**Supplementary Text 1: Regional Environmental, Landscape and Climate Context**

The southern region of the Czech Republic, specifically southern Bohemia, is situated within the temperate deciduous forest biome. This area encompasses a moderately undulating landscape with altitudes primarily ranging from 300 to 600 meters a.s.l. This altitudinal range contrasts with the Neolithic core settlements in Central Europe, which are typically located at altitudes ranging from 150 to 300 meters a.s.l. The study area is located approximately 100 kilometres north of the Alps at a distance of approximately 80 kilometers from the lowlands surrounding the Danube River to the south and 120 kilometers from the lowlands adjacent to the Elbe River in the north. The assessment of landscape and vegetation during the transition between the Older and Middle Holocene, corresponding to the Neolithic period, can be broadly inferred for the region. This inference is based on local palynological investigations (Pokorný 2002, Pokorný et al. 2010, Jankovská 1980, Rybníčková, Rybníček and Jankovská 1975, Rybníčková and Rybníček 1985) and modelled extrapolation of these data (Abraham et al. 2016, Kuneš and Abraham 2017). Among the tree species identified in the region, oak and spruce were found to be the dominant. The presence of pollen of Poaceae suggests that the landscape consisted also of open habitats or light forests (together with pine). In comparison to the Neolithic lowland settlement zone, the southern Czechia area exhibited a notably higher degree of forestation, manifested in the lower abundance of indicators of open habitats and the vegetation corresponds to a more humid climate as suggested by the proportion of spruce pollen. Furthermore, the difference is highlighted by the fact that the representation of Poaceae and oak in the lowland areas is substantial even in the preceding millennia, whereas in the studied area of southern Czechia, these elements only saw a significant increase during the Early Neolithic period. It is important to note that while existing data provide valuable insights into the general characteristics of the landscape and vegetation in the region, the direct contextual relationship with the individual sites under investigation remains uncertain. This uncertainty arises from the absence of pollen profiles in the immediate vicinity of studied sites.

Based on the CHELSA model (Karger et al., 2023), the basic climatic characteristics differed in the studied region when compared to the lowland Neolithic settlements. The modelled climate for the studied region in the time window from 5200 to 5100 BC was as follows: the Annual Mean Temperature ranged from 7.63 to 7.75 °C, the Minimum Temperature of the Coldest Month ranged from -9.25 to -9.45 °C, the Mean Temperature of the Driest Quarter ranged from -4.81 to -4.96 °C, and the Precipitation of the Warmest Quarter ranged from 283 to 311 kg m^-2 quarter^-1. In contrast, the lowlands where the Neolithic settlement concentrated, the climatic characteristics exhibited the following values: Annual Mean Temperature was mostly above 8 °C, the Minimum Temperature of the Coldest Month varied from -7.7 to -10.3°C (with lower temperatures in the eastern regions), the Mean Temperature of the Driest Quarter was similar to or slightly higher than that in the studied region, and the Precipitation of the Warmest Quarter mostly ranged from 220 to 290 mm.

Regarding temporal climatic changes, there was a noticeable shift between the time windows of 5100–5200 and 5200-5300 BC. There was an increase of 3°C or even more in winter temperatures, while other characteristics remained relatively stable over time. This shift is temporally correlated with the spread of occupation from the lowlands, where many sites are dated before 5350 BC (Jakucs et al. 2016), to our study region, where Neolithic occupation started after 5250 BC at the earliest according to radiocarbon dating.

**Supplementary Text 2:** **Local** **Archaeological Contexts**

Sampled sites

**1. Radčice 1 [49°9'56.917"N, 14°11'25.745"E].** The site is located on a moderate east-oriented slope. The terrain continues to slope toward the east to reach the alluvium of the Blanice river, which nowadays flows 700 m east of the site. The average altitude of the site is 410 meters a.s.l., and it is about 30 m above the recent level of the Blanice River. The first Neolithic finds were discovered in 1995 during rescue excavations and surface surveys preceding the construction of a nearby bypass road. The area of surface finds distribution covers ca. 8 ha. In 1996, limited excavations (30 square meters) revealed 12 sunken features dated to the LBK (Linear Pottery Culture) period and two features from the late SBK period. One of the late SBK features contained remains of a burial grave (Michálek et al. 2000). Archaeobotanical samples were not obtained during these excavations.

