kotowicz 2002, 4.
\textsuperscript{14} Poleski 2004, 100.
\textsuperscript{15} Auch 2016, 234-235, Fig. 118.
\textsuperscript{16} Auch 2009.
Fig. 3. Sanok-Biała Góra, Sanok District, site 1 – „Zamczysko” hillfort: 1 – topography of hillfort vicinity; 2 – topography of the hillfort; 3 – layout of the hillfort with arrangement of trenches from 2014-2015 (a). Drawing A. Sznajdrowska-Pondel, P. N. Kotowicz and R. Mrozowski.
was found\textsuperscript{17}. It is therefore almost certain that the jug was produced in Przemyśl. The stylistic analysis of these images demonstrates the greatest similarity to the eagles of rulers from the Piast Dynasty dated to the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} and the first half of the 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries\textsuperscript{18}. Of similar significance for the later chronology of the „Zamczysko” hillfort are two severed Prague groschen of John the Blind King of Bohemia. One of them was made certainly in the second quarter of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century (Fig. 5:2-3)\textsuperscript{19}. The chronology of another medieval coin – a 15\textsuperscript{th} century Jagiellonian denar – is very different. This coin was found in a humus layer, over the horizon with the burnt structure of the pali-sade. There are no traces of fire on its surface so we assume that the coin was lost accidentally after the hillfort’s destruction. Apart from these artefacts, rowel spurs and their fragments found on the courtyard and in the moat (Fig. 6) are of considerable importance for the chronology of the fortress. All preserved finds belong to variants close to Variants C, D and F in S. Kołodziejski’s typology (Fig. 7:1-9). On the basis on numerous analogies, these finds can be dated to the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries\textsuperscript{20}. There is also an abundant assemblage of buckles and fittings, which appeared mainly from the second half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century (Fig. 7:10-18)\textsuperscript{21}. Other artefacts found during the excavations and exploration with metal detectors are less distinctive, but among them there is a clear lack of such finds as jewellery which could be interpreted as belongings of women. Most of them can be related either to the wooden structure of the hillfort (nails, hooks, padlocks, keys, etc.), daily activities of its inhabitants (vessels, knives)\textsuperscript{22}, or the military sphere. The nature of these artefacts can confirm that only military garrison and ancillary personnel were stationed there.

A rich assemblage of finds related to projectile weapons – 131 missile heads altogether – stands out from other military artefacts found on the entire surface of the

\textsuperscript{17} Koperski 2001, Fig. 83; Koperski 2004, 118.

\textsuperscript{18} Similar royal eagles are visible on: the tombstone of Henry IV Probus Duke of Wrocław and Cracow († 1290), on the majestic seals of King Przemysł II (1295), or later majestic seals of Władysław I the Ell-high or Casimir III the Great – Piekosiński 1899, cat. Nos. 216-217, 321, 377, Figs. 161, 210, 252; Piekosiński 1936, 20, Fig. 464; Piech 1993, 36-38, cat. Nos. 99-101; Jaworska 2002, 59-6, Figs. 59-70. Most probably, the closest iconographic analogies to the eagle form the jug found on „Zamczysko” hill are birds pictured on the minor seals of Władysław I the Ell-high (1320) and Casimir III the Great (1330s, century as well as 1355-1356) – Piekosiński 1899, cat. Nos. 322, 379, 431, 440, Figs. 211, 253, 285, 291.

\textsuperscript{19} Kotowicz and Śnieżko 2016.

\textsuperscript{20} Kołodziejski 1985, 166-167; Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, 16-17, cat. Nos. 75-76, 109, 120, Figs. 13:3-4, 17:2, 18:3.


\textsuperscript{22} See also Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, passim.
hillfort’s courtyard (Fig. 8). There are both finds with flat and quadrangular cross-sections among them.

