The latest weapons in the Bogaczewo culture

The Bogaczewo culture armament as well as the ones of the other West Balt tribes is far from being well known. Although it lasted from the late stage of the Late Pre-Roman Period until the Late Roman Period, delivering a lot of weapon graves, our state of knowledge is extremely limited (see: Kontny 2007b) mainly because of the lack of apt publications from the pre-war period and the evaporation of the artifacts and archives of the Prussia-Museum during the Second World War. Therefore, while dealing with military problems of the Bogaczewo culture I had to search through the Prussia-Sammlung and the Prussia-Archiv rediscovered several years ago and nowadays stored in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Berlin (Reich 2003, p. 109-114; 2005). Naturally, also the heritage of various pre-war archaeologists like Martin Jahn1, Herbert Jankuhn2, Feliks Jakobson3, Kurt Voigtmann4 or Marta Schmiedehelm5 were taken into consideration.

In study of late weapons one may omit swords, that were extremely rare in Balts milieu and in the Bogaczewo culture appeared only in the Early Roman Period (Nowakowski 1994; 2007b). As refers to axes they were quite popular in the Bogaczewo culture but they appeared generally during the Early Roman Period and at the start of the Younger Roman Period. The later form of axes characterized by a massive blade is typical for the West Balt circle in the Younger and the Late Roman Periods but in the Bogaczewo culture frequently they were found without any dating elements (Nowakowski 1995, p. 37). So far it seems that although their late examples are documented in the Sudovian culture and in the Dollkeim-Kovrovo culture, there are not proved in the Bogaczewo culture (see: Nowakowski 1995, p. 36-38). The unique late element from Dłużec, com. Piecki, site I (former: Langendorf, Kr. Sensburg), grave 72 is mentioned further. I’m not dealing here with socketed axes and so called battle-knives, because of their unclear function. As refers to knives it was rather a tool, possibly used by warriors, but most probably killing wasn’t their prime function because their blades were too short for it; see e.g. remarks concerning long knives from the Przeworsk culture expressed by T. Bochnak (2003). The function of socketed axes is also problematic (Kontny 2006, p. 150 with further literature; see also: Szela 2006). Instead of the above mentioned categories, the most popular form of weaponry, known from the Bogaczewo culture were without any doubt lance-heads.

So far I’ve managed to collect 240 lanceheads from the Bogaczewo culture or information concerning their existence (plus 13 barbed ones and 17 arrowheads). Unfortunately only 38 of them

