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The aim of the study is to analize the weapons excavated on the 63 sites; and also to reconstruct the models of weaponry used by the Przeworsk culture warriors in the river Bzura basin. Obtained results will be used to notice the changes of choices in using the specified types of offensive and defensive armament during the consecutive phases of the Roman Period up to the Early Migration Period.

The choice of the Bzura River basin as the background of our discussion is entirely intentional. The settlement associated with this territory in the Roman period and in the early Migration period has clear and relatively broad limits which may suggest functioning in the period in question a separate population group of rank of a “small tribe” (Godłowski 1985, 135, maps 3–6).

Such an assumption is evidenced by phenomena which favoured the development of local settlement, such as relatively good soil, significantly developed water net, presence of saline springs and presence of mineral raw materials, amongst others in the form of peat deposits (Łęczyca area) and bog iron ore (mainly to the south from the Bzura River artery). It is worth mentioning that in direct contact with the region of the lower Bzura remained Mazovia metallurgical centre (Woyda 2002, 121–154) hence the raw material and semi-finished iron products first reached the Bzura River valley and through it spread further.

The role of the Bzura River basin in supra-regional trade should not be underestimated either. It constituted a certain bridge between the mid-Poland (the Warta River area) section of the Amber Route and Kujawy and Mazovia, and in broader perspective the northern areas. The best evidence of this role is the distribution of a large number of Roman imports occurring in the analysed area (Moszczyński/Siciński 1997, 17–38; Tyszler 2014, 201–211). Among them a kind of a strange phenomenon are terra sigillata vessels which frequency in the scale of the whole Przeworsk culture is here the highest and does not meet analogies (Tyszler 2012, 81–126, fig. 1; 16).

In the Bzura River basin, just like in the whole Przeworsk culture a standard practice was to equip the dead warriors with weapons which they used in combat. At the same time it was probably no custom of weaponry inheritance (Godłowski 1992, 71, 72, 76) and also the shape and form of weapons underwent relatively frequent changes linked with functional needs, the opponents’ innovations as well

1 The article is revised version of report which was presented on 9th protohistoric conference in Bratislava in 2013.
2 T. Bochnak (2014, 222), in turn, maintains that “The military artefacts not always had to be a real property of the deceased, sometimes they remained only a symbol, and they were placed (in graves M.O & L. T) because, in mourners’ opinion, such a gesture was appropriate and reflected a created image of the deceased. A trace of such a procedure is presence of weapons in graves of children who certainly did not undergo an initiation of adolescence”. In the latter case we are inclined to agree with the quoted author. However, as regards the graves of adult warriors, we do not share his opinion, i. e. we believe that weapons belonged essentially to buried individuals and were not grave goods in the strict sense of the term.
as fashion. This special “chronological sensitivity” of weapons along with their frequent occurrence creates a unique opportunity to reconstruct models of military equipment, especially that its frequent changes are possible to trace in specific time sections. The signaled problems will be a fundamental subject of analysis carried out by us below.\(^3\)

II

In the Bzura River basin parts of weaponry dated to the Roman period and the initial phase of the Migration period occurred on 63 sites, including 62 burial grounds and one settlement (Fig. 1). Due to the low research value a part of the material was excluded from the analysis. These are finds from former collections (now in museums), accidental discoveries, the so-called stray finds, or from excavations on destroyed sites. Abundant and important materials for this analysis provided in particular the following burial grounds: Biała, site 1; Gledzianówek, site 1; Ciosny Sady, site 1; Ciosny (Folwark), site 3; Grodzisk Mazowiecki; Kompina, site 12; Kutno, sites 2 and 3; Leźnica Wielka; Łódź street Szczecińska; Pludwiny; Wólka Łasiecka, site 1; Zduń; Żdżarów, site 1. Amongst the newer discoveries there should be mentioned burial grounds in Gozdów, site 1 and in Wiktorów, sites 1–4, excavated in the course of construction works. Finally 94 grave assemblages were selected (pit burials, urned cremations and inhumations) from 29 burial grounds, which considers only sites with compact assemblages (Fig. 2; see the list of sites).

