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FOREWORD

The Museum’s impressive collection of Hellenistic silver has been formed in hardly more than a decade. A large number of bowls and cups with inscribed and gilded design were bought in 1981. In addition there were agate pendants and silver phaletae and prometopidia, used to decorate the reins and bridles of horses, and jewelry, mainly torques and bangles, among the first acquisitions. To this material, which remains the core of the collection, were added silver cups and several hundred gold appliqués, buttons, and buckles in 1982 and 1983.

Shortly after he published a series of articles on early Hellenistic and late Classical ornament, Michael Pfrommer visited the Museum in 1983 to work on a group of Roman silver vessels and to see the collection of silver and gold. He soon began to study the collection in earnest. When we were offered eight additional silver and gilt vessels in 1986, his advice about the importance of these objects helped us decide to acquire them. Among these are the most spectacular objects in the collection, including the gilt silver rhyton in the shape of a stag and the two parcel-gilt rhyta in the form of lynxes.

We are indebted to Michael Pfrommer for the six years of work leading to this catalogue. He has been steadfast in seeing it through to completion and patient as the collection grew along with the catalogue. I am grateful to Charles Passela and Ellen Rosenbery of the Photo Services Department, who made all the photographs of the Museum’s objects for this catalogue; to Brian MacDonald, who edited the text; to Marion True, Curator of Antiquities, and the members of her department, who aided Dr. Pfrommer in many ways; and especially to Kenneth Hamma, Associate Curator of Antiquities, who oversaw the completion of the catalogue and shepherded it through to a finished book.

John Walsh
Director
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PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although this catalogue was undertaken at the suggestion of Jiří Frel, the project would not have been possible without the unstinting support of Marion True, Curator of Antiquities, who not only provided me with all the necessary facilities during my numerous visits to Malibu but also contributed advice concerning the text and the catalogue entries. I am deeply indebted to her and to the Museum for entrusting to me the publication of such an important part of the collection—a generosity with few parallels.

I am especially obliged to all present and former staff members of the Department of Antiquities. I should like to use this opportunity to express my gratitude for all the assistance and friendship I enjoyed over the years. The support of the staff, even at the busiest of times, will always remain a lasting impression. My thanks go especially to Karen Manchester and Ken Hamma for help and various suggestions concerning the scope and contents of the project.

I should also like to thank Karol Wight and Ellen Rosenbery, who contributed endless hours to preparing the extensive photographic documentation of the Getty pieces, as well as Renate Dolin, Carol Elkins, Marit Jentoft-Nilsen, and Sandra Morgan.

For the translation of my text concerning treasures I and II, I am especially grateful to Melanie Richter-Bernberg. I would also like to acknowledge my debt to R. Degen of the University of Munich, who provided the crucial translations of the Aramaic inscriptions on some of the vessels, and to Jerry Podany, Conservator of Antiquities at the Getty Museum, and David Scott of the Getty Conservation Institute, who completed the technical analysis of the silver.

Along with the Department of Antiquities, the Department of Publications made possible several visits to Malibu, thus providing the means to incorporate new acquisitions and to study relevant material in other American collections. Both Chris Hudson, Head of Publications, and Andrea Belloli, Consulting Editor, were supportive in this regard. I owe special thanks to Cynthia Newman Bohn, Managing Editor, for her patient correction of my English. Others whose assistance is appreciated include Brian MacDonald, who copyedited the manuscript, and Elizabeth Burke Kahn, whose attention to detail has been invaluable during the production process. For the inkings of my pencil drawings I am particularly obliged to Martha Breen (treasures I and IV) and Tim Seymour (treasures II and III).

For permission to reproduce works from their collections and for providing photographs, I should like to thank the following institutions: Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin; the British Museum, London; the Brooklyn Museum, New York; the German Archaeological Institute, Rome and Istanbul; the Hermitage, St. Petersburg; the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Musée du Louvre, Paris; Museo Archeologico, Naples; Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg; the Pilkington Glass Museum, St. Helens, Lancashire; Staatliche Antikensammlungen, Munich; and the Toledo Museum of Art, Ohio.
The preparation of this catalogue was also greatly supported by Edmund Buchner, former president of the German Archaeological Institute, and by the late Wolfgang Müller-Wiener, director of the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul. Moreover, I am indebted to many colleagues who contributed help and suggestions over the years. I should like to mention especially: D. v. Bothmer, I. M. Burgoyne, P. Calmeyer, J. E. Curtis, M. E. Dürr, L. Giuliani, K. Gödecken-Weber, A. Houghton, V. Heermann-Trömel, E. KüNZl, K. T. Luckner, R. A. Lunsingh ScheurleER, K. Parlasca, W. Schiele, and C. Weber-Lehmann.

Michael PfRommer
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SELEUCIDS, PARTHIANS, KUSHANS, AND THE GETTY SILVER

Between 335 B.C. and his untimely death in Babylon in the year 323 Alexander the Great had conquered an empire that stretched from India to the Mediterranean and from Bactria in central Asia to Egypt. Apart from his native Macedonia and Greece, the empire consisted primarily of the legacy of the collapsed Achaemenid Empire. Decades of struggles between Alexander’s former generals and high-ranking officers followed the founder’s death; eventually, the old empire was split up among several Macedonian dynasties. The Ptolemies held Egypt, the Antigonids Macedonia and parts of Greece. The Seleucids finally controlled an enormous realm, which extended from Asia Minor and Syria to the borders of India. Although the Hellenistic world had settled down considerably, the fragile balance of power caused wars time and again, especially between the Seleucids and the house of the Ptolemies, who fought no less than six “Syrian Wars” over the span of a single century. In the middle of the third century B.C. the third Syrian War, between Seleucus II and Ptolemy III, caused such extensive weakening of the Seleucid position in Iran and the adjacent northern provinces that the Bactrian territories broke away and established the independent Graeco-Bactrian Empire as a separate kingdom. Even Antiochos the Great had to recognize this secession in his Asian campaign of 212–205, when two years of siege of the capital Bactra had proven of no avail. The breakaway of the Greek- and Macedonian-dominated Bactrian realm was, however, not nearly as damaging to the Iranian position of the Seleucids as the emergence of a nomad-controlled empire southeast of the Caspian Sea. Taking advantage of the constant absorption of the Seleucid kings in the West, nomadic or seminomadic peoples, possibly the “Parni” of the ancient sources, who had formerly settled on the steppes north of the Oxus, invaded the old satrapy of Parthia around 238 and only a few years later successfully extended their impact on the neighboring province of Hyrcania on the southeastern shore of the Caspian Sea.

In the period following, the invaders became known as Parthians. After several unsuccessful attempts to regain control over the Parthian sphere of influence, the Seleucids were eventually forced to accept the status quo and to leave the invaders in the possession of Parthia and Hyrcania. In exchange the Parthians had only to formally recognize the sovereignty of the Seleucids. Consequently, in contrast to the Bactrian kings, the first two generations of Parthian rulers never seem to have proclaimed themselves kings. This situation changed completely, however, in 171 B.C., when the throne passed over to Mithridates I, who emerged as the real founder of Parthia as a major power. He not only seized former Seleucid Iran, but added Mesopotamia to the Parthian Empire. The new Parthian lords controlled a realm that combined influences from different cultures. Besides the old local Iranian nobility, who kept alive pre-Hellenistic Achaemenid traditions, a strong Greek element was present, especially it seems in the cities, which were controlled by the descendants of Greek and Macedonian settlers who had flooded into Mesopotamia and Iran in the days of Alexander and the Seleucid power. The Greek minority was regarded benevolently by the Parthian kings, as evidenced in the phrase philhellenos “friend of the Greeks,” on Parthian coins. The new lords, stemming from the southern central Asian steppes, could not match Iran or the Hellenistic world in cultural achievements. Ancient sources describe them as horsemen, a description that is consistent with their nomadic or seminomadic origins. Although they were in effect an ancient superpower, the culture of the early Parthians is in some respects almost unknown.

While the Parthian Empire asserted itself successfully and decisively against Seleucid sovereignty, the Greek- or Macedonian-dominated Graeco-Bactrian kingdom in what today is northern Afghanistan, Tajikistan, and the eastern part of Uzbekistan (and later even Pakistan) maintained its independence and in the early second century even extended its power to the western borders of India. This conquest caused the foundation of the Indo-Greek states, a Hellenized world that survived for some time even the eventual collapse of Greek Bactria under the onslaught of a new wave of nomadic invaders from the southern central Asian steppes in the latter half of the second century B.C. In the later years of the first century B.C., the Indo-Greeks came partly under the rule of the so-called Indo-Scythians and Indo-Parthians, the latter establishing only an ephemeral interregnum before all power was taken over by the nomadic Indo-Scythian tribes and their dynasties, whose ancestors had already been responsible for the collapse of the Graeco-Bactrian
world in the second century B.C. Coming out of southern central Asia, the Indo-Scythians share their origin more or less with the Parthians, who had invaded Hellenistic Iran over a century earlier. Their precise ethnic affiliations are an open question, but the nomad-controlled realms in Bactria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and western India must be considered forerunners of the later empire of the Kushans, which was, some generations later, to unite once again the Bactrian and the Afghan-Pakistani regions. Without entering into a discussion about the dating of the Kushan Empire, on which topic the author is hardly competent, one can state that the absolute chronology of its beginning is controversial, with suggested dates ranging between the first and third centuries A.D. In view of the nomadic central Asian ancestors of these dynasties and their forerunners, the similarities between the tombs and treasures of the late first century B.C. and of the following first century of the Christian era in Tillya-tepe in northern Afghanistan and the so-called Siberian gold from the central Asian steppes are hardly surprising. However, the relationship between some finds in these tombs and material from Taxila in Pakistan demonstrates the strong connection of these nomad-dominated dynasties in the period in question to the ruling nobility in Pakistan.

In 1981 and 1986, the J. Paul Getty Museum acquired four large treasures of silver bowls, jewelry, and horse trappings that shed light on some aspects of early Parthian and Indo-Scythian culture. Treasures I, II, and III belong to the Parthian sphere, whereas the fourth complex represents the nomadic kingdoms in what was once Greek Bactria and the Afghan-Pakistani regions. Although none of these treasures has any recorded provenance, in the case of the first three the archaeological evidence points to Iran as their place of origin. Only treasures II and III can be considered units in the archaeological sense of the word. Treasures I and IV, in all probability, are modern collectors’ treasures, assembled only in the art market.

