WEAPON FINDS FROM KING'S ROCK CASTLE[*]

SÓFALVI ANDRÁS[**]

Keywords: King's Rock, border castle, arrowheads, Teutonic Order

Abstract: King's Rock castle known by the locals as 'Oratea', is situated under the Piatra Craiului (HU: Királykő) Mountains near the exit of the road that leads from the Bran Pass to Wallachia (Muntenia) in the outskirts of Podu Dâmboviței village (Argeș County).

The fortification's dimensions are very modest. It has an irregular rhomboidal layout with a semicircular tower on the eastern side and is defended by a ditch on the same side. The entrance of the castle was identified on the southern side; furthermore, two structures dug into the rock were discovered inside the castle.

The castle, was mentioned for the first time at the beginning of the 15th century as a royal fortification, and after several decades it came into the possession of Szekler Count (*Comes Siculorum*). According to the historical documents it was used until the 16th century, a supposition corroborated by the results of the archaeological investigations carried out between 1968 and 1969 as well as in 1971. The archaeological finds discovered there in secondary position and kept today in the collection of the Argeș County Museum in Pitești are composed of iron objects, with a significant number of weapons (i.e. 40 arrowheads), hinting at the sieges suffered by the castle during the 14–15th centuries.

Based on the analysis of the topographical position of the castle we can put forward the hypothesis whereby King's Rock castle is the only fortification outside the arch of the Carpathian Mountains known today which corresponds with the contemporary descriptions referring to the fortifications built by the Teutonic Order. This theory isn't excluded from an archaeological point of view either; as certain early types of arrowheads (rhomboidal, pyramidal as well as some barbed forms) can potentially corroborate this assertion.

Cuvinte-cheie: Piatra Craiului, cetate de graniță, vârfuri de săgeată, Ordinul Teutonic

Rezumat: Cetatea Piatra Craiului (cunoscută de localnici sub numele de Oratea) se afla la poalele muntelui cu același nume, lângă ieșirea drumului din pasul Bran spre Muntenia, în hotarul satului Podu Dâmboviței (jud. Argeș).

[*] For the preliminary publication of the results see: Sófalvi 2018.

[**] sofalvi@hotmail.com

Fortificația are dimensiuni destul de modeste așezat pe plan romboidal neregulat, având un turn semicircular pe partea estică, fiind înconjurat dinspre est cu un șanț săpat în stâncă. Accesul în cetate era posibil pe latura din sud. În interiorul cetății au fost observate două încăperi săpate în stâncă, respectiv o cisternă.

Menționată în izvoarele istorice de la începutul secolului XV-lea ca cetate regală, după câteva decenii ajunge în posesiunea comitelui secuilor. Conform mărturiei documentelor istorice cetatea a fost folosită până în secolul al XVI-lea, fapt relevat și de rezultatele cercetărilor arheologice efectuate în anii 1968–1969 și 1971. Materialul arheologic provenit din poziții secundare și păstrat în colecția Muzeului Județean Argeș din Pitești este format din obiecte de fier, printre care un număr însemnat de arme (de exemplu 40 de vârfuri de săgeți) oferă mărturii cu privire la asediile suferite în cursul secolelor XIV–XV-lea.

Din analiza amplasării și topografiei cetății se poate lansa ipoteza că cetatea Piatra Craiului este singura fortificație din exteriorul Arcului Carpatic cunoscută în zilele noastre care corespunde descrierii referitoare la cetățile Ordinului Teutonic. Această ipoteză nu este exclusă nici din punct de vedere arheologic, unele vârfuri de săgeți aparținând unor tipuri timpurii (cele de formă romboidală, piramidală și câteva dintre cele cu barbă) par a veni în sprijinul ipotezei noastre.

Introduction: the geographic position of the fort and the origin of its name

King's Rock is situated on the Wallachian side of the Bran Pass, approximately 1.5 km south of the border between the Hungarian Kingdom and Wallachia, on the rock towering above the Oratea (HU: Vár-patak) Valley. The castle ruins are found just outside the village of Podu Dâmboviței (Argeş County), the monument being known by the name of Cetatea Oratea ('Oratea Castle') or Cetatea Neamțului ('the German's Castle'). (*figures 1–2.*)

The correlation between the name of the castle and that of the Piatra Craiului (HU: Királykő) Mountain situated to the west of the Bran Pass is clear, the identity of the medieval Hungarian king who inspired the name giving is however unknown at this time. At any rate, it is a well-known fact that for centuries the Bran Pass was known as the 'King's way', the name being preserved by 16–17th century literary sources.[1] The toponym Oratea derived from the Hungarian common noun 'várad', a version of 'vár' meaning castle or fort, can be found

[1] 1533: *„via publica ac regia Terch"*. SzO V, p. 52; 1611: *„a Király-után Rakat felől"*. Hidvégi 1863, p. 198-199.

in a 15th century letter written by the Wallachian voivode Alexandru Aldea (1431–1436) to the city of Brașov (GE: Kronstadt, HU: Brassó) requesting that an escort be assigned to the boyar Petru Man on his journey to '*Orade*'.[2] Later, during the transition between the 15th and 16th centuries, voivode Radu cel Mare's letter to the magistrates of the same city requested that his men captured by the '*Orăţii*' bridge be set free.[3] It quite likely, albeit not certain that the name refers to King's Rock, given the frequent occurrence of the toponym in question beyond the Carpathians. Indeed, László Mikecs documented over half a dozen cases in the Szekler County (Județul Săcuieni) which existed in Wallachia up until 1845.[4] It is important to note that the Orăţii Stream, a left affluent of the Prahova River flowing on the Wallachian side of the Tömösi Pass (Pasul Predeal) above the village of Posada, was also an important road connecting Transylvania and Wallachia.

King's Rock Castle in the medieval literary sources

The earliest direct references to King's Rock in the Hungarian chancellery and Transylvanian documents can be dated to the early 15th century, displaying the name of the fort in Hungarian ('Királykő'), but also in German ('Königstein') and Latin ('Lapis Regis'). During the revolt which broke out against King Sigismund of Luxemburg, King's Rock castle was held by the rebellious castellan Tuzsoni Bolgár Miklós until he surrendered it in 22 March 1404.[5] In 1427 King Sigismund issued a charter 'under the castle'.[6] The earliest data indicating that this remote fortification was an integral part of the Szekler Count's dominion comes from a letter written by Kusalyi Jakcs Mihály in 1435 to the city of Brașov, in which the Szekler Count was requesting that gunpowder be provided to the castellans of Bran (GE: Türzdorf, HU: Törcsvár) and King's Rock castle.[7] In 1443 the fortification is listed among the domains of Szekler Counts János Hunyadi (John Hunyadi) and Újlaki Miklós, who renewed the trade privileges held by the merchants of Brașov and Burzenland with regard to their dealings with Wallachia. Furthermore, they regulated the tariffs and instructed the castellans of Bran and King's Rock to abide by these privileges ('*vobis castellanis nostris castrorum Thercz et Keralkew*').[8] In 1457 the fortification is listed as a royal castle held by

[2] Coman 2013, p. 234-235.
[3] Bogdan 1905, p. 228.
[4] Mikecs 194, p. 455.
[5] Engel 1996, p. 341.
[6] „*Datum sub castello nostro Kiralku vocato"*. See Kordé 2003, p. 29.
[7] Ub. IV, p. 579; Kordé 2003, p. 29.
[8] Ub. V, p. 106-107; Kordé 2003, p. 35.