---

\(^3\) The authors would like to thank the Director of the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography in Łódź, Prof. dr hab. R. Grygiel, the Curator W. Siciński PhD and the Director of the Regional Museum in Brzeziny P. Zybala MA for making artefacts available to us and granting permission for their publication.
During the graves’ dating we took into account weapons, horse riding gear (spurs) and coexisting with them artefacts, especially parts of clothing (brooches, parts of belt). Dating of a significant part of assemblages to a specific phase or subphase can be regarded as a relatively satisfactory and reliable result (Tab. 1–6).

But before we move on to a more detailed analysis, it is necessary to make a few important explanatory remarks concerning the method of research, particularly in terms of the chronology applied. Its base is for us the relative dating scheme developed by K. Godłowski (1970; 1985), provided, however, that separated by this author phases B2/C1 and C1a we consider identical and therefore, we use only the term phase C1a (see Olędzki 2007, 699–719). Furthermore, we take into account the youngest section of B2 phase in the form of the subphase B2c, as it takes place in the system of the Wielbark culture materials dating (Wołągiewicz 1981) and materials belonging to east Przeworsk cultural subprovince (Andrzejowski 1998; 2001; Dąbrowska 1997). We do so not only because the lower Bzura River basin area is its integral
Fig. 3. Ciosny Sady, site 1, Zgierz district. Iron sword. Artefacts from the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography in Łódź. Photography W. Pohorecki. Design M. Grzelak.

Fig. 4. Ciosny Folwark, site 3, Zgierz district. Iron shield boss. Artefacts from the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography in Łódź. Photography W. Pohorecki. Design M. Grzelak.
part (Nowakowski 2003, 309–318; Olędzki 1992, 63; 2008, 65–67), but also due to the fact that within the Przeworsk culture territory there is a possibility to determine the so-called late horizon of B2 phase, which “de facto” stands for the same (Olędzki 2007, 704, 713).

With dating of finds is associated the issue of synchronization of individual groups of graves with weapons, also developed by K. Godłowski (1992; 1994), with corresponding phases of the relative chronology. In general it presents itself as follows: group 1 – phase B1, without subphase B1c; group 2 – subphase B1c; group 3 – subphase B2a; group 4 – subphases B2b and B2c; group 5 – phase C1a; group 6 – phase C1b; group 7a – phase C2; group 7b – phase C3; a group of 8 – phases C3/D1, D1. It is perceptible that we do not deal with a close matching, but on the contrary, only with an approximate one. This is due to two main reasons. Firstly, to the partial “overlap” of neighbouring groups of graves with weapons (Godłowski 1992, 72–76; Olędzki 2007, 707), and secondly, to the relative and essentially conventional nature of the chronological phases which we use.

Because we deal with specimens of weapons, and in particular with their dating, we cannot fail to mention the contribution of these researchers, whose merit is monographic discussion of different categories of weapons. They are: M. Jahn (1916), who introduced the shield bosses and grips scheme⁴, M. Biborski (1978) the author of the typology of swords and P. Kaczanowski (1995), who is the author of the

---

⁴ The M. Jahn (1916) typology was enriched and supplemented by T. Liana (1970). We do not use instead the typological study by N. Zieling (1989), as too general and not fully presenting the nature of the Przeworsk culture materials.
staff-weapons heads classification, the military artefacts occurring most frequently in the Przeworsk culture materials. Regarding the correlation of each category of weapons, both in specific compact (closed) assemblages as well as within individual chronological phases, the unquestionable merit, apart from already mentioned K. Godłowski, has in this respect B. Kontny (2001; 2002), that enriched and clarified these relations. He was also the first among authors dealing with the Przeworsk culture, who treated more broadly the issue of functional use of military artefacts, both defensive and offensive. This aspect, due to the modest volume of this sketch, will not be discussed here.