Although art-market sources claimed that treasures I and II have a common but unrevealed provenance, we are far from certain that this view can be vindicated beyond doubt. As the archaeological analysis will demonstrate, however, the two groups could already have formed units in ancient times. The vessels are almost contemporaneous—first century B.C.—and could therefore have been used at the same time. It is possible that the silver formed the tableware of a nobleman and was buried as a grave gift after his death. As an alternative, we could interpret the extraordinarily rich assemblage as a hoard that was buried when its owner was facing a sudden danger and never revealed. Furthermore, it can be ascertained almost beyond doubt that at least two vessels from treasure II were actually found together (nos. 66, 68). Some of the bowls represent the traditions of different ateliers in the Hellenized East, but unless it can be proven otherwise, it seems justified to publish treasures II and III as archaeological units.

In the case of the first treasure, we are dealing with a somewhat different situation. From an archaeological viewpoint, the no less than twenty vessels of this complex fall into three related but independent groups and seem to spread over the second and first centuries B.C. The third and youngest group is set apart not only by archaeological reasoning but by the use of Aramaic weight inscriptions on the bowls. It seems almost certain that we are confronted not only with different owners but with products of different workshops.

If we consider treasure I as an archaeological assemblage that was used and buried at the same time in the first century B.C., we would then have to accept that most of the material is of much older manufacture. Moreover, the highly important group of horse trappings, or phalerae, from the second century, which was bought along with the bowls, likewise has no counterparts among the later objects of the hypothetical hoard. I prefer, therefore, to consider the material from treasure I as a modern collector’s treasure of finds from different sources, most likely from several tomb groups. It is possible but not provable that the horse trappings belonged to these tomb groups. As already stated, both the vessels and the horse decorations of treasure I reflect the Hellenized culture of Iran or—less likely—of Afghanistan in the second and first centuries B.C. In terms of ancient history, the material—as is the case with treasures II and III—represents the early Parthian Empire.

Since the material of all these treasures does not stem from regular excavations, our options in reaching final conclusions concerning provenance and chronology are limited. In order not to obscure possible assemblages any further, it seemed advisable to arrange this catalogue by way of treasures, just as they have reached the Getty Museum over the years, but the very nature of these assemblages should always be taken into consideration. Because they provide a rare insight into the ethnic affiliation of their former Parthian owners, I shall begin my analysis with the phalerae from treasure I. The phalerae belong to a new class of non-Greek, non-Iranian horse decorations that came into use in Iran,
Afghanistan, and Pakistan in the second century B.C. and were subsequently adopted by nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples on the northern shore of the Black Sea. As the discussion of the silver bowls shows, it is possible that they too were in Parthian possession, although the Iranian nobility cannot be excluded with certainty.

The phalerae can be attributed to the sphere of Hellenized Iranian craftsmanship. Although we cannot reconstruct which of the bowls belonged with which harness ornaments, the treasure in its entirety actually supports the dualistic picture of early Parthian culture presented in literary sources. The overall importance of horses and cavalry for peoples of nomadic origin is mirrored in these rich horse trappings of a new type, whereas the workmanship of both the silverware and the harness ornaments can be attributed exclusively to provincial Hellenized workshops and demonstrates the preference of the Parthian nobility for Greek culture—consistent with the "philhellenos" on Parthian coins. Influences from the old Achaemenid tradition, which survived for centuries the breakdown of the Achaemenids as a political power in Iran, are almost entirely lacking. From the viewpoint of an art historian, the vessels exemplify provincial Seleucid traditions, even though they were made in the Parthian period.

Special attention should be drawn, as well, to the aspect of chronology. As far as the Hellenized East is concerned we are still without an established chronological system for metalware and the decorative arts. As a matter of fact, the Getty silver offers us the first possibility to proceed in this direction and beyond the suggested chronological limits—the second century B.C. for most of the material from treasure I and the first century B.C. for the third group of treasure I and treasures II, III, and IV; in my opinion it is impossible at the moment to assign more precise dates to the various vessels published in this catalogue. In some instances, I have suggested closer limits of time—for example, the later decades of the first century—but these should always be understood as tentative. In fact, the earlier groups of bowls from treasure I may belong not to the second but to the first half of the second century; even a dating in the latter decades of the third century is conceivable. In a way, the same holds true for treasures II and III. A dating in the early first century is as possible as an attribution to the later decades.

At the moment, one of the main obstacles is the very nature of the comparative material, a considerable part of which stems from regions outside the Hellenized Near East or at least from sites outside Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Any chronology for the Getty silver must be established in reference to this material—specifically by comparing the respective ornamental systems. Consequently, my emphasis is on the general development of Hellenistic decorative art and not on developments originating in the provincial areas in question. That means, for example, that for the earlier two groups of treasure I we can only point out that, according to developments in the centers of the Hellenistic world, these vessels could be dated as early as the second half of the third century.

In addition, our knowledge of the factor of retardation in the vast but provincial areas of the Hellenized East is unfortunately still very limited. We are able to trace early Hellenistic elements in provincial areas much longer than in regions under the constant influence of the centers. Consequently, two layers of evidence must always be kept in view: first, the dating according to the standard of the ancient centers; and second, the actual and possibly retarded chronology of the provincial material. For the most recent group of treasure I and treasure III, inscriptions offer some help, but for the earlier groups of treasure I and for treasure II we must build our conclusions on archaeological comparisons. Some of the differences that we interpret as chronological distinctions may in the future prove themselves as different but contemporaneous workshop traditions of widely distant areas.

A fourth important eastern treasure (treasure IV) in the J. Paul Getty Museum—composed of several vessels of precious metal, jewelry, and harness ornaments—can be attributed to the early period of nomadic control over the formerly Graeco-Bactrian or Indo-Greek world. The jewelry consists mostly of appliqués for garments and torque-like necklaces. One of the silver vessels finds a close parallel in the Parthian treasure II, thus stressing some connections to this Hellenized eastern world, a connection that is all too obvious for the silver, which stands within Greek traditions, but is almost absent in the case of the jewelry, which represents the central Asian affiliations of the artists and their patrons.

Nothing could be learned about the precise provenance of treasure IV and, as in the case of the Parthian treasure I, we cannot consider it as a single hoard or tomb group. Notwithstanding this fact, it reflects again the historical circumstances of the period in question. As is the case with treasures I, II, and III, the silver vessels demonstrate the survival of the old Seleucid and possibly the Graeco-Bactrian repertoire. In the formerly Greek world of Bactria, Afghanistan, and Pakistan,
Hellenistic traditions of craftsmanship apparently survived the eventual collapse of the Greek-dominated states, as to a similar extent the Seleucid repertoire lived on under the Parthian Empire in Iran and Mesopotamia.

Concerning the chronology of the gold from treasure IV, we are on much safer ground, having in the background the excavations from Tillya-tepe in northern Afghanistan or those from Taxila (Pakistan). A late Hellenistic or early Imperial date—the last decades of the first century B.C. or the first half of the first century A.D.—is highly probable, but the somewhat earlier placement of some of the silver in the first century B.C. must remain tentative, again because of the lack of datable monuments in Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

A precise ethnic attribution for the former owners is not possible at the moment, but their strong affiliation to the ruling nomadic classes of the period in question can hardly be denied. A term like Proto-Kushan may even be justified, but in order to avoid the controversial problem of Kushan chronology, the terms Indo-Scythian and Scytho-Bactrian have been selected. Standing alone, neither is entirely satisfactory, because the first excludes the northern Afghan, the latter the Pakistani regions. These designations are always used in combination to describe primarily the cultural and not the political bonds of the former users of treasure IV.

In general, while the treasures in the Getty Museum offer us a first, very incomplete, insight into both the relative and the absolute chronology of metal vessels and their decorative systems in the Hellenized Near East and central Asia, any more precise dating and the vindication of the suggested distribution of the material over different workshop traditions have to be left to the future. The reader is reminded that these considerations are crucial to the following discussions.

The Getty Museum silver, as a substantial body of material from the Hellenized East, offers us the opportunity to study, for the first time, the survival and development of Hellenistic traditions of form in the field of metalware under foreign, non-Greek rule, a repertoire that proved to be far more long-lasting than the oriental Graeco-Macedonian world as a political power.
TREASURE I

In 1981, the J. Paul Getty Museum acquired a large treasure, which, in addition to numerous silver bowls (nos. 1–24), also included horse trappings (nos. 26–36) and jewelry (nos. 38–65). The treasure was purchased in the Swiss art market, and nothing could be learned of its origins. Consequently, essential questions about the nature of the material must be answered through archaeological analysis and study.

Along with the treasure, the museum also acquired an oval Sasanian bowl and a silver vessel with a middle Persian inscription, vessels that have been excluded here because they have nothing in common with the Hellenistic material from treasure I.

It will be shown that the silver bowls in the treasure adopt forms from the Greek-Seleucid repertoire, whereas the horse trappings follow not Greek but central Asian traditions. The type of the horse trappings in combination with the inverted Seleucid anchors and Aramaic inscriptions on some of the bowls allow treasure I to be attributed to the Hellenized Near East—the workshops in all probability to be sought in Iran.

Although the ateliers that produced the silverware and the ornamental horse trappings stand almost exclusively in provincial but Hellenistic Greek traditions, the former owners of at least most of the material from treasure I were of non-Greek origin and can in all likelihood be identified with the Parthians, the new lords of Iran who followed the Seleucid dynasty.

ORNAMENTAL HORSE TRAPPINGS

The silver and bronze horse trappings in treasure I provide more information about the social and ethnic backgrounds of their former owners than does any other object in the collection.

THE PHALERAE

Numerous representations and preserved examples indicate that objects like the Getty Museum’s seven silver and bronze disks or phalerae, with their large loops for attachment at the back side, served as harness ornaments and perhaps as symbols of the rider’s rank. The phalerae at the Getty Museum form several pairs that were almost certainly attached to the horses’ breast straps on both shoulders of the horse. Many representations show a second pair of phalerae behind the saddle, and such representations will always be referred to as “with four phalerae.” Two of the Malibu pairs depict scenes of a lion killing a stag (nos. 30–33) in mirror image, and a third pair, also of silver, imitates bowls with omphaloi (nos. 34–35). The seventh phalera is made up of a simple bronze disk with a raised rim (no. 36).

Before we consider the figural decorations, we will examine the phalerae from a typological viewpoint, which is especially telling in light of the ethnic identification of their former owners. Although some medallions of smaller size with just one loop on the back side are known from horse trappings of late Classical times, the use of the larger version is typical for Sarmatian and Parthian peoples on the northeastern borders of the Hellenistic world (fig. 1).

