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Abstract

Several different cultural traditions stand out in Long Barrow Culture. Some of them are characteristic of the Baltic Finno-Ugrians, others of the Balts and Slavs. The aim of this work is to distinguish all these mentioned traditions that are manifested in warrior horsemanship’s accoutrements and riding gear of the fifth to seventh centuries. From the armament point of view, both Slavic tribes and the inhabitants of the Byelorussian and western Russian forest belt, whose ethnocultural affiliation remains disputed (Balts, Slavs, Balto-Slavs, Finno-Balts, Finno-Ugrians?), comprise an integral continuum from the River Danube to Lake Ladoga. The work also discusses the migrational processes that affected people in the forest belt in the fifth and sixth centuries.
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The main characteristics of Long Barrow Culture

Long Barrow Culture encompasses a huge territory in Eastern Europe’s forest belt, starting from southeastern Estonia and ending with the upper River Volga basin (Fig. 1) (Sedov 1995, Fig. 60). Its formation is associated with the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries. The chronological Lindora-Polibino horizon (Kargopol’tsev 1994, 1996), with its characteristic non-fortified settlements, barrows and flat burial grounds, is distinguished during this time period. Long Barrow Culture sites comprise several territorial groups: 1 southwestern Estonia, west of Lake Pskov/Peipus (Fig. 2A); 2 east of Lake Chudskoe/Pskov/Peipus, up to the River Luga basin (Fig. 2B); 3 the upper reaches of the Velikaya, Western Dvina/Daugava and Lovat Rivers (Fig. 2C); 4 from the Lovat to the Msta and Mologa river basins (Fig. 2D) (Sedov 1974, Table 1, 1995, Fig. 60).

It is generally acknowledged that Long Barrow Culture, with its essentially heterogeneous origin, is a synthesis of local and foreign elements (Sedov 1995, p.216; Beletskii 1996, pp.37-43; Burov 1996; 1996a; Konetskii 1997; Kazanski 1999c, p.130; Lopatin 2006). It is possible that the local inhabitants of the Roman Period who left the Zaozer’e type sites (Verkhnee Podneprovie 2002) were the main shaping component of Long Barrow Culture. South of Long Barrow Culture territory, in the upper reaches of the Dnieper and the Western Dvina/Daugava basin, the very similar Tushemya-Bantserovshchina Culture appeared at the same time (Lopatin, Furas’ev 1995; Lopatin 2006; Shchukin et al. 2006, pp.55-60).

Researchers distinguish several different cultural traditions in Long Barrow Culture: Baltic Finno-Ugrian, especially distinct in southeastern Estonia (Aun 1980, 1992; Kazanski 1999c, p.135), Baltic (Sedov 1995, p.216; Kazanski 1999b; Kazanski 1999c, p.133ff.), and Slavic (Sedov 1980; Kazanski 1999c, p.133). The aim of this work is to distinguish all these Long Barrow Culture traditions that are manifested in the warrior horseman’s accoutrements and riding gear in the fifth to seventh centuries.

Armaments of Long Barrow Culture

Weapons are rarely found in long barrows (Fig. 3; Appendix) and we cannot be certain that the artefacts we have at this time objectively reflect this culture’s true armaments. Usually large armament counts find their way into the hands of archaeologists when the weapon points to establish the chronology of certain finds. Because of the general chronology, it is not possible to accurately date the horse bridles from the Ust’-Smolka barrow field’s barrow 3 and Grishin-2 barrow field’s barrow 2 (Lopatin 2004, Figs. 3.1, 4), nor the narrow-bladed, blunt-ended or so-called Central Russian-type axes (Kazakevičius 1988, pp.78-81) found in the Long Barrow Culture zone, the Ust’-Belaya, Koloda and Kriukov settlements, as well as the Pleso and Stepanov barrows (Elena Mikhailova, personal communication). I take this opportunity to thank my colleagues Elena Mikhailova, Sergej Kargopol’tsev, and Yuri Lesman for their information and the opportunity to get acquainted with their yet unpublished works.
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Fig. 1. Long Barrow Culture territory, fifth to seventh centuries (after Sedov 1995).

Fig. 2. Diffusion of early sites of Long Barrow Culture (Lindora-Polibino horizon) (after Kargopo’tsev 1994, supplemented by the author).
ons are widely distributed as a grave good or sacrificial element (ie the Scandinavian bog finds, the mighty shrines of the La Tène epoch). However, neither one nor the other element occurs in Long Barrow Culture. Moreover, published material on Long Barrow Culture is very fragmentary, since the main focus in Russian archaeology during Soviet times was placed on synthesis-based publications, on works that generalized research results, and not the publication of the actual research material.

Nonetheless, we can now draw several general conclusions concerning Long Barrow Culture. The main armament complex of this culture was comprised of a spear, a javelin, arrows, and axes. The horseman’s accoutrements consisted of spurs, and the horse’s gear of girth buckles, bridle bits and bridle mountings. Shields with metal shield bosses and maille (chainmail) fragments are infrequently encountered. Such a collection of armaments is very reminiscent of the neighbouring forest belt cultures such as Tushemiya-Bantsersovshchina, D’iakovo, and Moshchininskaya, as well as of the Slavic Prague, Kolochin, and Penkovka cultures’ armaments of the fifth to seventh centuries (Kazanski 1999).