It should be realized that the reconstruction of the standard models of the Przeworsk culture warriors weaponry, in this case in the Bzura River basin, based on survived weapons relics, requires a broader reflection. A number of limitations blurring the picture in this regard has been already pointed out by B. Kontny (2001, 91, 92, 2004; 143, 144). Amongst the reasons obvious for an archaeologist there should be mentioned partial destruction of weapons resulting from high temperature on the funeral pyre and the progressive corrosion of relics after placing them in the ground, then quite often inadequate conservation manners of artefacts. Not without significance is also a number of other important issues, namely elusive magical-religious practices or unknown social and economic factors (Fig. 3–7).

III

From the older Roman period we know 35 graves, of which 17 assemblages are dated to B1 phase, while 18 assemblages to B2 phase (Tab. 1; 2; Fig. 8–11). In phase B1 share of graves containing swords...
Fig. 7. Ciosny Folwark, site 3, Zgierz district. Iron spearhead. Artefacts from the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography in Łódź. Photography W. Pohorecki. Design M. Grzelak.

Tab. 1. The Bzura River basin area. Sets of weaponry in graves from phase B1 of the older Roman period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets of weaponry (number of specimens)</th>
<th>Number of graves</th>
<th>Phases and subphases</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B1a</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), staff-weapons (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B1b–c</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2), shield (2?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B1a–b</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2), shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B1b, B1c</td>
<td>11,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1a–b, B1b, B1c, B1</td>
<td>23,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1b</td>
<td>23,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1c, B1</td>
<td>23,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 17 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2. The Bzura River basin area. Sets of weaponry and horse riding gear in graves from phase B2 of the older Roman period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets of weaponry (number of specimens)</th>
<th>Number of graves</th>
<th>Phases and subphases</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), staff-weapons (2), shield (1), spurs (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2b, B2b–c</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), staff-weapons (2), shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2b, B2b–c</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), staff-weapons (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2a–b, B2b</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2), shield (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B2b</td>
<td>16,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1), shield (1-2), spurs (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2b–c</td>
<td>5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2a, B2b</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2b</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2b, B2</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2a–b, B2b</td>
<td>11,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 18 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reaches 11.8% (2), while it increases significantly in phase B2 reaching about 33.3% (6). The predominant set of weapons in both phases consists of staff-weapons and shield, in phase B1 is about 41% (7) of all graves and in phase B2 even more than 66% (12). Staff-weapons occurred as two, and more often as single spearheads, in phase B1 respectively 17.6% (2 spearheads) and 53% (single spearhead) and in phase B2 respectively even 50% (2 spearheads) and 39% (single spearhead). Staff-weapons were basic offensive weapons in the older Roman period. Sometimes they are found without any additional equipment, in 23.5% (4) of graves from phase B1 and in 22.2% (4) of graves from phase B2. Shields generally co-occur with offensive weapons, more rarely are recorded without the aforementioned equipment, such graves in phase B1 consist 64.7% (11), while in phase B2 they reach 78% (14). The presence of parts of shields without accompanying weaponry calculated on 23.5% (4) for phase B1 and 11% (2) for phase B2 may result from, illegible to us today, practices of burial grounds’ users as well as from other circumstances.

Standard equipment in phase B2 is enriched by spurs recorded in three graves, occurring in pairs (two graves) or individually. Their share reaches 16.6% of the total number of burials of this phase.

