

**Ruzil Railiyevich Sattarov**

**Imported items in Pyanoborsk culture  
(late II century B.C. – II century A.D.)**

Specialty 07.00.06 – Archeology

**extended abstract of dissertation**  
dissertation in support of candidature  
for a historical degree

Kazan – 2019

The work has been complete at the Research Laboratory of Archeology of the Social-Humanitarian Institute of Academician S.P. Korolev Samara National Research University Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education (Samara University).

**Scientific Supervisor:**

**Sergey Edgarovich Zubov**, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Head of the Research Laboratory of Archeology at the Social-Humanitarian Institute of Academician S.P. Korolev Samara National Research University Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education (Samara).

**Official opponents:**

**Stavitsky Vladimir Vyacheslavovich**, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of General History and Social Studies of Penza State University the Federal State Budgetary Institution of Higher Education (Penza).

**Dmitri Gennadiyevich Bugrov**, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Researcher of the Department of Prehistoric Archeology of the Separate Structural Division of Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan the State Scientific Institution of A.Kh. Khalikov Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan (Kazan).

**Leading organization:** M. Akmulla Bashkir State Pedagogical University the Federal State Budgetary Institution of Higher Education (Ufa).

The defense will take place on June 26, 2019 at 1 pm at a meeting of the Council for the Defense of Doctoral and Candidate Theses D 999.124.02 at FSAEI HE Kazan (Volga) Federal University, the State Scientific Budgetary Institution the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan at the address: 1/55 Puskin Str., room 502, Kazan 420111.

You can read the dissertation at N.I. Lobachevski Scientific Library of FSAEI HE Kazan (Volga) Federal University at the address: 35 Kremlevskaya Str., (reading hall No.1, Kazan, 420008. An electronic version of the Extended Abstract and dissertation is posted on the official website of the Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University <http://kpfu.ru> and on the official website of the State commission for academic degrees and titles of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation <http://vak.ed.gov.ru>.

The Extended Abstract has been sent on \_\_\_\_\_ 2019.

Scientific Secretary  
Of the dissertation council  
doctor of historical sciences,  
professor

R.A. Tsyunchuk

## General Features of the work

**Relevance of the topic.** The study of Pyanoborsk antiquities has more than a century of history. This period was marked by active accumulation and analysis of archaeological sources. A huge array of data allowed delineating the area of distribution of the Pyanoborsk culture, considering the issues of its chronology, burial rites, economics and some other, necessary for its complete characterization. However, it is worth noting that all these extremely important issues of the study of the Pyanoborsk culture are far from being fully resolved. One of the key issues in the study of the Pyanoborsk antiquities is the study of imported items.

Customarily in archeology, the imported items (imports) are understood to be objects of material culture made outside the region under study and trapped on its territory as a result of various intercultural contacts. There are different reasons why the imports got to the area: as private and diplomatic gifts, the booty of war, payment of tribute or reward for service, as a result of trade operations, etc. In addition to items, various ideas could also be “imported”, including the production of items (for example, form borrowing). This is a more complex process, the understanding of which can be approached only after studying the imported items themselves.

The import items within the framework of the Pyanoborsk materials include various glass, faience and stone beads, bronze mirrors, brooches, sewed-on plaques, as well as some items of military, household and ritual purposes.

The first items of import on the monuments of the Pyanoborsk culture were revealed at the end of the XIX century. Since then, their number has been steadily increasing with large-scale archaeological work and to date it constitutes an extensive corpus of archaeological sources that urgently require in-depth study at the modern scientific level.

The imported items tie the antiquities of the Urals with the great civilizations of the ancient era well studied historically and archaeologically. Identifying the nature of these relationships is one of the most significant problems in the archeology of the Ural region of the early Iron Age. A detailed chronology of antiquity makes imported items reliable chronological indicators for the actual Pyanoborsk materials. This makes it possible with a considerable degree of confidence to disclose the internal processes of the Pyanoborsk culture genesis. The study of the entire array of imported items from the materials of the Pyanoborsk culture makes it possible to judge the various intercultural contacts of the Pyanoborsk population (trade, military, social) with other regions, both near and very distant.

**Level of knowledge.** Imported items from adjacent territories and cultures of the early Iron Age have long been the subject of close attention of researchers. Among the works on imports we can identify both dedicated to certain categories of imported items and those of summarizing nature. The monographs of V.V. Kropotkin on Roman imported products in Eastern Europe (1970), A.V. Simonenko on Roman imports from the Sarmatian of the Northern Black Sea Region (2011) and dissertation research of Lee Ji-Eun on Chinese imports in monuments of southern Russia (2010). In addition, it is possible to note the appearance of works dedicated to theoretical understanding of imports as markers of various intercultural contacts, for example,

the work of D. Quast on the development of exchange models from the Roman Iron Age to the Viking Age (2009).

Imported items in the Pyanoborsk culture were considered by researchers both in the dating of individual burial complexes and in the rationale of the general chronology of monuments and the culture as a whole. Some items of import were used in works with broader territorial and chronological framework.

There are very few special studies dedicated to the study of the categories of imports of Pyanoborsk culture. The most relevant among them are the following: the work of A.M. Volkovich on examination of Roman dishes from Akhtiyal treasure (1941); a number of studies A.A. Krasnoperov, including the study of imported mirrors, beads and partly weapons (2006-2011); results of processing of bead material from Toiguzinsky II fortification, presented by D.G. Bugrov (2007). Nevertheless, despite the presence of a certain amount of research on imports of the Pyanoborsk culture, there was no synthesis and analysis of the whole array of foreign cultural item as yet.

