THE REINTERPRETATION OF THE SARMATIAN FINDS FROM THE ROMANIAN PLAIN (I)\(^1\)

Abstract: Within the pages of this study, the first in the series we aim to accomplish, we analyse a few of the Sarmatian finds in the Romanian Plain (Lehliu, Buzău, Oltenița-Ulmeni, Vătănești), which have arisen or still arise debates and for which several chronological frameworks have been suggested. Moreover, the author resumes the discussion of certain aspects related to the Sarmatian presence in the Romanian Plain.

Following the analysis of the items in the damaged grave at Lehliu, it was noted that the brooch belongs to a variant dating to the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD. Concerning the pendant, it was concluded that the appearance of the rendered character, his sitting position, anthropological type, dress and hairstyle are indicative of the features specific to the eastern populations of Central Asia, including those nomad Iranian. Analogies with the individual’s appearance, sitting position, hairstyle and dress on a series of items, including from the Sarmatian environment, point to a dating in the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD. Based on such notes, it was reached the conclusion that the two items at Lehliu belonged to an individual in the Sarmatian group arriving from the east into the Danube mouths area, sometime in the second half of the 1st c. AD.

Based on the examination of the items in the “hoard” at Buzău, the author concluded they are a very small part of the funerary inventory of a very rich woman’s grave, part of the aristocratic graves of the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD from the north-west Pontic area. Furthermore, it was concluded that the grave including these items is from somewhere in the north-west Pontic territory (most likely from the Prut-Dniester interfluve) and by no means from the territory of Buzău county. Last but not least, it was concluded that the items belonged to a woman in the affluent stratum of the Sarmatian society, part of the group of Sarmatians arriving in the north-western area from territories east of Don starting with mid 1st c. AD. In what the dating of this find is concerned, the author pleads for a chronological framing in the second half/last quarter of the 1st c. AD, without yet excluding the end of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD.

Regarding the casserole, unguentarium and cup at Oltenița-Ulmeni, the author concludes based on the find circumstances, however also on the nearby presence of well datable Sarmatian graves, that very likely, the three items come from one of the damaged graves in 1957. From a chronological point of view, the author argues they were deposited in the grave/graves sometime by mid/ third quarter of the 2nd c. AD, maybe even in the chronological interval comprised between AD 140/150-180, nonetheless, by no means in the second half of the 21st c. AD or the first decades of the 2nd c. AD. The dating of the casserole, unguentarium and cup in this period is also supported by the dating of the objects in G 1 and G 3 in the second half of the 2nd c. AD. According to the author, it is hard to believe that among the graves identified in 1960
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and those damaged of 1957, to which most likely belong the mentioned artifacts, there are greater chronological differences, being rather, as suggested by the items’ dating, a contemporary group.

Another grave under analysis is that at Vitănești (T 2 G 2) dated in the specialty literature by the end of the 3rd c. AD, end of the 2nd c. – early 3rd c. AD or in the period previous Trajan’s reign. Upon its analysis, it was concluded that a series of elements and features of the funerary rite and ritual (main burial, large funerary pit, hiding-niche, flat circular ditch surrounding the grave) show that beside the preserved funerary inventory it belongs to the group of graves belonging to the Sarmatian elite in the north and north-west of the Black Sea. This date to the chronological comprised between the second half of the 1st c. AD and the first half of the 2nd c. Concerning the chronological framing of the grave at Vitănești, the author maintains it most likely dates sometime in the first half of the 2nd c. AD. The analysis of the few Sarmatian finds showed they date to a period other than that usually considered. Except for the new dating propositions, the performed analysis also evidenced that some of them (Lehliu, Buzău, Vitănești) are part of a larger group of Sarmatian finds from the north and north-west Pontic area, radically different from the rest of the Sarmatian graves in the same geographical area. Within the graves of this group, a series of elements and features were carried to this area by the novel Sarmatian tribes arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD. 
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Over the time, in the Romanian specialty literature were drafted many works publishing the Sarmatian remains identified in the Romanian Plain. They are supplemented a series of synthesis studies approaching various aspects related to the Sarmatians’ arrival and inhabitancy of this geographical area. Nevertheless, currently, even though it would seem curious, there is no consensus among the scholars concerning the dating of several Sarmatian finds in the Romanian Plain. Besides, one of the major issues still rising debates in the scientific environment of Romania is connected to the starting date of the arrival and effective settlement of the Sarmatians in this geographical environment. On the same line, it also concerns the dating and assignment of Sarmatian finds to the starting period of the Sarmatians presence in the vast plain by the Lower Danube.

Unfortunately, contradictory discussions are even today in good part based on the same archaeological finds, which are assigned, from an author to another, different chronological framings, often entirely erroneous. Most often, unfortunately, such errors are the result of the use of antiquated bibliography and unfamiliarity with the historical and archaeological realities of the Sarmatian world. Occasionally, certain statements and dates were maintained without taking into consideration also a series of aspects specific to the Sarmatian environment from a certain chronological interval. The unfamiliarity and failure to take into account the above resulted, in our view, into assignments and conclusions establishing a deformed image of the entrance and effective settlement of the Sarmatians in the vast plain by the Lower Danube and in the territory west of Prut.

In connection to the time of the Sarmatians’ settlement in the Romanian Plain, the views expressed by various scholars oscillate between placing this moment between the second half of the 1st c. AD and the period of the Marcomannic Wars. An entirely out of ordinary exception for the Romanian historiography is the view expressed by E. Condurachi suggesting, based on the theories expressed by A. Alföldi and J. Harmatta, an effective Sarmatian presence in Muntenia as early as the end of the 1st c. BC – early decades of the 1st c. AD. This point of view is not scientifically grounded and is informed by the realities evidenced by the archaeological and the classical written sources. Theyindicate the 1st c. BC, for the Sarmatian inhabitancy of mainly the north-Pontic area up to the Dnieper and for the first half of the 1st c. AD the western border being the Prut and the territories left the Danube mouths.

For instance, Gh. Bichir believed this process occurred after the abandonment in AD 117-118 by the Romans of large part of the Romanian Plain (Muntenia and south Moldova), territory which had belonged to the date, to the province of Moesia Inferior. A dating post AD 117-118 was more recently accepted also by C. C. Petolescu and I. Bogdan-Cătănică, who believe this process took place during the Marcomannic Wars.

V. I. Grosu considered that the entrance of the Sarmatians in Muntenia occurred after AD 102 and I. Ionită tends to believe that the Sarmatians’ entrance and settlement of Muntenia happened only after the conquest of Dacia.

In the last two decades, following the re-assessment of the same archaeological data and of those supplied by the ancient written sources, the arrival of the Sarmatians in the Romanian Plain was placed by R. Harhoiu and M. Babeş in the second half of the 1st c. AD. This view was later agreed with by also Gh. Niculescu and C. C. Petolescu.

A different view is that expressed in few lines by L. Oţa, who believes that the arrival of the Sarmatians in the Romanian Plain was a lengthy process. It took place over
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a period comprised between the end of the 1st c. AD and early 2nd c. AD\textsuperscript{16} or the last decade of the 1st c. AD and the first decades of the following century\textsuperscript{17}. Other times of the entrance and settlement of novel Sarmatian groups in the plain by the Lower Plain are placed by the same author in the second\textsuperscript{18} or end 2nd c. AD\textsuperscript{19} and in the 3rd c. AD\textsuperscript{20}. Without insisting or analysing the means and criteria according to which these stages were established, we wish to mention that the Sarmatian graves in the Romanian Plain from the second half of the 2nd – mid 3rd c. AD can be easily identified. The reason is the presence within many of those of certain artifacts (mirrors, brooches, amphorae, luxury wares, etc.) which are good dating elements, some of which being Roman imports. At first glance, one may also note the existence of certain graves with a certain dating to the first half of the 2nd c. AD.

We believe though, as suggested on other occasions\textsuperscript{21}, that some of the Sarmatian vestiges in the Romanian Plain might date sometime in the second half of the 1st c. AD. Subsequent to thorough and ample analysis, like for instance the case of the “Buzău hoard”\textsuperscript{22}, obviously, if it comes from the territory of Buzău County\textsuperscript{23}, or as noted in the case of several Sarmatian graves in the east-Carpathian area\textsuperscript{24}. Moreover, we suggest that the entrance of the Sarmatians in both the east-Carpathian areas as well as the Romanian Plain should not be regarded as a massive and violent entrance, but rather as a slow and gradual process.

In addition, we consider that currently, it is often difficult to separate the graves by the end of the 1st c. AD from those by the early 2nd c. AD and that one cannot speak about an effective inhabitancy of the Sarmatians in the Romanian Plain in the second half of the 1st c. AD\textsuperscript{25}.

By way of parenthesis, we wish to mention that often in the establishment of the arrival date of the Sarmatians in the Lower Danube plain, the poor inventory of the graves and the lack of the dating elements (small number of Roman imports identified in the Sarmatian graves from Muntenia)\textsuperscript{26} are invoked as hindrances. Although, often, a series of elements and features specific to the Sarmatian environment from a certain chronological interval are omitted. There are also Sarmatian finds whose chronological framings show methodological deficiencies like unfamiliarity with the archaeological material and the realities of the Sarmatian world from the enormous space they inhabited over several centuries.

At a simple glance over the import artifacts in some of the Sarmatian graves, there may be noted occasional circumstances when a series of objects, significant chronological markers, have reached the area later than their production date or were in use for a longer period. Such situations are found not once in the Barbarian world where sometimes goods no longer circulating were purchased and used. Additionally, in order to explain some aspects of absolute chronology, the use of the import products, especially gold and silver-made, as well as certain bronze object categories (for instance, bronze vessels) and chronological landmarks for the Sarmatian environment must be used with extreme caution. At the same time, they must be connected with all elements specific to the archaeological features and all archaeological and historical realities. Therefore, the use of certain precious metal objects, but not only, in dating the Sarmatian graves requires great caution. Due to the above stated, we believe that dating some graves in a very restricted chronological interval (for instance the end of the 1st c. AD, the last decade of the 1st c. AD, early 2nd c. AD or end of the 2nd c. AD etc.), except for certain very clear circumstances, is hazardous.

The lack or extreme rarity of 1st c. AD Sarmatian finds in the Romanian Plain seems rather surprising if keeping in mind that the plain area is familiar to these nomads of the steppes and corresponded to the needs of their pastoral economy, place from where they could also carry plundering expeditions to the right of the Danube\textsuperscript{27}. Should we take into consideration the archaeological realities and the information supplied by the ancient literary sources, it may be noted that the western limit of the space inhabited by the Sarmatians in the first half of the 1st c. AD is located in the area east of Prut and north the Danube mouths\textsuperscript{28}. Moreover, one should also take into account the fact that by the early of the 1st c. AD, the Romans laid the bases for the preventive system of the “security space” applied yet combined with the diplomatic treaties concluded between the Roman empire and various dynasts. This policy, as noted\textsuperscript{29}, was aimed at diminishing the threats of the neighbouring Barbarian world and consisted in the establishment of a very large distance between the Danube and the potential adversaries. The result of this policy should have been the significant reduction of the frequency of the Barbarian attacks from the neighbouring territories.

It is deemed that the policy of the “security space” enforced by the Lower Danube resulted in the cessation of inhabitancy in large part of the known Getae settlements in the region\textsuperscript{30}. However, it was likely, also a secondary cause hindering for a period the settlement of groups of Sarmatians in the Romanian plain, especially since they represented for some time, as also resulted from the classical authors’ accounts\textsuperscript{31}, a danger for the Roman possessions.

During the second half of the 1st c. AD, the Roman position in the Lower Danube area is substantially reinforced, while the policy of the north-Danubian “security space” was consolidated, and very likely, broadened by the actions of Tiberius Plautius Silvanus Aelianus, as legate of the province...
of Moesia between AD 57/60 - 67\textsuperscript{32}. Actions carried out by Plautius Silvanus Aelianus had not been yet accomplished by the placement of military garrisons along the Danube, in the part east Novae, neither by the elimination of the Dacian and Sarmatian danger by the Lower Danube, which was confirmed by the ancient authors.\textsuperscript{33} This account, occasionally in detail, on the Sarmatian incursions in the Roman possessions and the conflicts between the Sarmatians and the Romans in the years subsequent to the remarkable governorship of Tiberius Plautius Silvanus Aelianus. In fact, the increase of the Sarmatian activities around the Roman possessions is not due to the outdated methods of the "security space" policy and the insufficient military organisation of the Danube limes, but also to the cause of the entrance and settlement in the north-west are of the Black Sea. It started with mid 1st c. AD due to the novel Sarmatian groups arriving from the steppes past the Don river as a result of the Sarmatian tribes movement westwards during the 1st half of the 1st c. AD. This fact is confirmed by both the archaeological finds as well as by the accounts of the ancient written sources\textsuperscript{34} based on which one may note that including the Alans – the main cause of this process – reached the Danube mouths in the third quarter of the 1st c. AD.