The number of basic weaponry categories in phases B1 and B2 is illustrated by diagrams (Diagram 1–3).
Fig. 10. Kompina, site 12, Łowicz district. Grave 13, urned cremation (phase B2b–B2c). 1 – shield boss type J.7a/1; 2 – spearhead type K.XII/2; 3 – rivet; 4 – spearhead type K.VIII/1; 5 – strap-end fitting (lower part damaged); 6 – buckle; 7 – shield grip type J.9/1; 8 – pottery; 9 – pottery (urn); 10 – bronze-iron fibula A.130, 131; 11 – sword type B.III/7 (after Tyszler 1998, tab. III; V: 1, 2). Scale: a – 1, 2, 4, 9, 11; b – 3, 10.
Fig. 11. Kutno, site 2. Grave 4, urned cremation (phase B2b). 1, 2 – bronze fibulae type A.II.38, 39; 3 – whetstone; 4, 5 – chair-shaped spurs; 6 – strap-end fitting; 7 – sword type B.III/7; 8 – vessel (urn); 9 – spearhead type K.VI/1; 10 – spearhead similar to type K.VIII/3; 11 – bronze shield fitting; 12 – belt pendant; 13 – iron circle; 14 – strap-end fitting; 15 – buckle; 16 – shield grip type J.9/1; 17 – shield boss type J.7a/1 (after Moszczyński 1994, tab. III, IV). Scale: a – 1–6, 9–16; b – 7; c – 8, 17.


Tab. 3. The Bzura River basin area. Sets of weaponry and horse riding gear in graves from phases B2–C1a of the older and the younger Roman period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets of weaponry (number of specimens)</th>
<th>Number of graves</th>
<th>Phases and subphases</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2b–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2), shield (1), spurs (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2c–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2), shield (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2c–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2b–C1a, B2–C1a</td>
<td>22,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1), spurs (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2c–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2b–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2–C1a</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 9 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nine grave assemblages within the material gathered by us include equipment dated to phases B2–C1a of the older and the younger Roman period (Tab. 3; Diagram 4). In one of them the set of weaponry consisted of sword and shield without staff-weapons (it did not survive?), which represents 11% of graves. Weaponry consisting of staff-weapons prevailed, double or single, together with shield, occurring in approximately 45% (4 graves) of the assemblages in question. In 3 cases, there were only staff-weapons which constituted 33.3% of graves, and in one grave only remnants of a shield were found, 11% of graves respectively. The standard military artefacts equipment, therefore, does not differ from the standard determined for older phases of the Roman period, especially the large share of staff-weapons, double (33.3%) or single (44.5%), occurring in 77.8% (7) of discussed assemblages. Parts of shields were found in about 66.7% (6) graves, including the burial with a sword. There were also recorded two assemblages with spurs, a set of two and a single one (22% graves).

From older phase of the younger Roman period, we know 38 graves containing dated to phases C1a–C1b, and amongst them the dating a significant number of assemblages can be narrowed down to phase C1a (20 graves), and several to phase C1b (2 graves; Tab. 4; 5; Diagram 5, 6; Fig. 12; 13).

In the phase in question of the younger Roman period, we know 38 graves containing dated to phases C1a–C1b, and amongst them the dating a significant number of assemblages can be narrowed down to phase C1a (20 graves), and several to phase C1b (2 graves; Tab. 4; 5; Diagram 5, 6; Fig. 12; 13).

In phase in question of the younger Roman period, the share of assemblages with swords reaches about 26.3% (10 specimens). The most popular elements of weaponry in this time are staff-weapons in the form of double specimens (26.3%, 10 graves) or single ones (52.6%, 20 graves), occurring in
Fig. 12. Wólka Łasiecka, Skierniewice district, site 1. Grave 2, urned cremation (phase C1a). 1 – pottery (urn); 2 – shield boss type J.7a/2; 3 – shield grip type J.9/2; 4 – spearhead similar to type K.X; 5 – spearhead type K.X; 6 – shears; 7 – tweezers; 8, 9 – strap-ends; 10 – sickle-shaped knife; 11–13 – fragments of bronze and iron fittings (after Bender/Dąbrowska 2012, tab. II: grave 2). Scale: a – 1–5, 12, 13; b – 6, 11.