**The territorial framework** covers the area of distribution of monuments of Pyanoborsk culture, which occupies the territory at the junction of the Lower and Middle Kama regions in the basins of the Ik and Belaya rivers (within the modern areas of the North-West of the Republic of Bashkortostan, the North-East of the Republic of Tatarstan and the South of the Udmurt Republic).

**The chronological framework** is determined by the time of the existence of the Pyanoborsk archaeological culture. Practically all of its researchers (M. G. Khudyakov, A. P. Smirnov, V. F. Gening, B. B. Ageev, R. D. Goldina, S. E. Zubov) dealt with the chronology of the culture in question. However, differences over its lower and upper dates still persist. Taking into account the latest research on the Pyanoborsk culture, we adhere to the position that determines the period of its existence lies within late II c. BC. - II c. AD.

**The object of the study** is the material culture of the population of Pyanoborsk.

**The subject of research** is the imported items found on the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture.

**The purpose of the study** is to characterize the imported items in the materials of the Pyanoborsk culture as an indicator of intercultural contacts of the Pyanoborsk population.

To achieve this goal it is necessary to consistently solve the following tasks:

1. To characterize the state of knowledge of imported items within the framework of the Pyanoborsk culture.
2. To systematize the existing array of imported items in the materials of the Pyanoborsk culture.
3. To determine the stages and directions of entry of imported items into the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture.

**Source base of research.** In this work, the materials from 29 archaeological sites of the Pyanoborsk culture were used. Most of them (21 of 29 monuments) are items from funerary monuments, others are found on the sites of fortifications, as part

of treasures, or are separate finds.

The archaeological collections of 21 burial grounds, which are stored in the funds of the Museum of Archeology and Ethnography of the Ufa Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Ufa), the National Museum of the Republic of Bashkortan (Ufa), K. Gerda National Museum of the Udmurt Republic (Izhevsk), the Archeological Museum of the Udmurt State University (Izhevsk), the Museum of History and Culture of the Middle Kama Region (Sarapul), the Museum of Archeology of the Republic of Tatarstan A.Kh. Khalikov Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan (Kazan), National Museum of the Republic of Tatarstan (Kazan), Archeology Research Laboratory of Academician S.P. Korolev Samara National Research University (Samara). In addition, the catalog of imported items of the Pyanoborsk culture was formed by archival materials (scientific reports, field documentation)<sup>1</sup> and published works. The catalog contains total 7238 units of imported items.

**The methodology and research methods.** The methodological basis of this work is the principle of historicism, implying the study and interpretation of historical phenomena in the dynamics and interrelations with various processes and events, as well as an integrated approach, involving the systematization of all data. The research methods used in the work have been long and effectively used by archaeologists. We used the methods of classification, comparison, selection of analogies, mapping, as well as the results obtained by natural science methods (X-ray fluorescence analysis of non-ferrous metal objects, metallographic analysis of ferrous metal objects). When analyzing sets of beads, the method of “narrow” datings (M.B. Shchukin, I.V. Sergatskov) was used, which was tested by many researchers and proved its proper use.

**The scientific novelty of the study** is determined by the fact that it is the first consolidated work dedicated to the imported items in the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture. For the first time, the stages of import receipt are distinguished and their directions for entering the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture are determined. In this study the extensive archaeological material is used with all possible completeness both previously published and accumulated over the last decades of research, but not yet introduced into scientific circulation. In addition, the results of the author's own field and laboratory research are involved.

**The practical significance of the work** consists in generating a consolidated catalog of imported items from materials of the Pyanoborsk culture, which can be used in the attribution of museum collections, creating expositions, writing textbooks, popular science printed or electronic publications.

**The main provisions submitted for defense:**

1. The data on imports as part of materials from the Pyanoborsk culture were being accumulated with different degree of intensity. In the early stages of its study,

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank D.G. Bugrov, G.N. Zhuravleva, S.E. Zubov, V.A. Ivanov, A.A. Krasnoperova, N.A. Lifanov, V.V.Ovsyannikov, F.M.Tagirov, T.K. Yutina for the opportunity to read and use the materials of unpublished works, as well as V.A. Bernts, S.L. Vorobyova, E.V. Kamaleev, R.M. Kamalov, T.I.Ostanina, T.M. Sabirova, N.L. Reshetnikov, A.V. Shipilov for assistance in working with museum collections.

imports were rare, due to the insignificant volumes of field archaeological work, although most of the metalware was found at the first stage of the study of the Pyanoborsk culture. In the subsequent stages of studying the culture, the items of import were recorded in large quantities. The brightest imported items, which mainly included products of the so-called “long-range” imports (beads, fibula), were used by researchers to substantiate the general dating of monuments and the archaeological culture in general.

2. Two chronological stages of the entry of imported products into the territory of distribution of monuments of the Pyanoborsk culture were distinguished. The first stage (the late II - I centuries BC) is characterized by insignificant receipts of import items. Basically it is bead material and some types of weapons. The second stage (I-II centuries AD) is characterized by a large variety of imported items, including numerous (both typologically and quantitatively) beads, costume decoration elements and weapons.

3. Spatial and comparative and typological analysis of imported items allowed us to distinguish three directions of their receipt by the Pyanoborsk population: the southern, western and south-eastern. At the first stage of import there was only the southern direction recorded, associated with the nomadic Sarmatians. For the second stage all three directions are characteristic. The main one is the southern one. The western direction is connected with the population that left the monuments of the Pishersk-Andreevo Type. The south-east direction is connected with the Kara-Abyz culture in the middle stream of Belaya river.