Massive socketed artefacts with lanceolate/ellipsoidal leaves which are quadrangular in cross-section (Fig. 9:3-4) are numerous (43 finds – Types I:1-B.3 and I:2-B.3 according to P. Świątkiewicz)\(^{23}\). Another large group are similar heads (Fig. 9:1-2) with triangular leaves (26 finds – Types I:1-B.2 and I:2-B.2). Much less numerous is a group of artefacts with tangs and pyramidal/club-shaped leaves (Fig. 9:5-6) which are quadrangular in cross-section (12 finds – Types I:1-B.4 and I:2-B.4) and those with conical leaves (2 artefacts – Type I:2-B.5). All these finds\(^{24}\) have numerous, but widely dated analogies both in Central Europe\(^{25}\), and the western part of Eastern Europe\(^{26}\). Mostly, they are identified as bolt heads. A few finds bear traces of fire on their surfaces (Fig. 9:6). Apart of them, 6 socketed heads with leaves with two barbs were found (Types I:2-A.1 – Fig. 9:7)\(^{27}\), as well as single artefact with a socket and a flat lanceolate leaf (Type I:1-A.3 – Fig. 9:8). These artefacts, mostly identified as arrowheads, are known in whole Central Europe and neighbouring regions. They have no precise chronology, but they mainly appeared in the Early

\(^{23}\) A typology of missile weapon heads which was developed by P. Świątkiewicz (2010, 31, 33, Tab. 1) seems to be the most reasonable among typologies known from Europe. I apply this typology in order to classify the mentioned assemblage of projectile heads, but with some modifications. In the case of Group I, which includes heads with sockets, I add one more criterion concerning the shape of the socket. Therefore, heads of Group I:1 are artefacts with cylindrical sockets, and heads of Group I:2 have conical sockets, instead.

\(^{24}\) Cf. Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, cat. Nos. 3-13, Fig. 5:1-11.

\(^{25}\) Cf. Strzyż 2006, 93; Szpunar and Glinianowicz 2006, 160-162, Pls. 3-5; Abramek 2007, 96, 99, Fig. 3:1-15; Chudzińska 2014, 57-72, Pl. 1-15; Stasiak and Grygiel 2014, 344, Figs. 201-204.


\(^{27}\) Cf. Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, cat. No. 70, Fig. 12:1.
Middle Ages\textsuperscript{28}. Apart from them, 9 fragments (mostly sockets) of Type I missiles were found.

Finds with flat triangular leaves and necks (Fig. 9:9) are numerous among the artefacts with tangs. These are primarily identified as arrowheads (12 finds – Type II:2-A.2). Much less numerous are heads (Fig. 9:10) with flat, lanceolate leaves (6 finds – Types II:1-A.3 and II:2-A.3). A unique find is the type with flat, fan-shaped leaves, without necks (3 finds – Type II:1-A.4 /Fig. 9:11/). A small group are the artefacts with tangs but with leaves which are quadrangular in cross-section (Fig. 9:12-15). These are the projectiles with triangular leaves (2 finds – Types II:1-B.2 and II:2-B.2), as well as lanceolate ones (5 finds – Types II:1-B.3 and II:2-B.3). All of the mentioned artefacts have numerous and widely dated analogies in Eastern Europe\textsuperscript{29}, but in Central Europe they appeared rarely and are interpreted as Eastern influences\textsuperscript{30}. Apart from these projectiles, another 2 unspecified artefacts of Type 2, as well as 2 finds without any typological classification were included into this assemblage.

Most interesting artefacts are parts of armour, whose remains were discovered on whole courtyard of the hillfort (Fig. 10). They are represented by three categories of items. A unique find is a cone finial of a helmet – probably of Eastern type\textsuperscript{31} (Fig. 11:23). A single large and riveted ring is a part of chain mail (Fig. 11:20). Armour’s plates are extremely rare finds in the territory of Western Ruthenian duchies. Such artefacts were abundantly found on the almost entire surface of the courtyard. The largest assemblage are fragmentarily preserved plates (currently 62 finds)\textsuperscript{32}, in a few cases joined with each other. They were probably parts of lamellar or/and scale armour. Among them there are several types (Fig. 11:1-19). D-shaped lames dominate – these can be narrower or wider. Such finds have analogies mostly in the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries but they also appeared earlier. Similar ones were found

\textsuperscript{28} Medvedev 1966, 56, Pl. 30:2; Rožko 2002, 295-297, Fig. 5:1-6; Strzyż 2006, 81-85.

