



Fig 9. Alternative interpretation of the so called workshop on the example of the Hněvčeves assemblage

- 1 rough-outs cut have been brought to the settlement
- 2 or knapped from large broken tools
- 3 sandstones grinders are too small to make produce large tools
- 4 broken tools which were surely not broken during manufacturing
- 5 flakes and amorphous fragments with polishing on one side are remains of large tools
- 6 polished axe was modified by thinning of the sides by knapping
- 7 round stone and 8 material could have been brought to the settlement as for example hammerstones
- 9 fragments of material unsuitable for knapping could have been created by breaking of the material
- 10 core are evidence of drilling on the spot but they could have been created by secondary drilling
- 11 large fragment of a drilled axe could have been kept as repairable/ reusable
- 12 hammerstones with fine ware of shorter sides were probably used for pecking of grinders and querns
- 13 small wedges and 14 axes could have been made from damaged tools by secondary grinding
- 15 Unfinished drilling of unpolished rough-outs is the only clear evidence of primary drilling on the spot
- 15 cut off from short cutting, we do not know long cuts from settlements, it appears only in hoards
- 17 flakes and amorphous fragments without traces of polishing can be left over from working material, rough-outs or be remains of large polished tools
- 18 remains of drilled tools could have been potentially used as hammerstones

Numbers marked red show evidence of repairs or repeated polishing and create majority of the assemblage, blue numbers could have been brought to the settlement, black numbers represent primary manufacturing on settlement

Unless stated otherwise photos R. Tichý, for the pdfs: Image prepared by O. Štulc from photos by R. Tichý