**Assessment of the work.** The provisions and conclusions of the dissertation research were set forth in messages and reports at scientific conferences at the regional, All-Russian and international levels.

The regional conferences: the Annual scientific and reporting conference of the Samara Archaeological Society (Samara, 2013-2018), the Final scientific session of the Archaeological Society of the Republic of Belarus (Ufa, 2014-2018).

The All-Russian Conferences: Ural-Volga Region Archeological Conference of Students and Young Scientists (Izhevsk, 2013, Ulyanovsk, 2014, Kostroma, 2015, Kirov, 2017), Regional (All-Russian with international participation) Students' Archaeological and Ethnographic Conference for Postgraduate Students and Young Scientists (Krasnoyarsk, 2014, Irkutsk, 2015), All-Russian (with international participation) Scientific Conference “Problems of Sarmatian Archeology and History” (Ufa, 2014), IV (XX) All-Russian Archaeological Congress in Kazan (Kazan, 2014), XXI Ural Archaeological Meeting (Samara, 2018).

International conferences: II International Scientific Conference “Problems of ethnocultural interaction in the Ural-Volga region: history and modern time” (Samara, 2013), IV International Lower Volga Archaeological Conference (Saratov, 2013).

The main results of the work were reflected in 18 scientific articles, 3 of which are included in publications recommended by the State Commission for Academic Degrees and Titles.

**The structure of work.** The dissertation includes 2 volumes. Volume 1 consists of an introduction, three chapters, conclusion, list of references, list of

abbreviations on 167 pages. Volume 2 contains appendices on 157 pages, including maps, drawings, catalog, tables, illustrating the text part of the dissertation.

## **THE MAIN CONTENT OF THE WORK**

In the **introduction** there are the relevance of the topic, the territorial and chronological framework of the study identified, the object and subject of research, the purpose and objectives of the work formulated, the range of sources involved defined, the methodology and research methods identified, the scientific and practical significance of the results and assessment thereof indicated, the main provisions submitted for defense formulated.

### **Chapter 1. The history of the study of imported items in the materials of Pyanoborsk culture**

#### **1.1. Outline of the history of the study of Pyanoborsk culture**

The history of the study of the Pyanoborsk archaeological culture was repeatedly touched upon in numerous specialized literatures. Currently, there are several stages in the study of the Pyanoborsk culture. As the basis of the division into stages of study we have taken the development of B.B. Ageev (1992). The first stage (late XIX - early XX century) is characterized by the collection of the first finds, archaeological excavations carried out at a low methodological level, partial publication of bright complexes and finds. The second stage (1920 - mid. 1950) is characterized by the introduction of materials into scientific circulation, the definition of the territorial and chronological boundaries of the Pyanoborsk culture. At the third stage (mid-1950 – late 1980s), in connection with the large-scale archaeological work, an enormous body of sources was gathered for the study of the Pyanoborsk culture. The next, fourth stage (beginning of 1990 – 2000) is characterized by a certain decline in the study of the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture. Shutting down the ambitious projects and “popular construction projects” reduced the large-scale excavations of the contract-based orientation. At this time, many researchers have moved from extensive accumulation of material to its processing.

#### **1.2. The accumulation of imported objects in the materials of the Pyanoborsk culture and their interpretation thereof**

Over the entire long period of study of the Pyanoborsk culture (more than 130 years), a significant number of imported items were found. They are represented by the following categories of finds: swords, broadswords, daggers, armor plates, lamellar helmet, spearhead, beads, sew-on plaques, lining in the shape of gryphon heads, “plaque mirrors”, brooches, clasp with almond-shaped frame, buckles, bronze buckets and cups, a glass cup and a stone incense burner. They were accumulated with different intensity depending on the scale of archaeological field work. In the first two stages of the study of the Pyanoborsk culture imports were an episodic phenomenon, which was associated with insignificant volumes of field archaeological work. In subsequent stages imports were recorded in large quantities.

When interpreting imports in Pyanoborsk culture, researchers lack a comprehensive approach. In the few published works, certain categories of imports were considered mainly in solving chronology problems. The issues of intercultural

contacts with synchronous cultures were addressed only in passing, mainly when studying issues related to the process of interaction of two worlds with different economies that is the nomadic and settled population.

## **Chapter 2. Imported items in the material culture of the Pyanoborsk population: systematization of the material**

To date, the serious research has been carried out on the systematization of materials from the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture. These results allow us to proceed with the study of certain categories of finds, namely, with the consideration of imports in the material Pyanoborsk culture.

The classification of imported items includes 17 categories, which were divided into three groups: weapons, items of costume decoration, household items and ritual purpose items. In total the catalog of imported items of Pyanoborsk culture contains 7238 units.

### **2.1. The armament items**

The armament items are represented in 6 categories: swords, broadswords, daggers, armor plates, lamellar helmet and spearheads.

**Daggers** are represented with 11 specimens, which originate from the burials of Novosasykul'sky (5 specimens), Kipchakov'sky I (2 specimens), Yuldashev'sky (2 specimens), Kamyshlytamak'sky I (1 specimen), Starochekmak'sky I (1 specimen) burial grounds. The forms of daggers are absolutely identical to the Sarmatian. The insignificant number of daggers inside the types testifies to their uncharacteristic character for the Pyanoborsk culture. This is most clearly supported by the percentage of one type or another. If the total number of all daggers are determined by 87 specimens, taking into account even somewhat outdated reports of B. B. Ageev, then for each type of dagger imported accounted for from 1 to 7%. The datings of the Pyanoborsk burials with daggers do not contradict the developed schemes for dating bladed weapons from the monuments of the Sarmatian culture.