Fig. 13. Wólka Łasiecka, Skierniewice district, site 1. Grave 1, urned cremation (phase C1a-C1b). 1 – pottery (urn); 2, 3 – pottery; 4a, 4b – sword type BVII/2; 5a, 5b – hemispherical shield boss with conical top; 6 – scabbard’s pendant; 7 – spearhead similar to type K.VIII/3; 8 – scabbard fitting, from grave 1? (after Bender/Dąbrowska 2012, tab. I). Scale: a – 8; b – 1–3, 4a, 4b, 5–7; c – 4.
approximately 79% of assemblages (30 graves). They are still, as in the older Roman period, a basic offensive weapons. The category of defensive weapons are represented by parts of shields found in about 68.4% (26 graves) assemblages of warriors. In two graves it can be assumed presence of two shields belonging to one or two warriors. The presence of spurs, as a part of horse riding gear, is associated with assemblages from phase C1a (3 graves, 8%), including graves with swords.

A significant number of burials from phase C1a contains rich military equipment, emphasized by frequent occurrence of swords, in about 30% (6 graves) graves, comparable to the group of graves from phase B2 of the older Roman period, where swords occurred in approximately 33% (6) graves. The essential elements of a warrior’s equipment, found in about 75% (15) of burials, are staff-weapons – double ones (30%, 6 graves) or single ones (45%, 9 graves). These weapons, together with shield, appeared in 11 graves (55%). Shields occurred also as the only equipment in 4 graves (20%) or with sword (5%). In other words, graves with staff-weapons represent 75% (15) and graves with shields 80% (16) of the total number of assemblages in the discussed phase C1a.

Tab. 6. The Bzura River basin area. Sets of weaponry from late phase of the younger Roman period and the late Roman period (C2–C3) and early Migration period (D1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets of weaponry (number of specimens)</th>
<th>Number of graves</th>
<th>Phases and subphases</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), staff-weapons (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C1b–C2 (2), D1</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>8,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1), shield (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C1–C2, C2, C2–C3</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-weapons (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C1b–C2, C2, C2–D1 (D1)</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C2, C2–C3</td>
<td>16,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 12 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Bzura River basin assemblages with weapons from younger phase of the younger Roman period (C1b–C2, C2) and from the late Roman period (C2–C3, C3) are already scarce, to these periods 10 such graves are dated. The same concerns only two graves from the early Migration period (phase D1; Tab. 6; Diagram 7; Fig. 14; 15). The equipment consists of swords recorded in 33.3% (4) graves, staff-weapons and shields occurring, respectively, in 75% (9) and 75% (9) graves. Full equipment in the form of swords, staff-weapons and shields occurred in two assemblages from phase C1b–C2 and in one from phase D1, which represents 25% of graves. The share of swords in the total number of graves (about 33%) is relatively high, comparable to their frequency in phases B2 and C1a. Poorly equipped burials with a single items of staff-weapons (3) or shield (2) represent 41.7% (5) graves.


Fig. 15. Gledzianówek, Łęczyca district. Grave 11/1935, urned cremation (phase C2–D). 1 – shears; 2 – molten glass; 3 – buckle; 4 – iron axe; 5 – wheel-thrown bowl; 6 – fragment of knife, the other is currently missing (after Kaszeewska 1977, tab. LXIV: 7–12). Scale: a – 2–4, 6; b – 1, 5.
The recorded sets of warriors’ weaponry from phases discussed above generally do not differ from those found in earlier periods. Drastically decreases, instead, the general number of burials equipped with weapons, which undoubtedly was related in particular to changes in funeral rites.