Unlike their western neighbours, ie, the East and West Balts, as well as the Baltic area’s and Finland’s Finno-Ugrians, the “forest belt” tribes in Russia and Byelorussia did not have swords, shields with metal shield bosses, or battle daggers (seax). At the same time, Long Barrow Culture armament is distinguished from that of the Finno-Ugrians and from the world of the Volga and Urals further east in that it had spurs, but did not have socketed axes. Essentially, from the viewpoint of armaments, both the Slavic tribes and the inhabitants of Byelorussia’s and western Russia’s forest belt, whose ethnocultural affiliation is disputed (Balts, Slavs, Balto-Slavs, Finno-Balts, Finno-Ugrians?), comprised an integral area between the River Danube and Lake Ladoga in the fifth to seventh centuries.

In speaking of Long Barrow Culture, it can be asserted that in the armaments and horse riding gear of its members, as in other elements of its culture, several heterogeneous components stand out. The first of these is characteristic of all of Eastern Europe’s forest belt cultures. These are the characteristic socketed spearheads with barbs (Fig. 4), found in the flat burial ground of Iur’evskaya Gorka (Fig. 4.2; Appendix, 4) and barrow 9 of the Suure-Rysna barrow field (Fig. 4.1; Appendix,
9). Javelins with this type of spearhead spread among the Finno-Ugrians living in the forest belt, and in a rather broad territory extending from the middle of the Volga up to Finland and Estonia in the period of Roman influence and the beginning of the Middle Ages (ie, in the fifth to seventh centuries) (Rozenfel’d 1982, pp.128-134; Kargopol’tsev 1999, Fig. 1). Javelins with socketed and barbed spearheads are found in D’iakovo Culture sites (Fig. 4.5), known in Finno-Ugric sites of the Volga and Oka basin (Fig. 4.3, 4, 6-8), and found in the stone grave cemeteries in Estonia (tarand type sites), for example in Lihula (Mandel 1976), and in the stone-covered barrows in Finland (Kivistoki 1973, Abb. 304, 548).

Socketed spearheads with barbs are found in Lithuania, especially in East Lithuania, at the beginning of the Middle Ages, but are found much less frequently in Latvia and in the territories in which the West Balts lived (Kazakevičius 1988, p.55ff). This weapon is well known in Scandinavia in the period of Roman influence, where it held out at least until the D period, ie, until the Migration period. This provision is confirmed by the Evebø or Kvasheim finds (Ilkjaer 1990, pp.183-255, 308, Abb. 195). Such spears also occur in Tushemlya Culture, related to Long Barrow Culture, in the upper reaches of the Dnieper River basin (Shmidt 1995, Fig. 1.3). Occasionally, socketed spearheads with barbs are found in the Slavic Prague and Kolochin cultures (Kazanski 1999, Fig. 1.7, 8). Still, these javelins with socketed, barbed spearheads are more characteristic of the northern part of Europe.

Another type of armament very characteristic of the forest belt is the socketed spearhead with a pronounced midrib (type 1G according to Kazakevičius). One such spearhead was found in the Long Barrow Culture zone in the River Luga basin near Lake Samro in the Doložskii pogost barrow field, in barrow 45 (Fig. 5.1; Appendix, 1). Kazakevičius noted that such spearheads were widespread in East Prussia, Lithuania, Latvia and Finland, as well as among the middle Volga Finno-Ugrians (Kazakevičius 1988, p.29ff.). Socketed spearheads with pronounced midribs are also encountered in northeast Estonia, as well as in the Oka river basin (Kazanski 2000a, p.204), and in the region between the Oka and the Volga, where they are found in the fortified Sarskoe settlement (Leont’ev 1996, Fig. 34.8). It should be noted that similar spearheads with pronounced midribs are not found among the Slavic site material of the fifth to seventh centuries, where lanceolate spearheads dominate.

Rectangular iron girth buckles comprise yet another type of gear that is widespread throughout the entire forest belt. Judging from the inventory of the grave found in Puiga, rectangular buckles in the Long Barrow Culture context are encountered in the fifth to seventh centuries (Fig. 6.6; Appendix, 7). Numerous buckles were encountered in the following Long Barrow Culture cemeteries: Vargany barrow 2 (Shytikhau 1992, Fig. 23.3), Gurki barrow 2 (Sedov 1974, Table 24.25), Pagadzitsa barrow 2 (Shytikhau 1992, Fig. 24.3), Lipetsy barrow 7 (Alekseandrov 1982, Fig. 3.3), Ust’-Belaya barrow 1 (Kargaropol’tsev 1994, Figs. 9.5, 12, 14).
parallels of these buckles are known in the entire forest belt, including among central Russia’s Finno-Ugrians (Fig. 6.4, 5), the West Balts (Kulakov 2003, Fig. 132.3k), and further south, among the Slavs (Kazanski 1999, p.203). Sometimes the segments of these bridle bits are widened and bent into small rings (Fig. 6.1, 3). Similar bridle bits are known from Tushemlya Culture’s Demidovka (Shmidt 1989, Fig. 6) and Bliznaki hill-forts (Shmidt 1976, Fig. 44.18), the Katkuškės barrows in Lithuania (Kulikauskas, Kulikauskienė, Tautavičius 1961, Fig. 204.1), and the early Slav sites of Kolochin and Pen’kovka cultures (Kazanski 1999, Figs. 3.7, 17).