**The broadswords** are represented with 7 specimens, which originate from the following burials: Afonin'sky (3 specimens), Tarasov'sky (2 specimens), and Nyrgyndin'sky II (2 specimens) burial grounds. All the broadswords were made in a single weapon tradition. Forms of broadswords were absolutely identical to the samples of bladed weapons from the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type. The insignificant number of broadswords inside the types indicates their uncharacteristic for the Pyanoborsk culture. The percentage ratio of the Pyanoborsk broadswords and from the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type, attributable to the total number of burials, in our opinion, makes it possible to outline the vector of receipt of this type of weapon from the population that left the monuments of the Pyre-Bohr and Andreev type to the Pyanoborsk one.

**Swords** are represented with 20 specimens, which originate from Afonin'sky (1 specimen), Kamyshlytamak I (1 specimen), Kipchakov'sky I (1 specimen), Kushulev'sky III (2 specimens), Nyrgyndin'sky II (4 specimens), Novosasykul (7 c specimens), Tarasov'sky (3 specimens), Chegandin'sky II (1 specimen) burial grounds. The forms of swords are identical to the samples of the bladed weapons of the Sarmatian culture. Only with respect to type 1 swords (without crosshairs and



pommel) their import origin can be doubted, but metallographic studies of swords from the Tarasovsky burial ground confirmed their production outside the Kama region. The swords of Pyanoborsk culture are dated back to the first centuries of our era.

**The spearhead** originating from Novosasykul burial is imported. Its form is identical to the heads of specimens from the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type. The presence of a single specimen in this category indicates the uncharacteristic of this type of weapon for the Pyanoborsk culture. The concentration of the main body of typologically close heads within a single chronological slice to the west of the range of the Pyanoborsk culture indicates the primary source of these objects. Apparently, just as in the case of broadswords, such was the population that left the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type.

**The protective armament** is represented with an inlaid helmet and armor plates. The discovery of a metal helmet is from Kipchakovsky I burial ground. The helmet was made of narrow iron plates, fitted with a neck protecting carmail and cheek guards. S.E. Zubov and O.A. Radyush determine the date of this helmet as the turn of eras, leaning more towards the 1st century AD. In their opinion, the oriental tradition appears in the origin of narrow-plate helmets, introduced by Sarmatians and possibly by the Ural and Trans-Ural people of the forest-steppe zone.

The finds of plates from the armor are known in the materials of Kipchakovsky I burial ground, Kushulevsky III and Starokirgizovsky burial grounds. Their total number is estimated at 13 whole and several fragmented specimens. Apparently, the plates were initially overlapped on the leather base of the clothes and were intended to protect against stabbing and chopping. However, in Pyanoborsk culture these items are found in women's burials. This suggests that they were used to decorate clothes or as a talisman. It is very difficult to determine the vector of receipt of these imports due to their small size. It is necessary to confine only to the fact that their appearance most likely is the result of contacts with nomadic Sarmatians in the I – the early II century AD.

## **2.2. Elements of the costume decoration**

Elements of costume decoration include 7 categories: beads, sew-on plaques, lining with opposing images of the griffins heads, "mirrors", brooches, fasteners with almond-shaped frame and buckles.

**Beads** are the largest category of finds. According to the material they are divided into glass, earthenware, stone, clay and bronze. Clay and bronze are exclusively local types of beads, the rest are imported. The origin of glass, earthenware and stone beads in Pyanoborsk culture is traditionally associated with the ancient centers of the Northern Black Sea region, from where they through the nomads of the Volga-Don and Volga-Ural steppes got to the settled population of the Kama region. The reason for this is the absence of traces of glassmaking, processing of semi-precious ornamental stones in the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture.

In total, we have processed 7008 specimens of beads, which originate from 22 burials of the Pyanoborsk culture. This array includes beads of one-color (3960 specimens, 57%), multicolor (183 specimens, 3%) glass, glass with metal lining

(1967 specimens, 28%), Egyptian faience (516 specimens, 7%), stone (99 specimens, 1%) and cowry shells (283 specimens, 4%).

The basis of the bead collection was made up of burial materials, supplemented with artefactual remains from the territories of burial grounds. The entire bead array was distributed over 153 types of beads according to the classification of E.M. Alekseeva (1975, 1978, 1982). The analysis of the mutual occurrence of the types of beads in the burial complexes made it possible to correct the dating of each set thereof. For further work we selected and lined up in chronological order late 202 narrow-dated burial complexes with beads from the early to the, which allowed us to distinguish two of their chronological stages.

To the first stage dated the late II - I centuries BC belong 8 burials. These burials include beads of one-color (types 4, 15, 16, 94, 193g), multi-color glass (types 27d, 33g, 54v, 198), beads with a metal gasket (type 1a).

All other burials belong to the second stage dated the I-II centuries AD, and contain beads of one color (types 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 26, 29, 30, 31, 50, 54, 57, 60, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69, 74, 85, 91, 93, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 109, 132, 134, 141, 152, 159, 163, 165, 166, 170, 183, 188, 202), multicolor glass (types 26a, 26i, 27d, 33a, 33t, 59, 67b, 78a, 78b, 89, 92a, 104, 107a, 144, 190b, 193, 194, 197, 249, 252, 276b, 290, 319, 356, 428, 430, 434, 486), Egyptian faience (types 3g, 9, 11b, 16b, 50b, 50b, 52b, 57b, 68b, 69), beads with metal gasket (types 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, 10, 22), agate beads (type 2a), jet (types 9a, 27a), carnelian (types 2a, 4), chalcedony (types 3b, 21a) and cowry shells (type 7a). A small part of the types of beads encountered in the first stage also exist in the second. These are one-color beads of types 4, 15, 16, 94; multi-colored type 27d; beads with metal lining type 1a. Stone beads and cowry shells are encountered only within the framework of the second chronological stage.