Even the subsequent actions of the Flavian emperors whose main objective was the reorganisation of the defensive system of the Danube frontier by changing the disposition of the legions.\textsuperscript{35} On the same line, the entire strategic conceptions, however did not lead to the much-desired tranquility in the region, even though there was a more clear delimiting line set on the Danube, between the Roman Empire and the barbarian world.

Past the measures taken within the "security space" policy was preserved in the Lower Danube area. During this period were very likely regulated also the political and diplomatic relations between the Romans and the barbarians by the Middle and Lower Danube, amongst which also counted the Sarmatians. Taken measures were followed by a period of tranquillity by the Danube border of the Empire. This period lasted until AD 85, when the Dacians attacked the province of Moesia\textsuperscript{36}, thus proving both the inefficiency of the "security space" policy as well as the insufficiency of the military reinforcement of the right Danube bank\textsuperscript{37}. The changes imposed by Domitian by the Lower Danube by the administrative and military reorganisation of the Moesian defensive front, the military campaign enterprise by the Romans against the kingdom of Deccbalus as well as the political


33 TACITUS, Historiae I, 79, III, 46, 2; JOSEPHUS FLAVIUS, De bello Judaico, VII, 4, 3.

34 Cf. BĂRCĂ 2006, 244-262; BĂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 348-364; BĂRCĂ 2006b; BĂRCĂ 2013.

35 These measures would lead to an army composed of four legions in Moesia (ARICESC 1977, 32-45), while the beginning of the construction of the new forts by the Danube belong to governor Rubrius Gallus (MÖCZTY 1974, 42). Still under the Flavians, the Danube fort would be set up Clăgatu Flavia Moesica (See for clăgatu Flavia Moesica MATEI-POPESCU 2010, 245-258) and the first auxiliary military units would be brought to Dobrogea (Cf. SUCEVEANU 1977, 22-23; STROBEL 1989, 11-18. For the Roman auxiliary troops in Moesia Inferior see MATEI-POPESCU 2001-2002; MATEI-POPESCU 2010, 167-244.

36 TACITUS, Agricola, 41.

37 OPREANU 1998, 35.
to the Roxolani. Following negotiations Hadrian successfully turned the king of the Roxolani into rex amicus populi Romani, likely P. Aelius Rasparag anus rex Roxolarum, whom was granted Roman citizenship, one of the greatest awards that a rex amicus could obtain for services rendered to the Roman empire, represent beside all the other measures taken under Domitian – Hadrian.

After the events of AD 117-118, but also based on the treaty entered with the Roxolani, very likely the Sarmatians were granted the permission to settle the Romanian Plain. Settlement of Sarmatian groups after this date in this territory was yet, most likely, well controlled by the Romans, which is also confirmed by the scarce archaeological finds, at least in the current state of research, until the final moment of the Marcomannic Wars. Upon a careful analysis of the Sarmatian remains in the territory of Muntenia and their corroboration with the data provided by the ancient written sources one may argue that the Sarmatian inhabitancy of this area was permanently under Roman supervision. It is a similar situation to what happened for a good period in the case of the Sarmatian Iazyges in the Hungarian Plain. Under careful surveillance were kept starting with this period also part of the Sarmatian in the north and north-west Pontic area, evidence to this effect being the Roman military presence in the north and north-west of the Black Sea, aimed beside the protection of the Greek cities, also at surveilling the Sarmatians.

It is certain that following the conflicts by the end of Trajan's rule and the start of Hadrian's reign, the Sarmatian tribes in the territories around the empire were re-brought in the previously existent system of alliances, which ensured the Roman world by the Mid and Lower Danube a period of 50 years of tranquillity and peace. Nonetheless, it is certain that the Sarmatians represented during the 2nd c. AD, alike in the previous century, a major threat for the Roman empire. Evidence to the effect is the presence of the Sarmatians (Iazyges, Roxolani, and Alani) among the Barbarian peoples who conspired and attacked the empire under Marcus Aurelius, one of the greatest military conflicts of the Roman Empire during the first two centuries AD.

***

As noted, in the current state of research, there is a diversity of views related to the entrance and settlement of the Sarmatians in the Danube plain. Beside other issues arisen, the presence of the Sarmatian in the Romanian Plain this state of facts is based on the following causes:

- The small number of investigated graves compared to the opportunities provided by the hundreds of barrows from the Danube plain;
- The inappropriate research of certain graves and lack of record at the time of research of certain defining elements for the funerary rite and rituals;
- Omission when published of elements and traits specific to the Sarmatian environment of a certain chronological interval, either due to lack of knowledge or by neglect;
- The absence from the ancient written sources of clear references related to the entrance and settlement by the Sarmatians in the plain by the Lower Danube and, finally yet importantly, the disinterest for the research and study of the Sarmatians remains on the territory of Romania.

Obviously, the poor inventory or the small number of Roman imports found within graves may be invoked as argument. However, these are not the only dating elements within the funerary inventory of the Sarmatian graves. Indeed, such argument may be invoked in the case of an isolated grave, yet not when it is part of a group of graves, barrow, either flat or secondary in other period tumuli, where there are often also elements for a more accurate chronological framing.

Finally yet importantly, we wish to mention that although within the few synthesis studies published in the specialty literature in Romania, it was attempted to outline the main elements and specific traits of the Sarmatian graves on the territory of the Romanian Plain. On the same line, the issues related to the relations between the Roman Empire and the Sarmatians on the mentioned territory, there are still a series of aspects and features provided by Sarmatian funerary archaeological features previously ignored due to various reasons or which were approached rather seldom, and only sketchily.

In this study, the first in the series we proposed to accomplish, we wish to highlight certain chronological issues raised by some of the archaeological features and re-analyse a few of the Sarmatian finds in the Lower Danube plain (Lehliu, Buzău, Oltenița-Ulmeni, Vătănești) which have risen and still rise debates and for which were proposed several chronological framings.

A first find we shall examine is that at Lehliu (Călărași county), composed of an agate pendant-amulet (Fig. 1/1) and a bronze brooch with returned foot (Fig. 1/2). According to Gh. Bichir, the two items were discovered by a local inhabitant around 1963-1965, in an inhumation grave, found by chance. According to the Bucharest scholar, they reached via a student, professor D. Tudor, who received them in 1975, without yet details related to the discovery spot and the discoverer's name. Although the pendant-amulet is a rare and extremely interesting piece, within his ample study of 1977, Gh. Bichir published only the bronze brooch and mentioned nothing of the pendant-amulet. The bronze brooch was deemed by the same scholar as an artifact dating to the first decades of the 3rd c. AD. Gh. Bichir maintains that the agate pendant-amulet rendering a man

---

Additionally, it is worth mentioning that these diplomatic actions resulted also in the cessation of the attacks carried out by the Sarmatians from the north-west of the Black Sea over the Roman possessions by the Lower Danube until Trajan's death. It has been suggested that the Sarmatians were part of the Roman empire’s military operations. The Sarmatians were said to be in league with the Romans in order to defeat the Parthians, who were a serious threat to the empire.

The Sarmatians were a nomadic people who roamed across the steppes of Central Asia and Eastern Europe. They were known for their war-horses and their skill in deploying them in battle. The Sarmatians were considered to be a threat to the Roman Empire, especially during the reign of Emperor Trajan.

The Sarmatians were eventually defeated by the Romans, who were able to establish a lasting peace in the region. The Roman Empire was able to expand its territory and influence, and the Sarmatians were forced to recognize Roman authority.

---
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with eastern facial features sitting with legs crossed ("Turkish style") on an ornamented pedestal depicts Buddha. The same author argues that the item has no analogies in the north-Pontic steppes, while the closest depictions rendering Buddha in this position are found in Asia\(^\text{52}\). Based on the presented analogies, but also especially of the dating proposed by the brooch, the pendant-amulet was dated in the first decades of the 3rd c. AD. Purely speculative seems to us the statement that the pendant-amulet at Lehliu shows that the deceased’s belief was Buddhism and that this find suggest that some Sarmatians who entered the Geto-Dacian territory believed in Buddha\(^\text{53}\).

Unfortunately, the chronological framing and the assignment of these two items is not precisely successful.

For instance, the brooch at Lehliu (Fig. 1/2) belongs to the brooch type very well represented in the north-Pontic area of the first centuries AD. Such brooches have a returned foot wound on the bow, being made of a single metal wire. Their spring is bilateral, formed of four coils and either inner or outer chord. The bow is curved, and the foot extended and returned is attached to it by winding, forming several coils. The great majority of the exemplars are made of bronze and iron, but silver exemplars are also found.

Brooches with returned foot wound to the bow belong to group 15 of brooches in A. K. Ambroz’s classification\(^\text{56}\) and to group 4 in that of V. V. Kropotov\(^\text{57}\). Within the group, they were divided by A. K. Ambroz, based on certain morphological peculiarities, into four series (I, II, III, VI)\(^\text{58}\), and within the series, into variants\(^\text{59}\). The same applies for V. V. Kropotov, who assigns these brooches to group 4 divided into four series, and within the series in several variants\(^\text{60}\).

All these brooches are mainly specific to the southern regions of Eastern Europe, where they were in fact produced. They represent the most investigated and spread brooch type from this immense geographical space, while according to recent information, the brooches in this group are represented in the southern part of Eastern Europe by approximately 2300 exemplars\(^\text{61}\), of which around 1700 belong to series I\(^\text{62}\).

The item at Lehliu is made of a single bronze wire, has a bilateral spring made of four coils and inner chord. The bow is downward and is not strongly curved, while the extended and returned foot is attached to it by winding, forming four coils. In the lower part, the foot is slightly widened than the rest of the body. The pin is preserved fragmentarily. The brooch length is 4.3 cm.

In A. K. Ambroz’s classification, the brooch at Lehliu belongs to the second variant of the series I characterised by lowered bow and not very curved, and the slightly widened foot to the extremity compared to the rest of the body\(^\text{63}\). The same author included within this series both outer chord brooches as well as with inner chord of which he argues that only a part of the earlier exemplars were provided with inner chord\(^\text{64}\). The brooches of the second variant were dated by A. K. Ambroz in the 1st c. AD, mainly in the second half of the 1st c. AD, however did not excluded the possibility of their use also by early 2nd c. AD\(^\text{65}\).

The large number of such brooches made of a single metal wire with inner chord discovered in the last four decades, allowed V. V. Kropotov\(^\text{66}\) to frame all the exemplars in series II of brooches with returned foot wound to the bow. Within the series, they were divided, based on certain peculiarities, in four variants. The brooch at Lehliu belongs to form 2 in the second variant of series II copying largely the exemplars of series I, second variant in both A. K. Ambroz’s classification as well as in that of V. V. Kropotov\(^\text{67}\). Chronologically, the brooches in this variant are dated to the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD, confirmation to this end being also the artifacts by which they were found within the archaeological features.

Such brooch finds mainly focus on the Lower Dnieper basin and Crimea, but also sporadically in the Kuban region and north Caucasus.

Within the Sarmatian environment, the brooches of this variant come from T 2 G 3 at Glubokoe\(^\text{68}\), T 7 G 1 at Vladimirovka\(^\text{69}\), T 2 G 1 at Novofilippovka\(^\text{70}\), Konskie Razdory\(^\text{71}\), T 1 G 8 at Dneprovsk\(^\text{72}\), T 5 G 1, G 6 G 1, G 6 D 2, T 12 G 2, T 13 G 1, T 31 G 1, T 32 G 1, T 49 G 1 and T 71 G 1 at Ust’-Kamenka,\(^\text{73}\) etc. In connection with the exemplars in the Sarmatian environment may be noted that more than half come from the Sarmatian barrow cemetery at Ust’-Kamenka\(^\text{74}\), located on the right bank of the Dniiper\(^\text{75}\), which belonged to the novel wave of Sarmatians arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD\(^\text{76}\).

In what the agate pendant is concerned (Fig. 1/1) one must say that in its case things are simpler than supposed.

For instance, the depictions of individuals sitting with legs crossed are found on a series of items in the second half of the 1st millennium BC in Central Asia\(^\text{77}\). This position became yet a frequent iconographical depiction in this region only by the end of the 1st c. BC. Within the Sarmatian environment, the items rendering leg-crossed sitting individuals are represented
by the male figure-shaped mirror handle in the rich grave in the barrow at Sokolova Mogila68 (Lower Bug region) (Fig. 1/3-4) and the collar/diadem in the barrow no. 10 in the cemetery at Kobjakovo69 (near Rostov on Don) (Fig. 2/6-7) which renders in the central part a male character having on the knee a sword and in hands a vessel like the character of the mirror at Sokolova Mogila. The grave in the barrow at Sokolova Mogila dates to the second half of the 1st c. AD (likely the third quarter or even its last third)70, while that in T 10 at Kobjakovo sometime in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD71.