Our team started excavations at the site in 2015 (Vondrovský et al. 2018). The location of two trenches was selected according to the dark infill of Neolithic sunken features that was ploughed up on the surface in the central part of the site. The first trench (2 × 2.8 m) revealed a shallow oval pit with dimensions ca. 1.5 × 2.5 m. It contained finds of LBK pottery, but the assemblage was too small to reach a more precise relative chronology of the pit. The second trench was situated 8 m to the southeast. The trench of 5 × 6 m, revealed a circular feature with max. dimensions of ca. 3.5 × 5 m surrounded by several postholes. The pit consisted of two distinctive contexts. The first was an irregular shallow pit with an undulated bottom (subfeature 1A). The second was a roughly rectangular pit with a flat bottom and traces of burning (subfeature 1B), which reached a maximum depth of 55 cm. Based on its formal attributes, this context can be linked to the category of special pits interpreted mostly as places for tool manufacturing or cooking (Połczyński and Michalak 2016). Both pits were filled with a dark solid deposit which was in lower parts increasingly mixed with yellowish material from the subsoil. Pottery from both contexts was decorated in a style typical for phase IV (Šárka type) according to the chronology of Bohemian LBK (Pavlů and Zápotocká 2013).

In 2021, the area in the vicinity of the 2015 excavations was surveyed by a magnetometer prospection. Covering an area of 100 × 100 m, the survey indicates the presence of several sunken features. Based on their spatial distribution, the ground plans of four Neolithic longhouses can be assumed (Vondrovský et al. 2022).

Sampling for archaeobotany: features were sampled totally, meaning that 100 % of their infill was taken for archaeobotanical analysis. The samples were collected in a 50 × 50 cm grid and 5 cm arbitrary spits.

**2. Radčice 2 [49°10'38.437"N, 14°11'26.711"E].** The second Neolithic site at the cadastre of Radčice was identified in 2020 by M. Pták during a surface survey. The site is situated on the southeastern slope of a moderate hillock Na Psině (415 meters a.s.l.). The distance from the Radčice 1 site reaches only 1.3 km.

The first excavation at the site was undertaken already in 2020. It revealed a small round pit with a maximum dimension of 2.2 m. It contained only a scarce pottery assemblage which, however, allowed to date the pit into the SBK (Stroke Pottery Culture) period. A larger campaign followed in 2022, excavating 6 trenches covering 570 m2. Within them, 15 pits of various sizes were revealed. They were filled with blackish soil, mostly at the pit bottoms mixed with material from the subsoil. The spatial distribution of excavated pits did not suggest any structures like longhouses. Also, no postholes were identified despite the relatively large areas uncovered by trenches; mildly sunken postholes were probably erased by erosion.

Generally, pottery was scarce at the site, which complicates the dating of excavated features. Although one pit (feature no 15) yielded ceramic assemblage dated to the LBK, the plant remains from the same infill provided radiocarbon measurements corresponding to the SBK period. Therefore, due to its complicated taphonomy, this feature entered the analysis as belonging to the more general Neolithic category. Among the other features excavated in 2022, it was possible to date four pits to the SBK period (probably early as well as the late phase) and ten pits remained undated.

Sampling for archaeobotany: 10 l of sediment were collected from each 10 cm thick layer within the 50 × 50 cm grid.