**Fibulas** are represented by 22 specimens, which originate from the burials of Novosasykul'sky (14 specimens), Nyrgyndinsky I (2 specimens), Nyrgyndinsky II (4 specimens), Chegandinsky II (2 specimens) burial grounds. The fibulas correspond to groups 5-1, 11-I-1, 11-I-2, 12-4a, 12-4b, 13-2, 15-I-3, 15-I-4 according to A.K. Ambrose (1966).

Fibulas appeared in the Pyanoborsk culture in the first centuries AD. The criteria for classifying the items as imports are abnormality of fibulas for the culture in question, a small number of items of the same type, the absence of local prototypes.

**The "mirrors"** (71 specimens) originate from the Akhtiyal treasure (2 specimens), the Afoninsky burial (2 specimens), Kamyshlytamak'sky I (1 specimen), Kipchakov'sky I (15 specimens), Kushulev'sky II (2 specimens), Kushulev'sky III (5 specimens), Nyrgyndinsky II (24 specimens), Starochekmak'sky I (3 specimens), Chegandinsky II (2 specimens), Novosasykul'sky (14 specimens) burial grounds. Two more specimens were obtained as a result of collection from the sites of the Pyanoborsk burial ground and Yakimkov'sky I settlement. The items covered in this section are made of used bronze mirrors. In Pyanoborsk culture these items were used as costume jewelry – breast plates, belt tips, as well as in secondary products - the pendants, plaques and buckles – were cut from the mirrors.

The bulk of these finds belong to the first centuries AD, but some specimens were received at an earlier time. In assessing the origin of this category of finds, the opinions of researchers differ. The majority believe that the mirrors, from which later Pyanoborsk costumes were made, got to the settled environment via the nomadic Sarmatian (B. B. Ageev; A. Kh. Pshenichnyuk; A. A. Krasnoperov; S.L. Vorobyova) R.D. Goldina and co-authors explain the presence of numerous plates not by alteration of Sarmatian mirrors, but by the local production of mirror plaques from imported noils or the production of these plaques in the same workshops, where the mirrors were made. Izhevsk researchers insist on the technological peculiarities of noils (hardness and brittleness), considering at the same time various repeated operations with finished products to be extremely difficult. The results obtained in the study of the collection of non-ferrous metal items from the Kipchakovsky II burial ground using X-ray fluorescence analysis indicate that the Pyanoborsk masters actively used noil. Therefore, they were quite able to specifically use such an alloy for the manufacture of costume elements, including plaques, knowing the technological features of this alloy. However, on some metal plaques, as well as on cut out pendants, there are circular ornaments that find analogies in Sarmatian mirrors and Kara-Abyz metal plaques. Such an ornament is not seen on other elements of costume decoration, that is, it is not characteristic of the population who left the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture. Based on this, it is quite legitimate to attribute items with such décor to items of imported origin. In this regard, it is necessary to note one circumstance: if the product is cut from an area without an ornament and has no structural elements (a curb, for example), then it is almost impossible to determine whether it is imported or locally produced.

In our opinion, the “mirrors” in the Pyanoborsk culture should be considered secondary products that retain the features of the decor of the originals and/or structural elements. The question of the import or local character of the remaining noil plaques remains open.

**Sew-on plaques** are represented by 52 specimens that come from the burials of Deukovsky II (2 specimens), Kipchakovsky I (16 specimens), Kushulevsky III (6 specimens), Nyrgyndinsky II (2 specimens), Novosasykul'sky (4 specimens), Starokirgizovsky (4 specimens), Urmanayevsky II (16 specimens), Yuldashevsky (3 specimens) burial grounds. These items are made of thin plates with stamped ornaments. There are items made of copper, bronze, silver and gold (possibly gold plated) among them. In the classification of B. B. Ageev such items are marked as made of gold and low-grade silver. In our opinion, the type of metal does not matter, the ornamental tradition and the shape of the products are important. Their appearance in the Pyanoborsk environment should be associated with the nomadic Sarmatians. In the monuments of settled cultures such items are rare. The closest analogies are known in the materials of the Kara-Abyz culture. On the contrary in nomadic materials, they are found quite often and are represented by various types, mainly of precious metals. Chronologically all the sew-on plaques belong to the I-II centuries AD.

**Overlays** with opposed images of the griffin heads are represented by 22 specimens, which originate from the layer of Zuyevoklyuchevsky I fortification (1

specimen), burials of Yuldashevsky (18 specimens), Novosasykulsky I (2 specimens), Tarasovsky (1 specimen) burial grounds. According to V.V. Ovsyannikov such items are the “hallmarks of the Kara-Abyz culture”. By virtue of the quantitative ratio of this category of finds in Kara-Abyz and Pyanoborsk monuments, their Kara-Abyz origin is obvious. Chronologically all presented overlays belong to the I-II centuries AD.

**Bronze fastener with almond-shaped frame** comes from the Kushulevsky III burial ground. The analogies of the Kushuleva fastener are known in the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type. One more find of this type was found in the Pervomaisk burial ground in Vyatka. Chronologically these fasteners belong to the I-II centuries AD.