---

1 Stored in the Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw.
2 Collected in the Archäologisches Landesmuseum Schloß Gottorf in Schleswig (I would like to express here my gratitude to Prof. C. von Carnap-Bornheim).
3 The archive of F. Jakobson is kept in the Latvias Nācionalis Vēstures Muzejs in Riga. I would like to express my gratitude to its keeper, J. Ciglis M.A. as well as Prof. W. for an opportunity to use it.
4 Kept in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Berlin; I would like to thank Ch. Reich Ph. D. and H. Wieder Ph.D. for help and showing the collection and the archives.
5 Collected in the Ajaloo Instituut in Tallin; I’d like to express my gratitude to A. Juga-Szymańska, M.A. for giving me access to M. Schmiedehelm’s heritage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact, site</th>
<th>Literature, archival sources, collection</th>
<th>Type, proposed chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heads of a shafted weapon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dłużec, com. Piecki, site I (former: Langendorf, Kr. Sensburg), grave 72</td>
<td>The heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, file 7.20d-40, the information concerning the grave equipment see also file 7.13e-136, 7.13e-164; the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Berlin, Prussia-Sammlung, inv. no VII, 87, 9343</td>
<td>Type: close to Kaczanowski XXIII, var.1 Chronology: C₁⁻⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dręstwo, com. Bargłów Kościelny, loose find</td>
<td>Jaskanis 1968</td>
<td>Type: Kazakevičius IV Chronology: ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojtyny, com. Piecki (former: Moynthienen, Kr. Sensburg), grave 75</td>
<td>Hollack, Peiser 1904, p. 55, pl. 75: c</td>
<td>Type: Kaczanowski XXIII, var2, eventually XXIV Chronology: C₁⁻⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skomack-Ostrów (Ostrów), com. Elk (former: Werder in Arjisiæ, Kr. Lych), loose find</td>
<td>The collection of the Museum of Podlasie in Białystok, inv. no MB/A/233, 1163</td>
<td>Type: Kaczanowski XXIII, var2, ev. XXIV Chronology: C₁⁻ｒ–C₁⁻μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szeştno, com. Mrągosz (former: Wymisly, Kr. Sensburg), loose find</td>
<td>The collection of Museum of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn</td>
<td>Type: Kaczanowski XXIII, var2, ev. XXIV Chronology: C₁⁻ｒ–C₁⁻μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shield fittings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babięta I, com. Piecki (former: Babienten, Kr. Sensburg), grave 323</td>
<td>The heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, file 7.13e.90</td>
<td>Type: Ilkjær 6c Chronology: C₁⁻μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machary II, com. Piecki (former: Macharren, Kr. Sensburg), grave 309a</td>
<td>La Baume 1941, p. 10, fig. 6; Kaczanowski 1992, p. 63, 96, fig. 16: 1; Nowakowski 1995, p. 66, pl. XX: 2; Nowakowski 2001a, p. 72, pl. V: 3</td>
<td>Type: Zieling R2a (a Roman hemispherical umbo) Chronology: C₁⁻μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojtyny, com. Piecki (former: Moynthienen, Kr. Sensburg), grave 75</td>
<td>Hollack, Peiser 1904, p. 55, pl. 75: a</td>
<td>Type: Jahn 8 Chronology: C₁⁻μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shield grips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miętkie, com. Dźwierzuty (former: Mingfen, Kr. Ortelsburg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Ilkjær 5b/Zieling V1 Chronology: C₁⁻μ(C₁⁻μ⁻¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onufryjewo, com. Ruciane-Nida (former: Onufrigowen, Kr. Sensburg), grave 291</td>
<td>H. Jankuhn’s files; the heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, file 7.13e.205; Szymański 2005, p. 70-71</td>
<td>Type: Ilkjær 5b/Zieling V1 Chronology: C₁⁻μ(C₁⁻μ⁻¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyszembork, com. Mrągowo, grave 61</td>
<td>Szymański 2005, p. 70-71, pl. XXIV: 3</td>
<td>Type: Ilkjær 5b/Zieling V1 Chronology: C₁⁻μ(C₁⁻μ⁻¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dłużec, com. Piecki, site I (former: Langendorf, Kr. Sensburg), grave 72</td>
<td>The heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, file 7.20d-40, the information concerning the grave equipment see also file 7.13e-136, 7.13e-164; the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Berlin, Prussia-Sammlung, inv. no VII, 87, 9343</td>
<td>Type: later form Chronology: C₁⁻μ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The list of late weapons of the Bogaczewo culture.
I know from an autopsy. The others are documented only as photographs, sketches or only simple mentions in publications or archives. Comparing it with the Sudovian culture, known mainly from post-war excavations (70 lanceheads known, of which a great majority – 47 examples – I touched personally), one may say that the sample is not big enough. Nevertheless we cannot resent an archaeological material overlooking such studies. Taking into consideration the current state of knowledge it is inevitable to deal with the problem. Moreover being cautious one may attribute as many as 146 lanceheads from the Bogaczewo culture to the particular typology.

As I tried to prove in the other place (Kontny 2007b), weaponry of the Bogaczewo culture, including lanceheads, was as a whole influenced by forms from the Przeworsk culture. The latter ones became quite a good chronological factor (Kaczanowski 1995). Therefore it is possible to date them

Fig. 1. The head of a shafted weapon from Skomack-Ostrów, com. Elk, loose find (drawn by B. Kontny; courtesy of the Museum of Podlasie in Białystok).
precisely also in the Bogaczewo culture and – oppositely to M. Karczewski’s opinion (1999, p. 97, 101-102) – there are no serious premises to generally establish their later (not just prolonged) chronology (see: Kontny 2007b).

Basing on the results of typological studies on the Bogaczewo culture weaponry that I’m working on, I’ll try to pinpoint here the specimens dated to the latest stages of the culture (beside mentioned above I also took into consideration shield elements).

The first of them is the loose find from the survey taking place at Skomack-Ostrów, com. Ełk (fig. 1). Presently it is kept in the Museum of Podlasie in Białystok. Its basic dimensions and coefficients are: G (total length) = 14,0 cm (after the reconstruction), A (the maximum width = 1,8 cm), L (the length of the blade) = 9,0 cm (after the reconstruction), T (the length of the socket) = 5,0 cm, Q (the length of the blade’s part from the widest point to the top), PL (the cross section of the blade) 3C, PT (the cross section of the socket) ~7, T (the socket shape) 2, T/G = 0,36, A/L/ = 0,20, Q/L = 0,69. Taking into account the above, it should be attributed to type XXIII var. 2 after P. Kaczanowski what means that its chronology most probably should be linked with phases C_2 or C_3-D (Kaczanowski 1995, pl. XX); it is less probable to join it with phase C_1b, as it has quite a narrow blade characteristic for later stages of its appearance (Kaczanowski 1995, p. 27).