**3. Dehtáře [49°1'2.485"N, 14°18'24.157"E].** The site lies on the summit of a moderate bank that slopes down into a shallow valley utilized as a fishpond in the Middle Ages. LBK artefacts were first recorded by a surface collection survey at the end of the 1970s (Beneš 1979). Since then, several surface collection campaigns have helped estimate the total extent of the settlement area of 7.5 hectares. The average altitude of the area reaches 418 meters a.s.l.. The first archaeological excavations were undertaken in 2016 by M. Pták. Acknowledging that intensive ploughing had disrupted numerous archaeological depressions, a decision was made to excavate a small pit (Vondrovský et al. 2018). The oval pit with dimensions 1.3 × 1.4 m reached the maximal depth of 55 cm. It revealed a limited assemblage of artefacts that allowed only general chronological classification into the LBK period.

Our team continued excavations in 2021. A Magnetometer survey in the central part of the site examined a total area of 1.57 ha and identified several sunken archaeological features. Based on their dimensions and north-south orientation, some of them can be interpreted as the so-called construction pits that originally flanked the side walls of LBK longhouses. One of these sunken features was excavated within a 7.5 × 4 m trench. The uncovered pit of elongated irregular shape was 6.6 m long and 3.4 m wide; the maximal depth reached 70 cm in its centre. The infill consisted of an upper dark and organic-rich layer followed by a lower layer with an admixture of subsoil material. In the north part, there was an oven sunken in the sidewalls of the pit (Vondrovský et al. 2022). Based on field observation, we argue that at least some parts of the pit were filled up during the intentional deposition of waste. Preliminary analysis of excavated pottery dates the feature into the phase III of Bohemian LBK (Pavlů and Zápotocká 2013).

Sampling for archaeobotany: 10 l of sediment were collected from each 10 cm thick layer within the 50 × 50 cm grid.

**4. Mažice [49°11'52.809"N, 14°35'54.257"E].** The site is located only 0.9 km north of the Horní Bukovsko site. Similarly, it lies on a low terrace of a nearby creek at an altitude of 438 meters a.s.l. The site was discovered during a surface survey by V. Prokop in 2013. Repeated survey campaigns in 2013 and 2014 revealed numerous artefacts from infills of sunken features disturbed by deep ploughing. These remnants were identified within an area of ca. 10 ha. Our team started excavations in 2015 (Vondrovský et al. 2018). It was preceded by a magnetometer survey in a 50 × 200 m polygon that helped to identify sunken features suitable for excavation. Consequently, two trenches were opened in the central part of the measured polygon.

Trench no. 1 of 4 × 9 m revealed a large, pit of elongated outline with a length of 8.5 m and width of 3 m. The bottom was irregular and reached its maximum depth of 50 cm. It was oriented approximately in the north-south direction; therefore, it can be interpreted as a construction pit once adjacent to an LBK longhouse. The infill was dark and solid in the upper parts of the pit whereas the admixture of yellowish material from the subsoil increased toward the bottom. A daub crust of the size 1 × 1.5 m was excavated in the southern section of the pit and can be interpreted as a remnant of an oven.

Trench no. 2 was situated 7.5 m northwest of the first trench. It exposed an area of 80.7 m2 and scattered shallow pits and small postholes were excavated within. However, the excavated situation is unclear due to disruption caused by modern drainage and deep ploughing. Contexts from trench no. 2 were not included in the archaeobotanical analysis due to the risk of contamination.

Sampling for archaeobotany: features were sampled totally, meaning that 100 % of their infill was taken for archaeobotanical analysis. The samples were collected in a 50 × 50 cm grid and 5 cm arbitrary spits.

**5. Horusice [49°10'7.760"N, 14°40'9.096"E]**

The site is located in a flat landscape of the Třeboň basin. It lies on the left bank of a small creek at an altitude of 420 meters a.s.l. The site was discovered and excavated in 2015 and 2016 as part of a rescue campaign caused by construction works on the D3 highway. The excavations were led by Hussite Museum Tábor thus some aspects of excavation and sampling methods are different. Excavations were not targeted on specific sunken features but covered a larger area defined by construction works. With a total excavated area of 0.18 ha, Horusice represents the most extensive excavation of a Neolithic site in South Bohemia. In total, 88 sunken features were identified (Vondrovský et al. 2021). Artefacts and ecofacts were distributed unequally within these contexts, and a large portion of features did not contain any. All sunken features identified as pits were sampled for archaeobotanical analysis.