There are phalerae known from Scytho-Sarmatian burials north of the Black Sea (figs. 2, 3) as well as from central Asia and Pakistan (fig. 4). The evidence provided by numerous Near Eastern terracottas, perhaps by bronze belt buckles from Iran, by a lynx phalera from Iran, and from depictions of Parthians on Iranian rock reliefs indicates that phalerae were above all typical of the horse trappings of the Parthians and other peoples with central Asian connections. The same can be learned from a late Hellenistic textile, most likely Bactrian, from a tomb near Noin Ula in Mongolia, with a representation of a horse similarly caparisoned.

For the late Hellenistic period, the same conclusion can be drawn from the famous wall decorations of mounted archers from the palace in Khalchayan in Uzbekistan (fig. 5). In India, the Indo-Scythians and Kushans, all descendants of Saka peoples, also used harness ornaments of this type during the first centuries of the Christian era, and in Taxila they are to be found in a late Saka-Parthian context. The tradition is also encountered in Iran among the Sasanians, the successors to the Parthians. The Parthian connection is also suggested by wall paintings and incised drawings from Parthian Dura Europos and reliefs of the Parthian-influenced art of Palmyra.

Although we know of numerous representations of phalera from Syria, all the preserved phalerae have been found in the north Pontic region, in central Asia, and in India, all areas dominated for centuries by nomadic peoples. It is therefore not surprising that even in Syrian representations the depicted individuals wear exclusively oriental costumes, familiar not only in Iran but also among nomadic peoples from the Asian steppes.

The South Russian phalerae (figs. 2, 3) are concentrated in the regions east of Panticapeum and the Don (fig. 1), most likely a reflection in the archaeological rec-
FIGURE 1a. Distribution of phalerae (by type). For the key to the numbers, see below.

2. Silver phalera from Silverskaya Stanitsa. Moscow, Historical Museum (see note 21).
3. Silver phalera from Vozdvizhenskaya Stanitsa (see note 25).
6. Silver phalera from Janchekrak (see note 25).
7. Silver phalerae from Fedulovo. St. Petersburg, Hermitage (see note 25).
9. Terracotta statuette of a horseman, Phanagoreia (see note 2).
10. Terracotta statuette of a horseman, Mount Mithridates. St. Petersburg, Hermitage (see note 2).
12. Terracotta statuette of a horseman, South Russia. Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum (see note 75).
14. Silver phalerae from Volodarka (see note 25).
15. Silver phalerae from “Bactria.” St. Petersburg, Hermitage (see note 27).
16. Silver phalerae from “central Asia.” St. Petersburg, Hermitage (see note 26).
17. Bronze phalera from Typ-chona (see note 69).
18. Terracotta reliefs of horsemen from the palace of Khalchayan (see note 8).
20. Horsemen on gold-sheet appliqués, Tenlik Kurgan (see note 26).
21. Horsemen on textiles from Noin Ula (see note 7).
22. Silver phalera from Taxila (see note 10).
33 Bronze phalera from “Iran.” Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 81.AC.88 (cat. no. 36).
34 Silver plate with a horseman from “Iran.” Private collection (see note 207).
35 Silver phalera from “Iran.” Art market (see note 6).
36 Bronze phalera from Hasanlu. Teheran Museum (see note 70).
37 Rock-cut reliefs with Parthian horsemen from Tang-i Sarvak and Hung-i Nauruzi (see note 6).
38 Terracotta horse from Masjid-i Solaiman (see note 4).
39 Terracotta statuettes of horsemen from Seleucia. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan, Kelsey Museum 14210 and 15678 (see note 4).
40 Terracotta relief from Babylonia. London, British Museum 91908 (see note 4).
41 Terracotta statuette of a woman riding from Babylonia. New Haven, Yale University, Babylonian Collection 2992 (see note 4).
43 Wall painting from the Mithraeum in Dura Europos (see note 12).
44 Graffito from Dura Europos, temple of Azzanathkona (see note 12).
45–47 Graffiti from Dura Europos (see note 12).
48 Terracotta statuette of a horseman from Palestine. Paris, Musée du Louvre A. O. 10221 (see note 4).
49–52 Horsemen on “Palmyran reliefs” (see note 13).
53 Horseman on a relief from Djoubb el-Djarrah, Homs (see note 13).
54 Terracotta statuette of a horseman from the art market of Aleppo. Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum (see note 4).
55 Terracotta statuette of a horseman from “Syria.” London, British Museum 13,684 (see note 4).
56 Terracotta statuette of a horseman from the Syrian art market. Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum (see note 4).
58 Terracotta statuette of a horseman from Cappadocia. Paris, Musée du Louvre (see note 4).
59 Parthian horses on coins of Labienus (40 B.C.) (see note 14).
ord of the onslaught of the Sarmatian migration.

The first Roman “contact” with the fashion for phalerae can be seen in the Parthian horse on the coins of the triumvir Labienus, which were struck in 40 B.C.\" The identification of the horse as Parthian is further corroborated by the type of its trappings. A considerable number of phalerae decorate the trappings of horses on Roman tombstones of the northern provinces, not earlier than in the first century A.D., possibly reflecting the adoption of a Near Eastern tradition. The arrangement of the leather straps in these tomb reliefs is not the same, however, but the idea that the phalera is fixed over a strap junction is reflected in the short strap, hanging down from the medallion. The Roman military possibly borrowed this fashion from their most feared enemies in the East, the Parthians.

In contrast, no phalerae of this size are known from the main regions of the Hellenistic world, either from graves or depicted in the numerous equestrian representations. It is nevertheless no contradiction in terms if many of the known phalerae were executed in a strictly Greek style (figs. 3, 4). As was already the case in Classical times among the Scythians in South Russia, considerable work was done during the Hellenistic period by Greek craftsmen for non-Greek patrons. This is especially true of Bactria and Iran, since the small Graeco-Macedonian upper class was finally displaced as a ruling elite by nomadic peoples and local dynasties in the course of the second century B.C. The lack of comparable trappings in the areas under Graeco-Macedonian domination is in itself enough to suggest a different ethnic background for the owners of the Getty phalerae.

The decorative disks at the Getty Museum (nos. 30–36) belong to the group of flat phalerae from Hellenistic times. On the basis of their attachment to the harness, we can distinguish two basic types, which in turn provide further information about the nature of the harness itself. Some phalerae have two loops on the back for the straps of the harness. A larger group—including the Getty phalerae—is manufactured with three (fig. 4). It is striking that almost all of the examples with three loops are larger than the examples in Malibu, in some cases more than twice as large. The Getty pieces range in size from 12.6 (nos. 32–33) to 17.2 centimeters (nos. 34–35). The distribution of both types is represented in figures IA and IB.

Since the themes depicted on the Malibu disks suggest an early date for the pieces in the second and maybe even in the late third century B.C., and since by comparison none of the much larger pieces can be dated with certainty to the third century B.C., it is possible that the larger examples, especially those which measure between 25 and 30 centimeters, like the pair from

---

**Figure 2.** Terracotta horseman from Panticapaeum, Kerch, circa second or first century B.C. St. Petersburg, Hermitage (from L. Stephani, *CR* [1870–71], p. 168, pl. 2.7).

**Figure 3.** Silver phalera from Fedulovo, second century B.C. St. Petersburg, Hermitage. Photo: DAI, Rome.
Fedulovo/Cherkassy near the Don in South Russia (fig. 3), appear later in the second century B.C. This would correlate well with the early date around 200 B.C. or in the early second century assigned to two phalerae from Akhtanizovka, but less well with the relatively small disk from Siverskaya Stanitsa on the Kuban Peninsula that was found with coins from the last quarter of the second century B.C. Consequentially, smaller phalerae are not always to be attributed to earlier periods, a finding that is in harmony with the varying sizes of phalerae even on Syrian representations from Imperial times. Larger and smaller examples are at least to be found side by side from the second century on. However, the fact that there is not a single large example among the seven pieces at the Getty Museum might indicate that they represent an earlier phase in the development of the phalera fashion.

The antithetic representations of attacking animal groups on the two pairs from Malibu (nos. 30–33) show that the two pieces that make up a pair were attached on opposite sides of the horse and that the representations were most likely oriented toward the direction of movement.

Many representations show a harness with four phalerae, attached both in front of and behind the saddle (fig. 2). The loops attached to the Getty phalerae for the straps of the harness exclude the possibility of a usage behind the saddle, however. The Malibu phalerae were not affixed to a single strap but to crossed straps, with a vertical strap running downward from the point where the disk is attached to a horizontal strap. A similar arrangement can be seen on the reliefs from Khalchayan (fig. 5). As the illustrations show, no such arrangement of straps is known for a horse’s hindquarters, so the Getty phalerae must belong to four different sets of harnesses.

The special arrangement of the harness straps indicated by the loops on these pieces seems not to have been known in southern Russia in the fifth and fourth centuries. The examples of the early second century from Akhtanizovska Stanitsa, some late Hellenistic northern Pontic phalerae, such as a piece from Janchek-rak, and a pair bearing an inscription naming Mithridates were made for a single broad strap. Other phalerae of the second century, like the ones from Fedulovo (fig. 3), Siverskaya Stanitsa, Vozdvizhenskaya Stanitsa, and Voronezhskaya Stanitsa on the Kuban Peninsula, a pair with curled griffins from Novouzensk, north of the Caspian Sea, and another one with representations of Bellerophon found near Volodarka, in the South Ural district, show the three-loop arrangement that can be traced back to central Asian trappings. Examples of the special arrangement of the harness straps are the late Hellenistic reliefs of horsemen from the palace of Khalchayan in Uzbekistan (fig. 5), gold-sheet appliqués from the Tenlik Kurgan, and on an undecorated pair of phalerae in St. Petersburg from central Asia. To completely outline the geographical distribution of this type of harness, we should mention the three-loop phalerae from the Saka-Parthian strata in Taxila in Pakistan (see fig. 1).
Another pair in the Hermitage bears the image of an Indian military elephant framed by a belted garland (fig. 4). These and the undecorated pair in St. Petersburg are far larger than the Malibu phalerae.

