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1. Introduction

Some recent studies devoted to the history of the Kingdom of Bosporus ad-

cance a thesis about the political independence of the early Bosporan Kingdom

from the Achaemenid Empire, primarily based on the passage by Diodoros

about the rule of Archaenactidae, placed in the chapter devoted to events in

Asia.¹

Yet it has been argued that the passage in Diodoros about the events of 438

in Cimmerian Bosporus gives no direct proof of any prior independence from

the Achaemenids.² A range of material has been presented as indirect evidence

for contacts between the Achaemenid Empire and the north Pontic area and

the concomitant influence on the historical development of that region:³ the

Achaemenid seals found in Bosporus,⁴ the impression of an Achaemenid seal

on a clay weight from Olbia,⁵ the supposed connection between the Bosporan

and Persian weight systems, the parallels between some coin emblems of the

Bosporus and Olbia and Achaemenid symbols,⁶ not to mention the distribu-

tion of Iranian names in the onomasticon of Olbia and the Bosporus.⁷

This paper dwells on the finds of ‘Achaemenid’ silverware and goldware,

arms and jewellery in the vast areas outside the northern frontier of the Acha-

emenid Empire. I will characterize the objects which may be determined as

“Achaemenid” or “Achaemenid-inspired” or imitations of objects of the first

two categories, and dwell on the problems of their dating and the possibil-

ity of their attribution to certain local centres within the the wider so-called

“Achaemenid international style”.⁸

2. Analysis of objects from the north Pontic area

2.1. A rhyton from the Seven Brothers barrow no. 4

Among the five rhyta found in the Seven Brothers barrows,⁹ from barrow no. 4

came a silver rhyton with an ibex protome with a horizontally-fluted horn and
incised decoration (Fig. 1).\textsuperscript{10} The rhyton is traditionally considered to be the product of an Achaemenid workshop located in Iran and is dated to the fifth century BC. Oscar Muscarella\textsuperscript{11} compares it with four other rhyta, including that with a bull protome from Borovo in Thrace,\textsuperscript{12} a rhyton on the antiquities market,\textsuperscript{13} that to his mind seems to be a mate to the Seven Brothers rhyton, another one without provenance in the form of the full body of a ram and a vessel terminating in the forepart of a ram, supposedly from Kappadokia, once in the Norbert Schimmel Collection and now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.\textsuperscript{14} Muscarella suggests that these vessels were manufactured in the same or a closely-connected workshop, although it is difficult to define a location.\textsuperscript{15} Another rhyton of this group, 18.7cm high, was sold in 2001 at Sotheby’s in New York.\textsuperscript{16}

The protome of an ibex with outstretched front legs and with a spout for pouring wine, of unknown origin, is held in the Reza Abbasi Museum in Tehran.\textsuperscript{17} Figures of ibexes were also used as vessel handles, for instance on a silver amphora with horizontal fluting from Hamadan\textsuperscript{18} and in the case of the sculpted handles with lower attachments in the form of Silen masks in Berlin (allegedly from Erzincan)\textsuperscript{19} and Paris.\textsuperscript{20} A gold terminal of a bracelet or torque said to come from the Sardis area, once in Berlin, is also comparable in style.\textsuperscript{21}

The treatment of the lotus-and-palmette chain, including the horizontal ties at the base of the palmettes as well as the use of the guilloche pattern, puts the decoration of the upper part of the horn of the Seven Brothers rhyton (Fig. 2) close to that of the silver-gilt amphora-rhyton with sculpted handles from Kukova Mogila near Duvanli in Thrace, dated to the third quarter of the fifth century BC;\textsuperscript{22} the above-mentioned rhyton supposedly from Kappadokia, now in New York;\textsuperscript{23} a silver rhyton in the form of the head of an ibex from Siberia, kept in the State Hermitage Museum;\textsuperscript{24} as well as the skyphos from the former collection of Hagop Kevorkian, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.\textsuperscript{25} The shape of the latter finds its closest parallel in the bronze vessel from tomb no. 723 in Sardis, dated to the seventh to sixth century BC,\textsuperscript{26} although there are variations in the details of the treatment of the palmettes and lotus flowers and the latter are connected with arcs composed not of parallel lines but of dots. One should also mention a similar lotus-and-palmette chain on a silver flat-bottomed horizontally-fluted beaker in the British Museum,\textsuperscript{27} which belongs to a class of vessels shown in the hands of the members of Delegation XII, the Ionians, on the relief of the east side of the Apadana in Persepolis,\textsuperscript{28} and not only Delegation XV, allegedly the Arachosians, the latter mentioned by M. Vickers,\textsuperscript{29} as well as represented by the real finds in burial no. 6/1961 in Vani\textsuperscript{30} and allegedly from Erzerum.\textsuperscript{31}

These ornamental friezes differ in style from the lotus-and-palmette chain without guilloche pattern decorating the lip of the gold rhyton with lion protome from Hamadan, dated to the first half of the fifth century BC,\textsuperscript{32} or the frieze of palmettes and lotus flowers on the rhyton with the protome of a winged griffin from Erzincan in eastern Anatolia.\textsuperscript{33} However, a similar deco-
Fig. 1. A silver rhyton from the Seven Brothers barrow no. 4. State Hermitage, inv. SBr IV.3 (photo after Cat. St Petersburg 2004, no. 4).
rative pattern, the lotus-and-palmette chain, occurs on a wall decoration in glazed bricks from Susa, as well as on a silver-gilt bowl from the so-called second part of the Oxus Treasure and some other examples without provenance, such as a silver hemispherical bowl with gold appliqués in the Miho Museum.

The vessel from Kukova Mogila, given its characteristic shape, belongs to a class of vessels represented both by actual finds and depicted on the reliefs from Persepolis. The amphora-rhyton from Kukova Mogila is generally recognized as being executed in a purely Achaemenid style. Another, once in a private collection in Paris, originates supposedly from the region between Sinop and Trabzon. A third, in the G. Ortiz Collection in Geneva comes from a treasure found in about 1970 in the area of Sinop. It is worth noting that vessels of a similar shape are shown in the hands of the members of Delegation VI, the Lydians, and Delegation III, the Armenians. According to B. Filow, the depiction of similar vessels in the hands of members of different
delegations points to the fact that they were not regional types, but rather belonged to the type adopted by the Achaemenid court, and they could have been manufactured in workshops situated on the coasts of Asia Minor. Also, the analysis of the shape and the decoration of amphora-rhyta conducted by M. Pfrommer, gave him grounds to suggest that both the vessel from Kukova Mogila and those in the J. Paul Getty Museum were the products of a workshop in Asia Minor, probably located at the court of one of the satraps.