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Medvedev 1966, 61-87.

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Świętosławski 1997; Świętosławski 2006, 82-100.

\textsuperscript{31} Similar, but more lavishly decorated cone finial is part of a helmet found in a nomad burial No. 11 from Verkhne-Yankhenkov near Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation. The artefact is related to Rus’ or Byzantine workshops and is dated to the 11th c. (D’Amato 2015, 117, Pl. 26) or 12th century (Kirpičnikov 1971, 28, Pl. XI:2-2a).

\textsuperscript{32} Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, cat. Nos. 16-45, 64-65, Figs. 6-7, 10:1-2.
Fig. 7. Sanok-Biała Góra, Sanok District, site 1 – „Zamczysko” hillfort. Selection of equestrian equipment: 1-9 – rowel spurs and their parts; 10-11 – buckles; 12-18 – spur fittings. Drawing A. Sznajdrowska-Pondel, P. N. Kotowicz and A. Sabat.
Fig. 8. Sanok-Biała Góra, Sanok District, site 1 – „Zamczysko” hillfort. Distribution of projectile weapon heads: a – Type I:A; b – Type I:B; c – Type II:A; d – Type II:B; e – undefined. Drawing P. N. Kotowicz.

Fig. 9. Sanok-Biała Góra, Sanok District, site 1 – „Zamczysko” hillfort. Selection of projectile weapon heads: 1 – Type I:1-B.2; 2 – Type I:2-B.2; 3 – Type I:1-B.3; 4 – Type I:2-B.3; 5 – Type I:1-B.4; 6 – Type I:2-B.4; 7 – Type I:2-A.1; 8 – Type I:1-A.3; 9 – Type II:2-A.2; 10 – Type II:2-A.3; 11 – Type II:1-A.4; 12 – Type II:1-B.2; 13 – Type II:2-B.2; 14 – Type II:1-B.3; 15 – Type II:2-B.3. Drawing P. N. Kotowicz and A. Sabat.
During excavations at a few Eastern European sites, such as Novgorod in the Russian Federation, Gomel in Belarus or Vilnius in Lithuania, as well as in a mass grave (Armour No. 25) from the famous battlefield in Wisby (1361). Among them there is a find made from copper or brass, which was decorated with one row of embossed dots made on the edge of the plate (Fig. 11:11). Only three plates have a „fish scale” shape and a few artefacts belong to the forms in the shape of a rectangle or a rectangle with rounded corners (Fig. 11:18-19). Finally, a single find is also rounded to inside on one of the edges. Flat rectangular plates with rivets were also identified as armour fragments (Fig. 11:21-22). In one case, the artefact was decorated with a composition of multiple engraved lines and dots, probably inlaid (Fig. 11:21). It is possible that these finds can be associated with brigantine armour.

The foregoing observations point to the fact that the „Zamczysko” hillfort was suddenly destroyed. This is evidenced both by the traces of burnt fortifications and finds of numerous artefacts - mostly weaponry or equestrian equipment - lying on the surface of the courtyard. These artefacts were probably lost during the invasion and fire of the hillfort. Some of the projectile heads are also bent and deformed in result of collision with hard rock. We could clearly notice that the chronology of the stronghold is generally limited to the 13th and 14th centuries. However, precisely dated artefacts (like the jug with representations of eagles, the rowel spurs or the coins of John the Blind King of Bohemia) indicate that it could be restricted to the second half of the 13th and the 14th centuries.

We do not have any information about major disturbances in the Polish-Ruthenian-Hungarian borderland in the 1330s. The fact that Sanok received the Magdeburg Law location privilege in 1339 from Bolesław Jerzy II indicates a stable situation in this centre. In the second half of the 14th century when Sanok became part of the Kingdom of Poland there is no information about a possible armed conflict in this area, either. Moreover, Casimir the Great ordered to fortify the town with masonry walls and had the castle constructed. In 1366, he confirmed the location privilege. This situation did not change, either, after the death of Casimir the Great when Sanok and entire Red Ruthenia became part of the Kingdom of Hungary. In 1387, this province returned to Poland for good.