the Hunyadi family.[9] On 3 June 1460 by King Matthias instructed the city of Brașov to deliver one hundred gold florins worth of food to the castles of Bran, King's Rock and Hălchiu (GE: Heldsdorf, HU: Höltövény), as the earlier Szekler Counts failed to ensure their necessary provisions.[10] The present enumeration comprises only the documents published in the charter corpora, in the comprehensive secular archontology published by Pál Engel, as well as in the dissertation of Zoltán Kordé dealing with the history of the institution of Szekler Count. The aforementioned sources allow two important assertions. Firstly, King's Rock castle, one of southern- and south-eastern Transylvania's most important frontier fortifications was held by the Szekler Counts beginning with 1435. Secondly, the literary evidence in nearly every case mentions Bran and King's Rock together, moreover one document from 1535 places King's Rock 'above' the other one in geographical terms, thus locates it beyond the well-known frontier fort ('*Lapidis Regis dictae in Alpibus, supra castrum Thewrcz existentam*').[11] This information in conjunction with the fact that the two fortifications can be found at the opposite ends of the Bran Pass compelled Pál Engel to identify the ruins situated at the base of Piatra Craiului (King's Rock) Mountain with the castle mentioned in the above-cited document. It is worth noting that Gheorghe I. Cantacuzino, one of the participants to the archaeological investigation of the fort ruins reached the same conclusion based on the earlier assertions of local Saxon historian Walter Horwath.[12]

The architectural characteristics of the castle

Based on the ruins visible above ground as well as the data provided by the archaeological investigations carried out earlier, the plan and other parameters of the castle can be fairly well assessed. The fort facing the valley (Valea Orății – *figure 3.*) to the south has an irregular rhomboidal plan (*figure 4.*), its length measured along a north–south axis is approximately 30 m, while its width on the east–west axis is circa 20 m. The 2.6 m thick wall consisting of roughly worked limestone blocks held together by yellowish brown coarse mortar with pebble- and lime chunk inclusions are to this day preserved at a height of 4–5 m on the southern and eastern sides (*figures 5–5b.*). The extremely steep and rocky western side shows no traces of wall, the north-western and south-western corners are rounded. A 3.6 m wide semicircular tower, open towards the castle courtyard, is projecting outward directly

[9] Engel 1996, p. 341.
[10] Kordé 2003, p. 43.
[11] Quellen… p. 323.
[12] Cantacuzino 1981, p. 130.

from the eastern curtain wall (*figure 6a.*). The masonry structure of the tower ruin reveals a walled up window or porthole on the south-eastern side with an interior height in excess of 1 m and a width of 70–80 cm (*figure 6.*). On the southern side of the castle at about one third of its length from the south-eastern corner the wall was additionally fortified (i.e. thickened) by approximately 0.8 m (*figure 5c.*).

Two rectangular structures cut into the rock can be observed inside the perimeter of the fort (*figure 5d.*), although no traces of stone masonry buildings can be identified. The fort is enclosed by a 7–8 m wide and 1.5–2 m deep dry moat (ditch) cut into the rock starting from the north-east and arching along the eastern side (*figure 7.*). From the south-eastern corner of the fort the ditch continues until reaching the edge of the rock; in all probability access to the castle gate was provided by a drawbridge crossing over the moat onto the road cut into the rock and running along the southern side of the castle. In terms of its plan, no direct analogies can be found neither in Transylvania nor Wallachia. The main reason for this lies in the nature of the military architecture of the time, whereby the castle plans were adapted to the needs determined by the terrain and the surroundings. Furthermore, the medieval fortifications most often were constantly enlarged leading to more and more complex plans, albeit this is not the case of King's Rock, where no signs of later reconstructions or the addition of further defensive architectural elements could be observed.[13] The employment of wall towers in the case of castles with simple plans is quite rare, the closest analogy in geographic terms can be found in southern Transylvania at Rășinari (GE: Reutelburg, HU: Resinár), where the defences were built on the southern shorter side of the castle, which was dated based on the results of the archaeological investigations to the 13–14th centuries.[14]

The road between Wallachia and Transylvania between Câmpulung and Bran ran along the western side of the castle some 35–40 m below the rock, its traces still visible today on the ground (*figure 8.*). The wheel traces deeply sunken into the rock surface (the distance between the lines is 1.8 m) indicates that we are dealing with heavy carriage traffic. In order to ease the traffic, the gullies in the surface of the road were covered with planks. In all probability the aforementioned incident involving the men of the Wallachian voivode Radu

[13] Based on their plans, the early construction phases of the following castles of the period can be cited as analogies for King's Rock: Cuiești Castle (HU: Kövesd vára) from Bocșa (HU: Boksánbánya) in the Caraș-Severin region as well as Grădeț Castle (HU: Görényvár) from Schitu Topolniței, both royal castles in Wallachia, while in Transylvania one can mention Almás Castle from Mereni (HU: Kézdialmás), Bálványos Castle from Turia (HU: Torja), and Szentmihálykő Castle from Tăuți (HU: Tótfalud), each of them nobiliar castles. See Karczag, Szabó 2012, p. 122, 252, 386, 461, 468.
[14] Nägler, Beșliu-Munteanu 1998, p. 18.

cel Mare who were imprisoned by the authorities of the city of Brașov was caused by the destruction of the road's woodwork, essential for the commercial interests of the Saxon city.[15] Based on the late 16th century accounts of French traveller Jacques Bongars and of Italian military engineer Filippo Pigafetta certain sectors of the road were so steep that the carriages and cannons had to be towed with the help of pulleys and ropes.[16] The medieval customs station supervised by the castle must have been located somewhere in the vicinity. The interpretation of the accounts of Pierre Lescalopier from 1574, often cited in the historical literature, according to which the Wallachian voivode deployed a small military unit at the border of the country, who were stationed in a tower to which they retreated using a long ladder and controlled the road using a barrier, is subject to some inconsistencies.[17] In my view due to its topographical position, King's Rock castle was hardly suited for controlling the commercial and military movements from Transylvania. Indeed, the abovementioned description could refer to several other border forts, as the passage in question subsequently follows the description of Târgoviște.

Archaeological investigations at King's Rock Castle

The first archaeological investigations at the site were carried out in 1905 under the supervision of Grigore Tocilescu. Alas the investigations can hardly be described as professional, as they were limited to disturbing the interior of the fortification together with its stratigraphy, while the finds brought to light were collected without any documentation.[18] These included a large quantity of metal objects, such as iron arrowheads (partly from a charred beam discovered in the south-eastern area of the castle), iron dowels, sword fragments, horse shoes, spurs, buckles, nails, knives, as well as a couple of stone cannonballs, pottery vessel- and stove tile (?) fragments. On the north-eastern side a round water cistern cut into the rock with sandstone walls and clay floor was discovered. It had a diameter of 3.4 m and a depth of 5.35 m, with a narrow vaulted mouth opening. By the time of the 1970s the structure was largely destroyed, as was the wall portion erected on the rock plateau just outside of the castle on the southern side, most likely to provide a shelter for the gate.

[15] See note no. 3.
[16] Coman 2013, p. 235; Călători… III, p. 160, 545.
[17] Călători… II, p. 428; Cantacuzino 1981, p. 175; Coman 2013, p. 235.
[18] For information concerning the unpublished excavation see Ms. 5137 in the Library of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, also: Cantacuzino 1981, p. 120-124.