The second artifact comes from the cemetery at Dłużec, com. Piecki, site I (former: Langendorf, Kr. Sensburg), grave 72 (fig. 2). The amazing fact is that I came across the information concerning it in the heritage of M. Schmiedehelm (file 7.20d-40, courtesy of the Ajaloo Institute in Tallin). Instead of sketches of two knives (one of them was ornamented) and an axe of the later form (see: Nowakowski 1995, p. 37), the grave furnishing embraced also a lancehead. One should notice that drawings made by M. Schmiedehelm were frequently imprecise, impossible to attribute them to a certain type; the above notice refers particularly to a shafted weapon. Nevertheless in that case it wasn’t true. That unusual drawing documents some important details so it is apt enough to search for the original. Therefore it was possible to identify the artifact, now stored in the Prussia-Sammlung in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Berlin (inv. no. VII, 87, 9343). Although now it is covered with a foil to protect it from rust, doubtlessly we have to do with the same object: see the outline, shape of a midrib and the gap in the upper part of blade’s edge. As refers to the chronology,

---

6 The site is registered in the museum collection under that name. However usually it was described as Ostrów, com. Elk (former: Werder in Arjosee, Kr. Lyck), see: Engel, Iwanicki, Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz 2006, p. 210, fig. 2.

7 Inv. no MB/A/233, 1163. I’d like to express my gratitude to K. Biętkowska M.A., the Manager of the Archaeological Section of the Museum of Podlasie, for the access to the object and letting me to include it herein.

8 Accordingly to the P. Kaczanowski’s scheme (1995). The same refers to the further descriptions of heads of the shafted weapon.
there are no firm premises to establish it apart from dating of the lancehead type itself, i.e. phases C₂ eventually C₁b or C₃-D as we deal with the form very close to type XXIII var. 1 after P. Kaczanowski. Basic dimensions of the specimen are as follows: G = 18,3 cm, A = 3,7 cm, L = 8,0 cm, T = 8,0 cm, Q = 7,0 cm, PL ? (impossible to reconstruct because of a strong corrosion; traces of the high midrib are noticeable), PT 1, T 1, T/G = 0,44, A/L = 0,36, Q/L = 0,68. Comparing it to the Przeworsk culture form the only difference comes from the fact that the artifact in question is significantly wider. It seems to be the Balt trait. As examples of similarly wide form there may serve the artifacts of the same type from the Sudovian culture: Płociczno, com. Bakalarzewo (former: Plociczno, Kr. Sudauen), grave 9 (fig. 3) and 11. Such trait is treated by P. Kaczanowski as quite early (Kaczanowski 1995, p. 27) so its earlier chronology (subphase C₁b) is most possible.

There is one more artifact alike: the lancehead from Möjtyny, com. Piecki (former: Möythienen, Kr. Sensburg), grave 75 (Hollack, Peiser 1904, p. 55, pl. 75: c). Probably that one should be described as a form close to type XXIII, var. 2 or – less probably – type XXIV (basic dimensions are not given in the publication so we can only reconstruct a part of them basing on the included scale: G = 12,9 cm, A = 1,9 cm, L = 6,2 cm, T = 6,7 cm, Q = 4,6 cm, T/G = 0,52, A/L = 0,31, Q/L = 0,74). In furnishing (fig. 4) there were also found (Hollack, Peiser 1904, p. 55, pl. 75: a-b, d): an iron bar-like fire-steel type IICa after M. Jonakowski (1996), a knife and a hemispherical umbo type 8 after M. Jahn (1916). Because of that fact we have to take into consideration an earlier chronology: such umbos appeared in the Przeworsk culture during subphase C₁b or even the later stages of subphase C₃a (Godłowski 1992, p. 74; 1994, p. 171) and in the Dollkeim-Kovrovo one they are linked with its 3rd phase (not 3a) (Nowakowski 1996, p. 58, pl. 107), i.e. phase C₃ (Nowakowski 1996, pl. XVI: d). K. Godłowski believed that in Balt tribes milieu they should be linked with subphase C₁b or the initial stage of phase C₂ (Godłowski 1994, p. 171). Probably in that case we have to do with the dating for phase C₁b what is quite possible, also having in mind the type of a strike-a-light "Axes of the later form are dated widely from late stage of the Early Roman Period to Late Roman Period (Nowakowski 1995, p. 37-38)."

Fig. 3. The Sudovian culture (?) head of a shafted weapon from Plociczno, com. Bakalarzewo, grave 9 (drawn by B. Kontry; courtesy of the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte).
The very similar example of a lancehead was found lately on a destructed cemetery from the site that was located on the E. Hollack's map at Wymisly, Kr. Sensburg (Hollack 1908, p. 188; Szymański 2005, p. 114), the village not existing now\textsuperscript{11}. Unfortunately it was a loose specimen (finds from the site create the collection and cannot be attributed to particular graves) so we cannot date it precisely. Its basic dimensions are: $G = 9,0$ cm (after the reconstruction), $A = 1,3$ cm, $L = 4,5$ cm (after the reconstruction), $T = 4,5$ cm, $Q = 3,5$ cm (after the reconstruction), $T/G = 0,50$, $A/L = 0,29$, $Q/L = 0,78$. Because of a narrow blade (see: Kaczanowski 1995, p. 27) it should be dated quite late (phase C\textsubscript{2}?) but the closest analogy coming from Mojtyny is evidently earlier so one cannot be sure how to date it utterly.