---

33 Cf. Medvedev 1959, 128, 132, Figs. 2:5-6, 5:12; Kirpičnikov 1971, Fig. 17; Plavinski 2001, 146, Pls. 1:5, 15, Figs. 5:9-18, 6:11; Negin 2005, 83-85, Fig. 1; Lupinenko and Makušnikov 2009, Figs. 1:5-16, 20-23 and 2; Bugys 2016, Figs. 2:d and 13.
34 Thordemann 1939, 210-211, 218-220, Fig. 232:1; Thordemann 1940, Pl. 133-145.
35 Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, cat. Nos. 46-47, Fig. 8:1-2.
Therefore, the analysis of data clearly shows that the only occasion when „Zamczysko” could be damaged was the expedition of Casimir III the Great. The „Annals of Traska” explicitly tell us that this invasion was definitely military in its nature. It is possible, although not confirmed by sources, that the main stronghold located on the castle hill in Sanok stood up to this incursion. This may be indicated by a cultural layer from the Old-Ruthenian period, characterised by a jet-black colour and composed largely of burnt wood mixed with soil. However, no evident traces of invasion – beside single weaponry artefacts – were found in this layer.

Otherwise is the case of the „Zamczysko” hillfort, which may have been the last point of Ruthenian resistance, both because of its location and its role. Numerous projectile heads indicate severe combat. It is possible that the aggressors were shooting from the main route which connected the hillfort with the valley of the River San and went on the ridge located opposite – in the south and south-east – to the fortress (Fig. 12 – yellow hash). The only problem is that the distance between the mentioned ridge and the hillfort is c. 325-340 m, which is very long for bows and crossbows. Researchers assume that the maximum range of medieval crossbows with wooden or composite bows was c. 200-300 m\(^36\), but in fact it was

\(^{36}\) Cf. Ekhdal 1998; Nowakowski 2005, 87. Only replicas of 15th century crossbows with steel bows were used for experiments. They shot at a distance between 300 and 400 m – cf. Alm 1994, 44-45; Payne Gallwey 1995, 14-15, 20-22. However, such crossbows cannot be regarded as analogies to artefacts with wooden or composite bows, used in the 14th century.
probably greater. The self bow had a similar range\textsuperscript{37}, whereas in the case of a modern Mongol reflex bow the range is averagely c. 350 m.\textsuperscript{38} Any notable impact could be achieved only by plunging fire, whose point was not only elimination of the adversary, but first of all setting the hillfort on fire. The defenders probably responded to the attack. This is implied by artefacts discovered in the southern part of the mentioned route (Sanok-Biała Góra, Site 6). They are bolt and arrowheads, as well as a spur rowel – 30 artefacts in total (Figs. 13:6-16)\textsuperscript{39}. As a matter of fact, these finds could also be traces of minor hostilities which may have taken place at the mentioned route. Thereafter, the aggressors perhaps marched on, following the course of the ridge, to the place where the route turned westward and reached the most fortified part of „Zamczysko,” that is, probably the gate of the hillfort. The results of the analysis of dispersion of the missile heads with sockets and tangs on the courtyard was a very interesting observation (Fig. 8). Most missile heads with tangs which I relate to the defenders’ (Ruthenians’) armament were discovered nearby the mentioned gate, whereas the heads with sockets (which could be associated both the invaders and the defenders), were mainly found in the central and western parts of the hillfort. It cannot be excluded that these artefacts are remains of a final assault on the hillfort, when the defenders – having been forced to retreat – shot at their adversaries from the western part of the courtyard in the course of the hillfort’s gate.

\textsuperscript{37} The most reliable data referring to the range of similar bows can be found in the narrative of Daniel the Traveller from his trip to Jerusalem in the early 12\textsuperscript{th} century. In order to describe distances between different buildings in the city, the author was using the measure called „bowshot”. After the analysis of the location of these objects on the map of Jerusalem, researchers affirmed that a standard distance of a single shot was ca. 200-250 m – Medvedev 1966, 26-27.