Further archaeological investigations were carried out in 1968–1969 and 1971 as a result of the collaboration between various institutions from Bucharest and Pitești, under the coordination of archaeologist Alexandrina D. Alexandrescu.[19] These investigations resulted in observations regarding the masonry structure and building technique of the walls, the location of the gate as well as various archaeological phenomena documented inside the fort. Accordingly, it was noted that the emplekton wall was built directly on the levelled and cleaned rock surface. Furthermore, it was observed that the entrance into the fort was placed on the southern section, at a distance of 4 m from the inner side of the south-eastern corner, in the area where the wall was additionally fortified. The traces of the said structure were documented at a height of 1 m from the rock surface, according to the description its width was 2 m. The finds were mostly recovered in a secondary position inside the fort as well as in the ditch. Among these, the high quantity of metal objects must be noted, given that the short preliminary report indicates that the number of discovered arrowheads was in excess of 200.[20] Furthermore, medieval pottery fragments dated to the latter half of the 14th century as well as two Wallachian coins emitted by voivode Mircea cel Bătrân were also recovered from the deposits formed on the rock surface.[21] In addition to these, the archaeological repertory of the county mentions further four 14–15th century Wallachian coins.[22]

The comprehensive and detailed, i.e. scientific publication of the excavation results is yet to take place. Consequently, without the subchapter of the aforementioned book which deals in brief with the results of the investigations, the archaeological literature would effectively be one medieval castle short. It must be noted however, that this is by no means a singular situation, as the failure to publish the excavation result, i.e. the drawings, photographs and the finds is unfortunately quite common in the east and south-east European archaeology. Furthermore, the whereabouts of the documentation and pottery finds are to this day unknown, as these could not be located in the archives and collections of the institutions involved in the research, in fact only the metal objects kept in the custody of the Pitești

[19] The field investigations were a result of the collaboration between several institutions based in Bucharest, i.e. the Institute of Archaeology (Institutul de Arheologie), the History Museum (Muzeul de Istorie), the Military Museum (Muzeul Militar Central), the Commission on Historical Monuments (Direcția Monumentelor Istorice), and the Argeș County Museum in Pitești (Muzeul Județean Argeș). Besides the supervisor of the excavations, the team also included archaeologists Anca Păunescu, Gh. I. Cantacuzino, Lucian Chițescu, and Spiridon Cristocea.
[20] Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche 21, 1970, 3, p. 516. Cf. Cantacuzino 1981, p. 124.
[21] Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche 20, 1969, 3, p. 497.
[22] Măndescu, Dumitrescu, Păduraru 2014, p. 146.

Museum were available for first hand examination by the author.[23] The documentation resulted in the identification of more than two hundred metal objects discovered at King's Rock castle during the 1968–1969 excavations. Apart from a few exceptions, the assemblage consists mostly of forged iron weapons and various utilitarian objects.[24]

The analysis of the arrowheads

My research in the collections of the Argeş County Museum in Piteşti has led to the identification of 206 metal objects discovered at King's Rock, albeit the inventory register contained a total of 249 finds coming from the respective site. A part of these are connected to the architectural structure and construction of the castle (nails, dowels, and locks), to household and agricultural activities (knives, pins/leather punches, scissors, adzes, and sickles), and last but not least to the daily routine of life in the castle (razors, buckles, firesteels, axes, and horseshoes).

A considerable share of the metal objects consists of weapons, especially arrowheads, including variants for bows and crossbows alike. Overall a number of 40 arrowheads were identified and examined in the collection, however it must noted that 86 objects are recorded in the inventory register, among which 79 made for bows and only 7 for crossbows. In addition to these, two chapes for either dagger- or sword scabbards must also be mentioned.

The following section will be dedicated to the presentation and analysis of the bow and crossbow arrowheads, including a bronze armour-piercing projectile.

According to the traditional classification, the projectiles are grouped into two large categories, i.e. 1) tanged- and 2) socketed arrowheads, based on their attachment method to the shaft. The present assemblage includes 12 instances belonging to the first category. Several variants can be distinguished within this group based on the shape of the blade, which can either be rhomboidal, leaf-shaped, triangular, or pyramidal.

There are two instances of *rhomboidal* arrowheads in the assemblage (*figure 9. 1–2*), both displaying blades of elongated rhomboidal shape, although some morphological differences can be noted. The first one displays a prominent stopper on its tang, while the second one has a slightly concave shoulder which continues into the tang with no transition. In terms of analogies, according to Adrian Ioniţa the first type was mainly used by the

[23] I wish to express my gratitude to fellow archaeologist Dragoş Măndescu for readily providing unrestricted access to the finds from King's Rock castle in the custody of his institution and for consenting to their publication.
[24] The inventory numbers of the finds are: 570-612, 1290-1486.

Hungarians during the Arpadian period, although they can also be found in on the territory of the First Bulgarian Tsardom as well as in other regions too during the aforementioned period, such as Copăceni[25] in Wallachia. The second variant can also be found in Copăceni[26] as well as in Moviliţa and in the vicinity of King's Rock by the Dâmboviţa River at Cetăţeni,[27] the finds from the latter site being dated to the 13–14th centuries. Furthermore, a number of fragmentary elongated rhomboidal arrowheads dated to the 14–15th centuries were published from the fort at Păcuiul lui Soare.[28] Analogies dated to the 11–12th centuries are known from Pavlovca in Moldavia,[29] however similar finds from Dăneşti in Vaslui County were discovered in contexts dated to the 15–16th centuries (?).[30] With regard to Transylvania, several arrowheads belonging to this type were published from the castle at Dăbâca (HU: Doboka),[31] but they were also reported in the Szeklerland, e.g. at Poloniţa (HU: Székelylengyelfalva) in early Arpadian contexts.[32] The *leaf-shaped* arrows make up the largest variant within the category of tanged arrowheads. The flat blades continue usually with the tang, the transition being hardly perceptible (*figure 9. 4–6*). Analogies can be found in Wallachia at Moviliţa,[33] in Moldavia at Bâtca Doamnei near Piatra Neamţ,[34] but also in Transylvania at Dăbâca in Arpadian contexts.[35] The type with a narrow crested blade displaying a rhomboidal cross-section, concave shoulder, and prominent stopper towards the tang (*figure 9. 3*) has 14th century analogies at Orheiul Vechi,[36] but also from several sites in Transylvania, such as the neighbourhood of the cathedral in Alba Iulia,[37] the castle of Codlea (GE: Zeiden, HU: Feketehalom),[38] as well as from Satu Mare – Botos-dűlő (HU: Máréfalva),[39] all from Arpadian contexts. A somewhat rare type is represented by the narrow leaf-shaped arrowheads with crested rhomboidal section thickening towards the tip and flattened at the base (*figure 9. 7*), with analogies from the Bâtca Doamnei earth-and-timber

[25] Ioniţă 2005, p. 95, Fig. 51.12.
[26] Ioniţă 2005, Fig. 18.7, Fig. 51.11.
[27] Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14.5.
[28] Diaconu 1959, p. 663, Fig. 12.6.
[29] Spinei 1982, Fig. 30.4, 11.
[30] Zaharia, Petrescu-Dâmboviţa 1962, p. 58, Fig. 15.5. It must be noted that 15–16th century finds were discovered in conjunction with earlier i.e. 'early feudal (medieval)' artefacts, consequently it is possible that the arrowheads were in fact in a secondary position.
[31] Iambor 2005, Pl. LII. 1-2, 4, 11, 17-19, 22.
[32] Sófalvi 2017, p. 106, Fig. 47.1.
[33] Ioniţă 2005, Fig. 18.5-6.
[34] Spinei 1982, Fig. 7.13.
[35] Iambor 2005, Pl. LII. 2, 7, 28.
[36] Spinei 1982, Fig. 40.10.
[37] Marcu-Istrate 2009, nr. kat. 132.
[38] Costea 1968, Fig. 2.2-3.
[39] Sófalvi 2017, p. 106, Fig. 47.2.

fort.[40] Similar arrowheads dated to the 10th century (!) were published by Aleksandr Medvedev from the territory of the USSR.[41] Within the present assemblage there is only one single tanged arrowhead with a *triangular* blade (*figure 9. 8*). A closer observation reveals the fact that the blade is rhomboidal and has a central crest. A similar piece was discovered in Wallachia at Bucov, and was dated to the 9–10th centuries.[42] The series of tanged arrowheads is closed by three *pyramidal* triple bladed pieces (*figure 9. 10–12*). This type of so-called armour-piercing arrowhead can be found in the archaeological record of the Carpathian Basin already from the 10th century,[43] and due to its high efficiency it remains in use throughout Europe until the emergence of firearms.[44] Their occurrence in Wallachia is rare, however several finds are mentioned by Mandache from sites across Moldavia, such as Suceava, Târgu Trotuș, Baia, and Bacău from Late Medieval contexts.[45] In Transylvania this type is known from Cernatu de Jos – Damokos-kert (HU: Alsócsernáton) and dated to the reign of Louis the Great.[46]