The provenance of the elephant phalerae is unknown but it should definitely be sought within Russian central Asia. It has been suggested that the elephant phalerae are of Bactrian origin on the basis of the motif of the Indian elephant and the type of helmet worn by the warrior in the tower on the elephant’s back. Even if the type of helmet depicted is not in and of itself sufficient evidence, and although the Indian war elephants used by the Antigonids and Seleucids occasionally did fall even into the hands of the Egyptian Ptolemies, the Indian elephant with an Indian driver or “maout” does indicate an eastern origin. The main evidence in favor of an eastern, that is, central Asian provenance, is, however, the arrow-shaped ornament on the tower on the elephant’s back. The motif is typical of architectural decoration in the former Seleucid sphere of influence, but not of Seleucid architecture itself. It may have been adopted from the decorative repertoire of the minor arts, in which it is already to be encountered in Achaemenid times.

Since, moreover, the Seleucids and the other Hellenistic armies apparently did not use phalerae of this eastern type, and since nothing is known of any Parthian war elephants, the only possible area of origin remaining for the elephant phalerae is Bactria. Bactria already had traditionally close contacts with the nomadic peoples of central Asia during the period of Graeco-Macedonian rule. The elephant phalerae thus provide a further geographically identifiable example of the strap arrangement for which the decorative disks at the Getty Museum were made.

The later second century witnessed the breakdown of the Graeco-Bactrian world and the subsequent rise of realms under nomadic domination. It seems far more likely that the Graeco-Bactrian armies used Indian war elephants than that their nomadic successors did. That could mean, however, that the phalerae were produced for the Graeco-Bactrian cavalry and thus demonstrate the introduction of the phalera fashion into the Graeco-Bactrian repertoire. Furthermore, if we take the size of the elephant phalerae into consideration, a date earlier than the middle or the late second century B.C. should be ruled out. And, if the St. Petersburg pair are seen as evidence of the eventual takeover of the Bactrian world by nomadic overlords who did indeed use war elephants, a first century B.C. date is possible.

Such a late dating of the elephant phalerae raises the question of when the phalera fashion began in central Asia. A precondition for the development of the three-loop type is a trapping with straps that join in front of the saddle. The close ties of this particular harness feature to areas dominated by central Asian nomadic cultures is borne out not the least by trappings from the Pazyryk kurgans in the Altai. On a wall hanging from Grave 5 there is a horse with crossed straps in front of the saddle, and some of the harnesses from horses’ graves can also be similarly reconstructed. It might even be possible to identify a precursor to the phalera fashion among the finds.

The next step in the development is illustrated by a miniature golden statuette of a horseman from the Siberian collection of Peter the Great (fig. 6). The strap junction is already decorated by a small phalera, and the hairdo of the rider with an enormous topknot over the forehead immediately recalls representations on the tap-
entries from Pazyryk that were buried in the late fourth or early third century B.C. If we combine this evidence with the first rise of the phalera fashion in the north Pontic region about 200 B.C., it seems most likely that even in the Bactrian sphere the use of the phaleræ was not established before the late third century, and simultaneously reached Iran in the wake of the Parthian invasion.

These considerations set a first terminus post quern for the Malibu phaleræ. Furthermore, because material from sources inside the former Soviet Union is literally unknown on the modern art market, a north Pontic or south Siberian provenance can be excluded. That limits the provenance to Iran or, and this is theoretically only a slight possibility, Afghanistan. The latter option seems most unlikely, however, given the Parthian affiliations of the silver acquired with the phaleræ.

If we examine in detail the Getty phaleræ with attacking animal groups against this background, further arguments for attributing them to the central Asian region once under Seleucid and Parthian control are revealed. This applies in particular to the disks that depict a lion pouncing on a fallen stag (nos. 30–33). The actual pictorial medallion of one pair (nos. 30–31) is framed by a belted garland. The two pairs are quite different in quality, but both prove to be products of provincial workshops. On each pair the groups are given in mirror image.

The composition of numbers 30 and 31 follows the Greek type of an attacking animal group, a motif that appears continuously in more or less canonical form from as early as the fifth century B.C. Typical in particular is the position of the legs of the fallen stag, forelegs bent and one hind leg outstretched. Equally typical is the depiction of the lion with one paw on the stag’s hind leg and the head shown frontally. Although this position of the head is encountered frequently, it does not appear on every Greek group with attacking animals.

Further attention should be drawn to the turned head of the stag. Whether the attacker is a lion or a griffin, on Greek groups of this type the head of the helpless victim is almost always turned forward, in the direction of flight, just as we find it on the second pair of phaleræ in Malibu (nos. 32–33). With a few exceptions, an animal with its head turned back is usually to be found only in groups with two attacking animals. The turned-back head is known also on Achaemenid compositions, but the number of existing examples is too small to indicate whether this motif is a Near Eastern preference or not. This characteristic also recurs on the attacking animal groups on the textiles from the Pazyryk graves, compositions that already reveal a combination of Achaemenid and Greek forms. In view of the still-to-be discussed echoes of the Scythian and central Asian animal style in the figures of the deer on the Getty phaleræ, this could indicate an eastern connection for the repertoire.

Despite the care exercised by the silversmiths, a certain ineptitude is apparent. The attempt to depict the antlers in perspective, for example, is unsuccessful, as is the execution of the deers’ heads. In spite of the obvious effort to emphasize the plasticity of the relief by the rounded depiction of parts of the body and muscles, the lack of harmony between individual anatomical forms and a certain clumsiness are evident. Given the more schematic representation of the animal’s skin on no. 31, which does not depict the large starlike cowlicks on the deer’s flanks, we can assume the pairs represent the work of two different craftsmen.

In view of the attempt at realism in the portrayal of the lion, it is surprising to discover clear echoes of Achaemenid and central Asian animal style motifs in the portrayal of the stag. The carefully parted hair on the neck of one of the stags is unquestionably Achaemenid-inspired (no. 30), as is the prominent and quite ornamental arch over the eye. As on some representations of deer in the Scythian animal style, the round eyes were originally also inlaid with stones. Finally, the considerably elongated hooves point clearly to the Scythian animal style.

The use of the basically Greek composition is thus unquestionably to be localized in an area that was to a
very considerable degree under Achaemenid and central Asian influence. This fact combined with the distribution of ornamental disks with the type of strap arrangement already described (see drawing, no. 34) strongly suggests Iran or Bactria as the place of origin. Such a suggestion may also be supported by the use of the belted garland frame for the pictorial field, which occurs also on the elephant phalerae (fig. 4). The extreme slenderness of the lion's body just in front of the hind legs finds a parallel not only in a lion on a small silver relief that supposedly comes from the Iranian Dalaiman area but in even more exaggerated form in attacking animal groups on textiles from the kurgans of Pazyryk.

The second pair in Malibu is by far of more modest quality (nos. 32, 33). The position of the legs shows that the composition no longer strictly follows a Greek model, and the rendering of details is neither as varied nor of as high a quality as on the first pair (nos. 31, 31). The position of the head is different and echoes of the animal style are lacking in the form of the hooves. The minor quality of this pair is also illustrated by the fact that the surfaces of the animals' bodies are treated in almost exactly the same fashion as the background of the medallion. The conception as a whole, however, is to be found again on a saddle covering from the first grave in Pazyryk (fig. 7), although the circular form of the medallion led to an even greater compression of the group. The form of the disks themselves is also simpler than the first pair of phalerae. We find neither a framing garland nor a wide, undecorated rim. The analysis of this second pair also reveals ties to the Scythian art of the steppes, as is the case with the first pair, although the ties of the second pair are of a different kind and more limited.

The first pair especially is hardly thinkable outside the Hellenized world of central Asia. The allusions to nomadic forms, however, clearly point to a localization of the workshops in the northern border areas of the Hellenized Seleucid sphere or, less likely, the Bactrian sphere. However, since the custom of using phalerae was apparently not known in Hellenistic kingdoms of the northern coast of the Black Sea to the Altai. However, in Hellenistic times Greek horse trappings were decorated, with a few exceptions, with gods and heroes. The theme of the animal under attack thus fits perfectly into the nomadic world, although it is in our case iconographically anchored in the tradition of Greek forms. A further example for this preference is given by the pair of phalerae from Vozdvizhenskaya Stanitsa in the Kuban region on which a goat is attacked by a fabulous being that resembles a hydra.

In this connection, it comes as no surprise that on the Malibu phalerae echoes of the animal style are found especially in the stags, since this animal is documented in innumerable instances in this cultural sphere. That the stag had a similar special meaning among the Parthians is probable.

Dating the ornamental horse trappings at the Getty Museum is far more difficult than localizing their place of origin. Phalerae of this size have been documented at the earliest from a South Russian grave of around 200 B.C. At present, no phalerae of this size can be dated with certainty to the third century B.C.; however, the Getty pieces cannot be matched with the much larger examples that occur in contexts of the second half of the second century or later.

The iconographic parallels cited would readily allow a dating of our phalerae to the third century B.C., but a second-century B.C. representation of lions driving a bull in Pergamon shows how long such compositions, once established, were retained. Iconographic parallels from an early Hellenistic context thus cannot be

**FIGURE 7.** Lion felling an elk, detail from a saddle decoration, Pazyryk, Tomb 1, late fourth or early third century B.C. St. Petersburg, Hermitage. Drawing by the author.
regarded as a sufficient argument for dating these examples to the third century B.C. The Getty phalerae presuppose a nomad, Hellenistic-influenced cultural horizon that could scarcely have existed in the form necessary in northwestern Iran or provinces like Parthia and Hyrcania before the initial appearance of the Parthians in the last third of the third century B.C. Against this background and in light of the parallels with the belted garlands on two of the phalerae, we can assume that the pieces date not later than the second century B.C. and possibly even from the late third century.

The remaining silver pair of phalerae in treasure I provides little further evidence for attributing the pieces to the Irano-Parthian area, although a possible parallel for the singular feature of phalerae worked in the form of a phiale (nos. 34, 35) can be cited from the southern Caucasus. The fluted edge of the phiale phalerae in Malibu is worth noting here. The motif could perhaps be interpreted as an abstract version of the egg and dart motif, an ornament that is often to be found on bowl or cup rims in areas under Seleucid influence (no. 75).

The attribution of the phalerae to the Irano-Parthian territories is, however, strongly supported by the undecorated bronze phalera in Malibu (no. 36), for which an excellent parallel of the first half of the second century can be cited from Typ-chona in northern Caucasian. Another phalera, in this case decorated with a Pegasos, was reported to have been found in Iranian Azerbaijan. Although the winged horse comes from the Greek repertoire, the use of the Pegasos motif is already to be found in the northern Pontic-Scythian region.

In view of the parallels and of the size of the disks discussed above, a second-century date, perhaps even in the first half, seems likely.