Similar bridle bits are also encountered in Western Europe in Merovingian times, for example, in Aldingen cemetery grave 14 (Schach-Dörges 2004, Abb. 43.6), in the riding horse’s burial in the Bruchsal cemetery, discovered in 1913 (Oexle 1992, Taf. 7.22.1), in the riding horse’s burial in the Pleidelsheim cemetery discovered in 1964 (Koch 2001, Taf. 2B), and in the Runde-Berg-Urach hill-fort (Quast 2006, Taf. 11.28).

Judging by the mentioned Alemannic analogues, such broadened and bent bridle bit segment terminals were allotted for inserting straight curbs. Bridle bits with straight curbs spread in Europe due to Roman influence (Kazanski 1999a, p.302). In the same way, bridle bits with broadened, looped ends and ringed terminals (Fig. 6.11), for example, are known from the Slavic Semenki settlement in the southern Bug (Kazanski 1999, Fig. 3.17).

Axes are also common finds in all the forest belt cultures of the fifth to seventh centuries. Unfortunately, axes in Long Barrow Culture sites that truly belong to the fifth to seventh centuries (Iur’evskaya Gorka, Loozi, Fig. 6.12, 13; Appendix, 5, 6) are preserved only very fragmentarily and their typology is unclear. It is possible that they are narrow-bladed axes, widespread in Eastern Europe (Moora 1938, pp.485-498; Kazakevičius 1988, pp.76ff.; Kazanski 1994, p.456ff.; Malonaitis 2005).
A “southern” component is clearly distinguished in the Long Barrow Culture warrior’s accoutrements and horseman’s riding gear. Its appearance is most likely associated with the movement of some kind of Slavic groups into Eastern Europe’s forest belt. Actually, the Slavs are the only East European “forest belt” ethnic group that undoubtedly actively participated in the military operations of the late Migration Period in southern Europe, in the lower Danube region, the Balkans, and Italy. They were also the only forest belt people whose contacts with nomads of the steppes were recorded in sixth-century written sources. These contacts were reflected, for example, in Slavic armaments (Kazanski 1999).

The existence of Slavs in the sites of the Long Barrow Culture belt is clearly shown in the material of the Iur’evskaya Gorka settlement, while things typical of Finno-Ugrians and Balts occur among the ornaments. In general, the site reflects both autochthonic local forest belt inhabitant features (Long Barrow Culture) as well as the heritage of some kind of foreign groups, most likely of Slavs (Islanova 1997, pp.21-55). It must be stressed that “purely” Slavic finds in forest belt sites have not been encountered; they are found in sites where local forest belt culture artefacts are encountered in abundance. Ceramics characteristic of Long Barrow Culture dominate in the mentioned Iur’evskaya Gorka settlement, while things typical of Finno-Ugrians and Balts occur among the ornaments. In general, the site reflects both autochthonic local forest belt inhabitant features (Long Barrow Culture) as well as the heritage of some kind of foreign groups, most likely of Slavs (Islanova 1997, pp.21-55).

Aside from the modelled ceramics resembling the Prague type in the Iur’evskaya Gorka settlement, pottery was also found in the Mikhailovskoe, Volodi, Zherebiatino long barrows (Sedov 1980, p.7). Moreover, researchers treat the cremation tradition of cleaning out the cremated bones from the burial fire’s remnants as typical of the Slavs (Sedov 1980, p.6f.). Finally, certain female Long Barrow Culture ornaments could also be of Slavic origin. For example, triangular metal plates (appliqué), known by the small stone moulds...
used in their production, have been found in southeastern Estonia, one such mould being from the Loosi barrow field’s barrows (Sedov 1974, Table 27.2). Judging from the stone moulds found here, similar metal plates were produced in the Prague Culture’s Bernashevka settlement near the Dniester (Vinokur 1977, Figs. 22, 23 and 45).

The “southern” influence on riding horse gear is also evidenced by the snaffle harness buckle found on the eastern shores of Lake Chudskoe/Peipus, in the Zalakhov’e barrow field long barrow 154/10 (Fig. 6.9; Appendix, 10) (Khvoshchinskaya 2004, Table 3.3). Similar buckles have parallels with those in Hun burials in Zdvizhenskoe (Vozdvizhenskaya) Stavropol country (Fig. 6.10), and somewhat less correlations with those in the lower Kurnaevka Volga (Zasetskaya 1994, Tables 11.8, 30.3). In both cases, only separate burials were found. Similar snaffle buckles additionally were encountered in Kabarda-Balkaria, in the Zaragizh cemetery grave 118, dated to the fifth century (Or des princes barbares 2000: N° 26, 11), and in the central Danube, in the famous Untersiebenbrunn grave of the first half of the fifth century (Or des princes barbares 2000, 9 N° 9, 24). As shown by the mould used for the production of snaffle buckles found in the Berhashevka settlement in the upper Dniester, very similar buckles existed among the Prague Culture Slavs (Vinokur 1997, Fig. 16). As Khvoshchinskaya indicated, analogues for such buckles also existed later in the steppe cultures, in the eighth and ninth centuries (Khvoshchinskaya 2004, p.26). Archaic modelled ceramics from the Zalakhov’e cemetery’s mould (Khvoshchinskaya 2004, Table 3.5, 6) speak of an earlier date. On the other hand, a reliable Long Barrow Culture modelled ceramics chronology has not yet been prepared.