Among the tanged projectiles in the present assemblage, only one arrowhead can be included with certainty into the category of cross-bow projectiles based on its weight of almost 50 g (*figure 9. 9*). The projectile in question has a square section with a pyramidal end, its closest analogy coming from the castle at Codlea and is dated to the 13–14th centuries.[47]

The category of socketed arrowheads within the present assemblage comprises leaf- and triangular shaped pieces, barbed arrowheads, as well as projectiles with pyramidal and conical tips. The leaf-shaped arrowheads display a high degree of morphological uniformity, in terms of size however the variety is rather significant (*figure 10. 1–4*). Analogies can be found at Cetăţeni[48] in Wallachia discovered in 13–14th century contexts, while in Transylvania this type was reported at the earth-and-timber fort at Hărman – Lempes (GE: Honigberg, HU: Szászhermány)[49] dated to the 12–13th centuries and Bistra Mureșului (HU: Dédabisztratelep) with a somewhat later dating.[50] Analogies for the large-sized bay leaf-

[40] Spinei 1982, Fig. 40.11.
[41] Medvedev 1966, Pl. 17. 7-11.
[42] Chișvasi-Comșa 1959, p. 568, Fig. 1.2.
[43] Petkes, Sudár 2015, p. 116-117; Ruttkay 1976, p. 331.
[44] Zimmermann 2000, p. 73.
[45] Mandache 2013, p. 56.
[46] Székely 1990, Pl. III.11.
[47] Costea 1968, Fig. 6.1.
[48] Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14.11.
[49] Alexandrescu, Constantinescu 1973, p. 232-233, Fig. 4; p. 234, 242, Fig. 6.
[50] Győrfi 2014-2015, p. 123, Fig. 4.9.

shaped types (*figure 10. 4*) can be found at Dridu – La Metereze[51] in Wallachia, and at Dăbâca in Transylvania, dated to the Arpadian period.[52] The particularity of the arrowheads from King's Rock castle is represented by the flaring sockets, widened towards the shaft. A further type within the category of socketed projectiles is represented by the flat triangular bladed arrowheads (*figure 10. 5–9*). Their Arpadian period analogies are known from the earth-and-timber fort at Orlat – Winsberg (GE: Winsberg, HU: Orlát),[53] as well as the site of Bistra Mureșului.[54] This type also includes a piece with a small tip (*figure 10. 8*) presumably used mainly for hunting. Analogies for this variant come from Cetăţeni[55] and Dăbâca.[56] No direct analogies could be identified for the flat triangular arrowheads with a prominent protrusion below the blade (*figure 10. 9*), probably used for fastening incendiary material (?).

One of the most significant types within the category of socketed projectiles is that of the so-called *barbed* arrowheads (*figure 10. 10–15*) which in the case of the present assemblage have gradually widening (i.e. flaring) sockets. Their blades are either straight or arched, furthermore the assemblage features both variants with long and short barbs. This morphological difference may have chronological implications as according to the literature on the subject the longer barbs are characteristic to the latter pieces.[57] The analogies are abundant on both sides of the Carpathians. The short barb variant has analogies from the earth-and-timber fort at Ugra (GE: Galt, HU: Szászugra) in Transylvania discovered in 12th century contexts,[58] from Dridu – La Metereze in Wallachia discovered in 12–13th century contexts,[59] as well as from numerous sites across Moldavia such as Gura Idrici from 8–9th century contexts,[60] the earth-and-timber fort at Bâtca Doamnei from 12–13th century contexts,[61] and from Dăneşti discovered in 15–16th century (?) contexts.[62] The long barb variant is known from numerous sites in Transylvania, such as the outskirts of Joseni (HU: Gyergyóalfalu) dated to the 13–14th centuries,[63] Avrămești – Templomföld (HU: Szentábrahám) dated to the Late Medieval period,[64] Cernatu de Jos – Damokos-kert from the

[51] Ioniță 2005, Fig. 51.7.
[52] Iambor 2005, Pl. LIII. 38.
[53] Nägler 1977, Pl. VI.5.
[54] Győrfi 2014-2015, p. 123, Fig. 4.6.
[55] Rosetti 1962, Fig. 4.15.
[56] Iambor 2005, Pl. LIII. 39.
[57] Mandache 2013, p. 57.
[58] Popa, Ştefănescu 1980, p. 501, Fig. 4.d.
[59] Mihai 1983, p. 442, Fig. 2.9.
[60] Teodor, Maxim-Alaiba 1983, p. 465, Fig. 1.10.
[61] Spinei 1982, Fig. 7.10.
[62] Petrescu-Dîmboviţa, Zaharia 1962, p. 58, Fig. 15.3. With regard to the chronology see footnote no. 30.
[63] Sófalvi 2017, p. 126, Fig. 53. 8.
[64] Benkő 1992, Pl. 79. 4.

period of Louis the Great,[65] Bistra Mureșului from the Late Medieval period,[66] from the castle at Breaza in Făgăraș dated to the 14th century,[67] as well as from Tilișca (GE: Tilischen, HU: Tilicske) castle also dated to the 14th century.[68] Analogies for this variant are also found on the other side of the Carpathians in Wallachia at Dridu – La Metereze dated post 14th century,[69] and Cetăţeni from the 13–14th centuries,[70] but also in Moldavia in the earth-and-timber fort at Bâtca Doamnei dated to the 12–13th centuries.[71] Pieces with massive barbs are known in Transylvania from the castles at Codlea,[72] and Cernatu de Sus – Ika (HU: Felsőcsernáton) dated to the 13–14th centuries,[73] and the settlement at Tîrgşor in Wallachia, discovered in 15th century contexts.[74]

The largest share of socketed arrowheads is represented by the pyramidal four-bladed types. In morphological terms they are quite uniform, while regarding their size it can be noted that some of the pieces were fitted with shorter tips, and these generally have larger overall dimensions (*figure 11. 1–4, 10*). Their analogies are known from Cetăţeni,[75] from the castle at Tălmaciu (GE: Talmesch, HU: Nagytalmács),[76] from Alba Iulia,[77] as well as from Bistra Mureșului discovered in 13–14th century contexts.[78] The long and narrow arrowheads are smaller and lighter (*figure 11. 5–8*), one of them was exceptionally cast from bronze (*figure 11. 8*). This type is generally considered to be an armour-piercing projectile effective against chain mail. The analogies are scarce in the Carpathian region and can be found at Cetăţeni,[79] and Bistra Mureșului[80] where a single blunt tipped piece was discovered (*figure 11. 9*). The series is closed by a fragmentary cone-shaped piece (*figure 11. 11*), which has analogies at Cetăţeni,[81] and Codlea castle.[82] Based on their weight (>25 g),[83] two pieces can

[65] Székely 1990, Pl. III. 10.
[66] Győrfi 2014-2015, p. 123, Fig. 4.11.
[67] Nägler 1969, p. 101, Fig. 6.1, p. 114.
[68] Nägler 1967, Taf. III. 4.
[69] Ioniţă 2005, Fig. 51.6.
[70] Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14.10.
[71] Spinei 1982, Fig. 7. 9, 11.
[72] Costea 1968, Fig. 3.1-3.
[73] Székely 1976-1977, p. 93, Fig. 16. 2.
[74] Popescu 1959, p. 738, Fig. 11.2; p. 741, Fig. 13.6.
[75] Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14.14-15.
[76] Beşliu-Munteanu 1999, p. 51, foto 3, 5.
[77] Marcu-Istrate 2009, nr. kat. 133.
[78] Győrfi 2014-2015, p. 123, Fig. 4.14-16.
[79] Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14. 9, 12.
[80] Győrfi 2014-2015, p. 123, Fig. 4.17.
[81] Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14.8.
[82] Costea 1968, Fig. 4.1-2.
[83] According to a consensus in the literature the projectiles which weighed more than 25 g could not be shot from a bow. See Dzembasz 1999, p. 274. Naturally this does not mean that lighter arrowheads could not be used with cross-bows. Cf. Zimmermann 2000, p. 98.