If the lotus-and-palmette chain on the Seven Brothers rhyton cannot provide decisive confirmation about the place of its manufacture, the treatment of the locks of hair on the neck and manes of the ibex protome (Fig. 2) can offer assistance. Their closest parallels appear on the images of double-ibex protomes over winged sun disks on a silver phiale from Usak, eastern Lydia, and on a similar bronze phiale from Ünye, both now in Ankara, as well as on the figures of animals on the handles of the above-mentioned amphora-rhyta from Kukova Mogila and from the treasure found near Sinop, now in the G. Ortiz Collection. Among the Achaemenid-style rhyta, the closest parallel is on the damaged silver rhyton with calf protome, a 1965 chance find from an early Sarmatian barrow near the village of Dolinnoe in the southern Ural area.

Thus, it seems that we can tentatively identify the rhyton from the Seven Brothers barrow no. 4 (Figs. 1, 2) as a product of this Asia Minor workshop and suggest a date for its manufacture within the first half, most probably the second quarter, of the fifth century BC. Such a date corresponds well with the dating of the burial in the fourth barrow to ca. 450-425 BC.

I therefore cannot agree with Muscarella that all the rhyta which he mentions as parallels to the Seven Brothers rhyton may have been manufactured in one and the same workshop. Not only does the much larger scale distinguish the Seven Brothers rhyton from the objects cited above; also, its manner of construction is idiosyncratic. A muff, decorated with filigree and large hemispherical umbos, covers the junction of terminal and horn; the technique is paralleled on no certainly Achaemenid rhyton.

2.2. A sword from the Chertomlyk barrow
A sword found in the Chertomlyk barrow has a hilt with gold overlay, decorated in the Achaemenid style, which differs from the gold overlay of the scabbard, executed in the so-called Graeco-Scythian style and probably representing either scenes of the Trojan War or an episode from the battle between Macedonians and Persians (Fig. 3). Besides this discrepancy, it is stated that the sword has a blade untypical for Achaemenid swords: the upper part has a row of rectangular openings along the axis. E.V. Chernenko mentions that such open-worked blades are characteristic solely of swords originating from Scythian barrows of the fourth century BC. Analysis of the decoration of the hilt of the Chertomlyk sword led A.Ju. Alekseev and E.V. Chernenko too date it to the fifth century, or even to the late sixth to early fifth century BC.
Fig. 3. A sword from the Chertomlyk barrow and the main elements of its decoration. State Hermitage, inv. Dn 1863 1/448 (photo after Cat. New York 2000, no. 163).
and to identify it as an Achaemenid product. V.G. Lukonin dated it to the fifth century BC, suggesting that the hilt overlay was hammered by a Median toret. The suggestion that an originally Achaemenid sword was reworked in Scythia in the fourth century BC is indirectly proved by the technological observations made by R.S. Minasyan. Minasyan has, however, stated that “the final proof concerning the secondary use of the sword’s hilt may be reached only after study of the inner surface, up to now unavailable for examination”.

Several discrete elements of the decoration of the hilt of the Chertomlyk sword deserve fuller discussion: (1) a finial in the form of two antithetic bull heads; (2) a palmette, decorating the finial; (3) a palm-tree pattern, decorating the vertical axis of the hilt; (4) the figures of mounted archers galloping to the left and right and the ibexes wounded with arrows decorating the side friezes of the hilt.

The motif of double-animal protomes, including those of bulls, was widespread in both Achaemenid sculpture and decorative art. An important parallel with the finial of the hilt of the Chertomlyk sword is the use of a similarly shaped palmette on a double-bull column capital excavated by W.K. Loftus in 1850-1852 from the palace of Dareios at Susa. That this motif was used for the decoration of the pommels of Achaemenid swords is testified not only by the gold dagger said to be from Hamadan decorated with double lion heads, but also by an ivory pommel with double rams’ heads in the Louvre, the provenance of which is unknown.

The stylized palm tree, very similar to the central band, decorating the hilt, was used in the decoration of the western façade of the west staircase of the palace of Dareios (tachara) at Persepolis; the evidence of the inscription suggests that the reliefs were probably added in the reign of Artaxerxes III (359-338 BC). It also appears on a stone relief showing a winged sphinx from Persepolis, originally set up on a façade of palace G, constructed by Artaxerxes III, and later transferred to the north staircase of palace H.

Others have already mentioned the parallels to the representations of mounted archers and ibexes, including that with images of riders in a hunting scene on the umbo from the Oxus Treasure, which is usually dated within the fifth to fourth centuries BC.

On the whole, analysis of the parallels to the decorative elements does not allow a precise dating for the sword. The parallels range from the last decades of the sixth to the mid-fourth century BC. The shape of the cross-guard, characteristic of akinakai of the seventh to sixth and early fifth centuries, speaks rather for an early date. At the same time, the central frieze of the hilt with the image of the palm tree finds rather similar parallels on the reliefs from Persepolis dating to the rule of Artaxerxes III, i.e. to the mid-fourth century BC.

2.3. Imitations of “Achaemenid” silverware. A silver rhyton from Kul’-Oba A silver rhyton with horizontal fluting and with a protome of a recumbent ram (Fig. 4) was found in the Kul’-Oba barrow near Kerch in eastern Crimea.
Although its shape and the horizontal fluting of the horn correspond to those of Achaemenid rhyta, the treatment of the protome, decorated with circles with dots inside, is not characteristic of Achaemenid rhyta. Rather, it finds parallels on items of the Graeco-Scythian style, for instance, on a gold overlay with images of two rams from the Scythian barrow of the mid-fourth century BC in Gajmanova Mogila. Thus, the rhyton from Kul’-Oba should be considered as a local Bosporan imitation of rhyta of Achaemenid type.

2.4. Objects of the Achaemenid circle
Deep Achaemenid bowls from the Solokha and Zhirnyj barrows. Phiale from the tumulus on Mount Zelenskaja

A.Yu. Alekseev attributes to the items made in the so-called Graeco-Achaemenid tradition a set of horse bridle found in an individual horse grave
of the Alexandropol barrow, including a frontlet in the form of a sculpted horse head with a characteristic vertical bun on the head, untypical for Scythian horses, but having parallels in items of Achaemenid toreutic. Actually, Alekseev does not provide examples of such treatment of horse hair in metalwork. Except for similar buns on the heads of winged horses, for example the handles of a silver amphora-rhyton of unknown provenance, now in Berlin, the closest parallel of which I know is the rendering of the horse hair on the gold earrings from the so-called Akhalgori Treasure found in the late 19th century in the territory of modern southern Ossetia, but this is now considered to date to the second half of the fourth to the early third century BC. At the same time, stylistically, the treatment of the horse heads on the earrings from Akhalgori, being most probably an example of Colchian workmanship in an Achaemenidizing style, have nothing to do with the frontlet from the Alexandropol barrow. Similar treatment of horse hair is also seen on the earrings with pendants from Vani burial no. 6/1961; the earrings are examples of Colchian goldwork of the fifth to the first half of the fourth century BC. However, the attribution seems to be arguable, especially given the parallels both in form and decoration with gold and silver frontlets from the Thracian tumuli of the second half of the fourth century BC.