A maille fragment (Fig. 6.7; Appendix, 5) found in the Iur’evskaya Gorka settlement can also be ascribed to the “southern” origin of things (Islanova 1997, Fig. 78.2). Maille remains have been found in the fifth to seventh-centuries Penkovka and Kolochin Culture material (Igren’-Podkova 1 settlement; Lebiazh’e cemetery) (Kazanski 1999, p.204). Maille fragments were encountered among the Volga Finno-Ugrians in Armievo-type cemeteries (Polesslerkikh 1968, p. 206, 207). Further east, maille has been recorded in armaments and gear near the River Kama (Gening 1995, Abb. 28.1; Ostania 1997, Figs. 31.12; 78.18). Maille is also found among the steppe Huns (grave of Voskhod: Zasetskaya 1994, pp. 39 and 40). During the Migration Period and in the Early Middle Ages, (helmet) maille was encountered in the central Danube in the graves of Gepidic chiefs (Bona 1976, Fig. 22), while small fragments were found in soldiers’ graves (Bona, Nagy 2002, Taf. 32. Grab 24.4, Taf. 35. Grab 49.2; Nagy, Szöreg-Téglagyár 2005, Taf. 60. Grab 74.3, Taf. 61. Grab 79.4).

Maille is well known in the Scandinavian world. As an example, we present the maille found among the bog artefacts in Scandinavia (Arwidsson 1939, Fig. 2; Raddatz 1987, Taf. 94) or the armour and helmet found in the Vendel Period (Arwidsson 1939, Plates 3 and 4; 1954, Taf. 1, 6). In Merovingian Culture, maille fragments are found in both men’s and women’s graves. The finds from Planig (Kessler 1940, Abb. 9.2), Straubing-Bajuvarenstrasse I grave 470 (Geisler 1998, Taf. 161.8, 9), Pleidelsheim grave 115 (Koch 2001, Taf. 46.3), Breny grave 614 (Kazanski 2002, Plate 5.7), Donzdorf grave 79 (Neuffer 1972, Taf. 25B. 9-13) and Deersheim grave 29 (Schneider 1983, Abb. 97.12) must be mentioned. Maille has not been found among the Balts nor the Baltic Finno-Ugrians, thus we cannot as yet claim that this element of armament from the West could have reached Eastern Europe’s forest belt sites.

Other elements of the warrior and horseman’s accoutrements of the fifth to seventh centuries, as well as riding horse gear found in Long Barrow Culture zone,
are undoubtedly of “western” origin; they are primarily found in the material of the East and West Balts.

The spurs discovered in Long Barrow Culture belt sites are clearly of Baltic origin. I remind the reader that in the Early Middle Ages, spurs are characteristic of Western and Eastern Europe. In Eastern Europe, the Baltic and Slavic cultures comprised the eastern diffusion territory’s periphery of this element of a horseman’s accoutrements. There are barely any spurs among the Central Russian Finno-Ugric peoples and the steppe nomads. The most widespread spurs with two fastener hooks are characteristic of the world of the Balts and Slavs (Perkhavko 1978). Spurs are also well known in the Roman-Germanic West (Rettner 1997; Schlemmer 2004). Spurs with hooks in the eastern part of the barbaricum already existed in Roman times. At that time they were known both in Eastern Europe’s forest belt and more to the south, in Chernyakhov Culture (Perkhavko 1978, p.122; Kazanski 1994, pp.434 and 435).

A spur with a flat cross-section base and the ends bent outward was discovered in the Dorohi barrow field, in barrow 4, grave 1 (Fig. 7.1; Appendix, 3). This spur belongs to the Perkhavo V-a type with a slightly curved base. Parallels with this type are known in Baltic cultures, of which can be mentioned Minghen grave 1 (Gaert 1929, Abb. 243:d), the isolated spur found in Sauginiai (Fig. 7.3) (Merkevičius 1984, p.21, Fig. 2), and the spur found in the Saukas muiza cemetery (Fig. 7.2) (Moora 1929, Taf. 32.6; Latvijas PSR Arheoloģija 1974, Plate 31.3). The kind of spur found in the Kentskalns fortified settlement (Stubavs 1976, Table 11.11) also speaks of their diffusion among certain Baltic Finno-Ugrian groups1. On the other hand, similar spurs are found further east in Tushmelya culture sites, for example Nikidimovo (Sedin 1992, Fig. 2.3, 4), Nekasets (Perkhavko 1978, p.122), and Goro-dishche (Mitrofanov 1978, Fig. 54.6; Zviaruga 2005, Fig. 61.18).

Among the Slavs, spurs with ends bent outward spread in Kolochin Culture, ie, in the northern Slavic diffusion periphery: Taimanova, Chaplin (Perkhavko 1978, p.122; Kazanski 1999, II.14). Among representatives of both the Slavs and Tushmelya Culture, whose ethnic affiliation is unclear (Balts? Slavs? Balto-Slavs?) (Kazanski 1999c, p.125ff.; Shchukin et al. 2006, p.57), most likely these spurs spread as a consequence of contact with West and East Balts. I know of two indisputable metal shield bosses belonging to the Migration Period in the forest belt east of the Baltic. One of them was found in the Dolozhskii pogost barrow field in barrow 45, in Long Barrow Culture territory (Fig. 5.2; Appendix, 1), the other near the River Moskva in the Djakovo-type Lukovnia hill-fort (Akhmedov, Kazanski 2004, Fig. 5.8).

