

XIIb, XIIIc, XIXa, XXb, XXc) and cross-guards (4a, 11a, 12a,b,c, 13). In addition, the swords with identical or similar types of pommels, blades and cross-guards are classified into groups, which are identified, following the Oakeshott's practice, as the families of swords. As Oakeshott himself denoted the distinguished sword families using the capital letters of the alphabet up to the letter M that series has been continued here by adding sword families marked as N, O and P.

For the establishing the period of most frequent use of certain type of pommels, blades and cross-guards I used also the results of other scholars in addition to the conclusions suggested by Oakeshott. Besides the Oakeshott's typology mostly used chronology for certain types of pommels and blades is the one established by Alfred Geibig. The territory of Germany, i.e. the original territory of the German-Roman Empire is significant also for the production of swords in the southeast Europe because some of the leading sword making workshops in the Middle Ages were active in that area. The swords as well as the technology of their manufacture were exported and distributed from Germany to the other parts of Europe including also the southeast Europe. The typology of Geibig is based on precise morphological and metrological characteristics of the hilts, i.e. pommels and cross-guards as well as the sword blades. Generally, Geibig Combination Types 12 II, 13 II, 14, 15 II–VI, 16 I–II, 17 I–II, 18 and 19 for pommels and hilts and Types 6a–b, 7, 8, 9, 10a–b, 11, 12 and 13 for the blades date from the time considered in this work, (12th and 13th century).

Because it is based on precise morphological and metrological traits and dimensions of the sword parts the Geibig's typology was used in this work also to define more precisely certain characteristics of some types of the Oakeshott's typology. Although Geibig himself offered comparative table of his pommel types and those defined by other authors² in textual explanation of each individual type he mostly looked for parallels between the forms he defined and those suggested by other scholars. For better comprehension in Table 1 are compared and equated the pommel typologies of these two authors as I understood them in this work and also the typologies of other

Oakeshott*	Geibig	Ruttikay	Pinter	Šercer
A	16 I	IX	3	
B	15 II-15 IV	IX	4	
B1	12 II, 18	X		
C, D	13 II			
<i>D1</i>		XII, XIV?		
E	19			
<i>E1</i>		XIII	6	
F				
G				
G1				
G2				
H				
H1		XVIII/ XIX		2a-b,d
<i>H2</i>				2c
I		XVI	8	
<i>Ia</i>			7	1a
I1		XX	10	(1d)
J				
J1				
J2				1a
K		XVII	9	1b
<i>K1</i>			11?	
L				
M				
N (<i>Na, b</i>)	16 II	XV	5	
<i>N1</i>	17 I			
O	17 II			
P				
Q				
R**	14(<i>R1a</i>)	XI (<i>R1b</i>)		
S				
T**				4
U				
V**				
W				
Z**				3

Table 1 – Comparative review of pommel types by different authors as they were understood in this work

* With types which are supplemented in this book. In italics are types not defined in the Oakeshott's typology.

** Basic type with subtypes defined by Oakeshott or distinguished in this work.

² Geibig 1991, 16, Abb. 1.