In terms of cultural history, the Getty phalerae make it possible to reconstruct a situation similar to that evident from South Russian finds: Greek and Hellenized craftsmen provided the formal stylistic means while the nomadic patrons determined the type of object and the iconographic theme to be used. Regardless of whether the workshops involved were in the Bactrian or Parthian regions, the disks owe their existence to that interdependence of nomadic ideas and Greek traditions of form that M. Rostovtzeff postulated with so much foresight for central Asia and Bactria.

Rostovtzeff’s ideas can most likely also be adopted in one further point. He suggested that the very origins of the phalerae fashion should be sought in the steppes of central Asia that were dominated by the Scythians and nomads since phalerae were part of the horse trappings of the nomads—later the Parthians—who from this area invaded the old satrapies of Parthia and Hyrcania. Alternatively, Sarmatians pushing into the steppes north of the Black Sea could have transmitted this custom to the West.

This view was vehemently questioned by J. Hermatta but as figure 1 demonstrates, a listing of provenances of the three- and two-looped phalerae speaks strongly in favor of Rostovtzeff’s hypothesis, that the fashion should be considered as a central Asian one that was spread by the Parthians to the Hellenized Near East, and then reached the north Pontic regions with the Sarmatian migration and Pakistan with the rise of the Indo-Scythian and Indo-Parthian realms at the latest. But did these peoples simply adopt a central Asian, possibly Bactrian tradition, or should the fashion’s very origins be sought in the nomadic world of central Asia, or at least in the interaction of the non-Greek peoples with Hellenized Bactrian central Asia? The latter alternative would easily explain the use of phalerae in the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom and in all those nomad-dominated realms that followed.

THE RHOMBOID PROMETOPIDION

To the same cultural and historical context as the phalerae belongs a rhomboid silver plaque which, on the basis of parallels, can be identified as a forehead ornament for a horse, which is known as a “prometopidion” (no. 26). The richly decorated piece, 25 centimeters long, depicts a framed sphinx at the top, a large siren in the center, and below an eagle perched on a stag. The style of all the motifs is rather provincial.

The prometopidion was originally set in a fitting—perhaps of leather—which overlapped its edges to a width of about three millimeters and which was fastened to the edge of the metal with small rivets. Only traces of the overlapping edge with holes for the rivets are preserved. Two considerably larger rivet holes on the bottom edge of the plaque bear witness to rather carelessly executed repairs. The prometopidion was therefore not made specifically as a grave gift.

Interestingly, a prometopidion of this type has never been found with the phalera type discussed above. The lack of parallels for the combined use of the rhomboid prometopidion and large phalerae of the three-looped type may be the result of chance as far as the finds themselves are concerned, but it is striking that in all the representations of our type of prometopidion there are no large phalerae of the kind discussed here.
Even in the case of the very popular lenticular prometopidia of the Hellenistic world there is only one possible example of simultaneous use with large phalerae known to me. It therefore seems likely that the prometopidion and the phalerae owe their development to different cultural groups.

We must also add that there is no evidence that the Getty prometopidion originally belonged to the same harness as one of the pairs of phalerae. As will be demonstrated, however, the figural decoration does indicate that it can be assigned to the same nomadic-Parthian context sketched for the phalerae. The owner undoubtedly shared in the world of nomad ideas, even if his horse wore a forehead ornament of Greek type.

Typological parallels for the rhomboid prometopidion must be sought in a considerable number of pictorial representations. The silver prometopidion in the Getty Museum is the only preserved example known to me. Elliptical, lenticular prometopidia appear to have been much more popular in Hellenistic times, and examples are to be found from Ptolemaic Egypt to South Russia and from Greece to Italy and Sicily. However, representations of rhomboid prometopidia indicate a wide distribution of the rhomboid type also.

The use of small diamond-shaped prometopidia on the cross straps over the nose of a horse is already documented in the painting on the attic of the "tomb of Philip" in Vergina. A similar prometopidion is represented on the Alexander mosaic in Naples. The small type was even used on a terracotta relief from Canosa in southern Italy. On small terracotta reliefs of the third century, reportedly found at Tanagra and probably the remains of a wooden sarcophagus, the prometopidia are no longer fixed straight over but in the middle of the horses' noses. These prometopidia are also somewhat larger, although they do not reach the format of the Malibu piece.

The size of our prometopidion finds a match on the representations of horse trappings on the weapons frieze on the walls of the sanctuary of Athena Polias at Pergamon, built under Eumenes II in the early second century B.C. (fig. 8). Among the weapons depicted are what are most likely representations of spoils captured during the battle of Magnesia against Antiochus III in the year 190 B.C. In spite of the fragmentary state of preservation of the frieze, rhomboid prometopidia appear no less than three times, while the widespread ellipsoidal type is absent. At least two of the prometopidia are of considerable size, extending from the noseband to the front band.

Further evidence for the use of these prometopidia in the Seleucid area is provided by a small gold horse in the Oxus Treasure (fig. 9). Its forehead ornament is smaller than the piece in Malibu. The prometopidion is
attached to straps running diagonally across the horse’s head, a feature that recurs in the harness of a marble horse’s head in truly Greek style from Lindos.\textsuperscript{91} Despite this Greek parallel, the diagonally crossed arrangement of the harness straps appears to be a Scythian-nomadic feature, sometimes Thracian but not Greek. In addition to parallels from southern Russia\textsuperscript{92} and Thrace,\textsuperscript{93} there are examples of Imperial date from Bagram in Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{94} As such, the harness is of no chronological significance. The prometopidion, however, suggests that the small gold horse in the Oxus Treasure dates only from the third or early second century B.C. It would thus be one of the latest pieces in the Oxus Treasure, which was buried in the first half of the second century.\textsuperscript{95} The way the mane of the golden horse is bound together upright between the ears still reflects an old Achaemenid tradition.\textsuperscript{96}

The Near Eastern context of the rhomboid Malibu prometopidion is further supported by the horse of Marcus Aurelius from the Capitoline Hill in Rome (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{97} Not only does it follow the bound-mane Achaemenid style but the saddle cloth with the zigzag edge is also Persian in origin.\textsuperscript{98} The noseband is decorated with a small rhomboid prometopidion, which is like that in Malibu even in the blunted form of the small sides. The original was, nevertheless, smaller than the piece in Malibu—about the same size as the model of the prometopidion on the horse in the Oxus Treasure (fig. 9). It is of some significance that—in spite of the Achaemenid features—the horse of Marcus Aurelius does not carry central Asian phalerae, indicating again that the fashion is not Graeco-Hellenistic but nomadic-Parthian in origin. That the horse which now bears the image of the Roman emperor once belonged to an eastern, possibly Seleucid, equestrian statue cannot, in this author’s opinion, be doubted.

A representation of a horse on the late Hellenistic Lagina frieze from Caria in Asia Minor shows a possibly misinterpreted but nevertheless similarly formed prometopidion.\textsuperscript{99} Large-sized examples of our diamond-shaped type can even be seen on Hellenistic earrings with bull’s heads.\textsuperscript{100} This variant of the animal-head earring was especially popular in the Ptolemaic sphere and according to the size of the bridles, the earrings in question must be attributed to the late third or early second century.

More or less in the same period should date the small Ptolemaic faience head of an elephant with an elaborate harness and a rhomboid prometopidion (fig. 11).\textsuperscript{101} Given the small, evidently cropped ears,\textsuperscript{102} and above all the animal’s frontal humps, this must be a representation of an Indian war elephant, although it is depicted here with three instead of the anatomically correct two humps.\textsuperscript{103} Although the Ptolemies did capture Indian elephants in a number of cases, they themselves used the African species.\textsuperscript{104}

The non-Ptolemaic origin of the elephant that served as a model for the small faience figure is perhaps also suggested by the harness with prometopidion, whose use is reported in reference to the elephants of Antiochus III at the battle of Magnesia\textsuperscript{105} but which seems to be unknown otherwise.\textsuperscript{106} Since the Seleucid king lost a large number of such animals to Ptolemy IV in the Battle of Raphia in 217 B.C.,\textsuperscript{107} and since we have here a depiction of a harnessed Indian elephant in Ptolemaic faience, it may be a representation of one of the captured animals.

The widespread knowledge of the large rhomboid type of prometopidion is also demonstrated by an Ibe-
In format, the Malibu prometopidion corresponds to the representations on the weapons frieze from Pergamon (fig. 8). Thus, on the basis of purely typological reasons, there is nothing that speaks against a dating to the latter part of the third or the early second century B.C. In light of preserved Hellenistic monuments in the Near East, our type—although widely known—seems to have been especially popular in the Seleucid sphere.

As the typological analysis showed, it is possible to attribute the Malibu prometopidion to the Hellenized Near East, an attribution that is indicated not the least on the basis of the context of treasure I. As for the phalerae, the figurai decoration makes it possible furthermore to establish a relationship with the nomadic-Parthian sphere.

Eagle and Stag. The combination of a sphinx, a siren, and a predatory bird perched on a stag is, from the viewpoint of Greek iconography, more or less meaningless. The combination could, of course, be entirely ornamental. One way to explain this ensemble, however, is suggested by the motif of the eagle and stag. This small group includes a bird of prey, possibly an eagle, and a stag, which is characterized by its antlers, hooves, and short, stubby tail. The large, stylized eye immediately recalls the representation of the stag on the phalerae, while the decorative curls of the fur are somewhat suggestive of Achaemenid animal representations.

The quietly standing stag reveals no awareness of the bird that has its claws in his back. The bird, possibly an eagle, is turned away from its victim and the position thus conveys the impression that the bird is perched peacefully on the animal’s back. Parallels for this stiff composition, however, include a number of animal groups in central Asia that portray the attack of an eagle on a deer, elk, or ram. Several representations from the Pazyryk tombs (fig. 12) as well as a considerably later example from Noin Ula in Mongolia can be cited here. In addition, there are examples from the sphere of Ordo art and among the so-called Siberian goldworks with colored stone or paste inlays, a style whose origins are probably to be sought in Bactria, according to Rostovtzeff. As shown by recent finds from Tillya-tepe in northern Afghanistan that belong to a substantially later period, such objects were indeed used in this area and were probably even produced there.

The motif of the struggle between a bird and a deer or ram was far more widely known in central Asia than in the western Scythian world. The difference in the geographical distribution is especially noteworthy because there exists in general so much more material from the steppes north of the Black Sea.

As could be expected on the basis of the representations from central Asia, this motif is also found on works of Parthian origin—for example, on imprints of seals from the Parthian capital of Nisa and above all on two gold buckles from the Iranian Nihavend Treasure. The latter’s depiction of an eagle attacking an ibex is similar to a piece of Siberian goldwork in the Hermitage. We must therefore speak of a nomadic theme,
the meaning of which we are not able to determine for lack of written sources.