The shield boss from Dolozhskii pogost has narrow edges and a cylindrical rise ending in a conical top with an expressive protuberance. By these features, it can be ascribed to the Liebenau-type (Zieling E2) (Kazanski 1994, pp.445, 446). In the Migration Period, this shield boss type was widely used both by Germanic and the Roman armies. The Liebenau-type shield boss is found along the southern and eastern shores of the Baltic rather rarely (Kazanski 1987, Annexe 4). The finds from Glowiss/Glowyćze in Pomerania (Machowski 1992, Fig. 3.8), Stragus in West Lithuania (Kazakevičius 1988, Fig. 48.4), and Lääne-Nigula Kirimäe in West Estonia (Tallgren 1925, Abb. 20; 21) can be mentioned. Slightly more shield bosses are in southwest Finland, where they appeared in the fifth century (Pihlman 1990, pp.296 and 297, Bild. 21.6, 25; Kazanski 1987, Annexe 4, n°, 32-40). Several Liebenau-type shield bosses ascribed to the Migration Period were recently discovered in the central Danube (Ivišević et al. 2006, p.42).

As previously mentioned (Kazanski 1991), the “pearl” decor on the edge of the Dolozhskii pogost shield boss (Fig. 5.2) has analogues with almost exclusively Baltic shield bosses from Lithuania and Byelorussia. The shield bosses from Tchernaya Luzha, Grigiškės, Kriskštonys, Taurapilis, Pamūšis, Vyžiai barrow cemeteries (Kazanski 1991, Figs. 4-6; 1999, p.409; 2000a, p.204; Kargopol’tsev, Shchukin 2002, Fig. 6; 2006, Fig. 8), Zasvir’, and Karobki (Zviaruga 2005, Figs. 30.2 and 44.2) can be mentioned as examples. Thus, the mentioned shield boss from Dolozhskii pogost has long been ascribed as Baltic (Kazanski 1991). The decor mentioned is of visibly Germanic origin, since its “prototypes” from the period of Roman influence are affixed on shield bosses of Scandinavian bog finds (Raddatz 1987, Taf. 22.5, 79). Nonetheless, this decor did not visibly become established in Scandinavia, at least I know nothing of them during the Migration Period.

In speaking of “western” riding horse bridle elements, it is imperative to mention riding bits with a three-jointed mouthpiece. They were discovered in the Iur’evskaya Gorka settlement (Appendix 5) and Dolozhskii pogost
hill-fort 45 (Fig. 5.3; Appendix 1). Similar bridle bits were also discovered in the Tushemlya-type hill-forts in Bliznaki in the upper Dnieper, in the Smolensk region (Shmidt 1995, Fig. 1.22), and at Demidovka (Shmidt 1989, Fig. 6). This riding bit is treated as a Baltic one (Kargopo’tsev 1994, p.76). The Balts already truly knew of riding bits with a three-jointed mouthpiece in the period of Roman influence; such riding bits were widespread in the Migration Period (Kazanski 1999, p.410). Bridle bits reached Gotland, Sweden (northern Sweden), and Finland in the fifth to sixth centuries. Bridle bits with a three-jointed mouthpiece have been discovered in several graves of the Migration Period in Finland (eg. Maalahti-Junkbrännan, Kaaria-Ristimäki; Hackman 1905, Abb. 15.2; Kivikoski 1973, Taf. 42.387, 70.632). Nevertheless, their chronology could be broader than the Migration Period, since such bridle bits are associated with the last quarter of the sixth century in the Alemannic Klepsau burial site (Koch 1999, pp.189-191, Abb. 11a). In Karelia, riding bits with a three-jointed mouthpiece are found even later, in Viking times (Kazanski 1999, p.410). Cruciform bridle mountings were discovered in barrow 25 of the Shikhino cemetery (Fig. 8.7; Appendix, 8) and by the upper River Mologa (Mal’m, Fekhner 1969, Fig. 6.6). Similar mountings are also known from the period of Roman influence as well as the Migration Period in the Baltic material of Prussia, Lithuania and the Suwalki region (Fig. 8.5). Examples are the finds from the Szwajcaria barrow field barrows 2 and 32 (Antoniewicz et al. 1958, pl. 9.a; Antoniewicz 1963, Fig.1.i), Althof-Insterburg cemetery grave 135 (Gronau 1939, Taf. 7; Nowakowski 1996, Taf. 104), Greibau cemetery grave 207 (Nowakowski 1996, Taf. 60.4), Adlig Heydekrug cemetery (Nowakowski, Banytė-Rowell 2001, Fig. 3a), and Žviliai cemetery grave 47 (Vaitkunskienė 1989, Fig. 7).

Cruciform mountings are less frequently found among the Baltic Finno-Ugrians in Latvian and Estonian territory. They are known to me from Mantas-Kalna (Mantas-Kalning, Jēkabpils district) (Aspelin 1884, p.344, Fig. 1872) and from Kohtla-Jarve, tarand 2 (Shmidtkehl’ 1955, Fig. 33.4). Discussion in this case would probably concern the Baltic elements’ penetration into Finno-Ugric culture.