In crossed legs sitting position is rendered also one of the figurines on the lid of the Sarmatian cauldron at Kal’mius72 (Fig. 3/1). Alike the above cases, in this case also the character holds in his hands a vessel. In N. A. Bokovenko’s typological classification, the given cauldron belongs to type I73 and represents, beside other categories of items, one of the innovations of the mid Sarmatian period, brought, as believed, by the Alani74. Hence, one should mention that in the cases where they were identified in graves, the last had a marked eastern character.

It was believed these cauldrons date within the limits of 1st c. BC – 1st c. AD75. Such dating was established, yet, based on the chronological framing of the mid Sarmatian culture accepted for the period. On the Sarmatian territory, yet, there is no grave or archaeological feature composed of cauldrons of this type dating with certainty in the 1st c. BC. Thus, their dating should be placed, as mentioned with other occasions as well76, in the 1st c. (mainly in the second half) – early/first quarter of the 2nd c. AD, although in some cases it may be extended until mid 2nd c. AD.

In a position similar to that of the individual on the pendant at Lehlisu is that of the gagante pendant in the rich Sarmatian grave at Altitub (T 26 G 1)77, dating to the second/last quarter of the 1st c. AD78.

In a sitting position with legs crossed are rendered also the characters of the two figurines of musicians in grave 2 in the cemetery at Tillya-tepe79 (north Afghanistan) (Fig. 2/1-2). There are dated, most likely, sometime by early/first half of the 1st c. AD79 and in the 2nd-3rd centuries AD. It helps to date the life size ceramic statue depicting a fighter sitting with legs crossed in the ossuary near Koj-Krylgan Kala80 (Uzbekistan). To this effect may be mentioned also the fragmentarily preserved statue rendering a male coming the ossuary of the cemetery near Burly Kala81 (the Autonomous Republic of Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan). The sitting position with legs crossed is also found on the coins of the Indo-Scythian kings of the 1st c. BC Maues and Azes I82(2/8-9), however also on a funerary stela of the 1st c. AD at Phanagoria (Fig. 2/3), whose individual holds in his hands a rhyton83.

From the north-west Pontic Sarmatian environment we wish to mention herein the two golden belt buckles from T 2 G 1 at Porogi84 (left Mid Dniester) (Fig. 2/4-5), rendering each a male of mongolid features (Fig. 2/4-5) alike on the pendant of Lehlisu. To our knowledge, there is no analogy for the two belt buckles at Porogi. Technologically and typologically however, the two items are similar to those in some of graves at Tillya-tepe85. A depiction close to that on the buckles is found on two golden pendants from G 2 at Tillya-tepe86, to which also belong the two figurines rendering musicians sitting with legs crossed87. However, given their production technique and similarities with the depictions on the items in the grave at Tillya-tepe, it is

68 KOVAPENKO 1986, 66-72, Fig. 70-73; SIMONENKO 2003, 48, Fig. 2/3-4. The mirror type to which the exemplar at Sokolova Mogila also belongs is made of bronze and is in the shape of a disk with thick rim, conical projection in the centre and nail shaped handle. Their diameter varies between 10 and 16 cm, but larger diameter exemplars are also found. This type mirrors emerged in the Sarmatian environment by the end of the 1st c. BC and were intensely used over the 1st c. AD (Cf. HAZANOV 1963, 64-65; SRIKIPKIN 1990, 152, 155; MAKSIMENKO 1998, 131; GLUKHOV 1993-92, 93-92; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 172-173). In the north-Pontic area, the entrance of this type mirrors is put in relation to the eastern impulse (Alanic) by mid 1st c. AD (SIMONENKO 1993, 112-117; SYMONENKO 1999, 11; SIMONENKO 2003, 49). Evidence for such statements are the mirrors of the type in the aristocratic graves, of marked eastern features, in the tumuli, at Sokolova Mogila (Cf. KOVAPENKO 1986), Kamova Mogila (Cf. SIMONENKO, Mel’nik 2004) or the grave at Troyany (Cf. SIMONENKO 2008, 71, Pl. 84/2, 85-87).
69 GUGUEV 1992, 121-123, Fig. 4; PROKHOROV/GUGUEV 1992, 143-146, Fig. 5-6; MORDVINTSEVA 2003, 42-43, 89, cat. no. 69, Fig. 28; MORDVINTSEVA/TREISTER 2007, I, 205-206, 211-212, II, 39, cat. no. A109.3; III, Fig. 39, 65.
70 KOVAPENKO 1986, 127 dates the grave in the first half of the 1st c. AD. Cf. PROKHOROV/GUGUEV 1992, 159. In his work of 1990 V. K. GUGUEV dated the grave by the end of the 1st – early 2nd c. AD (GUGUEV 1990, 68), chronological framing also accepted by other authors (Cf. MORDVINTSEVA/TREISTER 2007, II, 39).
71 Sherten 1911, 43, Pl. V; SIMONENKO 1999, 165-166, Fig. 28/1; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 184-185.
72 BOKOVENKO 1977, 232-233, Fig. 3/II. Based on the aspects and certain constructional within the type may yet be identified several variants. For cauldron finds belonging to this type see SRIKIPKIN 2007, 207, Fig. 2/3.
73 BOKOVENKO 1977, 232, Fig. 3/II. 4 with complete bibliography and finds known at that date; MORDVINTSEVA/SERGATSKOV 1995, 114-124, Fig. 3/1; MAKSIMENKO 1998, 111-112, Fig. 7/2, 49/7-9; RAЕV 1986, 47-48, 51-52, Pl. 39, 42/1; BESPALY 1985, 163, Fig. 2/2; BESPALY 1986, 77-78, Pl. 70/1; ILYUKOV 1986, 79-80, Pl. 71/1. For the cauldrons of the type in the Sarmatian environment between the Don river and Dniester see KASHUBA/KURCHATOV/SHCHERBAKOVA 2001-2002, 208-209, 231-212, Fig. 14/47-68; MAKSIMENKO 1993, 62, Fig.19/2; SIMONENKO 2008, Pl. 15/2a, 38/2a, 39/3, 67/2c, 75/1, 79/3, 84/2; KURCHATOV/TELNOV 2010, 139-140, Fig. 1-3, BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 184-185, Fig. 68/2-5; BÂRCĂ 2011a, 45-46, Pl. I/5-8 with complete bibliography.
74 SRIKIPKIN 1990, 214.
believed that those at Porogi have the same origin. According to S. A. Yatsenko, the mongoloid individual riding a panther rendered on the two belt buckles is the image of the Lord of the Animals in the Nart sagas existent event today with a series of peoples from north Caucasus.

The marked eastern facial features of the individual on the pendant at Lehliu are similar to those of the individual on the mirror handle at Sokolova Mogila, the two musician figurines in G 2 at Tillya-tepe and the characters in the two plate-fasteners in the Siberian collection of Peter the Great (Fig. 3-2-3).

The male individuals of mongoloid features on the mirror handle at Sokolova Mogila (Fig. 1/3) and the plate-fasteners in the Siberian collection of Peter the Great (Fig. 3/2-3) are depicted with long moustaches, which is not specific to mongoloids. Neither is the beard worn by the individuals exhibited on the mirror handle at Sokolova Mogila and the collar/diadem at Kobyakovo (Fig. 2/6-7). Although beard wearing is not very specific to the Sarmatian environment, it is though recorded on a series of artifacts. In what moustaches are concerned, it is worth mentioning they were worn rather often by the Sarmatians as evidenced by representations.

In connection to the garment worn by the individual on the pendant at Lehliu, one may argue it seems not to exceed by much in length the waistband area and has a letter V-shaped neckline, decorated with stripes along the neckline cut. Unfortunately, in this case it is impossible to specify whether the coat was fastened or loose and tied with a band or belt in the waistband area. Fastened or loose, V-shaped neckline garments with a length that might reach to the knee, occasionally even lower, are a dress peculiarity specific to the immense territory inhabited by the Sarmatians in the chronological interval between the 4th/3rd c. BC and 4th c. AD.

Last but not least, it is worth mentioning that although the pendant at Lehliu has no identical analogy to our knowledge, we believe that the item is, in our view, of eastern origin. It is rather obvious from the rendered individual appearance. Its sitting position and anthropological type, dress and hairstyle point to the fact its features are specific to the eastern populations from Central Asia, including those nomads Iranian.

Therefore, based on the above mentioned, one may conclude that the two items at Lehliu belonged to an individual within the Sarmatian group arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD, reaching the Danube mouths of.

Studies in connection to the garment worn by the individual on the pendant at Lehliu, one may argue it seems not to exceed by much in length the waistband area and has a letter V-shaped neckline, decorated with stripes along the neckline cut. Unfortunately, in this case it is impossible to specify whether the coat was fastened or loose and tied with a band or belt in the waistband area. Fastened or loose, V-shaped neckline garments with a length that might reach to the knee, occasionally even lower, are a dress peculiarity specific to the immense territory inhabited by the Sarmatians in the chronological interval between the 4th/3rd c. BC and 4th c. AD.

Last but not least, it is worth mentioning that although the pendant at Lehliu has no identical analogy to our knowledge, we believe that the item is, in our view, of eastern origin. It is rather obvious from the rendered individual appearance. Its sitting position and anthropological type, dress and hairstyle point to the fact its features are specific to the eastern populations from Central Asia, including those nomads Iranian.

Therefore, based on the above mentioned, one may conclude that the two items at Lehliu belonged to an individual within the Sarmatian group arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD, reaching the Danube mouths of.

Studies in connection to the garment worn by the individual on the pendant at Lehliu, one may argue it seems not to exceed by much in length the waistband area and has a letter V-shaped neckline, decorated with stripes along the neckline cut. Unfortunately, in this case it is impossible to specify whether the coat was fastened or loose and tied with a band or belt in the waistband area. Fastened or loose, V-shaped neckline garments with a length that might reach to the knee, occasionally even lower, are a dress peculiarity specific to the immense territory inhabited by the Sarmatians in the chronological interval between the 4th/3rd c. BC and 4th c. AD.

Last but not least, it is worth mentioning that although the pendant at Lehliu has no identical analogy to our knowledge, we believe that the item is, in our view, of eastern origin. It is rather obvious from the rendered individual appearance. Its sitting position and anthropological type, dress and hairstyle point to the fact its features are specific to the eastern populations from Central Asia, including those nomads Iranian.

Therefore, based on the above mentioned, one may conclude that the two items at Lehliu belonged to an individual within the Sarmatian group arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD, reaching the Danube mouths of.

Studies in connection to the garment worn by the individual on the pendant at Lehliu, one may argue it seems not to exceed by much in length the waistband area and has a letter V-shaped neckline, decorated with stripes along the neckline cut. Unfortunately, in this case it is impossible to specify whether the coat was fastened or loose and tied with a band or belt in the waistband area. Fastened or loose, V-shaped neckline garments with a length that might reach to the knee, occasionally even lower, are a dress peculiarity specific to the immense territory inhabited by the Sarmatians in the chronological interval between the 4th/3rd c. BC and 4th c. AD.

Last but not least, it is worth mentioning that although the pendant at Lehliu has no identical analogy to our knowledge, we believe that the item is, in our view, of eastern origin. It is rather obvious from the rendered individual appearance. Its sitting position and anthropological type, dress and hairstyle point to the fact its features are specific to the eastern populations from Central Asia, including those nomads Iranian.

Therefore, based on the above mentioned, one may conclude that the two items at Lehliu belonged to an individual within the Sarmatian group arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD, reaching the Danube mouths of.

Studies in connection to the garment worn by the individual on the pendant at Lehliu, one may argue it seems not to exceed by much in length the waistband area and has a letter V-shaped neckline, decorated with stripes along the neckline cut. Unfortunately, in this case it is impossible to specify whether the coat was fastened or loose and tied with a band or belt in the waistband area. Fastened or loose, V-shaped neckline garments with a length that might reach to the knee, occasionally even lower, are a dress peculiarity specific to the immense territory inhabited by the Sarmatians in the chronological interval between the 4th/3rd c. BC and 4th c. AD.

Last but not least, it is worth mentioning that although the pendant at Lehliu has no identical analogy to our knowledge, we believe that the item is, in our view, of eastern origin. It is rather obvious from the rendered individual appearance. Its sitting position and anthropological type, dress and hairstyle point to the fact its features are specific to the eastern populations from Central Asia, including those nomads Iranian.

Therefore, based on the above mentioned, one may conclude that the two items at Lehliu belonged to an individual within the Sarmatian group arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD, reaching the Danube mouths of.