be identified as being cross-bow projectiles (*figure 11. 12–13*) fitted with short pyramidal tips and narrow necks. Their analogies are known from Bistra Mureșului[84] and Cetăţeni in the vicinity of King's Rock castle.[85]

The weapon's assemblage also includes two fragmentary dagger scabbard chapes made from iron. The chapes display rectangular cross-sections with rounded corners, one of them slightly widening upwards, while the other one shows a more marked flaring (*figure 12. 1–2*). Furthermore, one chape has a hemispherical ending, while the other one is flat. This type of artefact is quite rare among the medieval finds, and only two pieces are known from Wallachia, published by A. Ioniţa from Dridu – La Metereze and dated to the 14th century.[86]

The archaeological finds and the issues regarding the construction history of the castle

The historical interpretation of the weapons' assemblage from King's Rock castle presented above is problematical in many regards. The precise chronological attribution of the various arrowhead types, as shown above, is in many cases impossible to achieve, as several types have maintained their popularity for many centuries and thus their period of production extended to long periods of time. It goes without saying that a relative chronological sequence is impossible to put forward with no stratigraphic data available. The only contextual information refers to the arrowheads discovered in the charred remains of a beam. Unfortunately however the context was not documented even though its informational potential would have been quite significant, as the entire assemblage must have belonged to the same chronological horizon. Furthermore, the opportunity to pinpoint with certainty the types of projectiles used in battle was also missed.

The considerable amount of weapon finds in itself also reflects the important defensive role of this strategically placed fort. The location of the castle at the Wallachian end of the Bran pass indicates with a high degree of certainty that its main task was to supervise the military and commercial traffic coming into Transylvania. Based on the topographical situation of the castle it can be argued that this fort was in fact an outpost of the Hungarian Kingdom constructed beyond the mountains and thus was not built by the Wallachian voivodes. The construction of King's Rock castle may be linked with the

[84] Győrfi 2014-2015, p. 125, Fig. 5.4, 9.
[85] Rosetti 1962, Fig. 4.1-5; Chiţescu 1976, Fig. 14.16.
[86] Ioniţă 2005, Fig. 52.7-8.

emergence of Transylvanian colonist in Wallachia at the end of the Arpadian period, e.g. at Câmpulung and Curtea de Argeș, for which the most meaningful evidence is represented by the gravestone of Count Lőrinc (‘*comes Laurentius de Longo Campo’*) from Câmpulung, dated to around 1300.[87] According to the diploma issued by King Louis the Great on 19 November 1377 the Saxons from the Brașov region started the construction of a ‘new’ castle at the Transylvanian end of the Bran Pass, probably as a result of the fact that the founding and consolidation of the Wallachian state has exposed King’s Rock castle to the attacks of the Wallachian voivodes seated nearby at Câmpulung. The king who authorised the construction of the new castle also instructed that the customs station beyond the mountains (‘*iuxta Ruffam’*) be relocated to Bran castle.[88] The aforementioned source is basically an indirect attestation of King’s Rock castle, given that the respective customs station due to its exposure could only carry out its activity under the protection of a nearby fortification. Furthermore, the distance between the two castles is in excess of 20 km. From the chronicle of János Küküllei we learn that the king ‘has built the powerful fortress of Bran (HU: Törcsvár) at the Wallachian border and has enforced its garrison with troops carrying light “English” arms and archers equipped with cross-bows’.[89] According to the evidence of the archaeological record, the castle placed in a highly important strategic location was the scene of very intense sieges and it is likely that for a brief period it was captured by the Wallachians at the beginning of the 15th century during the rule of Mircea cel Bătrân.[90]

Given the aforementioned methodological problems, the existing weapon finds are not suitable for the elucidation of questions related to the construction of the fort, but still do help in defining a chronological interval, albeit a loose one, for the functioning of the castle (i.e. between the 13th and 16th centuries). No construction phases, reconstructions or additions of new elements can be outlined based on the analysis of the castle’s ruins, apart from the walled up opening on the south-eastern side of the tower. It seems that the emergence and spread of firearms during the 15th and 16th centuries did not seriously impact the architecture of King’s Rock castle’s defences. This assertion is seemingly in contradiction with Filippo Pigafetta’s short account written in the fall of 1591, in which the Florentine military engineer travelling on behalf of the Grand Duke to Transylvania and then to Wallachia mentions the

[87] See Lăzărescu 1975.
[88] Ub. II, p. 479-781. Most researchers identify the toponym featured in the source with present day’s Rucăr (Argeș County). During the following century this was the place of the customs station. Cf. Cantacuzino 1981, p. 126.
[89] The text is cited from the preserved variant of the Thuróczy chronicle. Thuróczy 1980, p. 262.
[90] See Coman 2013, p. 234. This assertion is corroborated by the presence on the territory of the castle of coins emitted during the reign of voivode Mircea.

presence of artillery in the castle featured under the name of *Chiral Petra*.[91] Furthermore, numerous data from the 16th century account books of Brașov indicate that the bridges leading to King's Rock had to be repaired by the residence of Râșnov (GE: Rosenau, HU: Barcarozsnyó).[92]

The historical interpretation is straightforward. The appearance of the Ottoman Empire and its oppressive military presence in the region during the 15th century has not spared Transylvania, furthermore, the aftermath of the battle of Mohács rendered the use and maintenance of such a distant outpost virtually impossible, and presumably no attempts were made to modernize the defences of the castle during the 16th century. The commissioners of Ferdinand I tasked with assessing the state of the castles and towns along the border in 1551–1552 as a preparatory measure for transforming Transylvania into a Habsburg province did not deal with King's Rock castle.[93] During the decades marked by the birth of the Transylvanian Principality, the castle was presumably abandoned by the political and military leadership of the new state, and its defensive role was transferred to Bran castle.

King's Rock, the castle of the Teutonic Order?

In 1211 King Andrew II of Hungary offered the region of Burzenland in the south-eastern corner of the Carpathian Arch to the knights of the Order of Saint Mary's Hospital based in the Holy Land with the aim to protect the Kingdom against the Cumans. The Teutonic Order which enjoyed a wide range of political, administrative, economic and religious privileges erected a network of earth-and-timber forts followed shortly by stone castles on its new territory. Due to breach of their accord with the King, Andrew II took back the offered land in 1222, but shortly retracted the measure and in addition to the Transylvanian domains, entrusted the knights with further lands beyond the Carpathian Arch up until the land of the *Brodnics*, where they built further castles ('*castrum munitissimum ultra montes nivium*'), that successfully fought off the attack of the Cumans.[94] In 1225 the king personally led a military campaign against the Order, seized their castle beyond the mountains and permanently expelled them from the Kingdom of Hungary.[95]

[91] Călători... III, p. 561.
[92] 1533: Quellen… II, p. 323; 1542: Quellen… III, p. 124.
[93] Oborni 2002; Barabás 1891a, 432; Barabás 1891b, 645-659; Barabás 1892, 143-158; Barabás 1892, 143-158.
[94] EO I, p. 173.
[95] EO I, p. 163.