In the mentioned barrow 25 of the Shikhino barrow field, a horse comb (Fig. 8.4; Appendix, 8), or, in the opinion of Lithuanian colleagues, an instrument to work wood (Kazakevičius 1993, pp.71 and 72, fig. 126) was found. Such accessories are known in Russia’s forest belt (Kliuchnikova, Matveeva 1985, Fig. 14); however, in my opinion, they could not occur in a burial context. Nevertheless, these “combs” have analogues with Baltic graves in the period of Roman influence and the Migration Period (Fig. 7.1–3). For example, they were discovered in Prussia, in the Eisliethen cemetery, grave 17 (Nowakowski 1996, Taf. 53.13); in the Hūbenberg/Gora Velikanov cemetery, grave 11 (Tiurin 2006, Fig. 2.5), grave 144 (Kulakov 1994, Fig. 2.6.11), and grave 260 (Kulakov, Tiurin 2005, Fig. 9.10); in Kleinhede in grave 8c (Kulakov, Skvortslov 2000, Fig. 2.4); in Lithuania in the Lazdijai region in Rudamina (Antoniewicz 1920, Table 6.4); Plinkagailis grave 232 (Kazakevičius 1993, p.57, Fig. 4.), and Veršvai (Rozenfel’d 1982, Fig. 35.14); and in Latvia in Mazkatuži/Rucava (Latvijas PSR Arheoloģija 1974, Plate 27.9). Not counting Russian forest belt sites, beyond the boundaries of the Baltic world, such an artefact is also known to me from Finland (Köyliö-Kjuloholm; Kivikoski 1973, Taf. 69.622).
It is probable that a considerable part of “Western” armament reached the Russian forest belt together with émigrés from western and Eastern Baltic territory (Kazanski 1999). The artefacts from the Dolozhskii pogost (Fig. 5.1-3) and Shikhino (Fig. 8.4, 7) burials are informative in this regard. The armament collection from Dolozhskii pogost’s barrow 45 – a spearhead, shield boss with characteristic “Baltic” decor (a pearl decor on the umbo’s border), and a bridle bit – is identical to the ones found in Suwałki group barrows in the period of Roman influence (Osowa’s barrows 41 and 71, Szwajcaria’s barrow 2). Such burial complexes are also rarely found beyond the borders of the Baltic world (Kazanski 1999, p.411; 2000a, p.205).

The riding horse gear found in barrow 25 in the Shikhino barrow field is characteristic of the western Balts from the Sambian peninsula and Suwałki region. It could be said that these two burials are most likely associated with émigrés from a Western Baltic environment. It should be noted that warrior elite burials clearly begin to distinguish themselves in the Western and Eastern Baltic burial traditions precisely during the Migration Period (Vaikūnškienė 1995; 2003; Kulakov and Eastern Baltic burial traditions). Such burial complexes are also rarely found beyond the borders of the Baltic world.

The relationship of Long Barrow Culture with the Baltic circle cultures

Long Barrow Culture’s relation with Baltic material, ie, with the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture, has been accentuated more than once. In both cases, a lengthened form of the barrow’s mound is seen, and remains from the cremation’s fire at the base of the barrow are observed (Tautavičius 1959, pp.144 and 145; 1980; Konetskii 1997, p.221). Sedov also drew attention to the similarity of certain long barrows to the burials of the Suwałki group. Stone constructions have been discovered in the long barrows of Severik, Lositys, Loozi, Verepkovo and Vybusty (Sedov 1995, p.216). Similar stone constructions have also been discovered in barrows with cremations in Suwałki Culture (Jaskanis, Okulicz 1981, p.241; Sedov 1987, p.415). Finally, Sedov discovered the remains of cremated humans and riding horse bones in the Lindora, Zherbiatino and Shikhino barrows. In his opinion, the burial of the riding horse is also a Baltic custom, well known in Lithuania and the Suwałki region (Sedov 1974, p.25).

There are also Baltic elements in Long Barrow Culture’s women’s apparel. The spiral temple ornaments found in the Kazikha, Lezgi and Reppi barrows are traced to East Lithuania (Sedov 1995, pp.218-229). Beads strung into spiral temple ornaments were discovered in the Berezno, Rysna-Saare II and Berezyńce VI cemeteries (Aun 1992, Fig. 51.8, 9; Kuz’min 2003, Figs. 1.14, 2.1, 7). These ornaments are of eastern Germanic origin, since temple ornaments dated to the period of Roman influence were discovered in abundance in Wielbark and Chernyakhov Culture sites (Kazanski, Mastykova 2003, p.166). Such temple ornaments could have reached Long Barrow Culture representatives while making contact with the Western Balts, since such finds also occur in the Suwałki group’s Netta cemetery barrow 7 (Okulicz 1955, Table 38.1).