IV

The above analyses should be recapitulated but we do not see need to summarize in detail the data contained in the tables and comments, which is synthetic and comprehensive enough. Hence, the general conclusions will be formulated. The dominant weapons in the population of the Bzura River basin were staff-weapons (spear, javelin, bifunctional staff-weapons), appearing individually or as often as two specimens present in one grave. Their frequency increases from phase B1 (70.6% of graves), through phase B2 (89.0% of graves) to phase C1a (75% of graves), reaching in phases C1a–C1b (79% of graves; Tab. 1–6). In the late Roman period and in the initial phase of the Migration period these weapons were slightly less numerous (75% of graves), appearing, however, as a single specimen. Similar is the frequency of shields showing an increasing tendency from phase B1 (64.7% of graves), reaching its apogee in phase B2 (78% of graves) and in phase C1a (80% of graves), with a general decreasing tendency in phases C1a–C1b (68.5% of graves; Tab. 1–6). It is still at a relatively high level (75% of graves) in the late Roman period and the initial phase of the Migration period.

In rich burials, with staff-weapons co-occurred parts of shields, in phase B1 they constitute 42.2% of graves, while in phase B2 even 66.7% of graves, and in phase C1 about 47.4% of graves. Quite often these sets were accompanied by swords, in phase B2 in 33.3% of graves, while in phase C1 in 21% of graves.

The presence of spurs, which shows an increasing importance of mounted warriors, starts in sub-phase B2b (16.6%), increases in phases B2c–C1a (22.2%) and remains in phase C1a (15% of graves).

The aforementioned sword was undoubtedly the most expensive weapon, due to the relatively difficult production and therefore having an ‘aristocratic’ character. In the initial stage of the older Roman period, i.e. in phase B1 only 12% of graves contained swords. Later, i.e. from phase B2 (33.3%) to phase C2 and phase D1 (33.3%) its frequency stabilized on a high level, usually exceeding 30% of all graves with weapons. Needless to say that graves with swords were also equipped with shields and common staff-weapons.

Of little importance in the area in question were axes, of small size, known from two sites, from Gledzianów and from Górki Pęcławskie (Józefowska et al. 2012, 111, fig. 144; Kaszewska 1977, 101, tab. LXIV: 10). Similarly looks the issue of bow use, the presence of which is evidenced by arrowheads discovered in graves. Not too frequent finds of them come for example from Zgierz-Rudunki (Skowron 2000, 79–89).

Finally, it is worthy to compare the noted by us models of correlated with each other weaponry elements occurring in the Bzura River basin with analogous finds at the macro level, i.e. taking into account the whole of the Przeworsk culture territory (Kontny 2001). A quite a clear difference in frequency of staff-weapons’ heads is here perceptible. The share of them in the Bzura River basin in phase B1 is lower (by 7.5%) and, in turn, in phases C2–D it is significantly higher (by 23.6%) than the one calculated for the Przeworsk culture by B. Kontny (2001, 93, Graph 1). The frequency of graves with two spearheads remains in the Bzura River basin, as well as into the macro scale at a high level. However, during phases B1, B2 (B2a, B2b) it is much higher in the scale of the whole Przeworsk culture (by 8.9%, 11.6%, 13.4%), to reach for comparable areas even level in phase C1 (Kontny 2001, 93, Graph 2). In the case of swords, their frequency in the area in our question is significantly higher, and yet levelled, and remains at a high level from phase B2 to phases C2–D (compare Kontny 2001, 103, Graph 11). It is a distinctive feature of the Bzura River basin. In terms of defensive weaponry, it also can be observed a higher percentage of parts of shields presence in our area in phases B1 and B2 (by 12.4%, 14.6%), reaching a comparable level of frequency in the Przeworsk culture area only in subsequent phases of the younger Roman period (Kontny 2001, 107, Graph 12).