**The buckles** of imported produce are represented by 2 copies from Kamyshlytamak I and Novosasykul burials.

The bronze buckle with a ring frame from the Kamyshlytamak I burial ground has analogies in the Okhlebinskoe burial ground of the Kara-Abyz culture and the Tulkhara burial ground in Central Asia, where it was contained in the burial of the last third of the II century BC – the first half of I century BC.

The analogies of the iron “Markoman” buckle from the Novosasykul burial ground are common among the Sarmatians of the Northern Black Sea region, the Volga-Don interfluvium and the Trans-Volga region, the late Scythians of the Lower Dnieper region and the Crimea, among the population of Przeworsk culture in ancient Black Sea cities. According to A.V. Simonenko, these buckles are chronological indicators of the Sarmatian monuments of the second half of the I century AD. The same buckles are known in the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type, where they belong to chronological group 2 dated back to the third quarter of the I century AD. In our opinion, the buckle from the Novosasykul burial ground came to the Subural region as a result of contacts with the population that left monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type. The buckle was encountered together with wide-bladed clasps, which have direct analogies in the monuments of the Piseralsk-Andreevo Type.

### 2.3. Household and ritual items

The household items are an extremely small category of import finds in the Pyanoborsk culture. They are represented by glass and metal dishes.

**The metal dishes** are presented by four specimens. Two specimens of the dishes were found in the Akhtiyal treasure: a broken bronze hemispheric cup of Italian production and a bronze bucket of Gallic production. Another bronze bucket comes from Novosasykul burial. In Pyanoborsk culture the items was used as a cup. On the rim of the cup an additional spout was designed for convenient discharge of the liquid. Separate find from the village of Nyrgynda represent a bronze bucket with a handle decorated with a relief ornament with the image of bird heads and a plant motif. All these items belong to the late stage of the Pyanoborsk culture, presumably to the II century AD.

**The glass** dishes are represented by 6 fragments of one hemispheric cup from the Trikol'sk burial ground. This cup is a typical product of provincial Roman glass-making workshops.

**The stone incense burner** of hemispheric shape divided into three compartments by walls, comes from the same burial of the Trikol'sk burial ground as the glass cup mentioned above. Objects of such appearance, molded from clay or carved out of soft rocks, are often included in the burial inventory of Sarmatians. The likely date of falling into the burial of the glass cup and the incense burner is the I century AD.

The analyzed array of items in general has a wide geography of analogies. Separate categories of items have analogies in the territory of the Roman Empire with its vast provinces, in the city-states of the Northern Black Sea region, in the territory of China, the Han dynasty, in the monuments of the Pissarsk-Andreevo Type in the Low Posure, in the nomadic Sarmatian of the Volga-Ural steppes, in the monuments of the Kara-Abyz culture in the middle of Belaya river. The clarification of the chronological positions of all types of imported items made it possible to distribute these things into three groups. The first group is dated back to the late II - I centuries BC, the second group is dated the I-II centuries AD, the third group is dated the late II century BC - II century AD.

### **Chapter 3. Imported items as an indicator of intercultural contacts of the Pyanoborsk population**

#### **3.1. Spatial and chronological distribution of imported items in materials of the Pyanoborsk culture**

An analysis of imported items showed that they appeared in the Pyanoborsk culture at different periods of its development. Imported items were divided into three chronological groups. The first and second chronological groups correspond to the two stages of the entry of imported items into the environment of the settled population, which left the monuments of Pyanoborsk culture.

The items of the first stage of admission are presented mainly in single specimens. They come from the burial grounds of the right bank of Kama river, basin of Xun and Belaya rivers. A greater number of categories of objects are concentrated in Xun and Belaya interfluvium, only beads of one-color glass are encountered both on the right bank of Kama river and in the lower reaches of the Xun river.

The items of the second stage of import receipt, in contrast to the first, are represented by more diverse categories of items, the distribution of which in the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture is different. Imports are concentrated in various parts of the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture. There are certain differences between imports encountered in the monuments of the right bank and the left bank of Kama river. The broadswords are found only in the monuments of the Kama right bank, daggers and plates from the armor, on the contrary in the left bank monuments. The remaining categories (beads, fibulas, "mirrors", sew-on plaques, swords, lining with opposed images of the griffin heads, metal dishes) are found in both territories. As a rule, in their distribution there are differences of quantitative and typological order, which indicate the movement of imports from the southern monuments of the Pyanoborsk culture to the northern ones. For the most part only metal dishes are focused on the right bank of the Kama.

### **3.2. Directions and dynamics of intercultural contacts of the Pyanoborsk population**

The spatial and comparative typological analysis of material allows us to group the flow of imported items in three directions: south, southeast and west.

At the first stage, the imported items entered the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture only along the southern direction as a result of interaction with the nomadic Sarmatians. The import items of this direction include: a bronze buckle with a T-shaped crosshair in a frame, a dagger with a crescent-shaped top, beads from one-color (type 193g) and multi-color glass (types 33zh, 54v, 198). There were at least three routes of import from the south: one on the left bank of Ik river and two along the valleys of the left tributaries of Ik river and Mella and Menzel rivers. With a certain degree of caution, it can be assumed that there could have been another path in the area between Mella and Styarle rivers, that is, in the valleys of Balanninka and Shuganka rivers. The presence of imports in the upper Xun river (Kamyshlytamaksky I burial ground) suggests the branching of the southern route, coming from the headwaters of Ik river. Probably, such a place could be a section, where Ik river is closest to Xun river, that is, opposite the mouth of Styarle river. In the direction of flow Xun river the import items could get into the area of Lower Belaya river. However, to the monuments of the Xun and Belaya interfluvium, there could be its own way of import. The Sarmatian burial ground is known in the immediate vicinity of the Pyanoborsk monuments. It is located to the south of the eastern outskirts of the village of Chui-Atasevo, on the left bank of Baza river.