The representations just cited (fig. 12) are considerably more animated than the group on the prometopidion. Parthian seals convey a more rigid impression, but even here there is usually a collapsing deer or one whose depiction makes at least reference to the attacking animal. The remarkably stiff composition on the Getty prometopidion could be the result of a lack of skill, but more likely it is a clumsy combination of two nomadic-Scythian appliqué motifs—the stag and the bird. Each theme is known individually: the peacefully walking deer and the eagle with its head turned to the side, which was especially popular in the north Pontic region in Scythian-Sarmatian contexts from the fifth century to about 200 B.C. Whichever explanation we accept for the stiffness of the composition, it is obvious that our workshop—confronted with the patron’s preference—was nevertheless not fundamentally oriented toward scenes and motifs from the nomadic world.

**Sphinx.** The hieratic stride of the sphinx in a separate field above the siren reminds us of Achaemenid examples, although there is a divergence from the traditional Achaemenid repertoire that should be noted here. Usually all four feet are touching the ground; only in the case of sitting sphinxes do we find the paw raised as it is depicted on the prometopidion. Both variants are to be found, for instance, as gold appliqués in Achaemenid graves in Sardis (fig. 13).

Only a few examples of the blend of these two motifs are known to me from the Achaemenid-influenced area, and they may have been produced even in Hellenistic times on the basis of older models. One is a round gold-sheet appliqué from the Oxus Treasure, which was buried only in the early second century B.C. Another is a fragment of an ivory comb with a representation of an Achaemenid royal sphinx in Teheran. The comb could be identified as an Achaemenid work without hesitation if the wing did not culminate in a lion-griffin head. Motifs of this type are typical for the “zoomorphic conjunction” of the Scythian animal style. Familiarity with this style may have existed in Achaemenid ateliers as well, but the use is rather peculiar. Iconographic parallels from the Oxus Treasure could speak rather for a post-Achaemenid dating of the motif.

The hooked wing of the sphinx on the Getty prometopidion follows Achaemenid tradition; however, the typical overlapping arrangement of feathers of increasing size on Achaemenid wings has given way here to a simpler successive arrangement of the feathers.

The typical Achaemenid stylization of muscles is lacking in the body of the animal. Both this feature and the lack of a real Achaemenid hairstyle on the human head—the hair on the back of the neck has been twisted together in Parthian fashion—point to the post-Achaemenid origin of the portrayal. The heavy, segmented chain around the sphinx’s neck is even documented as an ornament for the Parthian king Mithridates III before 53 B.C. Thus, although the sphinx follows Achaemenid prototypes, it certainly dates from a time after the collapse of the Persian Empire. The mold used for the image is not of Achaemenid origin. The use of a frame is in itself interesting and clearly shows that the mold was usually used for the making of small metal appliqués. Appliqués of this type look back on a long tradition. Gold-sheet plaques as early as the first half of the sixth century with several pictorial fields have been found, for example, in Delphi and in Asia Minor. In later centuries, small, framed metal appliqués are known to us from numerous Scythian-nomadic burials in the area between the northern coast of the Black Sea and the Pazyryk tombs in the Altai.

Despite the numerous Scythian appliqués from the fourth and third centuries B.C. found in northern Pontic kurgans, the number of rectangular examples framed by an astragal or by beading is limited, and only in contexts from the late fourth or early third century do we find an astragal. There are no other rectangular, framed metal appliqués with an astragal known to me at present from the Hellenistic Orient, but there are examples with a beaded frame from the Oxus Treasure. The astragal ornament is also to be found on heart-shaped ornamental plaques for belt buckles from the Iranian or Afghan-Pakistani area. Finally, there are sphinxes on...
small terracotta plaques from Nippur in Mesopotamia\textsuperscript{139} and even from Ptolemaic Egypt.\textsuperscript{140} These examples are clearly inlays for furniture.

The use of the sphinx on our prometopidion becomes clear against the background of the finds in western Scythian contexts. Sphinxes are to be found there on all types of monuments, on gold appliqués\textsuperscript{141} and gold jewelry,\textsuperscript{142} and even on one of the typical Scythian vases.\textsuperscript{143} Following the Greek sphinx tradition, the figures usually depict the female type, whereas the Achaemenids preferred the male variety (fig. 13). The sphinxlike creature depicted on a textile from Pazyryk is also male.\textsuperscript{144} In Parthian times, the dominant type in Iran, Bactria, and India seems to have been the female variant, usually with clearly defined breasts.\textsuperscript{145}

The hairstyle of the sphinx on our prometopidion suggests a male sphinx—the necklace does not carry any weight in such a determination in the Orient.\textsuperscript{146} The Achaemenid royal sphinx with a crown is generally depicted with a beard. The meaning may thus correspond to its Egyptian ancestors in which this is intended as a symbol of royal strength. The only exception to this is the crowned but beardless sphinx on an appliqué from the Oxus Treasure which, on the basis of this detail, should be dated to post-Achaemenid times.\textsuperscript{147}

As we have seen, there was, in addition to the Achaemenid royal sphinx, a beardless variant without crown,\textsuperscript{148} which, on the basis of the hairstyle, must also be identified as male.\textsuperscript{149} Since the sphinx image on the prometopidion follows Achaemenid tradition, we can see it as a follower of this group of beardless male sphinxes.\textsuperscript{150} Nevertheless, as in the case of the group with an attacking animal, the interpretation of the sphinx on the prometopidion is unclear.

Siren. The center of the prometopidion is decorated with a siren, now partly missing. The preserved parts are sufficient to permit a reconstruction almost in full. Despite its Hellenistic dating and provincial workmanship, the type of the siren is based closely on the well-known handle attachments with sirens on Greek bronze hydriai from the fifth century B.C. (fig. 14).\textsuperscript{151}

The shape of the wings\textsuperscript{152} and the plumage on the body\textsuperscript{153} are typical, and parallels can be cited for the long pendant braids, even if those of the “originals” are more lively.\textsuperscript{154} The hairstyle with the diadem-like band is unusual, although head ornaments can be found on other Greek examples.\textsuperscript{155} A new and unusual feature is the accentuation of the female breast with nipple.\textsuperscript{156} Parallels for the use of a necklace can be found on Greek siren handle attachments.\textsuperscript{157}

The scrolls demonstrate the close relationship of the composition to older models, although the “originals” usually have more volutes. The greater liveliness of the vegetal ornament on compositions from the fifth century B.C. is unmistakable. Nevertheless, even details like the raised dots in the centers of the volutes,\textsuperscript{158} the pointed tips between the two volutes of the lower pair, and the small, stiff palmettes under the wings of the siren recur in a very similar form, as does the pendant palmette.

Since the siren handle attachment with stylized, nonvegetal scrolls was no longer used in the fourth century,\textsuperscript{159} the silversmith who made the prometopidion must have followed a model that was possibly two hundred years old.

A great many examples can be cited to document the popularity of the frontal winged creatures in the northern Pontic-Scythian area; among them are bronze vessels of the fifth century B.C., which have sometimes
been found in much later contexts. The many representations of “female scroll figures” can be added to the group of actual siren motifs from this area. If we are justified in equating the “female scroll figure” with the figure of the siren in Scythia, then it is possible that these representations are related to the half-animal, primeval mother of the Scythians and nomads. To my knowledge, there are no known pre-Hellenistic examples from central Asia, but formally related birdlike creatures can be found in Parthian contexts as well as in Sasanian, Afghan, and even Indian art.

Thus, in contrast to the decorative motifs of the phalerae, only the animal group with the eagle and stag on the prometopidion can be identified as an iconographic theme typical for central Asia, though only in terms of meaning, not of iconographic form. The Achaemenid sphinx as well as the sirens derived from fifth-century Greek types are encountered far more often in the west Scythian area. A nomadic, non-Greek, and non-Achaemenid interpretation was most likely responsible for the spread of the motif. In addition, the sphinx and birdlike creatures are also to be found in later Parthian contexts.

The combination of the three motifs on a Seleucid-Greek prometopidion could be explained by supposing a Parthian patron who selected the motifs according to traditional nomadic ideas. According to Hellenistic representations, a date in the late third or early second century seems likely. This prometopidion remains formally nevertheless an exception among central Asian horse trappings.

HARNESS MEDALLIONS

Three round silver medallions with small female busts in low relief and a rim bent toward the back can also be identified as harness ornaments (nos. 27–29). Settings for the decorative disks worked of thin sheets of silver are now lost, as evidenced by two repair holes on one of the pieces (no. 27). The new rivets hammered through the silver undoubtedly replace an older arrangement for attaching the medallion that was part of the lost setting.

Since early Hellenistic times, small silver or bronze disks decorated with heads or busts had often served as ornaments for the crossed harness bands on a horse's head. Medallions of this type are also to be found on couches, or klinai, and sarcophagi, but such use can be discounted for the examples under discussion since the eyes on the back needed for attaching them to the harness can be reconstructed. The two holes to the right of the woman's head on the one example (no. 27) allow for two different possible reconstructions of the way the disks were attached. One possibility is that, given the small space between the rivets, there were two small eyes through which one thicker cord could be pulled. Since the medallion would have twisted if fastened to only one cord, we must assume that—similar to the phalerae—there was a third eye for securing the medallion. This solution is on the whole unsatisfactory, however, since it would imply the use of cords instead of straps.

More likely is the use of a single, large loop placed crosswise on the disk, which would mean that the strap ran vertically through the loop. Whether the loop was large enough so that both straps could be inserted at a cross point or whether the ornamental disks were only attached to the strap that ran along the horse's head cannot be decided. In any case, the female heads that decorate the medallions were correctly oriented by the natural position of the horse's head. We can assume for reasons of symmetry that there was at least one and possibly even three more examples for a complete set of four or six (figs. 8, 10).

Up to now, decorative harness medallions with heads or busts have not been documented before early Hellenistic times, although this may be simply a matter of chance. Examples have been found in South Russia, in Elis in the Peloponnes, in Tarentum, and also in Ptolemaic Egypt. The Getty medallions make it possible to trace this particular type of ornament in the Hellenistic Near East.