The next example (fig. 5) was found in Wojsak, com. Giżycko (former: Woysock, Kr. Lötzen). Probably it was a loose find as in the K. Voigtmann's files, where the drawing of the specimen was included, there is no information concerning the grave number or other elements of grave furnishing. One may reconstruct only the following dimensions of the lancehead: $G = 36,7$ cm (after the reconstruction), $A = 2,7$ cm, $L = 27,3$ cm (after the reconstruction), $T = 9,4$ cm, $Q = 21,3$ cm (after the reconstruction), $T/G = 0,26$, $A/L = 0,10$, $Q/L = 0,78$, so it is quite similar to type XX after P. Kaczanowski (1995). If so, probably it could be joined with phase C\textsubscript{2} or – less plausibly – phases C\textsubscript{2}-D (Kaczanowski 1995). If so, probably it could be joined with phase C\textsubscript{2} or – less plausibly – phases C\textsubscript{2}-D (Kaczanowski 1995).

\textsuperscript{11} Today the area belongs to the administrative territory of Szestno, com. Mragowo. I'm very thankful for the information and an access to the materials from Szestno to T. Nowakiewicz Ph.D. (the National Heritage Board of Poland) and J. Sobieraj Ph.D. (the Museum of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn).
Nevertheless in my opinion the drawing is not precise enough to exclude a different chronology. One may consider e.g. the Late Migration Period or early medieval times, although the latter possibility seems less probable.

The next late example comes from the cemetery at Onufryjewo, com. Ruciane-Nida, grave 145 (former: Onufrigowen, Kr. Sensburg). Its sketch was documented in the heritage of F. Jakobson but it is of so bad quality that we cannot attribute it to a particular type (fig. 6: a). Nevertheless it seems very probable that we deal with a late form as it was found together with an iron cross-bow tendril fibula type Almgren 161-162 (1923) characterized by a knee-shaped bow as well as additionally toilet tweezers and a knife. Such brooches are dated to phase Cγ, eventually also Cμ (Nowakowski 2001b, p. 133).

One should also mention the other specimen from Onufryjewo, grave 302b with the out-curved blade's edge (Jahn 1916, p. 98; Kontny 2007a, p. 85-86, fig. 6: a; M. Jahn's files; heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, files: 7.12/106, 7.13e/132, 7.1/231, 7.8a/141, 7.12/106, 7.13/25, 7.13/51, 7.13e/132) which is dated to phase Cγ as it was found together with the bronze pin type Beckmann C (1969) and an

---

Fig. 5. The lancehead from Wojsak, com. Giżycko, loose find (?) (the heritage of Kurt Voigtmann; courtesy of the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte).

---

12 See e.g. the Olsztyn group specimen from Tumiany, com. Barczewo (former: Daumen, Kr Allenstein), grave 120 (Juga, Ots, Szymański 2003, p. 214, fig. 4213: 2) or the Elblag group specimens from Nowinka, com. Tollmicko, grave 17 and 85 (unpublished materials; I'm grateful to M. Pietrzak M.A. from Archaeological Museum in Gdańsk for the access to the lanceheads). The lancehead from Wojsak reminds examples of type V after V. Kazakevičius, dated by him extremely widely from the 2nd till the 13th century AD (Kazekevičius 1988, p. 48-52; see also the remark by Iwanowska 2006, p. 54). The number of later heads is too small to draw any definite conclusions (see e.g. Głosek 1990, p. 132).

13 Lack of up to date classifications with aptly defined types concerning heads of the shafted weapon from the early medieval period doesn't let to propose any definite statements; e.g. quite a new proposition by W. Tokarski (2000, p. 84-85) is far from being precise. Nevertheless we may observe certain similarities referring to types II or V after A. Nadolski (1954) or type V after V. Kazakevičius (1988); the latter is imprecisely described and probably therefore its chronology is as wide as 2nd-13th century AD (Kazekevičius 1988, p. 48-52; see also the remark by Iwanowska 2006, p. 54). The number of later heads is too small to draw any definite conclusions (see e.g. Głosek 1990, p. 132).

14 Dated to phase B/C-Cγ and not later than subphase Cμ (Juga-Szymańska, Kontny 2006, p. 84-85); P. Szymański claimed that rarely they might have appeared also later (Szymański 2005, p. 28-29).
amber bead (fig. 6: b)\textsuperscript{15}. Unfortunately it cannot be ascribed to the particular type as the only known drawing of it, the sketch drawn by M. Jahn, is not precise enough to do so (see: Kontny 2007a, fig. 6: a)\textsuperscript{16}.