Baltic neck-rings with a saddle-shaped clasp were found in the Iur’evskaya Gorka settlement (Islanova 1997, Fig. 76.22) and in the Shikhino barrow field, in barrow 30 (Mal’m, Fekhner 1969, Fig. 4.2; Islanova 2006, fig. 101.B.3). Such neck-rings are rarely discovered in territories east of the Baltic. The neck-ring from Viazov-enka, Tushemlya Culture (Šmidt 1994, Fig. 5.5), and the cache from Uz’mina-Gorka, Gdov district, could be mentioned (Tallgren 1938, p.12, Abb. 15; Korzuhina 1954, Table 3). However, neck-rings with a saddle-shaped clasp are well known in territories inhabited by the Balts and Baltic Finno-Ugrians. This type of neck-ring, as evidenced by the one found in Plinkaigalis cemetery grave 45 in Lithuania (Kazakevičius 1993, pp.97 and 145; Figs. 1, 3), just as the Dollkeim-Kovrovo type Lithuanian variant pair of fibulae [in Lithuanian historiography, these fibulae are called crossbow fibulae with a cruciform foot – editor’s note], already existed in the sixth century (Kazakevičius 1993, p.111ff., Fig. 179; Bitner-Wróblewska 2001, p.48ff.).

In the southeastern Baltic, these fibulae are dated to the E period, ie, the sixth and seventh centuries. However, in Alt-Kossewew/Kosewo⁵, in a cemetery of the Olsztyn group, such a fibula was discovered in burial 308 together with a buckle in the shape of an eagle’s head, characteristic of the second quarter of the sixth century and typical of the Gepids (Kulakov 1989, Fig. 20.3). Other similar neck-rings found are usually dated to the seventh or eighth centuries, although a substantiated argumentation is lacking for such dating, as, for example, for the neck-ring from Srečdžius (Urbanavičius 1987) or the caches in Latvian territory (Urtāns 1977, Nº 30, Fig. 62.3; Nº 33, Fig. 65.1; Nº 34, Fig. 66.3; Nº 35, att. 67.1,2,4,5). The neck-ring with a saddle-shaped clasp found in the Sudata-I barrow field, in barrow 5 (Kaczyński 1963, Fig. 9), belonging to the Suwałki

---

⁵ This site is currently in Polish territory. In Polish and Russian archaeology, two names are used for sites from Prussian territory that fell into Russia’s composition: the old German name and the new Russian name, since this greatly eases work with prewar publications. However, for reasons I cannot understand, in some Polish works only Polish names are used for Prussian sites in Polish territory. In this work, when it is possible, I shall try to present both the German and the Polish names of sites in Polish territory.
Culture group (Sudovian Culture variant), also needs to be mentioned; a shield boss from a rather early period was also discovered here.

Small bells [bells from a bronze sheet, a decorative element of east Baltic women, usually terminated with variously ornamented chains – editor’s Note] with broad edges were found in the Arniko barrow (Sedov 1974, Table 23.35) and in the Rysna-Saare barrow field’s barrow 1 (Aun 1992, Fig. 51.1-6), as well as in Zapoł’e-1 (Platonova 1996, p.11). Such little bells are well known in the Baltic Early Middle Ages context (Zasvir’: Zviaruga 2005, Fig. 31.11; Laizānu: Latvijas PSR Arheoloģija 1974, 84 Fig.; Sedov 1987, Table 106.20; Kivi: Latvijas PSR Arheoloģija 1974, Plate 42.22; Grigishiš barrow 4: Kuncienė 1983, Fig. 10; Sudata first barrowfield barrow 10: Kaciński 1963, Fig.18). Little bells are more rarely found among the Finno-Ugrians (Kentskals: Studabs 1976, tab. 4.9; D’iakov: Krenke 1983; Uškela-Palomäki: Kivikoski 1973, Taf. 33.273) and in Tushemlya Culture (Mikol’tsy: Zviaruga 2005, Fig. 69.3).

Headbands characteristic of East Baltic women’s head ornaments, comprised of metal plates and spirals, are well known in Long Barrow Culture burials: in Volodi, Gorodnia, Berezno, Rep’i, Polibino, Kvasil’nikovo, well known in Long Barrow Culture burials: in Volodi, Gorodnia, Berezno, Rep’i, Polibino, Kvasil’nikovo, Liubakhin, Podol-1, Iur’evskaya Gorka. Metal headbands have analogues with East Lithuania and the nearby Byelorussian regions (Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė 1986, p.158; eg; the Pamūšis barrows: Kuncienė 1973, Fig. 5.4, 5; Luntupy: Pokrovskii 1897, Table 9.5, 6). At the same time, we need to remember that the diffusion territory of headbands is wider than the Baltic geographical range and also includes sites in the Finno-Ugric forest belt (Tallgren 1925, Abb. 16; Tamla, Janīts 1977, Abb. 1.12; Rozenfel’d 1982, Fig. 1.7; Voronina et al. 2005, Fig. 33.9; Myts et al. 2006, pp.156 and 157).

Baltic pins with similar terminals as neck-rings with a saddle-shaped clasp also are known in Long Barrow Culture. Such pins were discovered in Losasina, in barrow 11 (Aun 1992, Fig. 51.16) and in the Koloda settlement (Elena Michailova, personal communication). The same kind of pins are known from the Velikuskiš hill-fort in Lithuania (Sedov 1987, Table 125.2) and from the Skērstaini cemetery in Latvia (Latvijas PSR Arheoloģija 1974, Plate 41.26). Such pins also reached the Baltic Finno-Ugrians, for example, Kentskalsn (Studabs 1976, Table 5.37-43), Ojaveski (Shmidekhel’în 1955, Fig. 36.3), and Kokemäki-Köönikänumäki (Hackman 1905, N° 29. Abb. 5, 9; Kivikoski 1973, Taf. 36.249; Pernyö-Pärvis: Kivikoski 1973, Taf. 47.439). However, such pins there are considered East Baltic finds, or, more precisely, a type of ornament that arrived from Latvia (Kivikoski 1973, p.66).