Remains of a longhouse and adjacent construction pits dominated the excavated area. The longhouse was preserved only as a torso by five postholes. However, a triple-row arrangement, typical for LBK longhouse interiors, helped to identify this structure. Eight sunken features were interpreted as construction pits or their parts. The largest – feature no. 81 – has a total area of 29 m2 and a maximum depth of 60 cm. The infill was formed by a dark solid deposit that was in lower layers mixed with yellowish material from the subsoil. Although pottery assemblage retrieved from construction pits was relatively large, the low number of decorated sherds and heavy abrasion of their surfaces hindered chronological determination. Nevertheless, it is plausible that the house was inhabited during phase III according to the chronology of Bohemian LBK (Pavlů and Zápotocká 2013).

Sampling for archaeobotany: Samples of 10 to 20 l were collected in a 1 × 1 m grid and 10 cm thick spits.

**6. Horní Bukovsko [49°11'21.889"N, 14°35'45.006"E].** The site is situated in a flat landscape of the Třeboň basin. It lies on a low terrace above the creek Svodnice at an altitude of 437 meters a.s.l.. The site was discovered by amateur archaeologist V. Prokop in 2020. The surface survey revealed Neolithic artefacts and dark infill of sunken features scattered across the area of ca. 1.6 ha. Our team performed an excavation in 2022. Using the coring method, we were able to identify a dark infill in subsoil layers that indicates Neolithic sunken features. Consequently, a 7 × 4 m trench was opened which revealed a large, elongated pit with a maximum length of 4.8 m and a width of 2.7 m. The bottom was irregular and varied significantly throughout the pit. It reached a maximum depth of 60 cm. Judging from the formal attributes, it can be considered a construction pit originally adjacent to a longhouse sidewall. The pottery was decorated with elements typical for phase IV (Šárka type) according to the chronology of Bohemian LBK (Pavlů and Zápotocká 2013). An irregular feature filled with brownish soil disrupted the pit on the southern side. This structure was interpreted as a windthrow or remains of a tree growing. This context did now contain any archaeological finds and recovered plant material did not enter our analysis. The trench also revealed two small and shallow sunken features in the close vicinity of the construction pit. At least one of them can be dated to the Neolithic period, but their relation to the larger pit remains unknown.

Sampling for archaeobotany: 10 l of sediment were collected from each 10 cm thick layer within the 50 × 50 cm grid.