In summary, the Przeworsk culture population in the Bzura River basin area was distinguished by a relatively rich military equipment, which both in quantitative and qualitative terms presented itself greater than average standards typical for the entire area of the Przeworsk culture. Its quantitative superiority was expressed by a large number of individual weaponry elements – both offensive and defensive – correlated with each other. The qualitative features was emphasized by above-average presence of swords, weapons particularly appreciated, which indicated a high social status of their owners.
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Cieľom tejto práce je ukázať, ako sa časom menili modely (štandardy) výzbroje bojovníkov przeworskej kultúry v povodí Bzury v dobe rímskej. Táto oblasť s jasnými a pomerne rozsiahlymi hranicami nebola zvolená náhodne. Rozlišujúce znaky geografického charakteru a znaky súvisiace s osídlením naznačujú, že v oblasti našho záujmu fungovala samostatná skupina obyvateľstva na úrovni „malého kmeňa“ (Godłowski 1985, 135, mapy 3–6). Potvrdzuje to aj spoľahlivý zdrojový materiál, ktorý dobre poslúžil na analýzu. Navyše, “chronologická citlivosť” súčastí zbraní – mečov, hrotov kopí a oštepov, častí štítov, nám umožňuje zachytiť ich časté zmeny v čase, a tak zrekonštruovať modely hrobov bojovníkov v rôznych fázach relatívnej chronológie. Výsledky týchto rekonštrukcií sú uvedené v tabulkách 1–6 a v grafoch 1–7, ako aj v príslušných komentároch, ktoré berú do úvahy špecifické súbory militárií, ich datovanie a percentuálne zastúpenie dominantných kategórií zbraní v rôznych chronologických fázach a podfázach.

Celkový obraz, ktorý vyplýva z analýzy, ukazuje, že miestne obyvateľstvo uprednostňovalo používanie drevcových zbraní. Ich podiel počas staršej i mladšej doby rímskej zostáva na vyšoké úrovni: vo fáze B1 – 70,6%, vo fáze B2 – 89%, a vo fáze C1a – 71%, až do neskorej doby rímskej – 75%. To znamená, že počas vrcholného obdobia boli prítomné v deviatich z desiatich hroboch z desiatich. Prítomnosť štítov v hroboch je podobná, frekvencia ich výskytu postupne raste od fázy B1 – 64,7%, cez fázu B2 – 78%, po fáze C1a – 80%. V neskorej dobe rímskej miernie klesá – 75%. Vo fázech B2–C1a bola čast štítov zaznamenaná v štyroch z piatich hroboch so zbraňami.

Ešte zaujímavejšie výsledky sa týkajú prítomnosti mečov, zbraní relatívne vysokej hodnoty vďaka náročnosti ich výroby. Určovali vyššie postavenie bojovníka, ktorý ich používal. Od fázy B2 až po fázu D1 bola prítomnosť mečov...
Obr. 1. Mapa povodia rzeki Bzury przedstawia rozszerzenie pohrebského przeworskej kultúry so zbraňami a náhodnými nálezmi zbraní z doby rimskéj a včasnej doby sťahovania národov. Legenda: a – pohrebsko s hrobmi vybavenými zbraňami, a ojedinelé nálezy zbraní; b – pohrebsko s hrobmi zahrotnymi v analýze.