We can discuss with much more certitude the bronze phialae from the central burial of the Solokha barrow and from the destroyed burial of the Zhirnyj (“Fat”) barrow near Stanitsa Temizbekovskaja in the Kuban valley as examples of metalware of the Achaemenid circle: they belong to the group of the so-called deep Achaemenid bowls which originate primarily from Egypt, Iran, Syria and Cyprus. On the basis of proportions, Pfrommer dates the bowl from Solokha (Fig. 5) as early as the first half of the fifth century BC, which seems not to be substantially grounded. In its shape and proportions it is rather similar to a silver bowl from Gezer. The bowl from Zhirnyj barrow (Fig. 6), which M. Pfrommer does not discuss, finds closest parallels among the silver bowls from Raduvene in Thrace. Another close parallel is a bronze bowl found in the Lycian necropolis of Karaçalli near Antalya, dated to the first quarter of the fourth century BC. Its shape and proportions may also be compared with those of the silver bowls from Erzincan, although the latter are much larger in dimension.

A silver phiale from tomb no. 3 in the barrow on Mount Zelenskaja on the Taman peninsula (Fig. 7), with flaring offset rim and decorated in the lower round-bottomed part with numerous petals, belongs to the type “Flache Schale mit gerade verlaufender Wandung und ausladendem Rand” (after Abka’i-Khavari). It finds parallels in tomb B at Derveni in Macedonia, in the Naip tumulus in southeastern Thrace, in Prusias in Bithynia (reportedly) and in the burial on the acropolis of Susa. A similar mid-fourth century BC phiale comes from Acarnania. All these phialae are decorated with pointed leaves, not with petals, thus, they are often designated as “leaf phiale”, a type derived from Achaemenid fluted phialae of the fifth century and known in
Greece by the early fourth century. M. Pfrommer maintains that the phiale from the Zelenskoi tumulus is executed in the late Achaemenid tradition and he compares it with the pre-Ptolemaic phiale from the Tuch el-Karamus Treasure. Indeed, the shape of the Tuch el-Karamus phiale is similar to that of the Zelenskoi phiale. Among the phialae from Tuch el-Karamus, a vessel with similar petalled decoration should be mentioned. Petalled decoration is seen on a bronze phiale from Ur, with a very similar profile, on a silver phiale from the Oxus Treasure and more often on some silver bowls of similar shape from Thrace.

3. Achaemenid objects and earlier Near Eastern finds in the north Pontic area

Thus, the six finds discussed above are the only examples of: (a) toreutics of Achaemenid style (the handle of the Chertomlyk sword); (b) “Achaemenid-inspired” objects (the rhyton from the Seven Brothers barrow no. 4, the bowls from the Solokha, Zhirnyj and Zelenskoj barrows); and (c) imitations of the Achaemenid style (the rhyton from Kul’-Oba) found in the north Pontic area. Their volume is much less than the number of Near Eastern toreutic items of the eighth to seventh century BC found in the Kelermes barrows in the Kuban area. The Near Eastern imports are primarily details of furniture and utensils, which were most probably used by the Scythians in a way other
than originally intended. The majority of the other toreutic items found in the Kelermes barrows, arms (a sword, a ceremonial axe, decorative plates of shields and quivers), vessels (a bowl and rhyta) and a mirror, were rather items of Urartian, Iranian and Asia Minor origin made for Scythian customers in the second to third quarters of the seventh century BC. According to L.K. Galanina, several such workshops could have existed in the Near East. However, repeated stylistic elements on the items, executed in various artistic traditions, rather speak in favour of a single workshop, in which craftsmen of various origins could have worked together. Perhaps, this “Scythian workshop”, uniting toreuts from Urartu, Iran, Lydia and Ionia, could have operated at the headquarters of the Scythian kings during their raids in the Near East, although the suggestion of the possible location of this workshop at the Scythian headquarters in the Kuban area has also been raised.

In addition, fragmentary silver rhyta of the late seventh to early sixth century BC, most probably of the pre-Achaemenid period, were found in the early Scythian barrows in the Don area (Krivorozh’e) and the forest-steppe of Ukraine (Ljubotin barrow no. 2). They originally looked similar to the rhyta from Marash in Syria and Filippovka in southern Ural.
4. Patterns of distribution of Achaemenid finds

4.1. The Black Sea area and Caucasus
Another question concerns the various patterns of distribution of Achaemenid finds. The rhyton with a winged-ibex protome, which may be attributed to an Asia Minor workshop, worked in the Achaemenid style in the second quarter of the fifth century BC, is the only item executed in this style found in the rich burial of the Seven Brothers barrow no. 4. The barrow is dated to the middle to the third quarter of the fifth century, and yielded both toreutic items of supposedly Attic workmanship, a silver cup with gilded engraved images (Nike sitting on a stool with carved legs) dated to ca. 470 BC, and items of local Bosporan workshops, including other rhyta. Similar toreutic items worked in the Achaemenid style are represented, for instance, by the above-mentioned amphora-rhyton from Kukova Mogila in Thrace, whose burial is more or less synchronous to that of the Seven Brothers barrow no. 4, or the rhyton with a bull protome from the so-called Borovo Treasure of the first half of the fourth century BC.

It is worth noting that the small quantity of toreutic items in the Achaemenid style from the north Pontic area contrasts to the rather numerous distribution of seals, both cylinder and scaraboid, of Graeco-Persian type. They originate, primarily, from the necropoleis of the Bosporan Kingdom, first of all Pantikapaion, with separate finds in one of the Seven Brothers barrows and from Chersonesos (see Appendix 1) (Fig. 8). Remarkable also is the fact that such seals are practically unknown in the Scythian barrows of the Dnieper basin, where, for instance in Chertomlyk, there are known finds of gold finger bezelrings with engraved images of east Greek type. In the north Pontic area, four of 14 seals originating from reliable contexts are cylinder seals, which were used in the Achaemenid Empire from the reign of Dareios
I for sealing royal documents. At the same time, some of the seals found in the area of the Bosporan Kingdom were most probably cut in western Anatolia, primarily in Lydia, where numerous examples of Achaemenid-type seals have been found. Noteworthy is the comparison of the motif of a pair of confronting winged griffins on a scaraboid with a Lydian inscription from

Fig. 8. The distribution of Graeco-Persian seals of the fifth to fourth century BC in the Crimea and the Kuban area (map M. Treister).
Pantikapaion\textsuperscript{116} with the motif of a pyramidal stamp seal from Ikiztepe\textsuperscript{117}. Also, the loops of the scarabs from Nymphaion and Seven Brothers barrow no.3 find exact prototypes among the loops of the scaraboids from Ikiztepe\textsuperscript{118} and from Sardis\textsuperscript{119} in Lydia.