**Supplementary Table 1: Full archaeobotanical dataset**

A summary of all archaeobotanical data from all features across the sites.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Site** | **Radčice 1** | **Radčice 2** | **Dehtáře** | **Mažice** | **Horusice** | **Dolní Bukovsko** | **Sum** |
| Volume of positive samples (l) | 4716 | 2290 | 480 | 3124 | 559 | 1140 | 12309 |
| **Crops** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Triticum monococcum* grain | 118 | 105 | 4 | 731 | 11 | 27 | 996 |
| *Triticum monococcum/dicoccum* grain | 40 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 80 |
| *Triticum dicoccum* grain | 194 | 99 | 0 | 503 | 24 | 31 | 851 |
| *Triticum timoheevii* grain | 42 | 69 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 134 |
| *Triticum aestivum/compactum/turgidum* | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| *Triticum* sp. | 223 | 97 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 340 |
| *Hordeum vulgare* | 17 | 9 | 0 | 193 | 1 | 0 | 220 |
| Cerealia | 2247 | 757 | 7 | 1533 | 96 | 96 | 4736 |
| *Triticum timopheevii* glume base | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| *Triticum monococcum* glume base | 0 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| *Triticum dicoccum* glume base | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Cerealia glume base | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| *Lens culinaris* | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Pisum sativum | 70 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| *Leguminosae sativae* | 135 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 148 |
| *Linum usitatissimum* | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 271 | 0 | 295 |
| **Fruits and nuts** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Rosaceae* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Quercus* sp*.* | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Malus/Pyrus* | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| *Cornus mas* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Corylus avellana* | 4 | 9 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 28 |
| *Rubus idaeus* | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Rubus* sp. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Sambucus nigra* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| **Arable weeds and ruderals** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Avena* sp*.* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Secale Cereale* | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| *Persicaria maculosa* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| *Poaceae* | 2 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 18 |
| *Bromus secalinus* | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| *Bromus* sp*.* | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| *Chenopodium ficifolium* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| *Fallopia convonvulus* | 9 | 100 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 131 |
| *Fumaria officinalis* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Galeopsis* | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| *Galium spurium* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Galium* sp. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Neslia paniculata* | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Ranunculus* sp. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Rumex* cf. acet*osella* | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Rumex* sp. | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| *Setaria cf. Viridis* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Setaria/Panicum* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Setaria sp.* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Trifolium*/*Madicago* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Cyperaceae* | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| *Carex* sp. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| *Veronica* cf. *hederifolia* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Polygonaceae* | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| *Solanum dulcamara* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| *Humulus lupulus* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Polygonum aviculare* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| *Chenopodium murale* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Chenopodium album* | 0 | 31 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 2 | 265 |
| *Chenopodium* sp. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| cf*. Ajuga reptans* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *Pinus sylvestris* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| *Picea abies* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Abies alba* | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Undetermined | 18 | 29 | 40 | 1 | 14 | 11 | 113 |
| Sum excluding undetermined | 3152 | 1327 | 49 | 3428 | 425 | 224 | 8605 |
| Concentration (finds/l) | 0,7 | 0,6 | 0,1 | 1,1 | 0,8 | 0,2 | 0,7 |

A note on the identification of *Triticum timopheevii*: Archaeobotanical material recorded in this study comes from multiple excavations held between the years 2015 and 2022. The identifications were originally made by M. Ptáková, V. Komárková and T. Šálková. The presence of *T. Timopheevii* was not initially recognised. Further investigations and new reference material led the team to consult the wheat grains originally identified as *Triticum* cf. *spelta* and *Triticum dicoccum*/*spelta.* Based on the publication by Kohler-Schneider (2013), referencegrains and chaff kindly provided by Dr. Sabine Karg and The Crop Research Institute (CRI) Prague-Ruzyně, the material was discussed by multiple archaeobotanists and re-identified as *Triticum timopheevii* by M. Hajnalová and M. Ptáková. Poorly preserved grains lacking identification criteria were always classified as *Triticum* sp. or Cerealia fragments.

**Supplementary Table 2: Archaeobotanical cereal dataset**

A summary of the cereal plant dataset (grains and glume bases combined) from pit features with respect to their occurrence across the sites, archaeological dating, and quantity and volume of collected samples.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Site** | **Relative chronology** | **Number of sampled pit features** | **Volume of samples [l]** | **Number of cereal remains** | **Triticum monococcum** | **Triticum monococcum/dicoccum** | **Triticum dicoccum** | **Triticum timopheevii** | **Triticum aestivum/compactum/turgidum** | **Triticum sp.** | **Hordeum vulgare** | **Cerealia** |
| Radčice 1 | LBK | 2 | 4440 | 2838 | 115 | 40 | 193 | 38 | 8 | 218 | 17 | 2209 |
| Radčice 2 | SBK | 4 | 1140 | 491 | 48 | 8 | 41 | 38 | 0 | 54 | 3 | 299 |
| Radčice 2 | Neolithic | 2 | 620 | 477 | 45 | 4 | 45 | 24 | 0 | 35 | 2 | 322 |
| Dehtáře | LBK | 2 | 1140 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Mažice | LBK | 1 | 3124 | 3009 | 761 | 5 | 511 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 1535 |
| Horusice | LBK | 5 | 370 | 48 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Horusice | Neolithic | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| H. Bukovsko | LBK | 1 | 980 | 163 | 21 | 8 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 82 |
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