The other possibly late lancehead from the Bogaczewo culture is not dated precisely enough (fig. 7). A loose find of a lancehead type IV after V. Kazakevičius (1988) from Dręstwo, com. Bargłów Kościelny belongs to group of extremely rare specimens described accordingly to V. Kazakevičius’ typology, not the P. Kaczanowski’s one\textsuperscript{17}. Its basic dimensions are: $G = 16,6$ cm, $A = 3,7$ cm (after the reconstruction), $L = 9,4$ cm, $T = 7,2$ cm, $Q = 6,6$ cm, PL 4C, PT 1/2, T2\textsuperscript{18}. V. Kazakevičius proposed a very wide chronological scope for the type IV, i.e. 3\textsuperscript{rd}-6\textsuperscript{th} century AD (Kazakevičius 1988, p. 29). Comparable finds are known from the Sudovian culture\textsuperscript{19}. Therefore one may assume the late chronology, unfortunately so far there are no premises for more exact statements. Because of the fact that we do not know its exact chronology we cannot exclude the possibility that we have to do with the isolated find of the Sudovian culture itself (an import?): its area became quite close to the Augustów region, where Dręstwo is situated, starting from the turn of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD; we must not forget that cultural processes in the Augustów region during the Late Roman and the Migration

\textsuperscript{15} Amber beads appeared in Bogaczewo culture graves from the Younger and the Late Roman Periods starting from phase $B_2/C_1$, with single - possibly Early Roman – exception (Szymański 2005, p. 47).

\textsuperscript{16} It should be mentioned that in Onufryjewo there was also the head of a shafted weapon that might be late also but their chronology is not very precise: in grave 220 the lancehead of uncertain form appeared together with 8 figure-of-eight amber beads (the heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, file 7.13b.331), dated generally do the Late Roman Period, starting from phase $B_2/C_1$ (Bitner-Wróblewska 2007a, p. 62-63).

\textsuperscript{17} The specimen is stored in the Museum of Podlasie in Białystok (inv. no. MB/A/130, 566). I’d like to express my gratitude to K. Biernikowska M.A., the Manager of the Archaeological Section of the Museum of Podlasie, for the access to the artifact in question and letting me to include it herein. Although it was published (Jaskanis 1968) as the specimen from a grave, together with a lancehead type XIII after P. Kaczanowski, a knife and a comb type B after S. Thomas (1960) it was still found by chance and unprofessionally acquired so I cannot treat it as a furnishing of a single grave (as refers to interpretation of similar cases see Kontny 2003).

\textsuperscript{18} I resign from including the coefficients as they aren’t used in V. Kazakevičius typology.

\textsuperscript{19} The closest analogy comes from Osowa, com. Suwalki, barrow 14, grave 1 (Jaskanis 1958, p. 90, pl. XX: 3).
Periods are at least unclear (Engel, Iwanicki, Rzeszotarska-Nowakiewicz 2006, p. 204, fig. 3-5)\(^{20}\).

The observed rarity of late heads of a shafted weapon may be also presented as a result of a certain downward trend referring to a frequency of particular types of lanceheads from the Bogaczewo culture in successive chronological stages. On the bar chart (fig. 8) one may notice that after a quite significant frequency of the Early Roman types (I-V), the specimens of types VII, VIII and XII after P. Kaczanowski, dated generally to phases B\(_{2b}-C_{1a}\), became most popular. Later on (the heads of types XVI-XX, XXII-XXIV), the situation changed significantly and lanceheads almost utterly disappeared from a grave furnishing.

Also other weapons, like a few hemispherical umbos could not be dated surely later than phase C\(_{1b}\) (fig. 4). Beside the item from Mojtyń (mentioned earlier) and the bronze Roman import type Zieling R2a (1989) from Machary II, com. Piecki, grave 309a (former: Macharren, Kr. Sensburg), which is dated generally to phase C\(_1\) according among the others to the cross-bow tendril brooch (La Baume 1941, p. 10, fig. 6; Kaczanowski 1992, p. 63, 96, fig. 16: 1; Nowakowski 1995, p. 66, pl. XX: 2; 2001a, p. 72, pl. V: 3), one may recall here only the shield boss from grave 323 at Babięta I, com. Piecki

Another quite late lancehead from grave 370b at Onufryjewo is described further in this article. One could not neglect another artifact treated as late, i.e. the head of a shafted weapon from grave 61b at Romoty, com. Kalinowo (former: Romotten, Kr. Lyck), published lately (Juga, Ots, Szymański 2003, p. 243, fig. 4230: 2). It was ascribed to type XVIII after P. Kaczanowski (1995) and dated to phase C\(_1\) (Iwanicki 2007, p. 150). However such attribution is definitely wrong: we have to do with type V.2, eventually V.3 after P. Kaczanowski, both dated to the Early Roman Period (Kaczanowski 1995, p. 16-17, to compare dimensions and coefficients see also table 1). Thus it is not the artifact to be discussed hereby.

---

\(^{20}\) Another quite late lancehead from grave 370b at Onufryjewo is described further in this article. One could not neglect another artifact treated as late, i.e. the head of a shafted weapon from grave 61b at Romoty, com. Kalinowo (former: Romotten, Kr. Lyck), published lately (Juga, Ots, Szymański 2003, p. 243, fig. 4230: 2). It was ascribed to type XVIII after P. Kaczanowski (1995) and dated to phase C\(_1\) (Iwanicki 2007, p. 150). However such attribution is definitely wrong: we have to do with type V.2, eventually V.3 after P. Kaczanowski, both dated to the Early Roman Period (Kaczanowski 1995, p. 16-17, to compare dimensions and coefficients see also table 1). Thus it is not the artifact to be discussed hereby.
Fig. 8. Frequency of the Bogaczewo culture heads of a shafted weapon.