On the other hand, neither in Scythia nor in the Cimmerian Bosporus was jewellery of the Achaemenid style found. This situation contrasts sharply with numerous finds, including bracelets of various types\textsuperscript{120} and a pectoral,\textsuperscript{121} found in burial no.6 in Vani, Colchis. Also in Colchis (Mtsidziri), an “Achaemenid-inspired” silver rhyton with a protome of a syncretic deity was found.\textsuperscript{122} The finds of “Achaemenid-inspired” jewellery and vessels of Achaemenid style occur not only from Colchis, which paid tribute to the Achaemenid Empire and was a buffer state adjoining its border,\textsuperscript{123} but also in northeastern Georgia, most certainly outside the border of the Achaemenid Empire (the so-called Akhalgori Treasury, presumably an inventory of a burial dated to the late fourth to early third century BC\textsuperscript{124} and the so-called Kazbegi Treasure).\textsuperscript{125} It is also remarkable that in the territory of modern Georgia, of which only a certain part allegedly belonged to the Achaemenid satrapy, only six Achaemenid seals, four of which originated from later contexts of the first centuries AD, have been found.\textsuperscript{126} At the same time, Georgian finds of jewellery and vessels made of precious metals in the Achaemenid style, both in terms of quantity and variety of types, exceed those from Armenia, which was certainly an Achaemenid satrapy, and which has yielded silver Achaemenid and Achaemenid-style rhyta in the Erebuni Treasure\textsuperscript{127} and also separate finds of jewellery, such as a pectoral from Armavir.\textsuperscript{128}

4.2. The south Ural region
The distribution of Achaemenid and Achaemenid-style silver, silver-gilt and gold vessels, including various shapes, such as rhyta, double-handled jugs, cups and phialae, exemplifies an absolutely different pattern in the rather compact area of the south Ural. All ten finds originate from early Sarmatian burials of the fourth century BC, including those in barrows no. 1 and no. 4 of Filippovka,\textsuperscript{129} barrows no. 1 and B in Prokhorovka,\textsuperscript{130} Dolinnoe\textsuperscript{131} and Orsk.\textsuperscript{132}

4.2.1. Vessels made of precious metals
4.2.1.1. Vessels from Filippovka
A gold goblet with double-layered walls and double handles shaped as ibexes (Fig. 9) from cache no. 2 in barrow no. 1 is unique.\textsuperscript{133} However, a stylistically similar treatment of animal heads may be seen on a silver inscribed rhyton, the lower part of which is shaped in the form of three ibex heads. The rhyton,\textsuperscript{134} which is kept in the National Museum, Tehran, originates from the so-called Western Cave Treasure (Kalmakareh cave in Luristan), which was looted between 1989 and 1992.\textsuperscript{135} Given the Neo-Elamite and Neo-Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions on many of the vessels, the treasure may be dated to the late seventh or to the early sixth century BC. It may be supposed, thus,
that this is the earliest of the vessels found in Filippovka – it may be tenta-
tively dated to the late sixth to the first half of the fifth century BC – and can
be attributed as an item of an Iranian (Luristan?) workshop.

A silver amphora-rhyton (Fig. 10) from burial no. 4 of barrow no. 4/2006\textsuperscript{136}
belongs to the same class of vessels as a piece from Kukova Mogila, which
has already been discussed briefly above.\textsuperscript{137} The decoration of the vessel's
body with only vertical fluting (without lotus-palmette chain) finds parallels on vessels of unknown origin in the Pomerance Collection\textsuperscript{138} and the Berlin Museum.\textsuperscript{139} The closest parallel to the handle showing an ibex occurs on a vessel in the Ortiz Collection.\textsuperscript{140} A similar silver handle showing a bull figure with its head turned back (but without a spout) originates from the treasure of a toreut found in Babylon and dates to the middle of the first quarter of the fourth century BC.\textsuperscript{141} Given the distribution of such vessels, both actual artefacts and depictions,\textsuperscript{142} there are good reasons to date the amphora-rhyton from Filippovka from the mid-fifth to the early fourth century BC and to consider it as derived from an Asia Minor workshop.

The closest parallel in shape to the silver-gilt tulip-shaped rhyton (Fig. 11) from cache no. 2 in barrow no. 1\textsuperscript{143} is a silver goblet, with a lost, supposedly conical basin, from treasure no. 2 found in the early 20th century in Panderma in the western Asia Minor. The body of this cup is horizontally fluted, the incised frieze on the upper part of the body is composed of alternate circles and double lotus flowers. The shape and decoration of the goblet from Panderma give reason to consider it as inspired by the lydion shape and to date it tentatively to ca. 400 BC, considering it as an item of a Lydian workshop.\textsuperscript{144}
A rosette composed of lily petals (nelumbo) is a characteristic element of the fifth to fourth century BC silver goblets distributed primarily in Egypt, but known also outside of its borders, for instance in Asia Minor, Macedonia and Thrace. The feature of gilt elements alternating with similar ones in silver colour is characteristic of items of toreutics of the first half of the fourth century BC, for example the phiale said to have been found in Akarnania and those from the Rogozen Treasure, as well as the above-mentioned jugs from the Rogozen Treasure. Thus, the vessel from Filippovka may be most probably dated within the period the late fifth/early fourth century BC to the first half of the fourth century BC and considered as the product of a workshop located in western Asia Minor or Thrace.

A silver rhyton with a bull protome (Fig. 12) from cache no. 2 in barrow no. 1 finds its nearest parallel in the above-mentioned find from Borovo and is probably an item manufactured in the first half of the fourth century BC in the workshop of the quarters of the king of the Odrysian dynasty.

A vessel with a flat-bottom, egg-shaped body, decorated with concentric incised lines, encrusted with gold wire, with a short neck widening towards the out-turning lip (Fig. 13) from cache no. 1 of barrow no. 1 most probably imitates the form of the lydion, a silver vessel of that shape which is known also in Lydian pottery originating from looters’ excavations of the Ikiztepe barrow in eastern Lydia.

The encrustation of grooves with gold wire is a feature unknown, up till
now, on items of toreutics of the Achaemenid circle. Though some of the Achaemenid silver vessels bear gold inlays, they are made in the form of thin gold plates, inserted in grooves in the walls. At the same time, we see
motifs in gold wire or narrow strips of gold inlaid in silver on some items of Thracian toreutics dated to the first half to the middle of the fourth century BC. We cannot define precisely the centre of manufacture of the vessel from Filippovka or its exact date.
4.2.1.2. Vessels from Prokhorovka
Special studies devoted to the vessels from Prokhorovka allow me to avoid repetition of their analysis. One of the phialae found in barrow no. 1 (Fig. 14) may be dated to the second half of the fifth century BC, a second phiale from barrow no. 1 (Fig. 15) and the cup from barrow B (Fig. 16) belong to the second half of the fourth century BC.

The comparative material does not allow us to determine the manufacturing centre of the earlier phiale (Fig. 14), though parallels to its shape and decoration permit an attribution to the class of vessels which were broadly used in various satrapies of the Achaemenid Empire. From that point of view, the phiale now kept in Alma-Ata may be conventionally determined as an item of “Achaemenid international style”.