Studies in connection to the garment worn by the individual on the pendant at Lehliu, one may argue it seems not to exceed by much in length the waistband area and has a letter V-shaped neckline, decorated with stripes along the neckline cut. Unfortunately, in this case it is impossible to specify whether the coat was fastened or loose and tied with a band or belt in the waistband area. Fastened or loose, V-shaped neckline garments with a length that might reach to the knee, occasionally even lower, are a dress peculiarity specific to the immense territory inhabited by the Sarmatians in the chronological interval between the 4th/3rd c. BC and 4th c. AD.
filigree flower motifs. The triangular base is marked with some exemplars with one or two rows of twisted wire. The cabochons of these earrings are filled with glass of various colours. On the reverse, to the triangular base are attached 5-8 golden loops of which hand same metal chains with a hemisphere by the end, which in certain exemplars are filled with glass paste. In some exemplars, by the end of these chains is attached a bead. On the tip of the triangular plate is attached by soldering a loop, with a mobile loop inside.

Similar earrings with those at Buzău are represented in the north-Pontic space by three finds. The first pair of such earrings comes from T 2 G 2 at Porogi\(^1\) (Fig. 5/3-4), the second from a barrow grave at Olbia (Fig. 5/7) found in 1913 south-west the village at Parutino\(^2\), and the third was discovered in G 1 in tomb 620 in the late Scythian cemetery at Ust’-Al’ma (Crimea)\(^3\) (Fig. 5/1-2). All three graves where such earrings were identified date sometime during the second half of the 1st c. AD. V. Mordvintseva and M. Yu. Trejster assume the north-west Pontic exemplars were made at Olbia and for those at Ust’-Al’ma, their production by a Barbarian artisan working, likely, in the settlement at Ust’-Al’ma\(^4\). Earrings with a similar structure also come from Anhialo (Bulgaria)\(^5\).

Much more numerous in the north-Pontic area are the earrings with triangular plate yet provided with two cabochons. They come from a series of Sarmatian graves left the Lower and Mid Don River\(^6\) dating mainly in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD. V. Mordvintseva believes all these earrings in the Sarmatian graves in the Don area are, likely, products of the same production centre\(^7\). Two earrings pairing of the type come from tombs 775\(^8\) and 820\(^9\) in the cemetery at Ust’-Al’ma (Crimea).

\(^{117}\) SIMONENKO/LOBAJ 1991, 30-31, Fig. 19/1-2, photo 24; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 122-123, II, 74, cat. no. A235.2; III, Pl. 38, FLESS/TREJSTER 2007, 174, Fig. 6/2; BÂRCĂ 2006, 108, 353, Fig. 109/1-2; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 144, Fig. 52/1-2.

\(^{118}\) MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 122-123; II, 127, cat. no. B29.7; III, Pl. 55; FLESS/TREJSTER 2007, 174, Fig. 6/4.

\(^{119}\) MORDVINTSEVA 2002, 347-352, Fig. 1/1; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 122-123; II, 92, cat. no. A297.2; III, Pl. 42, ZAJTSEV/MORDVINTSEVA 2004, 184, Fig. 10/3; PUZDROVSKI 2007, 150, Fig. 113/1, Pl. 24; FLESS/TREJSTER 2007, 174, Fig. 6/13.

\(^{120}\) MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 123. See also MORDVINTSEVA 2002, 347-352.

\(^{121}\) MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 123 with the bibliography at note 588.

\(^{122}\) T 44 G 1 de la Krivoj Liman (MAKSIMENKO 1998, 122-123, Fig. 16/9, 58/23; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 43, cat. no. A117.1), T 26 G 1 at Alitub (RAEV 1986, 42-44 and the chart by the end of the book). MEDVEDEV 1981, 259, Fig. 5; SIMONENKO/LOBAJ 1991, photo 34/1; MAKSIMENKO 1998, 122-123, Fig. 58/22; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 5, cat. no. A3-11; III, Pl. 21; FLESS/TREJSTER 2007, 174, Fig. 6/3), T 40 G 5 in the cemetery Chertovitsk I (MEDVEDEV 1981, 256-257, Fig. 3/20-21, 4; MEDVEDEV 1990, 38, Fig. 11/6-7; SIMONENKO/LOBAJ 1991, photo 34/2; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 113, cat. no. A380.1; III, Pl. 49, T 2 G 8 at Berdya (SGRTSKOV 2000, 75-76, Fig. 94/6; MORDVINTSEVA/KHABAROVA 2006, 85, cat. no. 40, Fig. 3/40; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 13, cat. no. A21.3; III, Pl. 13, 23, Fig. 23), T 2 G 1 at Oktaybrskij II (MORDVINTSEVA/KHABAROVA 2006, 2006, 119, cat. no. 154, Fig. 3/154; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 35, cat. no. A162.1; III, Pl. 34, Fig. 23) and T 1 G 2 at Verbovskij II (MORDVINTSEVA/KHABAROVA 2006, 90, cat. no. 55, Fig. 4/55; MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 17, cat. no. A31a.1; III, Fig. 24).

\(^{123}\) MORDVINTSEVA/KHABAROVA 2006, 12.

\(^{124}\) MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 94, cat. no. A303a.2; III, Pl. 44; PUZDROVSKI 2007, 150, Fig. 116/1.

\(^{125}\) MORDVINTSEVA/TREJSTER 2007, I, 121; II, 94, cat. no. A305.2; III, Pl. 10, 44; PUZDROVSKI 2004, 299 (drawing), 300; PUZDROVSKI 2007, 150.
2 at Bădarii Vechi141, T 2 G 2 at Porogi142, T 2 G 1 in the cemetery at Oktjabrski114, several graves in the “Zolotoe kladbishche” cemetery (T 16 at Tiflisiska, T 1 and T 4 at Nekrasovskaya)143 and that at Novyi etc. All these graves with such appliqués date mainly in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD.

Identical appliqués with those at Buzău are known also in Sarmatian graves in the Ukrainian Plain144, dating, in our view, sometime in the last quarter of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD.

Small tubes made of thin golden leaf decorated with cross grooves (Fig. 4/5-7) part of a collar145 have also many analogies in the north-Pontic area. In the north-west Pontic Sarmatian environment such items were discovered in T 2 G 1 and T 2 G 2 at Porogi146, the Sokolova Mogila barrow147, T 1 G 3 at Severinovka148 etc. The 24 exemplars in T 2 G 2 at Porogi were components of the collar, while those at Sokolova Mogila had been sown on the coat sleeves of the deceased. Based on the rich inventory149, specific for the graves in the second half of the 1st c. AD, the grave in the barrow Sokolova Mogila dates, most likely, sometime in the second half of the 1st c. AD (likely the third quarter or even its last third)152. Such tubes are often found in Sarmatian graves all over the space they inhabited and were more complex collar parts or were sown to coats beside different types of golden dress appliqués153. They are known both among the adornment objects from the Greek cities on the northern shore of the Black Sea as well as the Barbarian environment in the Volga and Don rivers area, the Kuban region, the north-Pontic area west of Don and Crimea154.

Concerning the three items with the appearance of a ring made of golden leaf and provided with circular handles attached by soldering154 (Fig. 4/9-11) it must be mentioned they are pendant parts, whose central part was formed of a glass or semiprecious bead in the prolonged oval shape or barrel-shaped. Two of these ring like items still preserved one of the parts plated with golden leaf, which makes them resemble a small lid. These items were dressed on the bead or semiprecious stone ends. Pendants with similar structure are known, alike the earrings’ case, dress appliqués and golden leaf tubes, in several Sarmatian graves of the 1st c. – early half 2nd c. AD156, although their origin seems to be from the late Hellenistic period157. Alike the case at Buzău, there are circumstances when the central part of these pendant-amulets was missing or was found elsewhere in the grave. Such pendants are also present in the late Scythian cemetery at Ust’-Al’ma158. A large number of such pendants come from hoard 1 in the collection of J. Paul Getty Museum (USA), which supposedly come from the northwestern regions of Iran and date in the 1st c. BC – 1st c. AD159.

Among the items at Buzău also counts a golden ring (Fig. 4/19). It was made of a single metal wire and is characterised by a unitary appearance. The loop and upper part form a whole. In the round bezel a dark green gem was fit, on which a goat is engraved. The gem fit into the bezel slightly exceeds the upper line of the ring.

This ring is similar to both type 1c and type 2a in Hélène Guiraud’s typological classification160. Guiraud 1c type rings develop vertically and have the bezel incorporated into the loop, while the stone exceeds the upper line. The bezel is, mainly, elliptoid or round in shape. In what rings of Guiraud 2a type are concerned, they develop horizontally and have an oval or round bezel incorporated into the loop, which has a vertical profile widening towards the upper part and convex shoulders. The bezel where the decorative element is fit forms, alike the rings in type Guiraud 1c, a whole with the loop.

Rings of type Guiraud 1c are Hellenistic in origin and were used included in the 1st c. AD.161 The items of type Guiraud 2a, which are characterised by a fine and balanced form, are dated to the Roman environment mainly by the end of the 1st c. – first half of the 2nd c. AD.162 Although the commencement of the production and use must be placed in an earlier period, evidence to this end being the many analogies with the 1st c. AD. Similar or very close typologically rings with that at Buzău are known for a large geographical area, and their emergence placed sometime prior the mid 1st c. AD.164 Identical items with that at Buzău come also from a few graves in the second half of the 1st c. AD in the cemetery at Ust’-Al’ma (Crimea)164, whose
inventories also comprised other categories of items also found in the "hoard" at Buzău. The ring at Buzău is very close also to the exemplars in the Sarmatian graves at Mikhailovka (T 3 G 3)165 and Zapradu166, which are of type Guiraud 2a167 and Popović II 168. The grave at Mikhailovka dates in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD169 and that at Zapradu in the 1st c. AD, most likely in its second half170.

Given the types of items in the "hoard" at Buzău we are convinced they are a very small part of the funerary inventory of the rich woman grave171 part of the group of aristocratic graves of the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD in the north-west Pontic area. Furthermore, we believe that the grave to which these items belong is from somewhere in the north-west Pontic area (likely the Prut-Dniester interfluve) and by no means from the territory of Buzău County. Last but not least, one may conclude that the items had belonged to a representative of the wealthy in the Sarmatian society, part of the group of Sarmatians arriving to the north-west Pontic area from territories east of Don river starting with mid 1st c. AD.

Concerning the dating of this find, we wish to mention that although we chose to frame it chronologically in the second half/last quarter of the 1st c. AD172, one cannot exclude a dating by the end of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD173.

Another find rising recent debates is the bronze casserole (Fig. 6/7) at Olteniţa-Ulmeni174. It belongs to a type of metal vessel found both in the Roman Empire as well as in the Barbaricum. Such vessels are framed in H. J. Eggers's typology in type 144175, also known in the specialty literature under the name of “Gödäker” type casseroles. H. J. Eggers dates this casserole type in stages B1 (AD 10–70) and B2 (AD 70–150/160), mainly in the latter176.

Casseroles of the type are rarely found in the eastern and central parts of Europe177, however are well represented in the west and north178. Additionally, it was noted they were

179. SUBBOTIN/DZIGOVSKIJ 1990a, 21, Fig. 15/16; SIMONENKO 2008, 76, Pl. 119/1; BÂRCĂ 2006, 109, 329, Fig. 75/12, 177/1; BÂRCĂ/SIMONENKO 2009, 146, Fig. 53/1. The casserole from Mikhailovka is of bronze and has faience fit in the bezel with the depiction of a grape bunch in relief.

180. ROMANYUK/SIMONENKO 2001, 22, Fig. 7/4; SIMONENKO 2008, Pl. 76/22; BÂRCĂ/SIMONENKO 2009, 145, Fig. 53/15.

181. GIURAUD 1989, 181-182, Fig. 11/a, 12/a.

182. POPOVIĆ 1992, 10, 62.

183. See for the inventory and dating of this grave SUBBOTIN/DZIGOVSKIJ 1990a, 19-21, Fig. 15/10-16, 16/1-9; BÂRCĂ 2006, 329-330, Pl. 75-77; BÂRCĂ/SIMONENKO 2009.

184. MORINTZ/IONESCU 1968, 109, Fig. 12/1, 13; BICHIR 1972, Pl. XVII; BICHIR 1977, 177, 192, Pl. 25/2.


187. RADNÓTI 1938, 59-60, Pl. XXIV/3; KROPOTKIN 1970, 94, cat. no. 810, Fig. 61/3-4, 97, cat. no. 842, Fig. 62/5, 7; KRASKOVSKÁ 1978, 13, Fig. 5/1; SANIE 1981, 177, Pl. 49/a-50/b-51; WIELOWIEJSKI 1985, 291, cat. no. 219, Pl. 16;

188. RAEV 1986, 30.

189. EGGERS 1951, 172-173, map 41; EGGERS 1968, cat. no. 19, 45, 66, 75, 77, 87, Fig. 15, 16/4, 26/b, 62, 65; BOESTERD 1956, cat. no. 25-29, Pl. II/27-29; LUND HANSEN 1987, 46-47, map 55; TASSINARI 1973, 29 cat.13-18, Pl. III-V; BARATTE, BONNAMOUR/GUIALUMET/TASSINARI 1984, 75-76, not identified at Pompeii and in general were not discovered in Italy, and in Germania, the type imposed rather with difficulty179.