Fig. 9. Examples of late shield bosses from the Bogaczewo culture. a: Babięta, com. Piecki, site I, grave 323 (the heritage of M. Schmiedehelm, file 7.13e.90; courtesy of the Ajaloo Instituut in Tallin); b: Onufryjewo, com. Ruciane-Nida, grave 570b (the heritage of H. Jankuhn; courtesy of the Archäologisches Landesmuseum Schloß Gottorf in Schleswig).
(former: Babienten, Kr. Sensburg). It is known from M. Schmiedehelm's files (file 7.13e.90)\textsuperscript{21}, where the sketch of it was included (fig. 9: a). Although it is of a very bad quality we may surely describe it as an example of type Jahn 8 (1916), version with a knob (type 5c after J. Ilkjær/S2 after N. Zieling) or the Scandinavian form Ilkjær 6c (Ilkjær 1990)/Zieling S4 (Zieling 1989). Lately there appeared also the next source of information making the above data more precise i.e. inventory books of the Prussia-Museum (Bitner-Wróblewska 2008, pl. CII). Basing on the drawing included here one should be sure that the latter attribution is right. Therefore its chronology would be linked with the subphase C\textsubscript{1b} or the early stage of phase C\textsubscript{2} (Ilkjær 1990, fig. 199). The appearance of among the others: cross-bow tendril brooches\textsuperscript{22}, a belt buckle type D 17 after R. Madyda-Legutko\textsuperscript{23} and 2 amber beads\textsuperscript{24} in grave equipment suppose that the grave should be dated to phase C\textsubscript{1b}\textsuperscript{25}.

Another shield boss came from grave 370b at Onufryjewo (fig. 9: b). It is of type with pseudo-spike, typical for group 6 of the Przeworsk culture weapon graves (Godłowski 1994, fig. 1: 40)\textsuperscript{26} but appearing also in the Dollkeim-Kovrovo culture\textsuperscript{27}. The grave equipment embraced additionally an iron pin type Beckmann B\textsuperscript{28} (1969), two knives and a lancehead close to type I.3 after P. Kaczanowski\textsuperscript{29} (H. Jankuhn's files; M. Schmiedehelm's heritage, file 7.12.108) and as a whole should be most probably dated to the later stage of subphase C\textsubscript{1a} or – less probably – to subphase C\textsubscript{1b}.

One may mention here also a shield grip from grave 61 at Wyszembork, com. Mrągowo (type Ilkjær 5b/Zieling V1: form with trapezoid rivet-plates). Such specimens are dated to the late stage of subphase C\textsubscript{1a} and subphase C\textsubscript{1b},\textsuperscript{30} what is confirmed by the other elements of the grave furnishing. It was found together with a pin type C after Beckmann (1969)\textsuperscript{31}, a belt buckle type Madyda-Legutko D 29 (1987)\textsuperscript{32} and a fragment of a spindle whorl (Szymański 2005, p. 70-71, pl. XXIV) so its dating should be set most probably around the turn of subphases C\textsubscript{1a} and C\textsubscript{1b} (fig. 10: a).