The later phiale (Fig. 15), kept in Orenburg, was supposedly manufactured in Alexandria. The peculiar features of its shape and decoration testify that

Fig. 15. A silver phiale from Prokhorovka, barrow no. 1. Orenburg, Local Lore Museum, inv. 47/3 (photo courtesy of L.T. Jablonskij).
Fig. 16. A silver-gilt cup from Prokhorovka, barrow B, burial no. 3. Orenburg, Local Lore Museum, inv. 18873/1148 (photo courtesy of L.T. Jablonskij).
that is rather an “Achaemenid-inspired” item, executed in an early Hellenistic workshop, and one of the numerous articles executed also after the disintegration of the Achaemenid Empire in the territories of the former satrapies.161

For the “Achaemenid” bowls of the so-called Macedonian type, to which, given its shape, the cup from barrow B (Fig. 16) is rather close, a different decoration of the lower part of the body and the bottom is characteristic. Neither of the bowls found in Macedonia demonstrates similar incised and gilded floral patterns with ivy leaves.162 The “Macedonian” bowls have rather standard dimensions; they are significantly smaller than the bowl from Prokhorovka. Similar decoration, in terms of shape and technique, occurs only on two bowls of somewhat different shape, with much more elongated necks: one of these bowls originates from south Italy,163 the other from Thrace.164 The lower parts of both bowls have vertical fluting, similar to those of the “Macedonian” bowls. In spite of the proximity in terms of form and proportion to the so-called Achaemenid bowls of Macedonian type, the dimensions and decoration of the bowl from Prokhorovka testify most probably to manufacture outside of Macedonia. However, given the peculiarity of its decoration, we do not possess data which would allow for a more precise localization of its workshop.165

4.2.1.3. Comparative analysis of the imported metal vessels of the Filippovka and Prokhorovka necropoleis
In general, the silver vessels of the Achaemenid style from Filippovka (Figs. 9-13) are dated between the mid-fifth and the first half of the fourth century BC. The majority of them may be considered as products of Asia Minor and (or) Thracian workshops. The vessels found in Prokhorovka (Figs. 14-16) were manufactured in different centres and at different times: two of the three vessels are items not of the Achaemenid style, but, rather, they are “Achaemenid-inspired” objects, executed in the second half of the fourth century BC most probably in the Balkans and in Alexandria.

4.2.2. Jewellery
Not only the quantity of vessels, which constitute the most numerous group of Achaemenid and “Achaemenid-inspired” vessels of precious metals outside the borders of the Achaemenid Empire, and the variety of shapes speak in favour of a different pattern of distribution, but also the fact that some of the above-mentioned graves (Filippovka barrow nos. 4 and 15 and a barrow near Orsk) yielded finds of Achaemenid jewellery, including torques, bracelets and an element of a pectoral. Burial no. 4 of barrow no. 4/2006 of the Filippovka necropolis yielded gold jewellery in the Achaemenid style, including a torque (Fig. 17)166 and an omega-shaped bracelet with sculpted images of ibexes (Fig. 18)167 (similar images may be seen on the bracelets from the Oxus Treasure). A barrow near Orsk yielded a torque with the terminals in the form of sculpted ibexes169, similar to the images on the terminals of a pair of
Fig. 17. A gold torque from Filippovka, barrow no. 4, burial no. 4. Orenburg, Local Lore Museum, inv. 19066 (photo courtesy of L.T. Jablonskij).
bracelets from Filippovka.  

Comparable images of caprids decorate fragmentary gold torques from the Oxus Treasure and a piece now in Brooklyn.  

The modelling of the back legs in low relief with cells for inlays on the hoops (Fig. 18) finds parallels, for instance, on the gold bracelets with lion-griffin terminals from Dağ Kızıla Köyü near Manisa and from the Oxus Treasure.  

Also, the decoration of the ribbed hoop of the torque from Filippovka with transverse grooves (Fig. 17) finds numerous parallels in jewellery of Achaemenid style.  

At the same time, Achaemenid-style seals are almost unknown,
except for the find from barrow no. 2 near Pokrovka of a conical chalcedony stamp showing the king in a struggle with a lion.\textsuperscript{176}

A gold plaque with cloisonné decoration, showing a bearded man wearing typical Achaemenid headware (Fig. 19), was reused as an amulette in the female Sarmatian burial no. 1 of Filippovka barrow no. 15/2004.\textsuperscript{177} Its closest parallel originates from Yozgat in Turkey.\textsuperscript{178} Another piece of unknown origin is kept in the State Hermitage Museum.\textsuperscript{179} Both plaques were originally parts of some complicated ornament, like a pectoral, which is now kept in Miho Museum.\textsuperscript{180} The similarity of these objects, in terms of the images, style and decorative technique, with the gold roundels from Susa\textsuperscript{181} and an earring once in the Norbert Schimmel Collection\textsuperscript{182} is evident. The burial excavated in 1901 on the acropolis of Susa was previously dated to the very end of the Achaemenid period, based on the date of coins that were minted at Arad on the Syrian coast allegedly between 350-332 BC.\textsuperscript{183} However, the coins and, correspondingly, the tomb itself and the jewellery it yielded were recently redated to the late fifth century BC.\textsuperscript{184}

4.2.3. Arms

The silver handle of a knife, decorated with a stag protome with gold-inlaid details, was found in burial no. 5 of barrow no. 5 in Filippovka.\textsuperscript{185} It finds a close parallel in a hippopotamus ivory knife handle found in a tumulus at Dedetepe in northwestern Turkey, which is dated by the burial inventory to ca. 480-460 BC.\textsuperscript{186} Its Achaemenid inspiration is further confirmed by the outlined beard leading to the ears and, especially, by the typical representation of the animal’s hindquarters in relief, as we see on some of the Achaemenid rhyta,\textsuperscript{187} on the majority of amphora-rhyta\textsuperscript{188} and in jewellery.\textsuperscript{189} At the same time, the treatment of individual elements of the image (the eyes, wings, joints, shoulder blades etc.) on the knife handle from Filippovka vary from the characteristic canons of Achaemenid-style art. Although the silver figures of animals in the round which were used primarily as vessel handles are often additionally inlaid with gold,\textsuperscript{190} the decoration of the knife handle from Filippovka differs from these in the shape of the gold inlays, which are comparable with the gold-inlaid decoration on the iron swords, quiver hooks and knife from Filippovka\textsuperscript{191} and on the dagger from the princely Saka burial in Issyk barrow in Kazakhstan.\textsuperscript{192} The suggestion that this technique had early roots with the Eurasian nomads is corroborated by its use already in the...
seventh century BC, based on the evidence of the decoration of an axe\textsuperscript{192} and arrowheads\textsuperscript{194} from barrow Arzhan-2 in south Siberia. Thus, it is evident that the handle of the knife from Filippovka cannot be considered as an example of the Achaemenid international style, although it was inspired by such an item, most probably of Asia Minor manufacture in the first half of the fifth century BC. We do not know who created this knife handle. The peculiarities of style and the inlaid technique do not exclude the possibility that it could have been manufactured either in a provincial Achaemenid workshop where its craftsmen considered the tastes of the Sarmatian client or by a Sarmatian metalworker after Achaemenid prototypes.