In spite of the modest quality of the pieces, it is possible to determine that they were made by different craftsmen, drawing on the evidence of certain artistic misunderstandings. One of the pieces, for example, depicts a bust with a sketchily portrayed himation pulled over the shoulders (no. 27); on the second there is no indication of drapery (no. 29), and finally there is no bust at all on the last example (no. 28). Although these differences may not be regarded as conclusive arguments for different hands, the misunderstandings evident in the execution of the earrings do establish the point with certainty. One example depicts disk earrings with long, pyramid-shaped pendants (no. 27). The hair hanging down on the neck is clearly distinguished from the jewelry. On the other two medallions, the pyramidal pendants have been misunderstood as curls (no. 29) or have been entirely omitted (no. 28). The original Greek earring type was familiar to only one silversmith, or he at least copied faithfully what he found on his model. The division of labor observed for
the large phalerae can also be inferred here for the medallions.\textsuperscript{182}

The earrings permit us to establish a terminus post quem for the original of the Getty medallion. The pendant pyramids with the point hanging downward are surprisingly long in comparison with the size of the disk, much longer than on examples from the fourth century B.C.\textsuperscript{183} If the silversmith of no. 27 produced a faithful copy, then the original itself can scarcely be dated earlier than the middle of the third century B.C. Consequently, as in the case of the prometopidion (no. 26), these harness ornaments cannot be dated earlier than the later third century. As representations of prometopidia like that in Malibu show, this type was used along with small ornamental disks or medallions (figs. 8, 10). Because the prometopidion and the ornamental disks were acquired at the same time, we may conclude that the pieces originally belonged together.

**HORSE TRAPPINGS: SUMMARY**

Before we turn to the other groups of objects in treasure I, we should look once again briefly at the cultural and historical significance of the trappings as a whole. As the phalerae show, their former owners were in all likelihood Parthians. The representations of attacking animals on the phalerae are based on Greek compositions with a few, clear elements of the animal style and with reflections of Achaemenid details. The ties to central Asia are also more marked here than are the parallels to the west Scythian area.

The classification of these pieces has been confirmed by the prometopidion of a Hellenistic-Seleucid type, which shows on the one hand a sphinx in Achaemenid style and on the other hand the scene of the eagle attacking a stag, a typical central Asian motif. The siren in the center is based on an original of the fifth century.

Only an area under Seleucid as well as under nomadic central Asian influence can be regarded as the place of origin for the horse trappings. The area that most closely fulfills these conditions is northwest Iran (the former satrapies of Parthia and Hycania), which was occupied by the Parthians in the decade between 240 and 230 B.C.\textsuperscript{184} In the course of the second century, the entire area of western Iran came under Parthian domination. The analysis of the silver vessels in treasure I will provide further confirmation for this attribution.
very closely related to that in Malibu—not only in the hieratic frontality of the bust but in the vertical folds of the cloak and chiton and even in the depiction of a wide border on the latter. We can assume that the rhyton is closely based on a Near Eastern original, if it is not to be regarded as an import. The detail of the cloak pulled up over the head and then falling over the shoulders can be documented moreover for the Syro-Mesopotamian region on terracottas as well as on reliefs between the second century B.C. and Imperial times.

The hairstyle with the hair first laid horizontally across the forehead and then pulled back on the sides is unmistakably related to the hairstyles on the Great Frieze from Pergamon.

The small silver bust should consequently be dated to the second century B.C.

DECORATED VESSELS

The metal vessels of treasure I are of several different types, but they are all worked without a foot and without a base ring. With the exception of a small bowl with one handle (no. 19), three deep conical bowls (nos. 22–24), and two small unadorned bowls (nos. 20, 21), the vessels are of the widely distributed calotte type with decorated interiors. Only no. 1 has a small ornamental frieze on the exterior.

The shallow profile of the vessels is already known from pre-Hellenistic times, and it must be regarded as Near Eastern in origin in spite of its wide distribution in the Hellenistic world. Besides pre-Achaemenid examples, reference can be made to vessels from Achaemenid and Hellenistic Iran. In comparison to the often richly decorated Hellenistic bowls, these ancestors are frequently decorated only in the interior. In Hellenistic times we often find a small ornamental medallion in the center framed by tendril friezes or other decorative zones at varying intervals. Although vessels with leaf calyces in the centers are already known from pre-Hellenistic times, they vary considerably in details from their younger counterparts.
Although similar bowls are known from Magna Graecia (fig. 16)\textsuperscript{203} as well as from Ptolemaic Egypt,\textsuperscript{204} the Malibu bowls with their tendril decorations form a special group with several scattered pieces for which an Iranian provenance is usually cited. A bowl in private possession in Switzerland (fig. 17A-B)\textsuperscript{205} bears the emblem of the anchor and dolphin found on the Getty phialai. As is the case with a bowl in Hamburg (fig. 18), the piece is supposed to have come from Luristan in southwest Iran.\textsuperscript{206} The pair was reportedly found with a bowl that is now in private possession in Germany. The latter shows a mounted Parthian in a medallion framed by a scroll.\textsuperscript{207} The horse is wearing large phalerae of the type already discussed. Another bowl in the British Museum is also supposed to have an Iranian provenance (fig. 19).\textsuperscript{208} Here we can also mention a silver bowl in Boston,\textsuperscript{209} which is a companion piece to no. 10 in the Getty collection. The Iranian provenance is again corroborated by the Greek inscription beneath the rim, giving the Iranian name Artaxesas, most likely the owner.

In that connection, two almost undecorated bowls should be added, which were allegedly found in Mazandaran.\textsuperscript{210} The shallow profiles immediately resemble the shape of the Getty bowls and even the guilloche beneath the rim finds a parallel on no. 5.

\textbf{FIGURE 16.} Silver bowl from Magna Graecia, late third or early second century B.C. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 1981.11.19.

The attribution of the whole group to the Parthian, formerly Seleucid area is also confirmed by the Aramaic weight inscriptions on some of the bowls (nos. 2, 13, 14, 15) and by narrow bands of stepped embattlements (nos. 4, 6, 7, 9–11), an ornament that has its roots in Achaemenid architectural tradition.\textsuperscript{211}

\textbf{FIGURE 17A.} Silver bowl, reported to be from Luristan, late second or early first century B.C. Switzerland, private collection.

\textbf{FIGURE 17B.} Detail of figure 17A.
ANCHOR AND DOLPHIN: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The center decoration or medallion on the Malibu bowls is either a feather scale ornament (nos. 1–3, 9–12) or a small leaf calyx (nos. 4–8). In addition, three of the bowls bear the motif of an inverted anchor with a dolphin curled around it on feather scale medallions (nos. 1–3, fig. 20A–C). Although the calyx is very frequently used on Hellenistic bowls as a central ornament, the motif of the anchor with dolphin is rare and must not be confused with the motif of the dolphin and trident. Apart from the Getty bowls, among the few examples of this motif known to me is a bowl in private possession said to be from Luristan (figs. 17A–B, 20D), a few coins from Susa from the late second century B.C., minted under the Parthian king Mithridates II (123/2–92/1), as well as coins issued by the Indo-Greek king Nikias in the first century B.C. (fig. 21C). In addition, there are four representations on Delian mosaics from the second half of the second century B.C. (fig. 21D). At least one of these pavements is from a house that was owned by a Syrian. Of no relevance to our anchor and dolphin medallions, however, is a coin issued in Alexandria under Domitian and the use of a related motif in an early Christian context.

Although our monuments are scattered from the Aegean to Pakistan, they cover a surprisingly short period of time. The Delian mosaics date from the second half of the second or the earliest years of the first century B.C. at the latest, roughly the same time as the reign of Mithridates II. Finally the Indo-Greek king Nikias struck his coins in the seventies of the first century B.C. It is tempting to assign the silver bowls to the same period, but it will be demonstrated that they belong to different groups.

The orientation of the fish on the bowls shows that the anchor is depicted inverted, just as it is on numerous Seleucid coins. The inverted anchor is used on the Indo-Greek coins mentioned, and it recurs on the coins struck for Mithridates II in Susa, but not on the mosaics from Delos.

As we know, the choice of the anchor as a royal Seleucid insignia is based on the legends of the divine origins of the Seleucid dynasty’s founder: Apollo is supposed to have left the mother of Seleucus a ring with the image of an anchor as a sign of his fatherhood. A great many representations of anchors appear on the seals of Seleucid officials, on lead weights from the Seleucid realm, and especially on Seleucid coins (fig. 21A–B). The type of anchor on one of the Malibu phialai (fig. 20A) corresponds rather closely to anchors on Seleucid coins of Seleucus I (301–280 B.C.) (fig. 21A).
and on issues of the first reign of Demetrius II (146/5–144 B.C.) (fig. 21B). In contrast to the motif found on the Delian mosaics (fig. 21D), the remaining two Getty bowls (fig. 20B–C) also show the anchor with the bulging center so typical of the representations on Seleucid coinage but with a different construction of the horizontal elements above and below the anchors. The lobes attached to these horizontal elements on bowl no. 3 and on the Luristan bowl (fig. 20D) also recur on Seleucid coins. The huge hooks typical of the anchor on the Luristan vessel and bowl no. 1 are likewise represented. Even the widespread hooks on no. 2 find a rare parallel on Seleucid coins of Seleucus I. It remains to mention that the bulging center is absent on the Luristan bowl, a feature that holds true, interestingly enough, for most of the Elymaen coinage of the Kamnaskirad dynasty, struck in more or less the same region. If we sum up the evidence, it is all too obvious that while our silversmiths did not exactly copy them, they doubtlessly referred to the various types of Seleucid anchors.

In view of the cult of Apollo that was so essential to the Seleucids and which finds expression above all in their coinage, and in view of the worship of the god as Apollo Delphinios in the Greek world—particularly in Miletus, to which the Seleucids had very close ties—we could interpret the anchor with the dolphin as nothing less than a dynastic symbol: The sacred animal of the god of the Seleucid kingdom is curled protectively around the anchor, the symbol of the dynasty. Even the Delian mosaic, which was found in a household with demonstrable connections to the Syro-Phoenician world, would be consistent with a Seleucid-Syrian interpretation of the motif.

Unfortunately this Seleucid interpretation is not supported by other preserved monuments. Among the innumerable representations of anchors on Seleucid coins, clay bullae, and lead weights, there is not a single example of a dolphin curled around an anchor known to me. Consequently, there can be no doubt that this symbol was not a widely known, official dynastic emblem in the Seleucid world. On Seleucid monuments, we can cite only a few examples of representations of a small dolphin next to a large anchor, just as another official symbol of the Seleucid ruling house, a horse’s head, occasionally appears in small scale next to a huge inverted anchor.