\textsuperscript{21} It is in Estonian. I'm grateful to A. Juga-Szymańska M.A. for translating the text.
\textsuperscript{22} Probably type A.158 and two specimens of type A.161-162 (Almgren 1923). Cross-bow tendril brooches of the latter type from the Bogaczewo culture are generally dated to phase C\textsubscript{1}; later specimens, characterized by knee-shaped bow are rare (Nowakowski 1995, p. 34-35; 2001b, p. 136-137).
\textsuperscript{23} M. Schmiedehelm wrote that it was a belt buckle similar to one known from „Jask. 12” what surely means cemetery at Gasior, com. Ruciane-Nida (former: Jaskowska See, Kr. Sensburg), grave 12, where belt buckle type D 17 after R. Madyda-Legutko (1987) was found (Schmiedehelm 1990, p. 19, pl. XIII: 5). Such buckles were typical for phase C\textsubscript{1} (Madyda-Legutko 1987, tabl. 9).
\textsuperscript{24} See footnote 15.
\textsuperscript{25} One should not forget K. Godłowski’s remark that hemispherical umbos in Balt milieu should be ascribed rather to later stage of subphase C\textsubscript{1a} or initial stage of phase C\textsubscript{2} (Godłowski 1994, p. 171). Nevertheless his observation has been made basing on a very small sample originating from the Sudovian not the Bogaczewo culture. Therefore it cannot be conclusive for us.
\textsuperscript{26} Dated to the late stage of subphase C\textsubscript{1a} and vast part of subphase C\textsubscript{1b} (Godłowski 1992, p. 74).
\textsuperscript{27} See e.g. Elyanovka, raj. Bagratyonovsk, grave 38 (former: Wackern, Kr. Pr.-Eylau): Nowakowski 1996, pl. 56: 7); Prussia Archiv, no PM-A 636/L, p. 084-085; M. Jahn’s files; H. Jankuhn’s files. However objects attributed to the grave furnishing seem not to be chronologically coherent. It refers especially to the brooch, described by H. Jankuhn as raupenförmige gerippten Bügel, characteristic for the Late Roman Period or Early Migration Period.
\textsuperscript{28} Dated generally to the Early Roman Period but documented also for the initial stage of the Younger Roman Period (Szymański 2006, p. 28).
\textsuperscript{29} Identification after the sketch of the artifact drawn by H. Jankuhn; additionally he noticed that its length was 25 cm and the maximum width of the blade 4,8 cm. The coefficients calculated on the base of the drawing are following: T/G = 0,29, A/L = 0,27, Q/L = 0,74. However the typological description evokes slight doubts as the specimen is dated very late, comparing to the general time span characterizing that type i.e. the Early Roman Period; the other subtypes of type I after P. Kaczanowski lasted until the start of subphase C\textsubscript{1a} (Kaczanowski 1995, tabl. XX).
\textsuperscript{30} They are typical for group 6 of the Przeworsk culture weapon graves (Godłowski 1994, fig. 1: 45).
\textsuperscript{31} See footnote 14.
\textsuperscript{32} As refers to cultures of the West Balt circle it is dated to phases C\textsubscript{1a}-C\textsubscript{1b} (Madyda-Legutko 1987, p. 33, tab. 9).
A similar shield grip came from Onufryjewo, grave 291 (H. Jankuhn’s files; M. Schmiedehelm’s legacy, file 7.13e.205; Szymański 2005, p. 70-71). It appeared together with an iron brooch with a lyre-shaped chord type A.167 (1923), a knife and 3 amber beads (fig. 10: b). The grave furnishing should also be dated to phase C₂, probably its later stage, because of the shape of the shield grip,

Fig. 10. Examples of late shield grips from the Bogaczewo culture. a: Wyszembork, com. Mrągowo, grave 61 (Szymański 2005, pl. XXIV); b: Onufryjewo, com. Ruciane Nida, grave 291 (the heritage of H. Jankuhn; courtesy of the Archäologisches Landesmuseum Schloß Gottorf in Schleswig).

It is worth to notice that probably the specimen was repaired, what is proved by appearance of two rivet-holes on one of the rivet-plates.
the fact that such fibulas appeared during the Late Roman Period and additionally because of the appearance of amber beads. Analogical shield grip was found in grave 260 from Miętkie, com. Dźwierzytę (former: Mingfen, Kr. Ortielsburg), unfortunately only with a nail (H. Jankuhn’s files), so its chronology cannot be set precisely. Therefore, the shield fittings presented above don’t change the fact that late weapon forms are exceptional in the Bogaczewo culture.

Concluding one should say that examples of late weapons in the Bogaczewo culture are unique; so far we can enumerate only a few specimens and there are almost no artifacts dated later than phase C_{1b} (table 1). The question appears: is this a result of a general impoverishment of a burial rite and a grave furnishing? It has been noticed that a grave furnishing became poor during the Younger and the Late Roman Period not only in the Przeworsk culture (Szydłowski 1977, p. 76; Godłowski 1985, p. 91; Błażejewski 1998, p. 111) but also in the Bogaczewo one (Nowakowski 1995, p. 19-20; Szymański 2005, p. 105). Comparing it with the Przeworsk culture case it is clear that in the latter one, a general impoverishment of burial rite didn’t exclude weapons from grave furnishing. They were still quite numerous from phase C_{2} on, although frequently they appeared only symbolically, as single specimens (or fragments of them) not the whole sets (Kontny 2002, p. 127-128). The only elements that almost ultimately evaporated were spurs (Kontny 2001, p. 102-104, diagram 10). Therefore it seems equivocal to explain the rarity of weapons in that way. Moreover the impoverishment mentioned above was not the overwhelming rule, as graves characterized by relatively rich equipment still appeared in the Bogaczewo culture as late as phase C_{3} e.g. Wyssembork, grave 201a, grave 201c or grave 191a-b (remarks concerning the chronology of those graves: Szymański 2005, p. 106). It should be underlined that weapons are invariably frequent in the neighboring cultures of the West Baltic circle during the Younger and the Late Roman Period. Despite reduction in number of specimens in a grave furnishing, weapon graves are well documented in the Dollkeim-Kovrovo culture at least to phase D (Nowakowski 1996, p. 58). Also in the Sudovian culture there are a lot of graves with an armament from phases C_{3}-D from cemeteries at Netta, com. Augustów, Osowa, com. Suwałki, Szwajcaria, com. Suwałki, Żywa Woda, com. Jeleniewo (Kontny 2007b; see: Bitner-Wróblewska 2007b, p. 114).