At the second stage, in the first centuries AD the situation somewhat changes and becomes more complex. At this time, the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture expands to the north, its western and south-western borders are drawn out. The composition of imported items becomes more diverse, more bead material is recorded, which is more than at the first stage, which indicates more frequent trade contacts. This correlates well with the opinion of A.S. Skripkina on the beginning of the northern branch of the Great Silk Road in the I century AD and establishing trade relations in the steppe.

The origin of the main mass of beads, daggers, swords, “mirrors”, sew on plaques, brooches, plates from armor, helmet, glass and metal dishes, incense burners can be surely linked with the nomadic population. It is possible that some part of the “mirrors” could also come through the south-east direction from the population of the Kara-Abyz culture. Part of the swords (without knobs and crosses) could come from the west of the population, who left the monuments of Peseralsk-Andreevo Type.

The contacts most likely took place along the same paths as in the first stage of the receipt of the imported items. The spread of imports went in the directions of flow of Belaya and Ik rivers. In the right bank of Kama river the imports apparently flowed along Ik river, then spread to the east.

Belt lining with opposing images of griffin heads came from the southeast. These imported items appeared as a result of contacts with the Kara-Abyz population. The geographical location of the monuments of the Kara-Abyz culture implies the arrival of belt linings in the direction of the flow of Belaya River. However, it is difficult to talk about their further distribution throughout the territory of the

Pyanoborsk culture due to the considerable distances between the monuments containing these finds.

The broadswords, a spearheads with needles, a “Markoman” buckle and an almond-shaped fastener entered the territory of the Pyanoborsk culture the west, from the population, who left monuments of the Pisheralsk-Andreevo Type.

In the **conclusion** the research topic is summarized. This dissertation research is the first consolidated work specifically dedicated to the analysis of imported items of Pyanoborsk culture. The systematization of the material resulted in creation of a catalog of imported products of the Pyanoborsk culture.

The analysis of the entire set of imported items originating from the monuments of the Pyanoborsk culture made it possible to distinguish two chronological stages of the entry of imported items into the territory under consideration. The first stage (the late II - I centuries BC) is characterized by insignificant receipts of import items, relating mainly to bead material, single items of weapons and costume elements. The flow of imports came from (or through) nomadic Sarmatians. Other directions are not recorded at this time.

The second stage (I-II centuries AD) is characterized by the arrival of more diverse imports, including bead materials, costume jewelry and weapons. At this time political stability is established in the steppe and favorable conditions are created for the formation of steppe sections of international trade routes. In addition, there is an impulse for imports from the territory of distribution of monuments of the Pisarelsk-Andreevo Type, which to a greater extent bears not a commercial, but a military character. Another kind of intercultural contacts of the Pyanoborsk population is observed in the flow of items from the southeast, characteristic of Kara-Abyz culture. The context of Kara-Abyz items in the Pyanoborsk complexes makes it possible to speak not about trade or military contacts, but rather about marriage and family relations.

The observed two-stage entry of imports into the Pyanoborsk culture clearly shows the process of change in the intercultural contacts of the Pyanoborsk population. If the first stage can be characterized as a time of cultural isolation and detachment from contacts with neighboring nations, then at the second stage we observe a wide range of intercultural contacts: from kinship and trade to military.

Thus, the analysis of imported items of the Pyanoborsk culture showed that the population of the Pyanoborsk culture being far from developed ancient civilizations, did not remain aloof from the general cultural trends and historical events at the turn of the eras.

**The main provisions of the dissertation are reflected in the following publications of the author:**

*In the journals included in the List of peer-reviewed scientific publication recommended by the State commission for academic degrees and titles of the Russian Federation:*

1. Sattarov R.R. Burial grounds of the Pyanoborsk culture: systematization and mapping /R.R. Sattarov// Bulletin of the Samara Municipal Institute of Management: theoretical and scientific-methodical journal. - Samara: SAGMU Publishing house, 2013 – No. 4 (27). - p. 71-78.

2. Zubov S.E., Sattarov R.R. Sarmatian imports and borrowings in the armament of the tribes of the Pyanoborsk culture of the Ik and Belaya interfluvium /S.E. Zubov, R.R. Sattarov // News of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. - Samara, 2014. - Volume 16. – No.3. - p. 314-320.

3. Zubov S.E., Sattarov R.R. New burial ground of the Pyanoborsk culture in the Ik and Belaya interfluvium / S.E. Zubov, R.R. Sattarov // News of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. - Samara, 2015. - V. 17 - No 3 (2). - p. 537-547.

*In other publications:*

4. Sattarov R.R. Clay plastic of the Kipchak ancient settlement of Early Pyanoborsk time / R.R. Sattarov // XLV Ural-Volga Archaeological Conference of Students and Young Scientists (Izhevsk, February 1-3, 2013): report thesis - Izhevsk: Udmurt University Publishing House, 2013. - P. 111-113.

5. Sattarov R.R. On the issue of the hunt of the population of the early Iron Age of the Ural region (based on materials from the remains of wild fauna from the monuments of the Pyanoborsk culture) / R.R. Sattarov // XXXIX Samara Regional Student Scientific Conference: report thesis - Samara, 2013. - p. 13.