Obr. 2. Mapa povodia rzeki Bzury zobrazuľa rozsarie pohrebského przeworskej kultúry s hrobo so zbraňami a náhodnymi nálezmi zbraní z doby rimskéj a včasnej doby sťahovania národov. Legenda: a – pohrebsko s hrobmi vybavenými zbraňami a náhodnymi nálezmi zbraní; b – pohrebsko s hrobmi zahrotnymi v analýze, čísla – viď zoznam polóh. 1 – Biela, poloha 1, okres Zgiezer; 2 – Bolimowska Wieś, poloha 2, okres Spheniewicz; 3 – Ciosny Sady, poloha 1, okres Zgiezer; 4 – Ciosny (Folwark, Folwark-Kolonia), poloha 3, okres Zgiezer; 5 – Gledzinévôk, poloha 1, okres Zgiezer; 6 – Gozdów, poloha 1, okres Zgiezer; 7 – Góriki Pęcławskie, okres Łęczyca; 8 – Grodzisk Mazowiecki, Charzanowska ulica 1, okres Grodzisk Mazowiecki; 9 – Grodzisk Mazowiecki (Grodzisk Kalczyn), okres Grodzisk Mazowiecki; 10 – Kocierzew Południowy, poloha 3, Łowicz district; 11 – Komorów, okres Rawa Mazowiecka; 12 – Kompania, okres Łowicz; 13 – Kutno, poloha 2, okres Kutno; 14 – Kutno, poloha 3 (Kutno Józefów), okres Kutno; 15 – Leónow, poloha 2, okres Łowicz; 16 – Leźnica Wielka, okres Zgiezer; 17 – Łódź, Szczecirska ulica 96/100, poloha 1; 18 – Mnič, okres Kutno; 19 – Patočki, okres Łowicz; 20 – Pęclawice, okres Łęczyca; 21 – Płudwiny, okres Zgiezer; 22 – Sochaczew-Karwowo, poloha 1, okres Sochaczew; 23 – Witaszewice, okres Łęczyca; 25 – Wólka Łasiecka, poloha 1, okres Spheniewicz; 26 – Wola Błędowa, okres Zgiezer; 27 – Wrzask-Zagłoba, okres Zgiezer; 28 – Zdyny, okres Łowicz; 29 – Zgiezer Rudunki, poloha 1/1a (Zgiezer Zegrzanki, poloha 1), okres Zgiezer; 30 – Zdzarow, poloha 1, okres Sochaczew.

Obr. 3. Ciosny Sady, poloha 1, okres Zgiezer. Železný meč. Artefakty z Múzea archeológie a etnológie v Łodzi. Foto W. Pohorecki, design M. Grzelak.

Obr. 4. Ciosny Sady, poloha 1, okres Zgiezer. Železný hrot kopí. Artefakty z Múzea archeológie a etnológie v Łodzi. Foto W. Pohorecki, design M. Grzelak.

Obr. 5. Ciosny Folwark, poloha 3, okres Zgiezer. Železná puklica štítu. Artefakty z Múzea archeológie a etnológie v Łodzi. Foto W. Pohorecki, design M. Grzelak.


Obr. 7. Ciosny Folwark, poloha 3, okres Zgiezer. Železný hrot kopí. Artefakty z Múzea archeológie a etnológie v Łodzi. Foto W. Pohorecki, design M. Grzelak.


Obr. 13. Wólka Łasiecka, okres Spheniewicz, poloha 1. Hrob 1, urnový žiarový hrob (ťažba Cl–C1b). 1 – keramika (urna); 2, 3 – keramika; 4a, 4b – meč typu BVII/2; 5a, 5b – poluželezitá puklica štítu s kužeľovým vrcholom; 6 – závesok pošvky meča; 7 – hrot kopí podobnej typu K.VIII/3; 8 – kovanie pošvky meča z hrobu 1 (podľa Bender/Dąbrowska 2012, tab. I). Mierka: a – 8; b – 1–3, 4a, 4b, 5–7; c – 4.


Diagram 1. Povodie Bzury. Bojovnícke hroby z fázy B1 staršej doby rímskej. Legenda: a – hroby s mečmi; b – hroby s bodnými zbraňami; c – hroby so štítmi.


Diagram 5. Povodie Bzury. Bojovnícke hroby z fázy C1a mladšej doby rímskej. Legenda: a – hroby s mečmi; b – hroby s bodnými zbraňami; c – hroby so štítmi.


Tabela 1. Povodie Bzury. Sady zbraní z fázy B1 staršej doby rímskej.


Tabela 5. Povodie Bzury. Sady zbraní a jazdeckej výbavy v hroboch z fázy C1 (C1a, C1a–C1b, C1b) mladšej doby rímskej.

Tabela 6. Povodie Bzury. Sady zbraní z neskorej fázy mladšej doby rímskej a neskorej doby rímskej (C2–C3) a včasnej fázy doby sťahovania národov (D1).
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