Concerning the period when they were produced, B. A. Raev believes that the start of their production should be placed by mid 1st c. AD, ceasing sometime by the end of the 1st c. AD180. U. Lund Hansen considers they started to be produced in few numbers in Campania, from around mid 1st c. AD, followed by a large scale production in the Gaul workshops181. Moreover, it was noted that most vessels from Europe date in stage B2, but there are exemplars coming from features dating to the 3rd c. AD182.

The analysis of all casserole finds allowed R. Petrovskzy to divide them, according to shape and decoration, in three distinct groups. The author notices that vessels in group a are not decorated and few, being found in Sweden, Denmark, Britain, France, to which add a specimen at Intericusa (Hungary), Parutino (Ukrain) and Osiek (Poland)183. Group b, discovered in much larger numbers, have their shoulders decorated with a strip decorated with palisade-shaped motifs, while those in group c have an extended foot and the shoulder decorated with a stripe decorated with stylised vegetal motifs184.

Following the analysis of all casserole finds, but also of the archaeological features where they were identified, R. Petrovskzy concludes that vessels in groups a-b started production in AD 55/60, while those in group c in AD 60/70185. The same author succeeded to establish the production cease shortly after early 2nd c. AD (groups a-b AD 90/120, and group c in AD 100/120)186. Nevertheless, there are cases when such casseroles were in use much after the production ceases, being discovered even in the 3rd c. AD187.

Beside the specimen at Olteniţa-Ulmeni, in the Sarmatian graves in the north-Pontic area, such casseroles are represented by the specimens in T 3 G 1 at Cuconeşti Vechi188, T 2 G 1 at Chuguno-Krepinka189 and the barrow grave 1 at Kobyakovko (cemetery located east of Rostov-on-Don)190. The Chuguno-Kreplinka casserole is stamped with letters PICYSF Picus (fe(icit)) or [All]picus (fe(icit)), artisan who produced in Gaul under the Flavians (AD 69-96)191.

The Cuconeşti Vechi casserole belongs to group b, and the grave to which is part dates, based on the entire inventory192, most likely in the last quarter of the 1st c. AD – cat. no. 100-101, Pl. XXXV; PETROVSZKY 1993, 214, 218, 253-258, 269, 271, 279, 322.

179. Cf. LUND HANSEN 1987, 47; PETROVSZKY 1993, 84.


181. LUND HANSEN 1987, 46-47.

182. RAEV/NAUMENKO 1993, 155.


184. PETROVSZKY 1993, 80-83.

185. PETROVSZKY 1993, 82.

186. PETROVSZKY 1993, 82.


188. DERGACHEV 1982, 27-29, Fig. 7/2-7; GROSU 1990, 51, Fig. 19; GROSU 1995, Fig. 8/a-3; BÂRCĂ 2001, 350, Fig. 3; BÂRCĂ 2006, 172-174, 306, Fig. 48/1, 189/3; BÂRCĂ 2009, 101, 105-106, Fig. 6/3; BÂRCĂ/SIMONENKO 2009, 187, 189, Pl. XI, Fig. 69/3.

189. SIMONENKO 2008, 17, 66, Pl. 61; BÂRCĂ/SIMONENKO 2009, 187, 189, Fig. 69/5.

190. GUGUEV 1986, 71, 72, Pl. 45/2.


192. For the inventory of this grave see DERGACHEV 1982, 27-28, Fig. 7; GROSU 1982, 10-11, Fig. 2/9-12; GROSU 1990, 51, Fig. 19; BÂRCĂ 2006, 306, Fig. 48.
early/first quarter of the 2nd c. AD. The Chuguno-Krepinka and Kobyakov casserole belong to group c alike that at Oltenița-Ulmeni. The grave at Čuguno-Krepinka dates based on the rich inventory193 in the first quarter of the 2nd c. AD and that at Kobyakov sometime in the first half of the 2nd c. AD194. Finally yet importantly, we wish to mention that all casserole in types Eggers 137-144 in the Sarmatian environment come mainly from graves dated to the second half of the 1st c. – third quarter of the 2nd c. AD195. Referring to the production place of Eggers 144 casseroles, most of the scholars agree that the main production centre was in south Gaul196. Functionally, the casserole analysed above were used as mixing wares among the drinking wares, but also as eating and measuring wares. The vessel at Oltenița-Ulmeni poses questions related to its find spot and conditions. The bronze casserole was found by chance, beside a cup and an unguentarium (Fig. 6/6), in 1960 following rescue archaeological excavations required by the destruction in 1957 of several inhumation graves in occasion of irrigation works. The archaeological investigations yielded a few Sarmatian graves197. One of them (G 1) had an inventory comprising pottery, beads and a bronze brooch198 (Fig. 6/1). Another (G 3) presents a rectangular disk mirror with perforated side handle, decorated in relief on the exterior part (Fig. 6/3), a wheelthrown cup made of red fabric (Fig. 6/4), loom weights, a small bell (Fig. 6/2) and a bronze bracelet with crossed ends and coiled199 (Fig. 6/5).

Gh. Bichir dated the casserole in the first half of the 2nd c. AD200. Based on the consideration that the bronze vessel is part of the same grave with the brooch R. Harhoiu dated the casserole in the second half of the 1st c. AD201, although the authors of the research clearly state it was found scattered and it cannot be said with certainty that it comes from a damaged grave. Regardless, it is certain that the bronze vessel was not part of the inventory of grave 1 as argued by R. Harhoiu202. The brooch (Fig. 6/1) in G 1 at Oltenița-Ulmeni203, which R. Harhoiu uses to date the casserole, was dated by the excavators to the 2nd c. AD and early 3rd c. AD204, and in the first half of the 2nd c. AD by Gh. Bichir205. The item belongs to type Almgren 84, broadly used in both the Roman Empire206 as well as the Barbarian environment207. Within the Roman Empire, the provinces where many specimens of such brooch were identified are Noricum, Panonnia, Moesia and Dacia208. In S. Cocis’s typological classification for the 173 brooch specimens of Almgren 84 type (Cocis type 8b2) in Dacia, the specimen at Oltenița-Ulmeni belongs to type 8b2b1209. Concerning the dating of the brooches of the type, it was noted that in the province of Dacia, where there were workshops manufacturing such brooch type (Napoca, Porolissum), their maximum use period was in the interval between early 2nd c. AD and the third quarter of the same century210. In connection to the chronological framing of such brooches, one should mention that there are also other dating propositions: first half of the 2nd c. AD211; last quarter of the 1st c. – second half of the 2nd c.;212 Hadrian’s reign – early 3rd c. AD;213 the 2nd c. – early 3rd c. AD214 or the second half of the 2nd c. – early 3rd c. AD215. For the brooches of the type in Eastern Europe it was noted that based on the items they were discovered beside within graves, their use in the second half of the 2nd c. – early half of the 3rd c. AD216. An example to this effect is the brooch in the Sarmatin grave 10 in the cemetery at Bocani217 (Republic of Moldova), dating based on the rich funerary inventory218 in the second half of the 2nd c. – early 3rd c. AD219.

Given the above mentioned we believe that also grave G 1 at Oltenița-Ulmeni may be dated in the second half of the 2nd c. AD, which is supported, as we shall see below, also by the dating of the items in G 3.

The bracelet (Fig. 6/5) in G 3220 belongs to the type of bracelets with crossed and coiled ends. Items of the type are in the shape of simple loops, made of bronze, silver and rarely gold wire or bars, round or rectangular in section, closed by the overlap and then coiling of the two ends on the loop. The diameter of these bracelets is comprised between 5 and 8-9 cm. Items of the type were broadly spread for a long period of time. They were intensively used in pre-Roman Dacia, where they were discovered in both settlements as well as a series of hoards221, but
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193 See for the rich inventory of this grave SIMONENKO 2008, 65-66, Pl. 56-66.
194 GUGUEV 1986, 72.
196 RADNÔTI 1938, 50; KROPOTKIN 1970, 25; RAEV 1986, 30 with all views and bibliography; LUND HANSEN 1987, 47; PETROVSZY 1993, 82.
198 MORINTZ/IONESCU 1968, 110, 111; MORINTZ/IONESCU 1970, 40, 44, Fig. 3/1; BICHIR 1977, 187, Pl. 22/2.
199 MORINTZ/IONESCU 1968, 110, Fig. 14/1-3; BICHIR 1972, Pl. XVII/2, 4, 8; BICHIR 1977, Pl. 22/5, 8, 10, 25/4.
200 BICHIR 1996, 300.
201 HARHOIU 1993, 46.
202 HARHOIU 1993, 46.
203 MORINTZ/IONESCU 1970, 40, 44, Fig. 3/1; BICHIR 1977, 187, Pl. 22/2.
204 MORINTZ/IONESCU 1970, 40, 44.
also in the Bastarnae environment\(^222\). They are also frequently found in the Roman environment of the first centuries AD\(^223\), but also the cemeteries of the north-Pontic cities in the first centuries AD\(^224\). Bracelets of the type are also present in the graves in the Bosporan cemeteries\(^225\) or late Scythian\(^226\), and the Sarmatian graves all over the space they inhabited\(^227\).

Related to the mirror (Fig. 6/3) in G 3\(^228\) it must be said it belongs to the type of mirrors disk with thickened rim and side handle, in rectangular, perforated shape. The outer part of these mirrors is decorated in relief with the representation of the various motifs; most often, solar symbols or tamga type sings\(^229\). Among the specimens of this mirror type are found specimens with a conical projection in the central part.

A. M. Khazanov dated such mirror in the 2nd – 3rd c. AD\(^230\), while A. S. Skripkin noted that the peak period of their use in the Sarmatian world in the Lower Volga area was the second half of the 2nd c. – mid 3rd c. AD\(^231\). M. P. Abramova dated the mirror of the type with decoration in relief on the outer part from the north-Caucasian territories to the 2nd – 3rd c. AD, specifying that they emerge as early as the end of the 1st c. AD\(^232\). Upon the analysis of such mirrors in the Kuban region, I. I. Marchenko noticed that they are found there in archaeological features only beside brooches of the 2nd c. AD\(^233\), in the Sarmatian environment of the north-Pontic area, the great majority of the mirror of the type come from graves dated to the second half of the 2nd c. – first half of the 3rd c. AD\(^234\). Confirmation to this effect is the fact that in most cases, they belong to the funerary furniture of graves comprising also a series of artifacts representing good dating elements. Some mirrors of the type are rarely found in graves dating to the mid and second half of the 3rd c. AD\(^235\).

Concerning the wheelthrown cup (Fig. 6/4) made of red fabric in the same grave\(^236\) we wish to mention it is similar to the specimen discovered in the barrow cemetery at Histria dated to the 1st – 2nd c. AD and assigned to type XLVI in Al. Suceveanu typology\(^237\).

In the same chronological interval is also placed the green glass *unguentarium* (Fig. 6/6) found isolated beside the casserole and cup.

This shape of *unguentarium* may be rather considered with a quasi-globular body with concave base and cylinder neck with a narrowing by the base. According to the typology of C. Isings, as also framed by I. Glodariu\(^238\), it may be deemed form 82A1 *candlestick unguentarium*\(^239\). Noticeably, this form (at Oltenița-Ulmeni) is slightly different from form Isings 82 A1 precisely by the almost globular shape of the body. The narrow part by the neck base would be an element that would orient to a dating in the 1st – 2nd c. AD, however is not a compulsory element as it appears often also in the 3rd – 4th c. AD.