4.2.4. Changes of function and repairs
Another important feature is a change of function for some of the objects by the Sarmatians. In contrast to the finds from Colchis and northeastern Georgia, which are represented both by imports from the Achaemenid Empire, most of which were manufactured presumably in Anatolia, as well as by locally made “Achaemenid-inspired” items, one of the objects found in south Ural may be identified as a locally-made item imitating metalware or jewellery of Achaemenid type. At the same time, the phialae from barrow no. 1 near Prokhorovka had secondary use as phalerae of horse-harnesses (Figs. 14-15), while one of them bears signs of a handicraft repair, by means of sewing with the help of a narrow silver strip (Fig. 15).\textsuperscript{195} One of the handles of a silver-gilt amphora-rhyton (Fig. 10) from barrow no. 4/2006 near Filippovka was lost and the vessel was most probably used as an incense-burner.\textsuperscript{196}

5. The means of distribution
A.Yu. Alekseev suggests that the Chertomlyk sword (Fig. 3) could have been a gift from Alexander the Great to the Scythians, in exchange for the gifts sent from Scythia, or that it could have been a Scythian heirloom that somehow made its way from Persia in the fifth century BC, perhaps via the Saka tribes.\textsuperscript{197} According to E.V. Chernenko, the sword could have been booty that the Scythians captured from the Persians during Dareios’ invasion of the steppes at the end of the sixth century BC.\textsuperscript{198} All these suggestions seem to me to be mere speculations, as we do not have any conclusive data for dating the sword and its reworking.

The possible manufacture of the Seven Brothers rhyton (Figs. 1, 2) in an Anatolian workshop, working in the Achaemenid style, as well as the burial inventory do not give us any hints concerning the possible relation of the find to direct contacts with the Achaemenid Empire, although one cannot exclude the possibility that the rhyton was a diplomatic gift. Such a function fits the suggestion that the Seven Brothers barrows formed a necropolis of the Sindian kings,\textsuperscript{199} and the proximity of the dates of the rhyton and the burial. It is worth noting that the earliest items of toreutics and glyptics of the
Achaemenid style find their way into Cimmerian Bosporus and Sindike not later than the middle of the fifth century BC, during the rule of Artaxerxes I. Most of the cylinder seals and scaraboids, whose provenance is known to us (Fig. 8), originate from the fourth century burials. However, the earliest burial complex containing such a find – the tomb of a warrior excavated in Nymphaion in 1876 (see Appendix 1, no. 9) – is dated already to the first half of the fifth century BC. Is it possible to discuss them as evidence of diplomatic contacts of the Achaemenid Empire, for which, in the period discussed – the last stage of the Graeco-Persian Wars before the Kallias Peace (449 BC) – the strengthening their positions in the basin of the Black Sea could have a certain interest? Although the material in our possession does not give any grounds for direct historical conclusions, undoubtedly it reflects certain contacts (see below). In any case, we have a striking similarity in the distribution patterns of the Achaemenid seals of the fifth to fourth centuries BC and the bronze finger rings of the late third century BC of Ptolemaic type in the north Pontic area, which can hardly be coincidental.

There are also several examples of bronze and silver phialae of Achaemenid types, found both in the early burial of the royal Scythian barrow of Solokha (Fig. 5) as well as in the fourth century BC burials on the Taman peninsula (Zelenskaya Gora: Fig. 7) and in the Kuban area (Zhirnyi barrow: Fig. 6). The Kul’-Oba rhyton with a ram protome (Fig. 4) testifies that toreutic items of Achaemenid style were known in the north Pontic area and were even imitated by local craftsmen.

The various patterns of distribution of Achaemenid goldware and silverware and jewellery by the early Sarmatian tribes of the south Ural area (Fig. 20) suggest a different explanation of the means of their distribution. One of the burials in the barrows near Orsk (not the same one with the gold torque, executed in the Achaemenid style, and a silver rhyton) contained an alabastron with a quadrilingual inscription with the name of Artaxeres, most probably Artaxerxes I, and the most plausible explanation, according to R. Schmitt, is that “solche Gefäße als Geschenke des Großkönigs für irgendwelche Verdienste aufzufassen sind, die die so Ausgezeichneten dann mit nach Hause genommen haben…” Also, A.S. Balakhvanstev and L.T. Yablonskij maintain that such prestigious objects could have been donated to chiefs of nomads for their service as mercenaries for the Achaemenids. These suggestions seem to be appropriate explanations. It is maintained that the major stream of objects of Near Eastern and Egyptian origin penetrated to the south Ural region via Khoresm and could hardly have found their way into this area after the independence of Khoresm from the Achaemenid Empire, not later than the late fifth century BC. If one accepts this, then most of the Achaemenid-style vessels found in Filippovka and the phialae and bowl found in Prokhorovka (i.e. both the vessels allegedly manufactured in Asia Minor workshops in the second half of the fifth to the first half of the fourth century BC and the “Achaemenid-inspired” items of the second half
of the fourth century BC manufactured by craftsmen of the eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans) found different ways to the Sarmatians of the south Ural region.

One explanation with regard to the finds of silver vessels in Prokhorovka is the suggestion that the Sarmatians could have acquired them during the plundering of the Macedonian transport. This hypothesis is based on the passages in Diodoros and Curtius Rufus which state that the Dachoi and Massagetae served under Dareios III and played an important role in the battle near Arbellae (Diod. 17.59; Curt. 4.15.1-12). To my mind, this is a plausible explanation of the finds of parts of objects and the dense distribution of various categories of objects, a considerable number of which was reworked or used in a way other than the original function. In any case, the same way via Dachoi is suggested by A.S. Balakhvantsev and L.T. Jablonskij for the silver bowl found in Prokhorovka barrow B (Fig. 16).

Appendix 1. Achaemenid seals in the north Pontic area

Seals which are more or less contemporary with the date of the burials in which they have been found have been identified in Seven Brothers barrow no. 3 (no. 9). The barrow is allegedly associated with the latest Sindian king, Hekateios. Also, both finds from Nymphaion (nos. 10-11) seem to be more or less close in date to those of the respective burials. However, some of the seal finds originate from distinctly later complexes, for instance, a scaraboid (no. 7) which is dated to the first half of the fourth century BC was found in a rather modest female burial on the Mithridates mound in Kerch dated to the late fourth to early third century BC. A fifth to fourth century BC seal (no. 12) was found in the burial of the “3rd Dame” in Bol’shaja Bliznitsa tumulus, which is also dated to the late fourth to early third century BC. A fourth century BC scaraboid (no. 6) was found in a cremation dated to the first half of the third century BC. Two early fourth century seals (nos. 1, 2) originate from a destroyed female burial in a wooden sarcophagus in a barrow at Stanitsa...
Blagoveshchenskaja near Anapa, which is dated to the mid-third century BC; a prism seal from this barrow (no. 2) and a cylinder seal from Chersonesos (no. 13) were in secondary use.