---

35 See footnote 15.
36 As refers to shield elements, P. Iwanicki included to the Bogaczewo culture materials also the hemispherical shield boss from grave 79 at Netta, com. Augustów (Iwanicki 2007, p. 149). In my opinion, however, the attribution is not so obvious. The grave is dated quite lately, to phase C_{5} (Bitner-Wróblewska 2007a, p. 25-26, pl. XXXVII-XL), although one may suggest even earlier dating, to subphase C_{4} (a bronze crossbow tendril brooch with a false spring and a knee-shaped bow appeared here – see: Nowakowski 2001b, p. 133). Therefore it seems to be too late to be joined univocally with the Bogaczewo culture. It is generally accepted that starting from subphase C_{5a} we have to do with the Sudovian culture (Nowakowski 1995, p. 77), although such a view could change with further researches taking into consideration archival data. One should mention here A. Bitner-Wróblewska, who underlines that despite the Bogaczewo culture influences clearly visible in the materials from Netta, its local features are well apparent. She enumerates i.a. rectangular grave pits (Bitner-Wróblewska 2007a, p. 116), and it was also the shape of grave 79 mentioned above (Bitner-Wróblewska 2007a, p. XXXVII). Moreover stone structures documented in that case find analogies in Suwałki area (Bitner-Wróblewska 2007a, p. 103). Concluding, so far there are no grounds to treat grave 79 as the Bogaczewo culture one, especially if we take into consideration fact that P. Iwanicki didn’t accounted for his controversial thesis.

37 The grave equipment embraced: beads, a clay vessel and two cross-bow fibulas incl. one with a full catch-plate (Szymański 2001, pl. XLIV).
38 In grave there were found: a fibula type A.168 with a knee shaped bow, 3 clay vessels, a knife, 2 beads, a fragment of an ornamented bone item (Szymański 2001, pl. XLV).
39 Several glass beads, different belt fittings, a fibula A.172 and clay vessels were found here (Szymański 2001, pl. XXXIX-XL).
As refers to the Bogaczewo culture, in my opinion, at the moment it seems most probable that the custom of putting weapons into graves was abandoned or at least significantly limited before the end of the culture itself. Later on, the phenomenon touched the Sudovian culture but here it was strictly connected with a general pauperization of a grave equipment. How then to explain the excluding the armament from grave furnishing in the case of the Bogaczewo culture? One cannot exclude the possibility that it was a result of influences from the Wielbark culture, where a custom of putting weapons into graves hadn’t been practiced. It should also be noticed that the contact zone between the Bogaczewo culture and the Wielbark culture became longer after replacing the Przeworsk culture in its east zone by the Wielbark culture during the Younger Roman Period. Together with almost entire evaporating of the border zone between the Bogaczewo and the Wielbark cultures in the Pasłęka basin (Andrzejowski, Cieśliński 2007, p. 281-282) it had an impact on better prospects for the ideas exchange, cutting it out from the Przeworsk culture influences (see: Bitner-Wróblewska 1989, p. 165; Nowakowski 1989, p. 151). It is documented e.g. by the appearance of bronze buckles and cross-bow tendril brooches ornamented with coils of a notched wire typical for the Wielbark culture (Nowakowski 1989, p. 151, 153). Some scholars even claim that we have to do with the stylistic community joining both cultures (Andrzejowski, Cieśliński 2007, p. 305). If really so, why couldn’t it concern also a burial rite, namely an absence of weapons? Such supposition has already appeared in the archaeological literature but referring to the Sudovian culture during its late stage, so called “Prudzisiki phase” (Bitner-Wróblewska 2005). A. Bitner-Wróblewska assumed that such trait of the funerary ritual was adopted by the Sudovian culture through the Olsztyn group (Bitner-Wróblewska 2005, p. 38-40). It has been questioned lately (Szymański 2006, p. 375-376) because of chronological reasons: weaponry had disappeared from the Sudovian culture graves earlier than the Olsztyn group emerged. Nevertheless “Gothic” influences on the Sudovian culture are not denied utterly as they quite reasonably explain the lack of weapons in Gołdapa region (Szymański 2006, p. 375) linked with the Sudovian culture but showing many Bogaczewo culture traits. Can we employ the same explanation in the case of the Bogaczewo culture itself? Such supposition seems the most plausible, but so far problem cannot be solved ultimately and it demands further studies...
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40 The process of the Bogaczewo culture’s atrophy is still the subject of discussion e.g. W. Nowakowski (2000, p. 170-171) versus A. Bitner-Wróblewska (2000; 2007b).
41 The problem of contacts between both cultural units has been already discussed (Bitner-Wróblewska 1989; Nowakowski 1989; Andrzejowski, Cieśliński 2007) however without touching the problem of weaponry.
The latest weapons in the Bogaczewo culture