At Panticapaeum, it appears in graves from the second half of the 1st c. – early half of the 2nd c. AD often together with other glass and pottery vessels. There, such *unguentaria* is framed in type II, group 1 of researchers N. Kunina and N. Sorokina\(^240\). In J. Hayes, the form appears as a Syro-Palestinian product and dated towards the half of the 1st c. AD\(^241\), although similar forms are presented by the same author as datable to the first half of the 2nd c. AD\(^242\). At Augusta Rauricorum, B. Rütti frames this recipient, very similar to that at Oltenița-Ulmeni, in form 143\(^243\), where it appears together with coins from Faustina (unspecified). The form is dated to the last part of the 2nd c. AD until the 4th c. AD\(^244\). In Greece (Macedonia), in a 1st c. AD grave were identified five similar items, of which three have a narrow portion at the neck base\(^245\). Among previous specimens of the form, and better dated, count those at Herculanum (*ante quem* AD 79). The items identified there are bluish, cylinder neck and shape in a bulb form, being believed by the editor as north Italian\(^246\). A similar shape *unguentarium*, deemed east-Mediterranean product, counts in the collections of the Art Gallery of the Yale University being dated to the 2nd c. AD\(^247\), still in east Mediterranean in the collection of the Museum of Jerusalem counts an analogue item, colourless, with air bubbles and green colour, inverted rim and the neck slightly widened by the base, where it is also narrowed joining it with the globular body and flat base. The item is dated to the 1st – 2nd c. AD and...
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\(^{222}\) SMIRNOVA 1981, 195, Fig. 4/3-4, 7, 5/3, 6.


\(^{230}\) FEDOROV 1960, PL. 37/18-19; BOGDANOV/GUSHCHINA/LOBODA 1976, Fig. 4/45, 6/51, 8/20, 10/41; DERGACHEV 1982, Fig. 40/12; ARKHEOLOGIYA SSSR 1989, PL. 82/9; VADAY 1989, PL. 100; GUSHCHINA/ZASETSKAYA 1994, cat. no. 146, 370, PL. 15/146, 41/376; FARKAS 1998, PL. II b; BUBLULICH/HAIHEU 2002, Fig. 8/42; BÂRCĂ 2006, 104, Fig. 30/2, 176/2; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 140, 234-235, Fig. 50/9, 93/6.

\(^{241}\) KHAZANOV 1963, 65-66. Within his typological classification, A. M. Khazanov frames these mirrors in type IX.

\(^{242}\) MATHESON 1980, 62-63, no. 152 (16.7 cm high), the author assigning it to form Isings 280.
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is deemed an east-Mediterranean product\(^{248}\). In the Adriatic Sea area are known similar specimens in the 2nd – 3rd c. cemeteries at Bakar (Croatia)\(^{249}\) and Pocradec (Albania)\(^{250}\). A similar *unguentarium*, yet without narrowing by the neck base, deemed as a product of the Eastern Mediterranean is housed with the collections of the Museum of Berlin being dated to the 1st – 2nd c. AD\(^{251}\).

Similar *unguentaria* are known in a series of graves at Tomis. They were dated to the 2nd – 3rd c. AD and framed by M. Bucova\(\text{\v{c}}\)alá in type XLVI. One of them (no. 246), beside other glass items, lay beside a coin dated under Probus\(^{252}\). From Odessos comes another specimen (canddlestick) dated by A. Minčev in the 1st – 2nd c. AD and deemed a micro-Asian product\(^{253}\). Similar *Unguentaria* to that at Olteniţa-Ulmeni were discovered at Chersonesus (Crimea). They were framed by V. M. Zubar’ to type 5 in his typological classification, mentioning they were spread in the period comprised between the end of the 1st c. AD and the first half of the 3rd c. AD\(^{254}\).

A green glass *unguentarium* with globular body and slightly concave base and cylinder neck with a narrowing by the base is part of the inventory of the Sarmatian grave in T 18 at Tiflisskaya\(^{255}\) ("Zolotoe kladbishi\(\v{c}\)e cemetery"). It is dated to the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD.\(^{256}\) It must be specified that this specimen at Tiflisskaya has the body height equal to that of the neck and its total height is smaller than that of the specimen at Olteniţa-Ulmeni, with the quasi-globular body and the neck height represents almost two thirds of the total height.

Noticeably, dating and typological framings are rather elastic and cover a considerable geographical area.

Given the globular form of the body, neck base narrowing, eventual rim eversion, concave base, air bubbles in the composition and green colour we believe that the assignment of the item in the 2nd c. AD is most plausible. Should we yet consider the find conditions and spot the dating of the items in G 1 and G 3, then the dating of this *unguentarium* may be nuanced.

Given the find spot and conditions of the casserole, *unguentarium* and cup as well as the presence nearby of some well datable Sarmatian graves, is very likely that the three items come from one of the damaged graves in 1957, view expressed four decades ago by Gh. Bichir\(^{-257}\). Related to the chronological framing of the above items we believe they were deposited in grave/graves sometime by mid/third quarter of the 2nd c. AD. Maybe, even sometime in the chronological interval comprised between AD 140/150-180, at any rate in no case in the second half of the 1st c. AD or the first decades of the 2nd c. AD.

A dating of the casserole, *unguentarium* and cup in this period is reinforced in our view also by the dating of the objects in the researched graves in 1960. In fact, it is hard to believe that the graves discovered in 1960 and those damaged in 1957, in which they originate, most likely the mentioned artifacts are great chronological differences, they being rather, as shown by the items’ dating, a contemporary group. Another argument in favour of the proposed dating is also the fact that the producer’s stamp on the casserole handle is erased\(^{258}\), which points to a long use of the object. This is indicative of the fact that the moment when it was deposited in the grave has nothing to do with the date when it was produced or reached the Lower Danube area. Even though the artisan stamp would have been preserved, we are not able to argue, for the lack of other more accurate dating elements, for a framing of the casserole and implicitly, of the grave it was part in the chronological interval when such vessels were made.

It is certain that in the current state one may conclude that the graves at Olteniţa-Ulmeni seem to have belonged to a group of Sarmatians entering the Romanian Plain sometime by mid 2nd c. AD.

Another interesting find worthy of mention is the grave at Vitâneşti (T 2 G 2)\(^{259}\). It is a main burial in a Sarmatian barrow which at the time of the archaeological investigation was 15 m in diameter, 0.3 m height from the surface level and 0.85 m height from the constructive level (Fig. 7/1). Following the research, in sections I and III was noted the existence of a flat circular ditch, truncated cone in profile surrounding the grave (Fig. 7/1). Due to the partial research of this circular ditch, its diameter could not be established. The grave was central to the barrow. Since it was plundered, the pit shape at the research time was irregular. Nevertheless, one may argue it was rectangular. The pit of large sizes and was provided with steps but also with a small niche on the southern side (Fig. 7/2). The pit bottom was at 2.95 m below the current surface level. Due to the fact the grave was plundered, the bones (the anthropological analysis determined the dead was an adult woman 35 of age when buried) were found scattered all over the pit surface at various depths. The anatomical position of the left lower limb and part of the right indicate the dead was oriented with the head northwards. In the rest of the grave were identified, at various depths, fragments of basin bones, clavicle, humerus ribs, cubitus and right femur.

Among the inventory objects found in the grave and published by the excavators count glass beads; three tubes made of thin gold leaf with smooth surface (Fig. 8/1-2); 17 golden circular appliques with spherical central part decorated on the rims with transversal grooves and provided with attachment orifices (Fig. 8/6); a hexagonal golden applique decorated with seven circular projections surrounded by transversal grooves (Fig. 8/7); nine approximately rectangular golden appliques with grooves by the ends, rhomboid decoration in their central part and four attachment orifices (Fig. 8/3-4); two rosette...
shape golden appliques (Fig. 8/5), two semi-spherical bronze buttons (Fig. 8/12-13); iron nails (Fig. 8/8-11); rectangular bronze plates provided with one orifice each by the ends (Fig. 8/14-18); iron bits and items (Fig. 8/19-22); two censers (Fig. 8/23-24); a wheelthrown red fabric cup (Fig. 8/25), fragments of an yellowish-red amphora (Fig. 8/26) and a few galas vessels fragments620.

The excavators dated the grave based on the remaining funerary inventory by the end of the 3rd c. AD621. The chronological framing of the barrow grave at Vitănești is yet far from being a resolved issue as long as no careful analysis is carried for the artifacts and some of the existent aspects providing clues for a more accurate dating. Even the most recent dating propositions are contradictory and are based only on the analysis of certain elements or aspects within the grave. Thus, without making an analysis of the grave, Gh. Bichir proposed a dating by the end of the 2nd c. – early 3rd c. AD.622 M. Babeş chose, based on the golden objects and analogies with T 2 G 2 at Porogi and the Sokolova Mogila barrow, in favour of a dating of the grave at Vitănești in the period prior to Trajan's reign623.

Yet, in order to find the place of the grave at Vitănești among the Sarmatian antiquities by the Lower Danube, analysis should be performed for all the elements providing more accurate information for a chronological framing. The analysis of the funerary rite and ritual in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment west of Don river from the 1st c. – mid 2nd c. AD indicates that similarly to the previous period (the 2nd c. – 1st c. BC) predominant are secondary burials in barrows of previous periods64. In the second half of the 2nd c. – 4th c. AD, in the same region yet predominate main burials in Sarmatian barrows and not secondary burials in previous periods barrows625.

Main burials for which the barrows were built emerge yet in the north-Pontic area west of Don River by mid 1st c. AD626. All these main burials from the mid Sarmatian period (1st c. – mid 2nd c. AD) are mainly in individual barrows. In the late Sarmatian period, the second half of the 2nd c.–4th c. AD, the vast majority of the Sarmatian barrows with main burials west the north-Pontic area are part of larger cemeteries (Cucoșetii Vechi I – 33, Cucoșetii Vechi II – 49, Petrești – 42, Holmskoe – 22, Alkaliya– 18, Vasilevka – 13, Divizia – 10, Kube – 10) or smaller (Bădragii Noi – 7, Aliyaga – 6, Hadzhider II – 6, Feştelita – 6, Gradeshka – 4). Yet are rarely found in individual Sarmatian barrows. In the east of the north-Pontic area up to Don River, the large part of the main burials were within individual barrows. Cuurently, are known only two small cemeteries (Shevchenko – 7, Brilevka – 8)627.

Commonly, main burials below the barrows were at their centre. There are cases when they were found farther from the mound centre.

In connection to the main burials, it must be said that in the early Sarmatian period, in both the north-Pontic area west of Don river as well as the vast space inhabited by the Sarmatians east of Don and Volga, their numbers is rather small628. Starting though with the 1st c. AD, numbers increase significantly compared to the previous period, especially in certain regions the Sarmatian inhabited. Thus in the Volga – Don interfluve, they represent 78.9% and east of Volga, 78.7%, and in the region south the Ural Mountains, 94.7%629. Instead, in the Kuban region, territory inhabited by the Syracian Sarmatians, secondary burials in barrows of previous periods continue to be preponderant630 similarly to the north-Pontic area west of Don. Concerning the main burials in the north-Pontic area, one must say that most of them cluster in certain regions: the area near the Sea of Azov, South Donbas, and the space between rivers Orel’ and Samara, the Dniiper basin and the north-west Pontic area631. Most frequently, they group in smaller barrow cemeteries (Novo-Podkryazh, Vinogradnoe, Primorsk, Boguslav, Verbki, Turlaki, Primorskoe, Belošeš) or larger (Molchansk, Podgorodnoe, Ust’-Kamenka). The number of Sarmatian barrows within these cemeteries varies from 3–5 (Belošeš, Boguslav, Verbki or Vinogradnoe) to 71 (Ust’-Kamenka)632.

Commonly, the Sarmatian barrows are flat circular and they were raised by a single technique. Heir diameter varies on the entire space inhabited by the Sarmatian, being found both 10-15 m diameter barrows as well as barrows whose diameter exceeds a few tens of meters. The height from the ancient surface level of the barrows varies between 0.3–0.4 m and 3 m.

Based on the shape of the pits of the main burials it was noted the existence of several funerary construction types: rectangular; rectangular with side steps; niched; square and in catacomb633. Another note worth mentioning is that funerary pits of the main burials are often larger than those secondary in tumuli of previous periods624, which may be noted also in the case of the grave at Vitănești.

In the north-Pontic area west of Don in the 1st c. – mid 2nd c. AD, the rectangular pits of the Sarmatian graves are most numerous, compared with their much smaller ratio in the Sarmatian environment east of Don and Volga625. They are dominant in the north-Pontic area west of Don also in the first stage of the late period (the second half of the 2nd c. – early

620 LEAHU/TROHANI 1979, 134, 138, Fig. 5-7.
621 LEAHU/TROHANI 1979, 138.
622 BICHIR 1999, 302.
623 BÂRCĂ 1999, 234.
627 Cf. SIMONENKO 2004, 149; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 205.

628 See to this effect SIMONENKO 1993, 20, 26; SIMONENKO 2004, 135, BÂRCĂ 2006, 38, 206, BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 41; SKRIPKIN 1990, 181-183, tab. 16. The number of main burials in barrows erected by the Sarmatians is small also with the Syracian Sarmatians in the Kuban region steppes (Cf. ARKHEOLOGIYA SSSR 1989, 250; MARCENKO 1996, 95).
629 SKRIPKIN 1990, 185.
631 Cf. ARKHEOLOGIYA USSR 1986, 190-195; SIMONENKO 2000, 134, Fig. 4/1; SIMONENKO 2004, 141; BÂRCĂ 2006, 38, Fig. 222/2; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 100.
half of the 3rd c. AD). This proves that we are dealing with both the preservation of the ancient traditions as well as the kinship of the ideological representations of the Sarmatian from the late period with those in the previous period.