Seals with recorded find context

   Blue chalcedon.
   Date: early fourth century BC.
   Date of the complex: mid-third century BC (Pfrommer 1990b, 262, FK 120). On a wooden sarcophagos, see Sokol’skij 1969, 29-31, no. 21 with bibliography.
   State Hermitage, inv. Гп. 1882.55.
   Literature: CR St Petersburg 1882-1888, pl. V.3-3a; Boardman 2000, 163, fig. 5.19, 165; Boardman 2001, 353, pl. 878; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 30, no. 7.

2. Blagoveshchenskaja near Anapa, a barrow, excavated by V.G. Tiesenhau-sen in 1882.
   Four-sided prism seal (A) a Persian holding a bow; (B) a bearded Greek, in a himation, playing with a dog; (C) a naked woman stretching; (D) two cocks fighting. Greek style.
   Cornelian.
   Date: early fourth century BC.
   Date of the complex: mid-third century BC (Pfrommer 1990b, 262, FK 120).
   State Hermitage, inv. Гп. 1882.56.

3. Kerch, 1834. Tomb number or description unknown to me.
   Cylinder seal. Persian king in battle with Greek warriors; a symbol of Akhuramazda above.
   Discoloured stone in gold frame with double hoop.
   Date: fifth century BC.
   Date of the complex: unknown to me.
   State Hermitage, inv. П. 1834.71.
   Literature: Reinach 1892, 58, pl. XVI.2-3; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 30, no. 9.

4. Kerch, 1842. Tomb number or description unknown to me.
   Cylinder seal. Persian king, two sphinxes, a Demon under a palm tree; a symbol of Akhuramazda above.
Cornelian, on a gold chain.  
**Date**: fifth century BC.  
**Date of the complex**: unknown to me.  
State Hermitage, inv. П. 1842.112.  
**Literature**: Reinach 1892, 59, pl. XVI.5-6; Nikulina 1994, fig. 426; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 30, no. 10.

5. Kerch, excavations at the Pavlovskaya battery by A.B. Ashik in 1842. Cist tomb with a female burial in a wooden sarcophagos.  
Scaraboid. Two sphinxes sitting in crowns, over them a Lydian inscription. Court style. West Anatolian stamp seal (Boardman 2000, 166).  
Cornelian, flattened gold hoop, widening in the centre.  
**Date**: fifth century BC.  
**Date of the complex**: late fifth century BC (Boardman 1970, 37, n. 98). About the complex, see Reinach 1892, 50 (gold finger ring pl. XVIII.9; bronze mirror, alabaster).  
State Hermitage, inv. П. 1842.111.  
**Literature**: Reinach 1892, 59, pl. XVI.10; Boardman 1970, 39, no. 5, pl. 1.5; Nikulina 1994, fig. 447; Boardman 2000, 166-167, fig. 5.27; Boardman 2001, 351, pl. 834; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 31, no. 12; Fedoseev 2007, 1022, fig. 16.4. Cf. a similar hoop, widening in the centre: a scaraboid from Pavlovskij barrow (Boardman 2001, pl. 822).

Scaraboid. A sphinx.  
Discoloured stone, flattened gold hoop.  
**Date**: fifth century BC.  
**Date of the complex**: unknown to me.  
State Hermitage, inv. П. 1852.18.  
**Literature**: Reinach 1892, 59, pl. XVI.14; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 32, no. 19.

Chalcedony.  
**Date**: fourth century BC.  
**Date of the complex**: mid-third century BC(?). A scaraboid with an image of a stag (Reinach 1892, 59, pl. XVI.9), a gold finger ring (Reinach 1892, 61, pl. XVIII.1), a bronze finger ring with a portrait image of Ptolemy II (Reinach 1892, 62, pl. XVIII.12; Neverov 1976b, 167, 170, pl. I.3, 179, n. 7) and earrings (Reinach 1892, 47, pl. VII.1) were found in a “painted vase with the profiles of a female head and the head of a horse”. About the complex, see Reinach 1892, 59; Neverov 1976b, 167.  
State Hermitage, inv. П. 1839.8.
Chalcedony.
Date: first half of the fourth century BC.
Date of the complex: late fourth to early third century BC. Among other finds, six copper coins (Burachkov 1884, pl. XX, 89 = Shelov 1978, pl. V, 56 = Anokhin 1986, pl. 3, 112) and one copper coin (Burachkov 1884, pl. XX, 93 = Shelov 1956, pl. V, 55 = Anokhin 1986, pl. 3, 113) were found. According to V.A. Anokhin, the coins belong to the series Π-24, which he dates to ca. 314-310 BC (Anokhin 1986, 140). E.M. Alekseeva dates the beads found in the burial to the second half of the fourth to the third century BC (Alekseeva 1975, 76, no. Π200). A gold finger ring with an image of a lion attacking a bull (Shkorpil 1910, 18, fig. 3) is dated to the fourth century BC (Neverov 1986, 23, 27, n. 75).
State Hermitage, inv. Π. 1907.7.
Literature: CR St Petersburg 1907, 79, fig. 68; Pharmacowsky 1908, 169 f.; Shkorpil 1910, 18, fig. 2; Neverov 1976a, no. 49; Neverov 1983, 109; Nikulina 1994, fig. 290; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 34, no. 32.

9. Seven Brothers barrow no 3, excavated by V.G. Tiesenhausen in 1876.
Scaraboid. A bear. The Group of Leaping Lions.
Chalcedony. Gold hoop, circular in section.
Date: first half of the fourth century BC.
Date of the complex: first quarter of the fourth century BC (Vlasova 2001b, 131), after the find of a Thasian stamp of the early fourth century BC.
State Hermitage, inv. СБр. III.1.

10. Nymphaion, barrow no. 24/1876, tomb no. 19 1876, burial of a warrior.
Scaraboid. (A) A cow with a calf; (B) a symbol of Ahuramazda.
Obsidian. Gold hoop, circular in section.
Date: first half of the fifth century BC.
Date of the complex: first half of the fifth century BC.
State Hermitage, inv. ГК/Н. 84.
Literature: CR St Petersburg 1877, 224, pl. III; Minns 1913, 208, fig. 106; Silant‘eva 1959, 56, fig. 24.2; Brentjes 1967, 239, pl. I; Artamonow 1970, 24, fig. 36; Neverov 1983, 108; Neverov 1995, 72-73, no. 15, pl. XII.3; Cat. St Petersburg 1999, 112, no. 293; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 35, no. 35.
11. Nymphaion, barrow no. 5/1868, female burial.
Scaraboid. A winged lion, standing on its hind paws.
Chalcedony.
**Date:** first half of the fourth century BC.
**Date of the complex:** first half of the fourth century BC(?)
**Literature:** Vickers 1979, 44, pl. 14b-c; Boardman 2001, pl. 838; Vickers 2002, 9, 42-43, pl. 15 (below).