While analyzing the topography of the castle ruins located on the exterior of the Carpathian Arch, I have come to the realization that King's Rock is the only such fortification that fits the profile of the castles built by the Order in this region. My assertion is not without precedents,[96] although at first sight it seems that it is not corroborated by the archaeological evidence and the majority of researchers reject this thesis. In light of the castle's research history however, the opinions put forward in the past concerning the foundation and construction of the fortification cannot be fully validated by the archaeological evidence. This is due to the fact that the investigations carried out in 1968 were effectively limited to collecting the finds scattered during the 1905 excavations as the archaeological contexts were already compromised during this first stage of research. In all probability, a large share of the finds was discarded, while the collected ceramic assemblage is still unlocated, which is all the more regrettable considering that the early finds could shed light on the issues regarding the construction of the castle. Based on the typological analysis of the large arrowhead assemblage we can note that certain types, such as the tanged rhomboidal and pyramidal projectiles, as well as the socketed short barbed arrowheads, can be dated before the 14th century and could even contemporary with the presence of the Teutonic Order in the region. Even so, the semicircular tower erected on the eastern side could have originally fulfilled the role of chapel in my view. Furthermore, the plan of the castle is nor revelatory in this regard, as the particularities of the Order's fort architecture developed only later in the Baltic region.

Conclusions

King's Rock castle (r. Oratea, m. Királykő, g. Königstein, l. Lapis Regis, Chiral Petra) is highly interesting in many regards, even though it belongs to the series of unjustly forgotten medieval castles. Even though it captured the attention of researchers as early as the beginning of the 20th century, the results of the archaeological investigations carried out on its territory remained mostly unpublished, as were the discovered finds. This has effectively hindered the historical interpretation of the castle. The present paper aimed at addressing this deficiency; however, in the absence of the archaeological documentation its scope can only be limited.

[96] Among the first proponents of this thesis we find the Transylvanian Saxon historian Walter Horwath. See Horwath 1929.

Based on the historical sources, the weapon finds, as well as the topographic observations, the paper attempts to offer a critical assessment of the castle's construction history. King's Rock castle is one of the outposts built on the other side of the Carpathians during the expansion of the Hungarian Kingdom. The medieval diplomas starting with the 15th century mention the castle as belonging to the dominion of the Szekler Count, but references to King's Rock are also made with regard to the commercial links of the Saxons of Brașov with the Wallachians. In addition to these data, the sources generally concentrate on the military role of the castle. The typological and comparative analysis of the arrowheads, in addition to the Late Medieval types, also outlined an earlier, i.e. Arpadian horizon. In light of the historical and archaeological analysis, the possibility that King's Rock castle was in fact built by the Teutonic Order at the beginning of the 13th century is quite plausible.

(The paper was completed with the financial support of Bolyai János research scholarship no. BO/00303/15/2.)

Catalogue of finds

1 – 9. figure 1
Elongated rhomboidal arrowhead with a flat blade ending in a stopper; tang with a circular section; full length: 8 cm; blade length: 5.1 cm; blade width: 2.1 cm; weight: 8.8 g; inv. no.: F1331

2 – 9. figure 2
Elongated rhomboidal arrowhead with a flat blade, concave shoulder which continues into the tang with no transition; full length: 4.6 cm; maximum width: 1.3 cm; weight: 2.13 g; inv. no.: F1333

3 – 9. figure 3
Leaf-shaped arrowhead with a long crested blade, concave shoulder, rhomboidal cross-section, stopper and a tang with a square cross-section; length: 8.2 cm; blade length: 4 cm; maximum width: 1.6 cm; weight: 8.07 g; inv. no.: F1298

4 – 9. figure 4

Leaf-shaped fragmentary arrowhead, its blade is gradually thinner towards the tip; the tang has a round cross-section; length: 4.1 cm; blade width: 1.4 cm; tang length: 2.1 cm; weight: 2.93 g; inv. no.: F1515

5 – 9. figure 5
Leaf-shaped fragmentary arrowhead, its blade is gradually thinner towards the tip; the tang has a round cross-section; length: 5.2 cm; blade width: 1.5 cm; weight: 5.65 g; inv. no.: F498 (741)

6 – 9. figure 6
Leaf-shaped fragmentary arrowhead, its blade is gradually thinner towards the tip; the tang has a round cross-section; full length: 4.9 cm; blade length: 2.5 cm; maximum width: 1.3 cm; weight: 1.74 g; inv. no.: F1300

7 – 9. figure 7
Leaf-shaped arrowhead with a narrow blade, its tip is thickened and has a rhomboidal cross-section, and a prominent crest; the lower part of the blade is flat, and the tang has a circular cross-section; full length: 6.9 cm; blade length: 3.3 cm, maximum width: 1.1 cm; weight: 4.97 g; inv. no.: F1339

8 – 9. figure 8
Triangular-shaped arrowhead with a prominent crest, deformed tip; the neck has a protrusion and its cross-section is rhomboidal; the tang has a round cross-section; full length: 7.4 cm; blade length: 4.3 cm; maximum width: 2 cm; weight: 6.13 g; inv. no.: F1290

9 – 9. figure 9
Cross-bow projectile, it has a prismatic body ending in a pyramidal tip, the tang is deformed and has a square cross-section; full length: 9.6 cm; blade length: 5 cm; maximum width: 1.5 × 1.5 cm; weight: 48.24 g; inv. no.: F1358

10 – 9. figure 10
Pyramidal arrowhead with three blades, its tang has a round cross-section; full length: 4.5 cm; blade length: 2.5 cm; maximum width: 1 cm; weight: 4.37 g; inv. no.: F1347

11 – 9. figure 11

Pyramidal arrowhead with three blades, its tang has a round cross-section; full length: 4.2 cm; blade length: 2.5 cm; maximum width: 0.8 cm; weight: 2.82 g; inv. no.: F1345

12 – 9. figure 12

Pyramidal three bladed arrowhead, its tang has a round cross-section; full length: 3.6 cm; blade length: 2.3 cm; maximum width: 0.8 cm; weight: 2.77 g; inv. no.: F1344

13 – 10. figure 1

Leaf-shaped arrowhead with a long flat blade and flaring socket; full length: 4.5 cm; blade length: 2.3 cm; socket diameter: 0.8 cm; maximum width: 1.3 cm; weight: 2.47 g; inv. no: F1308

14 – 10. figure 2

Leaf-shaped arrowhead with wide and flat blade and flaring socket; full length: 5.9 cm; blade length: 3 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 1.4 cm; weight: 3.59 g; inv. no.: F1314

15 – 10. figure 3

Leaf-shaped arrowhead with a long fragmentary blade and socket; length: 5.1 cm; blade length: 2.5 cm; maximum width: 1.2 cm; weight: 2.57 g; inv. no.: F576

16 – 10. figure 4

Leaf-shaped arrowhead with a wide chipped blade having a triangular cross-section; full length: 7.4 cm; blade length: 3 cm; socket diameter: 0.8 cm; maximum width: 1.8 cm; weight: 7.12 g; inv. no.: F1330

17 – 10. figure 5

Triangular-shaped arrowhead with a flat blade and gradually widening socket; full length: 5.9 cm; blade length: 3.2 cm; socket diameter: 1.1 cm; maximum width: 1.8 cm; weight: 4.67 g; inv. no.: F1325

18 – 10. figure 6

Triangular-shaped arrowhead with a flat, wide, crested and bent blade; full length: 6.6 cm; blade length: 3.5 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 1.8 cm; weight: 5.70 g; inv. no.: F1680

19 – 10. figure 7
Triangular-shaped arrowhead with a flat, wide, crested and bent blade; full length: 6.3 cm; socket length: 3.3 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 2.7 cm; weight: 8.43 g; inv. no.: F1676

20 – 10. figure 8
Triangular-shaped arrowhead with a small flat blade, long neck and flaring socket; full length: 5.3 cm; blade length: 1.3 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 1.3 cm; weight: 5.43 g; inv. no.: F1334

21 – 10. figure 9
Triangular-shaped arrowhead with a flat crested blade and a prominent shoulder; full length: 6.9 cm; blade length: 3.5 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 1.7 cm; weight: 6.65 g; inv. no.: F1316