Several remarks on the formation of Long Barrow Culture

Thus, alongside the Slavs and Finno-Ugrians, Baltic input in the formation of Long Barrow Culture is, to my mind, obvious. Apparently, “Western” armament reached Russia’s forest belt with some Western or Eastern Baltic groups. In my opinion, the material analyzed verifies the assumption made earlier that in the Migration Period, in the fifth to seventh centuries, some kind of militarized groups of people from the Germanic surroundings of the central Danube, as well as Slavic and Baltic groups penetrated Eastern Europe’s forest belt (Kazanski 1999b; 2000, 2000a; Akhmedov, Kazanski 2004). This movement was summoned by the destabilization of the military-political situation in the central Danube, during the establishment, and, somewhat later, the fall, of the Hun state, as well as the eastern Germanic kingdoms’ formation in this region.

The comparatively not numerous, but strictly very militarily organized groups of various tribes left the region of the central Danube and began migrating in various directions to the very southern part of Scandinavia, as is evidenced by the famous reference of Procopius of Caesarea about the Heruls and their migration into southwest Sweden, the Gauoi/Gaughigothi (Procop, Bel.Got., II.15; Gaughigothi localization: Svennung 1967, pp.65-78, Figs. 4; 5) tribe’s territory. Other groups probably advanced northeast, since the Danubian elements in Prussia’s and Lithuania’s archaeological material are accentuated in the works of various researchers more than once (Werner 1977; Kulakov 1989, p.174; Kazakevičius 1993, pp.113 and 114; Nowakowski 2000). From here, along the rivers of the East Baltic basin, Central Europe’s warriors, together with Baltic groups going in the same direction, could have reached Russia’s and Byelorussia’s forest belt.

The beginning of the Slavic expansion from along the Dnieper and along the Dniester to the south towards the Danube is recorded at practically the same time, but not later than the boundary of the fifth and sixth centuries. The culmination of the early period of this expansion was the horrible assaults of the Sclaveni in the Balkans in 540–550 (Kazanski 1999c, p.67). It is logical to assume that Slavic migration could have affected not only the Balkans and central Danube, but also the more northern territories inhabited by related...
Slavic and Balto-Slavic tribes. By the way, fifth-century crossbow fibulae found in Lithuania are similar to Slavic fibulae from Prague Culture (east of the Carpathians) (Gavritukhin 1989, pp.78-85). The appearance of militarized “southern” and “western” groups of people aggravated the military situation in Eastern Europe’s forest belt sites, but in the end, due to rather few migrants, their influence is insignificantly reflected in the forest inhabitants’ ethnocultural history.

Translated by Indrė Antanaitis-Jacobs

Appendix

Armament, elements of horsemen’s accoutrements, and riding gear components of the fifth to seventh centuries discovered in Long Barrow Culture sites

1. Dolozhskii pogost, barrow 45: spearhead with pronounced midrib (Fig. 5.1); Liebenau-type shield boss (Fig. 5.2), bridle bit with three-jointed mouthpiece (Fig. 5.3).


2. Dorohi-1, barrow 1: snaffle with looped segments (Fig. 6.3).

Reference: Shtykhau 1992, Fig. 17.1.

3. Dorohi-4, barrow 1: spur (Fig. 7.1).

Reference: Shtykhau 1992, Fig. 17.6.

4. Iur’evskaya Gorka, grave 5: socketed spearhead with barbs (Fig. 4.2).

Reference: Islanova 1997, Fig. 84.2.

5. Iur’evskaya Gorka, settlement: hafted lanceolate arrowhead (Fig. 6.8); segments of two riding bits (Fig. 7.4, 5); small maille fragment (Fig. 6.7); two axe fragments (Fig. 6.12, 13).

Reference: Islanova 1997, Figs. 77.21; 78.2; 79.8, 9, 11, 14.


Reference: Sedov 1974, Table 27.14 (first identified by Michailova).

7. Puiga, barrow 20: rectangular girth buckle (Fig. 6.6).

Reference: Mal’m, Fekhner 1969, Fig. 5.2.

8. Shikhino, barrow 25: cruciform bridle mounting (Fig. 8.7); horse comb (?) (Fig. 8.4).

Reference: Mal’m, Fekhner 1969, Figs. 5.6, 6.4; Islanova 2006, Fig. 100. 7, 8.

9. Suure-Rysna, barrow 9: socketed spearhead with barbs (Fig. 4.1).

Reference: Aun 1992, Fig. 53.

10. Zalakhtov’e, barrow 154/10: snaffle with looped terminals (Fig. 6.1); jointed girth buckle (Fig. 6.9).

Reference: Khvoshchinskaya 2004, Table 3.1, 3.

11. Zherebiatino, barrow 1: bridle bit segment (Fig. 6.2).

Reference: Sedov 1974, Table 28.4.
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