12. Great Bliznitsa tumulus, the so-called burial of the “3rd Dame”, excavated in 1868.
Octogon seal. Persian king in a struggle with a lion. Court style.
Chalcedony, flattened hoop.
**Date:** fifth to fourth century BC.
**Date of the complex:** late fourth to early third century BC (Pruglo 1974, 77; Schwarzmaier 1996, 136).
State Hermitage, inv. ББ. 123.
**Literature:** CR St Petersburg 1869, pl. I.18; Boardman 1970, 42, no. 86, pl. 4; Neverov 1983, 107; Nikulina 1994, fig. 445; Schwarzmaier 1996, 123, fig. 10 (below right); Boardman 2001, 351, pl. 824; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 31, no. 14.

13. Chersonesos, 1853.
Cylinder seal, fragmented. A mounted Persian with a spear.
Cornelian.
**Date:** fourth century BC.
**Date of the complex:** unknown to me.
State Hermitage, inv. X. 1853.5
**Literature:** Neverov 1983, 111; Neverov 1984, 47; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 31, no. 11.

14. Phanagoria, tile burial in a barrow to the west of the site, excavated in 1954.
Scaraboid. A female with a phiale in her hand.
Chalcedony, flattened gold framing.
**Date:** middle to second half of the fourth century BC.
**Date of the complex:** late fourth to early third century BC.
Moscow, State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, inv. Ф-1138.
**Literature:** Marchenko 1960, 22-27; Nikulina 1965, 186, fig. 1.11, 192-195; Finogenova 1993, no. 3; Nikulina 1994, fig. 516; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 31, no. 11.

15. Smela, Cherkassy region, Ukraine, a group of barrows over Kholodnyj Jar, barrow no. 19/1885.
Cylinder seal. Horse galloping to the right. A symbol of Ahuramazda above.
Chalcedony.
**Date**: late fifth to fourth century BC.
**Date of the complex**: fourth century BC (Petrenko 1967, 95).
**Literature**: Bobrinskij 1887, 76, fig. on p. 77; Minns 1913, 193, fig. 85; Rostowzew 1931, 425, Achaemenid; Onajko 1970, 119, no. 849, pl. XVIII.
The closest parallel is a chalcedony cylinder seal in Berlin attributed as an item of the Achaemenid court style: Boardman 2000, 159-160, fig. 5.14; Boardman 2001, 351, pl. 831; Cat. Speyer 2006, 45.

Greco-Persian seals most probably found in the territory of the Bosporan Kingdom

16. From the collection of A. Zvenigorodskij (Kerch), acquired by the State Hermitage Museum in 1880.
**Date**: late fifth to early fourth century BC.
State Hermitage, inv. ГЛ 501.
**Literature**: Lukonin 1977, 86 (ill.); Nikulina 1994, 419; Boardman 2000, 159, 160, fig. 5.6; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 30, no. 6.

17. Acquired in Kerch by N.P. Kondakov.
Discoloured stone. Gold hoop, circular in section.
**Date**: fifth to fourth century BC.
State Hermitage, inv. Ж 428.
**Literature**: Nikulina 1994, fig. 511; Boardman 2001, 355, pl. 928; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 32, no. 17.

18. From the collection of A.V. Novikov (Kerch), acquired by the State Hermitage Museum in 1900.
Discoloured stone.
**Date**: first half of the fourth century BC.
State Hermitage, inv. ГЛ 895.
**Literature**: Nikulina 1994, fig. 515; Boardman 2001, 353, pl. 887; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 33, no. 25.

19. From the collection of E.M. Kir’jakov (Kerch).
Scaraboid. A Persian female with vases.
Discoloured stone.
**Date**: fourth century BC.
State Hermitage, inv. Ж 427.
**Literature**: Knipovich 1926, pl. III.5; Cat. St Petersburg 2004, 33, no. 24.
Notes
* I would like to express my gratitude to Leonid Jablonskij (Institute of Archaeology, Moscow) for the supply of photographs and to Margaret Miller (University of Sydney) for revision of the English version of the text.
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161 Treister 2008, 158; Treister 2009 a.
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164 From the treasure of the second half of the fourth century BC found near Vurbitsa in the Shumen region (Filow 1934, 173, fig. 189; Pfrommer 1987, 70, 232, no. KaB H 15; Cat. Cologne 1979, no. 317; Cat. Montreal 1987, no. 365; Cat. Venice 1989, 185, no. 147.1, 193 (ill.); Archibald 1989, 13-14, fig. 1Bf; Cat. Florence 1997. no. 98; Archibald 1998, 270-271, fig. 11.10-11, pl. 33; Zimmermann 1998, 37-40, 161, no. BM 18.
165 Treister 2008, 157-158; Treister 2009 b.
166 Jablonskij & Meshcherjakov 2007, 58, fig. 5, col. pl. 1; Cat. Orenburg 2008, 81, no. 2.
167 Jablonskij & Meshcherjakov 2007, 57-58, fig. 4, col. pl. 2; Yablonsky 2007, 89, 95, fig. 9; Cat. Orenburg 2008, 88-89, no. 14.
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169 Savel’eva & Smirnov 1972, 115-116, fig. 6; Smirnov & Popov 1972, 221 (ill.).
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171 Dalton 1964, no. 136, pl. XX; Rehm 1992, 80, 86, no. C4, fig. 59.
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Akishev 1978, 105, pl. 24 (right).

Čugunov et al. 2006, pl. 26, 121, no. 13.

Čugunov et al. 2006, pls. 31-32, 123-124, no. 16.

Treister 2007, fig. 4. See, in detail, Treister 2009 a.

See n. 136.


Chernenko 1984, 50.

Vlasova 2001b, 130. On the inscription from the Seven Brothers settlement (ancient Labrys) suggesting that the settlement was a capital of the Sindian Kingdom, see Tokhtas’ev 2006, 1-62 with bibliography.

Treister 1982, 71, fig. 2 (the distribution map); Treister 1985, 126-139. See also new finds in the vicinity of Phanagoria (Limberis & Marchenko 2007, 235) and in the Kuban area (Tenginskaya: Beglova 2002, 303, fig. 8.1). Against my interpretation as diplomatic gifts, see most recently Limberis & Marchenko 2007, 235. In favour of my suggestion, see Archibald 2004, 11; Ladjynin 2007, 235-252 with bibliography.
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This is a preliminary list, which is based only on the published materials. Also, the information on the burial complexes is not complete. Despite numerous requests to the curators of the Antiquities Department of the State Hermitage Museum, I have not received the desired information about the contexts of some finds, about which there is no data in the literature.

Vlasova 2001b, 131.
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