\textsuperscript{38} Świętosławski 1999, 60. According to Turkish sources, in the early 1500s archers used this kind of bow (Ottoman bow) to achieve a range of ca. 850 m – Karpowicz 2007, 675.

\textsuperscript{39} Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, Figs. 18:3, 19:1-10, 20:1-8, 21:1-6, 25:1, 27:1-5. An axe head was also found on the surface of the ground at Site 6 – see Fedyk and Kotowicz 2006, Fig. 18:1 – but we have no evidence to link it with the described episodes. Its chronology is not later than the end of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century – Kotowicz, forthcoming.
Fig. 13. Sanok-Biała Góra, Sanok District. Location of medieval military finds from probable routes guiding to the hillfort: 1-5 – Site 1A; 6-16 – Site 6. Drawing P. N. Kotowicz.
Of course, we must also assume that invaders could have chosen a totally different route. The analysis of the topography of the neighbourhood of the stronghold indicates at least two more alternative possibilities. The aggressors could have selected the shortest way, marching in the valley of a nameless stream which runs on the north-western side of the hillfort, and then climbing by a steep hillside to the western side of the fortress (Fig. 12 – red hash). This can be suggested by accidental finds from the flattening of this slope, located c. 100 m to the west of the hillfort (Sanok-Biała Góra, Site 1A). Four arrowheads with tangs and a fragment of a stirrup were discovered here (Fig. 13:1-5)\(^40\). On the other hand, artefacts related to craftsmanship (an iron bloom and a sharpening /\(^*\) stone\(^*\)) were found in this place, which could suggest that a small workshop which operated for the hillfort’s needs was located here. The hypothesis that the invaders could have stormed the hillfort from this side is less probable due to the existence of the strong defence system with wooden ramparts and a dry moat.

The third of the proposed routes is the longest but is relatively safe for potential invaders. Analogously to the second one, it went in the valley of a nameless stream and later on the slope of a hill located to the north of the hillfort. After a 400 m march to the east, the troops could reach the main route leading to the hillfort’s gate (Fig. 12 – black hash).

Finally, we can assume that the firing with incendiary arrows and bolts led to the destruction of the hillfort. No human remains among the bone material may suggest that the garrison surrendered to the conquerors. New Polish administrators of Sanok did not decide to rebuild the hillfort and its history slowly fell into oblivion. In 19\(^*\) century legends, the preserved remains of „Zamczysko” were commonly associated with a failed investment of Bona Sforza, wife of Sigismund the Old, the 16\(^*\) century King of Poland.

The reconstruction of these events it is of course only a hypothesis, but with a fairly strong support from archaeological data. More detailed conclusions will be possible after conducting new archaeological research. The first step is the clarification of problems concerning the type of fortification of „Zamczysko” and the arrangement of remains of buildings. It is also important to determine the actual route of march of the invading troops. In order to explain this question, it is necessary to carry out a comprehensive research with metal detectors on all slopes of the hillfort’ hill and slopes of hills with reconstructed routes.
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Streszczenie

Polsko-ruska granica w 1340 roku i upadek grodziska „Zamczysko” w Sanoku-Białej Górze

Rok 1340 był niezwykle istotny dla sytuacji politycznej w księstwie halickim. Wczesną wiosną jej ostatni władca – Bolesław Jerzy Trojdenowicz został otruty przez bojary, a wkrótce po tym, związany z nim umową sukcesyjną król polski Kazimierz Wielki przekracza granice polsko-ruską i włącza do Korony zachodnie partie księstwa, w tym również przyszłą ziemię sanocką.