22 – 10. figure 10
Barbed arrowhead with a fragmentary and deformed blade (the barbs are intact) and flaring socket; length: 4 cm; socket diameter: 0.9 cm; weight: 3.45 g; inv. no.: F 1508

23 – 10. figure 11
Barbed fragmentary arrowhead with flaring socket; length: 4.5 cm; socket diameter: 1.1 cm; weight: 4.12 g; inv. no.: F1506

24 – 10. figure 12
Barbed arrowhead fitted with a socket, one of its barbs is broken, the other one is deformed; length: 5.2 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; weight: 6.53 g; inv. no.: F 1515

25 – 10. figure 13
Barbed arrowhead, its blade and socket are fragmentary, the barbs are intact; length: 5.3 cm; barb length: 3.2 cm; width: 2.4 cm; weight: 3.46 g; inv. no.: F581

26 – 10. figure 14
Barbed arrowhead, its blade and socket are fragmentary, the barbs are intact; weight: 3.77 g; l.sz: F580

27 – 10. figure 15
Barbed arrowhead with flaring and bent socket; full length: 6.1 cm; barb length: 5.3 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 3 cm; weight: 5.38 g; inv. no.: F1504

28 – 11. figure 1
Pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead, the socket is fragmentary and is not separated from the blade by additional elements; length: 3.4 cm; blade length: 1.7 cm; width: 0.6 × 0.8 cm; weight: 4.77 g; inv. no.: F643 (886)

29 – 11. figure 2
Pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead with a narrow neck and a deformed socket; full length: 4.5 cm; blade length: 2 cm; width: 0.5 × 0.6 cm; weight: 2.6 g; inv. no.: F642 (885)

30 – 11. figure 3
Pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead with a slightly narrowed neck and fragmentary socket; length: 4.8 cm; blade length: 2 cm; width: 0.6 × 0.7 cm; weight: 8.26 g; inv. no.: F640 (883)

31 – 11. figure 4
Pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead with a prominent neck under the blade and fragmentary socket; full length: 4.4 cm; blade length: 2 cm; socket diameter: 0.9 cm; width: 0.5 × 0.8 cm; weight: 6.8 g; inv. no.: F641 (884)

32 – 11. figure 5
Thin four-bladed arrowhead with a flaring socket; full length: 4.8 cm; blade length: 2.7 cm; socket diameter: 0.9 cm; width: 0.4 × 0.45 cm; weight: 3.27 g; inv. no.: F1295

33 – 11. figure 6

Pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead with a thin tip, neck and socket; full length: 5.3 cm; blade length: 2.8 cm; socket diameter: 1 cm; maximum width: 0.7 × 0.7 cm; weight: 4.22 g; inv. no.: F1332

34 – 11. figure 7
Pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead with a thin tip, its neck is thin and deformed; full length: 4.3 cm; blade length: 2 cm; socket diameter: 1.3 cm; maximum with: 0.5 x 0.4 cm; weight: 3.06 g; inv. no.: F1297

35 – 11. figure 8
Bronze pyramidal four-bladed arrowhead with a thin tip, narrowing neck and socket; full length: 4.3 cm; blade length: 1.7 cm; socket diameter: 0.9 cm; maximum width: 0.5 × 0.3 cm; weight: 3.21 g; inv. no.: F1292

36 – 11. figure 9
Irregular pyramidal arrowhead, with a blunt tip and fragmentary socket; length: 3.7 cm; maximum width: 0.5 × 0.5 cm; weight: 3.25 g; inv. no.: F579

37 – 11. figure 10
Irregular pyramidal arrowhead, with a blunt tip and fragmentary socket; length: 4.5 cm; maximum width: 0.7 × 0.8 cm; weight: 7.53 g; inv. no.: 573

38 – 11. figure 11
Cone-shaped arrowhead with fragmentary socket; length: 4 cm; maximum diameter: 1.1 cm; weight: 2.75 g; inv. no.: 574

39 – 11. figure 12
Pyramidal cross-bow projectile with a socket and cylindrical neck; full length: 6.1 cm; maximum width: 1.1 × 1.2 cm; socket diameter: 1.1 cm; weight: 26.1 g; inv. no.: F1360

40 – 11. figure 13
Pyramidal cross-bow projectile with a socket with a slightly narrowing neck; full length: 7 cm; socket diameter: 1.2 cm; maximum width: 1 × 1.1 cm; weight: 29.47 g; inv. no.: F1359

41 – 12. figure 1

Dagger scabbard chape, it has a rectangular cross-section with rounded corners, its lower end is profiled and rounded, its upper part is fragmentary; length: 7.5 cm; maximum width: 2 × 1.1 cm; inv. no.: F530 (773)

42 – 12. figure 2

Dagger scabbard chape, it has a rectangular cross-section with rounded corners, its lower end is profiled and prism-shaped, its upper part is missing; length: 4.6 cm; maximum width: 2.1 × 1.1 cm; inv. no.: F1677

Illustration list

Figure 09. Tanged arrowheads and cross-bow projectiles from King's Rock Castle (Argeș County Museum – the drawings were made by the author)

Figure 10. Socketed arrowheads from King's Rock Castle (Argeș County Museum – the drawings were made by the author)

Figure 11. Socketed arrowheads and cross-bow projectiles from King's Rock Castle (Argeș County Museum – the drawings were made by the author)

Figure 12. Dagger scabbard chapes from King's Rock Castle (Argeș County Museum – the drawings were made by the author)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexandrescu, Pop, Marcu 1973 – A. D. Alexandrescu, I. Pop, M. Marcu, *Raport asupra săpăturilor de la Hărman, jud. Braşov (1961-1971)*, MCA 10, 1973, p. 231-259.

Barabás 1891a – S. Barabás, *Erdély történetére vonatkozó regesták 1551-1553-ig,* 1. közlemény, TT 14, 1891, 431-454.

Barabás 1891b – S. Barabás, *Erdély történetére vonatkozó regesták 1551-1553-ig,* 2. közlemény, TT 14, 1891, 639-659.

Barabás 1892 – S. Barabás, *Erdély történetére vonatkozó regesták 1551-1553-ig,* 3. közlemény, TT 15, 1892, 143-158.

Benkő 1992 – E. Benkő, *A középkori Keresztúr-szék régészeti topográfiája*, VarArchHung V, 1992.

Beşliu-Munteanu 1999 – P. Beşliu-Munteanu, *Fortificaţii medievale de la Tălmaciu şi Turnul Spart. Raport arheologic preliminar*, BCMI 10, 1999, 1-4, 47-59.

Bogdan 1905 – I. Bogdan, *Relațiile Tării Românești cu Brașovul și cu Țara Ungurească în sec. XV. și XVI.*, vol. I, 1413-1508, București, 1905.

Cantacuzino 1981 – Gh. I. Cantacuzino, *Cetăţi medievale din Ţara Românească (sec. XIII-XVI)*, Bucureşti, 1981.

Chişvasi-Comşa 1959 – M. Chişvasi-Comşa, *Săpăturile de la Bucov*, MCA 6, 1959, 567-578.

Chiţescu 1976 – L. Chiţescu, *Cercetări arheologice la Cetăţeni, judeţul Argeş*, CA 4, 1976, 155-188.

Coman 2013 – M. Coman, *Putere și teritoriu. Țara Românească medievală (secolele XIV-XVI)*, Iași, 2013.

Costea 1968 – Fl. Costea, *Obiecte metalice descoperite în cetatea de pe Măgura Codlei*, Cumidava 2, 1968, 79-89.

Diaconu 1959 – P. Diaconu, *Săpăturile de la Păcuiul lui Soare*, MCA 6, 1959, 654-666.

Dzembasz 1999 – O. V. Dzembasz, *Előzetes jelentés a nevickei vár feltárásáról*, JAME 41, 1999, 267-312.

Engel 1996 – P. Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1457*, I-II, Budapest, 1996.