In the second stage of the late Sarmatian period (the second half of the 3rd c. – 4th c. AD) the rectangular funerary pits are not anymore found, their place being occupied by those of other types. In the north-Pontic area, such pit types are known only in a few cases (Balki T 12 G 1, Bogorad). In fact, in the region east of Don, rectangular funerary pits are rarely found.

In relation to the niche-hidden place in the southern wall of the grave at Vităneşti, we must argue that they are frequently found in large funerary pits of the rich Sarmatian graves of the mid period.

Therefore, judging after the inventory of the graves with large funerary pits, even though in large part were plundered, precisely like the case at Vităneşti, one may argue that they belonged to the representations of the wealthy part of the Sarmatian populations.

Another significant element also in the case of T 2 G 2 at Vităneşti, omitted mention and analysed by all researchers, is the flat circular ditch surrounding the grave.

Enclosures with various flat shaped ditches, with or without graves inside, identified below individual Sarmatian barrows or within barrow or flat cemeteries started to be known also in certain territories inhabited by the Sarmatians (mainly in the Prut-Dniester interfluve, the Lower and Mid Don area and the Pannonian Plain) only a few decades.

For the enclosures of the type in the north and north-west Pontic area was proposed the following classification:
1. Square with access from one of the sides and without graves inside;
2. Rectangular without access and graves inside;
3. Rectangular with and without access and graves inside;
4. Trapezoid with access and graves inside;
5. Circular with and without access inside yet with graves placed mainly in the central area.

At the first sight, the current state of research indicates that most part of the circular ditched enclosures below barrows are from the first stage of the late Sarmatian period (the second half of the 2nd c. – early half of the 3rd c. AD). It was noted that similarly to those in flat square shape the enclosures emerged in the Sarmatian environment, beside a series of ritual acts and novel elements in the funerary rite and material culture as early as the mid Sarmatian period (1st half of the 3rd c. AD).
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This evidence to this effect are the enclosures below barrows with main burials at Cazaclia (T 10), Obileni (T 5), Verbik, Mar’ina Roscha and Krivoj Liman (T 41, T 48) dating based on the funerary furniture in the chronological interval comprised between the second half of the 1st c. AD and early 2nd c. AD.

Enclosures with flat circular ditch have always graves inside, and when they are provided with access, it is placed on the southern side, south-west or southeast. The diameter of the ditched circular enclosures below barrows varies from case to case alike their width and depth.

The graves inside the circular enclosures below barrows have mainly funerary pits of rectangular shape, of rectangular shape with side steps along the long sides or with niche below the western wall. There are a few cases when inside the circular enclosure are found catacomb graves. In parenthesis, we wish to mention that the conditions below T 2 at Vităneşti is found below T 41 and T 48 in the cemetery at Krivoj Liman where the rectangular funerary pits of these graves are provided with niche-hiding and are surrounded with flat circular shaped ditches.

In connection to the flat square, rectangular, trapezoid and circular ditched enclosures in the north and north-west Pontic area, we must mention that they emerge as early as the 1st c. AD despite their provenance from cemeteries or individual barrows dating mainly in the second half of the 2nd c. – early/first half of the 3rd c. AD. In the same geographical area, the latest are the circular enclosures in the Kubej and Kurchi cemeteries dating to the second half of the 3rd – early 4th c. AD. Similar circumstances were noted also for the Don River basin. Although, currently, the enclosures that belong to the period comprised between mid 3rd c. AD and early/first half of the 4th c. AD are still the most numerous, the number of those dating in earlier chronological intervals is on the rise for instance Chertovitski II, Pisarevka, Krivoj Liman (left Don river), Cazaclia, Obileni (Prut-Dniester interfluve).

Enclosures with variously shaped flat ditches are present also in the Sarmatian environment of the Pannonian Eastern Europe.
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Plain\textsuperscript{292}, where by 2003, were known 50 sites with grave finds placed inside ditched enclosures\textsuperscript{296}. Rescue archaeological research carried out in the last decade on the Hungarian territory revealed other new cemeteries with graves surrounded by ditches\textsuperscript{297}. Most of these ditched enclosures in the Iazyges Sarmatian environment are flat circular, however oval, square, hexagonal or octagonal are also found. Access inside the ditched enclosures in the Sarmatian environment of the Pannonian Plain is placed, alike those in the north and north-west of the Black Sea, most often on the southern, southeastern and southwestern sides\textsuperscript{298}. Finally yet importantly, we wish to mention that the two Sarmatian graves with large funerary pits surrounded by flat circular ditches discovered following the rescue archaeological excavations on the Nădlac-Sibiu motorway, Nădlac-Pecica section, in 2011\textsuperscript{299}.

The custom of ditch-surrounding the graves was brought, beside other novel elements and features (for instance the barrow graves with eastern elements), in the Sarmatian environment of the Pannonian Plain following the displacement to this area of a group of Sarmatians arriving from the north-west of the Black Sea sometime after the Marcomannic Wars.\textsuperscript{300} It would be used until the Sarmatian disappear from the historical background of the Carpathian Basin\textsuperscript{301}.

Related to the graves inside the ditched enclosures, we should also argue that predominates simple rectangular funerary pits followed by those with side steps on the long sides, often larger, and those rectangular with niche below the western wall. In addition, it was noted that enclosures below small or flattened barrows are also much smaller than the large barrows. The dead in the graves inside ditched enclosures are placed on the back with hands and feet straight and oriented with the head exclusively northwards, northwestwards or northeastwards.

Another note is that the enclosures below large barrows, beside the funerary banquet and other ritual actions below or in their mantle, are specific mainly to the aristocratic graves and those who belonged to the wealthy layer of the Sarmatian society. To this effect pleads also the funerary inventory within these graves, even though in many cases they were plundered.

Finally yet importantly, we wish to mention that for the north and north-west Pontic territory one may conclude that most often, the any shape ditched enclosures, with or without graves inside, were closely connected to the barrows, although often, the shape of the enclosures is independent from the barrow mound. Thus, we may argue that the ditched enclosures in this area are mainly an attribute of the barrow funerary ritual, though there are cases when they are also present in flat cemeteries.

In connection with the ditched enclosures with graves inside, we believe that their ditches very likely served for separating the dead from the outside world\textsuperscript{292}, and the enclosures surface was the background of ritualistic acts occurring after the burial of the dead\textsuperscript{305}. The ditches of these enclosures also likely served to protect the ritualistic acts performed within, from the influence of the evil spirits. Thus, it is very likely that ditched enclosures with or without graves inside functioned as backgrounds for ritualistic acts related to the funerary banquet and other elements of the cult of the dead\textsuperscript{292}.

Given all the above, we believe that the grave at Vitanăști belonged to a person in the Sarmatian elite of the region. Such statement is supported in our view by both the fact we are dealing with a main barrow burial in a large funerary pit with niche-hiding place on the southern part as well as the flat circular ditch that surrounded the grave. To this effect pleads also part of the preserved funerary furniture, which is to some extent similar to that in graves belonging to the Sarmatian elite in the north-Pontic steppes of the second half of the 1st c. – first half of the 2nd c. AD.

For instance, the golden appliqués in the grave at Vitanăști, which were definitely much more numerous and varied as types, are part of the category of adornment and luxury dress objects, which in the Sarmatian environment belonged mainly to the fashion of the first two centuries AD. Furthermore, these luxury objects are either decorating garments or parts of adornment objects, are also good chronological markers.

The small tubes made of thin golden leaf with smooth surface from Vitanăști (Fig. 8/1-2) were either part of a collar or decorated the clothes of the dead. Similar to the tubes with crossed grooved-decorated surface, those with the smooth surface have also many analogies. In the north-west Pontic environment, such items were discovered in a series of graves like those at Beloîâle (T 9 G 1)\textsuperscript{306} or the Sokolova Mogila barrow\textsuperscript{306} etc.

Such smooth tubes made of gold are often found in the Sarmatian graves all over the space they inhabited\textsuperscript{307} and were

\textsuperscript{292} For the first time, information related to them were synthesised by the Hungarian scholar G. Vörös (VÖRÖS 1982-1983, 157), and a pertinent analysis was made by V. KULCSÁR (KULCHAR 1997, 126-133; KULCSÁR 1998, 35-40, 95-96, 111).

\textsuperscript{296} ISTVÁNOVITS/KULCSÁR 2003, 273. The current state of research points to the presence of the enclosures in almost every major Sarmatian cemetery on the current territory of Hungary.

\textsuperscript{297} See to this effect BATIZI et alii 2006, 42-48; GULYÁS 2006, 89; RAJNA/ DINNYÉS/KOVÁCS 2006, 104-105; GULYÁS 2011; HULLÁM 2012. We want to thank this way Mrs. Valeria Kulcsár for the information related to most recent finds of such enclosures in the Sarmatian environment of the Pannonian Plain.

\textsuperscript{298} Cf. KULCSÁR 1998, Fig. 18-24, 26a, 26b, 27, 31-32. Cf. COCIȘ et alii 2013, 220-221; BÂRCĂ/COCIȘ 2013. BÂRCĂ 2014; BÂRCĂ/COCIȘ 2013, 40. Evidence to this end is the dating of the graves inside the ditched enclosures from the Pannonian Plain.

\textsuperscript{299} KULCHAR 1997, 131.

\textsuperscript{300} For the first time, information related to them were synthesised by the Hungarian scholar G. Vörös (VÖRÖS 1982-1983, 157), and a pertinent analysis was made by V. KULCSÁR (KULCHAR 1997, 126-133; KULCSÁR 1998, 35-40, 95-96, 111).

\textsuperscript{301} ISTVÁNOVITS/KULCSÁR 2003, 273. The current state of research points to the presence of the enclosures in almost every major Sarmatian cemetery on the current territory of Hungary.

\textsuperscript{302} Cf. KULCSÁR 1998, Fig. 18-24, 26a, 26b, 27, 31-32. Cf. COCIȘ et alii 2013, 220-221; BÂRCĂ/COCIȘ 2013.

\textsuperscript{303} BÂRCĂ 2014; BÂRCĂ/COCIȘ 2013, 40. Evidence to this end is the dating of the graves inside the ditched enclosures from the Pannonian Plain.

\textsuperscript{304} KULCHAR 1997, 131.
either part of more complex collars or were sown on coats beside other types of gold dress appliques. They are known both among the adornment objects in the Greek cities on the northern shore of the Black Sea as well as the Barbarian environment in the Volga and Don River, Kuban region, the north-Pontic area west of Don and Crimea328.

The 17 circular golden appliques with spherical central part decorated on the rims with grooves and provided with attachment orifices (Fig. 8/6) are part of the category of dress appliques sown to the clothing in a certain order, thus forming ornamental compositions329. In I. I. Marchenko’s classification, such appliques may be framed in type I.4.3 in group A or type 2 in the same group330.

Circular appliqués with spherical central part and projecting rim decorated with grooves were discovered in a series of Sarmatian graves like those at Belołęse (T 9 G 1)331, Severinovka (T 1 G 3)332, Tsvetna333, Turlaki (T 7 G 1)334 dating to the second half of the 1st c. AD. Similar to the specimens at Vităneşti are those in T 2 G 2 at Mocra335 dating, likely sometime in the interval between the end of the 1st c. AD and the first quarter of the 2nd c. AD336.

Within the Sarmatian environment, such appliqués were also identified beside other types of golden dress appliqués and in a series of graves of the 1st c. – first half of the 2nd c. AD in the Sarmatian cemetery at “Zolotoe kladschisce” (T 37 at Ust’-Labinsk337, T 18 and T 20 at Tilišskaya338, T 2 at Kazanskaya339). Appliques of type I.4.3 in the Sarmatian graves in the Kuban region are dated by I. I. Marchenko in the second half of the 1st BC – 2nd c. AD, and those of type 2 in the second half of the 1st c. AD – 2nd c. AD340. Such type of dress appliques are also present in the cemetery at Ust’-Alma341.