Stolicą tej ziemi zostaje Sanok, dziś niewielkie miasteczko położone w południowo-wschodniej Polsce, a w wczesnym średniowieczu jeden z ważniejszych ośrodków na południowo-zachodnich rubieżach Rusi Halickiej. Sanocki kompleks osadniczy składał się w okresie staroruskim i mongolskim (koniec XI w. – 1340) z dwóch grodzisk zlokalizowanych w dzisiejszej Treczyć i Sanoku, na których odkryto m.in. obiekty sakralne i cmentarzyska, a także z szeregu osad podgrodowych i otwartych. Głównym elementem całego kompleksu było grodzisko „Horodyszczę” w Treczyć, identyfikowane ze wspomnianym w łapisach grodem Sanok, zniszczone zapewne w czasie nawały mongolskiej w połowie XIII wieku. Pomocniczą rolę pełnił początkowo gród na „wzgórzu zamkowym” w Sanoku, który jednak po upadku „Horodyszczę” przejął rolę centrum administracyjnego.

Dodatkowo, już po niezdolności mongolskiej, powstał niewielki gród zamożnych położony na wzgórzu „Zamczysko” w Górah Słonnyc w Sanoku-Białej Górze. Obiekt ten składa się z trójkątnego płaskiego majdaniczki otoczonej dwoma fosami oraz dookólnym wałem i zabezpieczony był dodatkowo wałem zaporowym w miejscu usytuowania bramy wjazdowej. W trakcie prowadzonych kilkukrotnie badań odkryto na nim liczne „zbroiny ochronne” – w większości bagnetów pancernych, roślinnych i wierzchołków, liczne (62) elementy uzbrojenia ochronnego – w większości zbrojników pancernych lamelkowych i lejekowych, wszystkie załączone w półkolistej wraz ze wspomnianymi „zbrojami” wskazują na dramatyczne koniec gródka.

Analiza przekazów pisanych i sytuacji politycznej na pograniczu polsko-ruskim w tym czasie wskazuje, że właściwie jedynym momentem, kiedy mogło dojść do zniszczenia interesującego nas obiektu była wspomniana wyprawa króla Kazimierza Wielkiego w 1340 roku, która jak informuje nas przekaz „Kroniki Traski” miała zdecydowanie
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niepokojowy charakter. Niewykluczone, choć niepotwierdzone źródłowo, że opór stawił główny gród na „wzgórzu zamkowym” w Sanoku. Wskazywać może na to warstwa kulturowa wiązana z tym okresem, charakteryzująca się smoliście czarną barwą. Brak jednak w jej wypelnisku wyraźnych śladów najazdu w postaci chociażby licznych militariów czy szczątków ludzkich. Inaczej ma się sprawa z gródkiem „Zamczysko”, który mógł być ostatnim punktem oporu, zarówno z uwagi na swe położenie, jak i rolę, którą pełnił. Liczne groty strzałów i beltów wskazują na silny ostrzał gródka, który prowadzono najpewniej z głównego szlaku komunikacyjnego łączącego go z doliną Sanu, a biegnącego równoleżnikowo po grani zlokalizowanej bezpośrednio na południe od warowni. Być może śladem tego są zabytki odkryte na rekonstruowanym szlaku, dokładnie na południe od gródka (stan. 6). Oczywiście nie można wykluczyć, iż oddziały atakujące „Zamczysko” wybrały zupełnie inną trasę. Analiza topografii najbliższej okolicy gródka wskazuje na przynajmniej jeszcze dwie takie alternatywne możliwości. Możemy przypuszczać, iż ostrzał płonącymi strzałami i beltami doprowadził do wzniecenia pożaru, który zniszczył strażnicę. Brak szczątków ludzkich w odkrytym materiale kostnym może wskazywać na fakt, iż załoga gródka poddała się zdobywcom. Polscy administratorzy Sanoka nie zdecydowali się jednak na odbudowę gródka i powoli w świadomości miejscowej ludności zacierała się jego historia, a w XIX i początkach XX w. jego zachowane w terenie relikty powszechnie wiązano z nieudaną inwestycją wznoszenia w tym miejscu zamku, której patronowała Bona Sforza. Przedstawiona rekonstrukcja zdarzeń jest oczywiście pewną hipotезą, mającą jednak dość silne poparcie w odkrytym materiale. Bardziej szczegółowe ustalenia powinny przynieść kolejne planowane badania archeologiczne.