Győrfi 2015-2016 – Z. Győrfi, *Medieval Weapons from Bistra Mureşului*, Marisia 34–35, 2015-2016, 117-138.

Hidvégi 1863 – *Hidvégi Mikó Ferencz históriája (1594-1613)*, in MonHungHist 2, Scriptores 7, Pest, 1863.

Horwath 1929 – W. Horwath, *Die Burg bei Rucăr. Die Erbauung der Burg*, Das Burzenland IV, Die Dörfer des Burzenlandes 1, 1929, 56-62.

Iambor 2005 – P. Iambor, *Aşezări fortificate din Transilvania (sec. IX-XIII)*, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

Ioniţă 2005 – A. Ioniţă, *Spaţiul dintre Carpaţii Meridionali şi Dunărea Inferioară în secolele XI-XIII*, Bucureşti, 2005.

Karczag, Szabó 2012 – Á. Karczag, T. Szabó, *Erdély, Partium és a Bánság erődített helyei. Várak, várkastélyok, városfalak, templomvárak, barlangvárak, sáncok, erődítmények a honfoglalástól a 19. század végéig*, Second edition, Budapest, 2012.

Kordé 2003 – Z. Kordé, *A székely ispáni méltóság története a kezdetektől 1467-ig*, PhD dissertation (Manuscript), Debrecen, 2003.

Lăzărescu 1975 – E. Lăzărescu, *Despre piatra de mormânt a comitelui Laurențiu și câteva probleme arheologice și istorice în legătură cu ea*, SCIVA 4, 1975, 1-2, 109-126.

Mandache 2013 – T. Mandache, *Tipologia vârfurilor de săgeţi din Moldova secolelor XIV-XV. Metodologie, clasificare şi analiză statistică*, Analele ştiinţifice ale Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iaşi, Istorie, S. N. LIX, Iaşi, 2013, 41-60.

Marcu-Istrate – D. Marcu-Istrate (ed.), *Catedrala romano-catolică şi palatul episcopal din Alba Iulia. Arheologie şi istorie. Catalog de expoziţie – A gyulafehérvári székesegyház és püspöki palota. Régészet és történelem. Kiállítási katalógus – The Roman Catholic Cathedral and the Episcopal Palace in Alba Iulia. Exhibition catalogue. Archaeology and History*, Alba Iulia, 2009.

Măndescu, Dumitrescu, Păduraru 2014 – D. Măndescu, I. Dumitrescu, M. Păduraru, *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Argeș*, Brăila, 2014.

Mihai 1983 – V. Mihai, *Cercetările arheologice de la Dridu – „La Metereze" (jud. Ialomiţa)*, MCA 15, 1983, 439-445.

Mikecs 1943 – L. Mikecs, *A Kárpátokon túli magyarság*, in Magyarok és románok (ed.: J. Deér, L. Gáldi), Budapest, 1943.

Nägler 1967 – Th. Nägler, *Die mittelalterliche Burg Tilişca nach ihrer archäologischen Erforschung*, Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde 1, 1967, 77-85.

Nägler 1969 – Th. Nägler, *Cercetările de la cetatea Breaza (Făgăraş)*, StCom 14, 1969, 89-117.

Nägler 1977 – Th. Nägler, *Cetăţile feudale de la Orlat şi continuitatea românilor din sud-estul Transilvaniei*, StCom 20, 1977, 27-49.

Nägler, Beşliu-Munteanu 1998 – Th. Nägler, P. Beşliu-Munteanu, *Fortificaţii medievale la marginea voievodatului Transilvaniei. Cetatea medievală de la Răşinari (jud. Sibiu)*, BCMI 9, 1998, 3-4, 13-18.

Oborni 2002 – T. Oborni, *Erdély pénzügyei I. Ferdinánd uralma alatt 1552-1556*, Budapest, 2002.

Petkes, Sudár 2015 – Zs. Petkes, B. Sudár (ed.), *Magyarok fegyverben*, Budapest, 2015.

Petrescu-Dîmboviţa, Zaharia 1962 – M. Petrescu-Dîmboviţa, E. Zaharia, *Sondajul arheologic de la Dăneşti*, MCA 8, 1962, 47-63.

Popa, Ştefănescu 1980 – R. Popa, R. Ştefănescu, *Şantierul arheologic Ungra. Jud. Braşov*, MCA 14, 1980, 496-503.

Popescu 1959 – D. Popescu, *Şantierul arheologic de la Tîrgşor*, MCA 6, 1959, 727-745.

Rosetti 1962 – D. V. Rosetti, *Şantierul arheologic Cetăţeni*, MCA 8, 1962, 73-88.

Ruttkay 1976 – Al. Ruttkay, *Waffen und Reiterausrüstung des 9. bis zur ersten hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts in der Slowakei (II)*, SlovArch 24, 1976, 2, 245-396.

Sófalvi 2017 – A. Sófalvi, *Hadakozás és önvédelem a középkori és fejedelemség kori Udvarhelyszéken*, Kolozsvár, 2017.

Sófalvi 2018 – A. Sófalvi, *Királykő vára*, in Certamen V, Előadások a Magyar Tudomány Napján az Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület I. Szakosztályában (ed.: E. Egyed, T. Fejér), Kolozsvár, 2018, 153-160, 307-310.

Székely 1990 – Z. Székely, *Kora középkori települések a Székelyföldön (XI-XIV. század)*, VTT, 1990, 3-19.

Teodor, Maxim-Alaiba 1983 – D. Gh. Teodor, R. Maxim-Alaiba, *Săpăturile arheologice de la Gura Idrici – Vaslui*, MCA 15, 1983, 464-469.

Thuróczy 1980 – J. Thuróczy, *A magyarok krónikája*, Translated by J. Horváth, Budapest, 1980.

Zimmermann 2000 – B. Zimmermann, *Mittelalterliche Geschossspitzen. Kulturhistorische, archäologische und archäometallurgische Untersuchungen*, Schweizer Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters 26, Basel, 2000.

ABBREVIATIONS

BCMI – Buletinul Comisiei Monumentelor Istorice, București

CA – Cercetări arheologice, București

Călători… II-III – *Călători străini despre Țările Române II-III.* Volum îngrijit de M. Holban, București, 1970-1971.

EO I – *Erdélyi Okmánytár I (1023-1301).* Bevezető tanulmánnyal és jegyzetekkel regesztákban közzéteszi Zs. Jakó, Budapest, 1997.

JAME – A Jósa András Múzeum Évkönyve, Nyíregyháza

MCA – Materiale și cercetări arheologice. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan", București

MonHungHist – Monumenta Hungariae Historica 2, Scriptores 1-38, Pest-Budapest, 1857-1906.

Quellen… – *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Kronstadt in Siebenbürgen II-III*, in Rechnungen aus dem Archiv der Stadt Kronstadt, Kronstadt, 1889, 1896.

SCIV(A) – Studii şi cercetări de istorie vecie (şi arheologie). Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan", Bucureşti

SlovArch – Slovenská Archeológia, Nitra

StCom – Studii şi Comunicări, Arheologie – Istorie, Sibiu

SzO V – *Székely Oklevéltár V* (ed.: L. Szádeczky Kardoss), Kolozsvár, 1896.

TT – *Történelmi Tár*, 1878-1911, Budapest

Ub. II – *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen II* (hrsg.: F. Zimmermann – C. Werner – G. Müller), Hermannstadt, 1897.

Ub. IV – *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen IV* (hrsg.: G. Gündisch – F. Zimmermann), Hermannstadt, 1937.

Ub. V – *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen V* (hrsg.: G. Gündisch – F. Zimmermann), București, 1975.

VarArchHung – Varia Archaeologica Hungarica, Publicationes Instituti Archaeologici Academiae Scientiarium Hungaricae Budapestini, Budapest

VTT – Veszprémi Történelmi Tár, Veszprém