Although at first sight, it seems rather surprising the presence in this grave of iron bits and objects (Fig. 8/19-22), it is worth mentioning that the harness items in the grave at Vităneşti are not the single find of the type in the Sarmatian environment of the first centuries AD. Even though the bits and hackamores are rarely found in the Sarmatian environment, they are still recorded in a series of graves in the north and north-west Pontic area in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD. Alike those at Boguslav T 2 G 1 (group 4)342, Casaclia (T 10 G 1)343 or Ust’-Kamenka (T 3 G 1, T 24 G 1, T 38 G 1, T 66 G 1)344. Bits of two iron bars with round bent ends and loops by the extremities come also from the Sarmatian grave at Konstantinovka (Crimea)345, dating, most likely, in the second quarter of the 2nd c. AD346. Bits and hackamores were discovered also in a few graves of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD in the Kuban region (G 9 at Cemeldon347, T 44 and T 46 located between Kazanskaya and Tilišskaya348, T 6, T 14 and T 17 at Kazanskaya349, T 31 and T 32 at Ust’-Labinskaya350 and T 6 (researched in 1908) at Tilišskaya351). A series of Sarmatian graves in the chronological interval between the second half of the 1st c. AD and the second half of the 2nd c. AD in the Don river basin also present such artefacts352.

Beside the above mentioned, one should mention that

328 Simonenko 2008, p. 61-62, cat. no. 46, pl. 35/2. The grave goods also include two fragmentary amphorae of B type in D. B. Shelov’s typology (SHELOV 1978, 18, Fig. 4) or C IV B in that of S. Yu. Vnukov (VNUKOV 2006, 166, 167, Fig. 1/8, 10). Amphorae of the type are dated to the second third of the 1st c. – mid 2nd c. AD (SHELOV 1978, 18; OPAIT 1980, 301, type VIA) or AD 75/80-130/140 (VNUKOV 2003, 202, 2006, 166, 167, fig. 10).
329 AGULNIKOV/BUBULICI 1999, 288, Fig. 3/11-12; BĂRCĂ 2006, 216, 302; BĂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 201. The rich inventory also included a bronze cauldron (AGULNIKOV/BUBULICI 1999, 288, Fig. 3/4-5; AGULNIKOV/BUBULICI 1999, 12, Fig. 2/4-5; BĂRCĂ 2006, 174, 302, fig. 43/1; BĂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 190-191, Fig. 70/1) of Eggars 70 type (Repov type) but also a yellow-light fabric amphora with a profiled rim, vertical neck, elongated conical body, short foot and profiled handles (AGULNIKOV/BUBULICI 1999, 288, Fig. 5/6; AGULNIKOV/BUBULICI 1999, 12, Fig. 2/6; BĂRCĂ 2006, 90, 302, Fig. 43/2; BĂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 130, Fig. 45/2) of B type and D. B. Shelov’s typology (SHELOV 1978, 18, fig. 4) or C IVB in that of S. Yu. Vnukov (VNUKOV 2006, 166, 167, Fig. 1/8, 10).
323 KOSTENKO 2003, 20, 41, 74, 110-111, Fig. 6/21-22, 24-26, 13, 22/20, 23, 28/9-11; SIMONENKO 2008, 64, cat. no. 62, pl. 47/5.
324 ORLOVS’KII 1989, 70-71, Fig. 17; SIMONENKO 2008, 72-73, cat. no. 95, pl. 86/4.
325 Simonenko 2011, 145. Among the inventory of the grave counts an Eggars 100 bowl, a bronze cup in the “Stralžhka” group and two amphorae. The first belongs to type C in D. B. Shelov’s typological classification (SHELOV 1978, 18, Fig. 6) and Ç IV C in that more recent of S. Yu. Vnukov (VNUKOV 2003, 202; VNUKOV 2006, 166, 167, Fig. 1/9, 10). D. B. Shelov dated them in the 2nd c. AD. Following an analysis of the archaeological features and find contexts, S. Yu. Vnukov noted they date in the chronological interval between the second quarter of the 2nd c. AD and end of the 2nd c. AD. The second amphora is an intermediary shape between type A and B in D. B. Shelov’s typology (SHELOV 1978, 18, Fig. 5) or Ç IV A2 in that of S. Yu. Vnukov (VNUKOV 2006, 158, 167, Fig. 1/7). Amphorae of the type are dated in the period between the 60/les and end of the 1st c. AD (VNUKOV 2003, 202; VNUKOV 2006, 158, 167, Fig. 10).
328 GUSHCHINA/ZASETSKAYA 1994, 43, 45, cat. no. 44, 66, 73, pl. 66/6, 73, 74/4.
330 GUSHCHINA/ZASETSKAYA 1994, 77, cat. no. 55, pl. 55/555.
331 MEDVEDEV 1990, 41, 42, 47, 52, 55, 107, 109, 111, 117, 128, 137, 139, 141, 152, Fig. 12/4, 13/18, 18/2; 21/2, 22/9, 31/7, 32/8, 33/6, 34/16, 35/11, 40/2, 42/4, 44/7, 45/4, 46/5-6, 10; GUGUEV/BEZUGLOV 1990, 172, Fig. 2/19; ILYUKOV/VLASKIN 1992, 244-245, Fig. 3/15, 207, 257, 29/13, 16; BĂRCĂ 1992, 180, Fig. 4; PROKHOROVA/GUGUEV 1992, 156, Fig. 8/45; MAKSENKO 1998, 136-137, Fig. 78/1-4.
emerges around mid 1st c. AD, being mainly found in a series of graves and cemeteries from the second half of the 1st c. – early first half of the 2nd c. AD. An example to this effect are the graves at Porogi T 2 G 2345, Turlaki T 7 G 1346, Severinovka T 1 G 3351, Mocra T 2 G 2352, Bashtetchi T 19 G 1353, Bogdanovka T 8 G 3354, Vaslui G 1355 but also those in the barrow cemeteries at Ust’-Kamenka (eg. T 21 G 1, T 22 G 1, T 38 G 1, T 45 G 1, T 50 G 1356), Molchanov or Podgorodnoe357. In T 9 G 1 at Beloševé were deposited three censers358, and in T 2 G 2 at Mocra, the two censers were placed in a three-legged ritual vessel359.

Such custom, as well as some censer types, was brought to the north and north-west Pontic by the novel Sarmatian tribes arriving from the east – the Aorsians or the Alans. In fact, it is not by chance that the finds in the north and north-west of the Black Sea come from graves with definite eastern features.

Concerning the amphora (Fig. 8/26), we believe that its reconstruction was not particularly successful and that we might not even deal with an amphora as depicted by the drawing. In fact, even its classification to type IV in Gh. Popilian’s classification360 is erroneous. Unfortunately yet, the fragments based on which the graphical reconstruction was made could not be found in the deposit of the National Museum of Romanian History361.

Although in the Sarmatian environment of the first centuries AD, amphorae are rather scarce within graves362, it is noteworthy that amphorae or their fragments were also discovered in several enclosures surrounded by a flat ditch of various forms, with or without graves inside, identified below individual Sarmatian tumuli or in certain barrow or flat cemeteries363. Based on the amphora’s types, description of various forms

335. Cf. to this effect Smirnov 1973, Fig. 1-3, tipul XII; ARCHEOLOGIYA SSSR 1989, Pl. 80/32, 34; SKRIPKIN 1990, Fig. 37/16; PROKHOROVA/GUGUEV 1992, Fig. 3/10; KOSTENKO 1993, Fig. 13/9; DZYGOVS’KYJ 1993, Fig. 25/2-6; GUSHCHINA/ZASETSKAYA 1994, cat. no. 308, Pl. 32/308.

336. SMIRNOV 1973, Fig. 1-3.

337. GROSU 1995, Fig. 29/4; DZYGOVS’KYJ 1993, 69-70 Fig. 39/4; BÂRCĂ 2006, 75, 366, Fig. 130/8, 166/1; SIMONENKO 2008, 77, cat. no. 109, Pl. 121/10; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 117, Fig. 35/6.

338. SHCHERBAKOVA/KASHUBA 1993; KASHUBA/KURCHATOV/SCHHERBAKOVA 2001-2002, 208, Fig. 14/1; BÂRCĂ 2006, 75, 334, Fig. 79/4; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 117.

339. SUBBOTIN/DZIGOVS’KIJ 1990a, 16, Fig. 14/3; SUBBOTIN/DZIGOVS’KIJ, Ostrovekhov 1998, 101, Fig. 39/3; BÂRCĂ 2006, 75, 292, Fig. 28/3; SIMONENKO 2008, Pl. 120/13.

340. YAROVO/CHIRKOV/BULUCI S 1990, 29, Fig. XVIII/3.

341. KOSTENKO 1993, 40, Fig. 13/9; SIMONENKO 2008, 64, cat. no. 62, Pl. 48/2c-d.

342. Usually, such items are of coarse yellow-greyish fabric, dark brown or black, fired unevenly and preserve, like the rest of the censers, strong fire burns on the inside.

343. SHCHERBAKOVA/KASHUBA 1993; KASHUBA/KURCHATOV/SCHHERBAKOVA 2001-2002, 208, Fig. 14/3; BÂRCĂ 2006, 76, 334, Fig. 79/3; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 117, Fig. 35/13.

344. KOSTENKO 1993, 20, 49, Fig. 6/14, 16/20.


346. SKRIPKIN 1990, 99, Fig. 37/6-16. For such finds, see also MEDVEDEV 1980, 50, 37, 68, Fig. 19/2-3, 24/4-5, 28/3-4; MEDVEDEV/YEFIMOVA 1986, 84, Pl. 37/3; YURKOV/VLASKIN 1992, 109, 198, Fig. 28/13-14; PROKHOROVA/GUGUEV 1992, Fig. 31/0, 13.
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S. Yu. Vnukov noted, following the analysis of the archaeological features and the find contexts, that they date to the chronological interval comprised between the second quarter of the 2nd c. AD and the end of the 2nd c. AD.

Following the analysis of the grave at Vitănești, it can be concluded that a series of elements and features of the funerary rite and ritual prove – beside the preserved funerary inventory – that it was part of the group of graves belonging to the Sarmatian elite from the north and north-west of the Black Sea. They can be chronologically framed between the second half of the 1st c. AD and the first half of the 2nd c. AD.

In our opinion, the grave at Vitănești dates, most likely, sometime in the first half of the 2nd c. AD.

It is certain that following the analysis of the few Sarmatian finds, it was noted they date to a different period. Except these recent date propositions, the analysis also evidenced that some of the finds belong to a larger group of Sarmatian finds in the north and north-west Pontic area radically different from the rest of the Sarmatian graves in the same geographical area. Among the graves in this group are present a series of elements and features brought to this area by the novel Sarmatian tribes arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD.

Other aspects outlined following the re-analysis of the Sarmatian remains in the Romanian plain are those related to the effective presence of the Sarmatians in this region and the relations with the Roman Empire, which were more complex than commonly believed.

Concerning the early Sarmatian presence in the Romanian plain, we believe that for the second half of the 1st c. AD, one cannot speak of an effective inhabitation of the space, which is the case of the period of the 2nd-3rd c. AD. Recent dating of certain Sarmatian finds on the territory of Brăila County between the end of the 1st c. AD and early 2nd c. AD are slightly forced. On the same line, to date to later chronological segment earlier graves based only on some artefacts (even, made of gold) is a lacking grounds enterprise if other artefacts and aspects of the funerary rite and ritual are ignored (e.g. the display of graves; the funerary pit type and its arrangement; the orientation of the skeleton). An example to this effect are also the graves at Oltenița-Ulmeni framed by some of the researchers, as mentioned, in the mid Sarmatian period. A similar scenario was also in the case of the Sarmatian finds on the current territory of Brăila county, but also for the barrow grave at Galați-Seromală. Obviously, there are cases when graves with an accurate chronological framing were dated later, while items with definite cultural assignment within certain graves were assigned or dated erroneously (eg. Chiscani-sat, Lișcoteanca Moș Filon G 7). All of this though will be discussed in the second part of this study.
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Fig. 1. Pendant (1) and brooch (2) of Lehniu (after BICHIR 1996); 3-4. Mirror in the barrow at Sokolova Mogila (after KOVPANENKO 1986).
Fig. 3. 1. The cauldron at Kal’mius (after SHTERN 1911); 2-3. Plate-fasteners in the Siberian collection of Peter the Great (after RUDENKO 1962).
Fig. 5. Gold earrings. 1-2. Ust'-Al' ma G 1 tomb 620 (after Puzdrovskij 2007); 3-4. Porogi T 2 G 2 (after Simonenko/loboj 1991); 5-6. Severinovka T 1 G 3 (after Simonenko 2008); 7. Olbia (after Fless/Trejster 2007).
Fig. 6. The items in the Sarmatian graves at Oltenița-Ulmeni. 1. Brooch (G 1); 2. Small bell (G 3); 3. Mirror (G 3); 4. Cup (G 3); 5. Bracelet (G 3); 6. Unguentarium; 7. Casserole (after BICHIR 1977). 1-3, 5, 7 – bronze, 4 – pottery, 6 – glass.
Fig. 7. 1. Layout of the barrow, sections and profiles of T 2 at Vălănești; 2. Layout of grave 2 in the barrow 2 at Vălănești (after LEAHU/TROHANI 1979).