6. Sattarov R.R. Imported goods as an indicator of ethnocultural interaction in the early Iron Age of the Volga-Ural region (to the problem of trade relations of the population of the Pyanoborsk culture) / R.R. Sattarov // Problems of ethnocultural interaction in the Ural-Volga region: history and modern times: a collection of articles. - Samara: PGSA, 2013. - p. 79-83.

7. Sattarov R.R. Modern problems in the study of the Pyanoborsk culture in the territory of the Western Urals in the early Iron Age / R.R. Sattarov // Modern problems of ancient and traditional cultures of the peoples of Eurasia: report thesis LIV Regional (X All-Russian with international participation) archeological and ethnographic conference of students, postgraduate students and young scientists dedicated to the 130th anniversary of the discovery of Paleolithic on Afontovaya mountain and the 100th anniversary of the first excavations of monuments of Andronovo culture, Krasnoyarsk, March 25-28, 2014 / responsible editor P.V. Mandryka - Krasnoyarsk: Sib. feder. Univ., 2014. - P. 140-142.

8. Sattarov R.R. Trade relations in the environment of the Pyanoborsk tribes of the Western Urals /R.R. Sattarov// XLVI Ural-Volga Region Archeological Conference of Students and Young Scientists (UPASK, 5-7 February 2014, Ulyanovsk): report thesis - Ulyanovsk: FSBEI HPO Ulyanovsk Ulyanov State Pedagogical University, 2014. - p. 156-159.

9. Sattarov R.R. On the issue of Kara-Abyz imports in the monuments of the Pyanoborsk culture of the Ik and Belaya interfluvium /R.R. Sattarov// International Field School in Bolgar. Collection of materials of the final conference. - Kazan, Bolgar, 2014. - p. 110-114.

10. Sattarov R.R. Imported items in the Pyanoborsk culture: a historiographic review /R.R. Sattarov// Works IV (XX) All-Russian Archeological Congress in Kazan. Volume II. - Kazan: Otechestvo publishing house, 2014. - p. 229-232.



11. Sattarov R.R. Some remarks to the study of imports in the early Iron Age of the Volga-Ural region (on the example of the interaction of the settled and nomadic population) /R.R. Sattarov// Materials of the LV Russian Archeological and Ethnographic Conference of Students and Young Scientists. Irkutsk, March 23-27, 2015 / resp. Ed .: G.I. Medvedev, E.A. Lipnina. - Irkutsk: Publishing House, 2015. - P. 121-123.

12. Sattarov R.R. Archaeological research in the vicinity of the village of Kipchakovo, Ilishevsky district of the Republic of Bashkortostan in 2014 - 2015. / R.P. Sattarov // News of the Academy of Management: Theory, Strategies, Innovations. - Samara: SAGMU, 2016. - No 1 (17). - p. 93-95

13. Sattarov R.R. New data in the study of the “mirrors” of the Pyanoborsk culture / R.R. Sattarov // Ethnoses and cultures of the Ural-Volga Region: history and modern times: materials of the Jubilee X All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference of Young Scientists. - Ufa, 2016. - p. 170-174.

14. Levkova K.S., Sattarov R.R. Beads of the Pyanoborsk archeological culture: historiographic review /K.S. Levkova, R.R. Sattarov// XLIX Ural-Volga Region Conference of Students and Young Scientists. Materials of the All-Russian Conference with international participation. 1-3 February 2017, Kirov/ responsible editor A.O. Kaisin, scientific editor V.A. Korshukov. - Kirov, 2017. - p. 131-133.

15. Levkova K.S., Sattarov R.R. Figured ornaments from the Egyptian faience on the territory of the Western Ural Region in the Early Iron Age (to the definition of ways of entering beads to the Pyanoborsk culture) / K.S. Levkova, R.R. Sattarov // V (XXI) All-Russian Archaeological Congress [Electronic resource]: collection of scientific papers / resp. ed. A.P. Derevianko, A.A. Tishkin. - Electron. text. data (36,739 MB). - Barnaul: Altai State University, 2017.

16. Sattarov R.R. On the use of imported bronze arrowheads by the population of the Pyanoborsk culture / R.R. Sattarov // Ethnoses and cultures of the Ural-Volga Region: history and modern times: materials of the XI All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference of Young Scientists/ esp. ed. E.V. Kamaleev. - Ufa: Institute for Ethnologic Research of Ufa Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2017. - p. 103-106.

17. Zubov S.E., Sattarov R.R. Arrowheads of the Pyanoborsk culture as chronological markers (based on the materials of the burial complexes of Kipchakovsky I kurgan and soil burial ground) / S.E. Zubov, R.R. Sattarov // XXI Ural Archaeological Meeting dedicated to the 85th anniversary of G.I. Matveyeva and the 70th anniversary of I. B. Vasiliev. Materials of the All-Russian Scientific Conference with international participation. - Samara: Samara State Social and Pedagogical University Publishing house; Porto-print LLC, 2018. - p. 210-214.

18. Lifanov N.A., Sattarov R.R. Finding of a carved bone plate in the Ik and Belaya interfluvium /N.A. Lifanov, R.R. Sattarov // Problems of Archeology and Museology: Collection of articles dedicated to the memory of N.V. Khabarova (1955-2017) / FSAEI HE Volgograd State University, Culture State Budgetary Institution Volgograd Regional Local History Museum, State Budgetary Institution Volgograd Regional Research and Production Center for the protection of monuments of history and culture, All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural

Monuments; Editorial staff: A.S. Skripkin (ch. Ed.) [Et al.]. - Volgograd: Volgograd State University Publishing House, 2018. - p. 198-200.