The above mentioned coins with anchor and dolphin were struck at a time when Seleucid rule over Iran and Pakistan was nothing but past history. The use of the anchor on the Elymaen coinage certainly reflects the
nomadic-Scythian monuments as early as the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. bol that could only be understood as Seleucid seems unlikely, if the emblem did not at least offer at the same time a local interpretation. For Hellenistic Parthia the reference to the anchor could symbolize the Arsacid dynasty’s conquest of the Seleucid realm and the Parthians’ view of themselves as their legal successors.

In that case, the emblem would be more than appropriate for Parthian table silver. The use on the bronze coins minted in Elymaïs under Mithridates II could be interpreted as a special reference to the legality of Parthian-Arsacid power in this local kingdom, or the demonstrated association of the Seleuco-Kamnaskirad anchor with the Parthian dolphin could be interpreted as an expression of a special relationship between Mithridates II and the local dynasty. These assumptions are corroborated perhaps by the fact that anchor and dolphin were never again used on coins from this province.

We can only speculate about the historical background behind the anchor and dolphin motif. The basis for the development of the symbol of the Seleucid anchor and the nomadic-Parthian fish may even lie in

DECORATED VESSELS
the earliest phase of Parthian rule, when Seleucids and Parthians came in contact for the first time. In the late third century B.C., after various struggles between the Seleucids and the Parthians, Seleucus II (230 B.C.) and Antiochus III (210 B.C.) were under a contractual obligation which stipulated that the nomadic Parthians were obliged to supply military contingents to the Seleucids. However, at the same time, these contracts evidently confirmed the Arsacid possession of the former Seleucid satrapies of Parthia and Hyrcania. These contracts no doubt served a face-saving function for the Seleucids since they secured at least some recognition of their supremacy. The symbol could refer to some sort of formal alliance between the two dynasties. To determine the exact motive behind the conception of the emblem will likely never be possible. The options range from diplomatic contracts to interdynastic marriages.

Whatever the Parthian or Iranian users of our table silver saw in the emblem, the composition demonstrates a considerable amount of respect for the old dynastic symbol of the Seleucids. This attitude is perhaps paralleled in the use of Seleucid motifs on Parthian coinage. Apollo sitting on the omphalos is replaced by the Parthian archer on the omphalos, and even special symbols like the Seleucid horse figure on Parthian coins. This obvious desire for a certain continuity and the adoption or transformation of dynastic symbols grew perhaps in the long decades of coexistence between the rising Arsacid empire and the declining Seleucid realm. It seems that the new lords of the Hellenized Near East deliberately used the old symbols to proclaim themselves as legal successors.

This interpretation of the anchor and dolphin emblem also makes possible a revised explanation for the bronze coins of the Indo-Greek king Nikias in the Hydaspes region (fig. 21c). Greek rule in the northern Punjab ends with this ruler and with his contemporary Hippostratos, under the attack of the Indo-Scythians, peoples ethnically related to the Parthians. W. W. Tarn saw in the emblem a “maritime” symbol of a victory on the Hydaspes and regarded the anchor and dolphin, as did C. Picard, as a Phoenician symbol. Nevertheless, the question arises as to whether this too is not instead a conscious reference to the symbol of Partho-Greek, or rather Partho-Selucid, coexistence, giving visible expression to the last phase of balance between the nomadic intruders and an Indo-Greek sovereign.

Even if we consider the anchor and dolphin as originally a purely Seleucid emblem symbolizing the patron deity Apollo and the royal house, the dolphin’s nomadic connotation at the same time provided the possibility of a special Parthian interpretation for members of the Parthian nobility. The same would be valid for the special coin issues of Mithridates II and Nikias.

Even for the Delian representation (fig. 21d) it is hardly difficult to establish a local explanation. It is not surprising to find a symbol of seafaring in connection with an animal sacred to Apollo, which also happens to be a sea creature, in the houses of merchants living on Delos, the god’s sacred island. The explanation is undoubtedly similar to that for the trident or the rudder, objects that were occasionally also used in combination with the dolphin on the same mosaic. At the same time, the possibility that the anchor was used in the mosaics as an allusion to the Syrian origins of the owner cannot be excluded. It will not have been more than an allusion, however, since the likelihood that someone would use a dynastic symbol, or a composition that could be understood as a dynastic emblem, without hesitation for a mosaic in a private house seems rather remote, even if such use were supposed to indicate a certain loyalty or association.

In view of the Seleucid symbolism of the inverted anchor and the nomadic connotation of the fish, especially the dolphin, this emblem on Near Eastern coins and silverware can be understood as reflecting the shift of power from Hellenistic or local dynasties to nomadic central Asian conquerors. These conquerors considered themselves the legal successors of the Greeks, proclaiming themselves friends of the Greeks and placing a high value on Greek culture.

THE TENDRIL DECORATIONS

Besides the calyx systems in the centers of bowls nos. 4–7, the flower tendrils on vessels nos. 1, 8–11, and 13–16 form the other main decorative element of the Malibu silver. To facilitate an overall view of the varying details, the individual flowers and other elements of the tendrils have been assembled in a single chart (see p. 244). Other characteristics such as the profiles of the vessels, the use of small friezes of stepped embattlements, or the existence of inscriptions on some of the bowls are likewise incorporated. In addition to the Getty bowls, the chart includes bowls in other museums, in private collections, or from the art market.

The composition of the small source calyxes of the tendrils, the forms of the tendril ends, and the various flower types suggest an attribution of the Getty silver to three different groups. These groupings are corroborated independently by decorative elements like the crenelated friezes of embattlements, the profiles of the
bowls, or the use of Aramaic inscriptions—the latter almost exclusively confined to the third group.

There can be little doubt that the differences in concept, style, and execution of the individual bowls document different artistic workshop traditions. The archaeological interpretation of these groups, however, is open to question. Are the groups representative of different artistic provinces? Different but contemporaneous? Are they simply evidence of different artists, active at the same time in one single cultural area? Or do the decorations illustrate a real development in style and details, and is their significance consequently chronological? At least at the moment, these questions cannot be answered with certainty given our very limited knowledge of the Hellenized Near East.

On the other hand, the floral elements of the decorations link the first group almost certainly to early Hellenistic traditions, whereas the third group is dated by the Aramaic weight inscriptions not earlier than the first century B.C. Consequently, I prefer an expanded interpretation not only in terms of workshops but in terms of absolute chronology as well. In view of the insecure provenance of the vessels and on the evidence of retardataire tendencies in the Hellenized Near East that have been documented in the figurai decorations on the horse trappings, I prefer to suggest rather broad limits of time for the individual bowls.

All of the vessels with scroll decoration at the Getty Museum (nos. 1, 8–11, 13–16) bear floral scrolls, which found their way into Hellenistic art by way of the Macedonian repertoire at the time of Alexander the Great, a decorative repertoire that shows strong South Italian influences. Typical of these floral tendrils is the substitution of blossoms on winding stems for the originally undecorated volutes of the late Classical Greek scroll. In this study the terms “tendril” and “scroll” are used interchangeably.

In contrast to the conventions usually observed for pure floral tendrils, there are also tiny spirals on a number of the Getty bowls. Although the spirals are not as important as the large spiral volutes of Italian spiral volute scrolls, they nevertheless represent the adoption of a detail that was originally alien to the ornamental repertoire. The first signs of the development of such scrolls are found in the fourth century B.C., but most of these ornaments date only from the earlier Hellenistic period. As a rule, the flower scrolls as well as the Italian spiral volute tendrils from Magna Graecia were “companion” scrolls—that is, the shoot that is necessary to fill an oscillation of the main tendril does not originate in an acanthus knot at the vertex of the oscillation but develops earlier and accompanies the main body of the tendril before ending in a flower or a volute (fig. 22).

If we compare Macedonian and other eastern versions of South Italian tendrils in the late fourth and early third centuries B.C., it is immediately obvious that the feature of the companion scroll was scarcely ever adopted, although it was occasionally used even in Hellenized central Asia. Sometimes the two compositional principles have been joined, resulting in a mixed system, as can be seen from the Italianizing scrolls from the middle of the third century on the sarcophagus from Anapa in the Bosporan kingdom (fig. 23). Some of

---

**FIGURE 22A, B.** South Italian “companion scroll systems” of the late fourth century B.C. A: flower tendril (amphora, Naples, Museo Nazionale H 3219). B: spiral volute tendril (plate, Ruvo, Museo Jatta 1613). Drawings by Tim Seymour after the author.
the shoots have been developed in the companion system, others follow the conventional tradition of Greek decorations.

The traditional Greek form was used for a number of the later pieces among the Getty bowls (nos. 11, 13–16). To these vessels can be added the plate with the representation of a mounted Parthian mentioned previously. The almost pure form of the companion tendril is found on bowl no. 1 with the anchor and dolphin. To this example can be added the bowl in Hamburg (fig. 18) and the one in a Swiss private collection (fig. 17A–B), the latter bearing again the anchor and dolphin.

One phiale (no. 9) is ornamented in a fashion that completely abandons the compositional principle of Classical tendrils (see fig. 22). The stems of the blossoms first develop forward and then curl back. From a typological view, an earlier stage of this motif is represented by another Getty bowl (no. 10) and its companion piece in Boston on which this feature is to be observed in some sections of the scrolls. Finally, we can cite a bowl at the British Museum with a mixed scroll of the type already described (fig. 19). The difference between these tendrils and floral scrolls of the late fourth and early third centuries B.C. could indicate that such an early dating for the Malibu vessels can be excluded but an absolute date cannot be established on the basis of the system of tendrils alone, since once these systems became established in the repertoire they proved to be very long-lived. However, the use of the floral scroll does point to an artistic province under Macedonian influence since these forms seem to have spread along with Macedonian expansion.

The scroll system as a whole is less relevant chronologically than details such as the form of the acanthus calyx at the beginning of the scroll or the way the scroll ends. For the development and relative dating of these forms, see the chart on page 244. In the discussion that follows, references to this chart appear as parenthetical citations giving the number/s of the flower type/s.

In the early group, the scrolls have been developed from acanthus calyces that are almost late Classical or early Hellenistic in appearance (nos. 1, 10). The bowl in Boston is closely related. The leaves on the sides of the calyx are shown in profile, a detail known from as early as the late fourth century B.C., as is the center leaf in frontal position with the bent tip (fig. 24). Even the peculiarity of no. 1 in showing the bent tip of the acanthus leaf with a smooth instead of a serrate edge is already known from the Macedonian repertoire of the late fourth century B.C. On the bowls the calyx now fills the entire height of the frieze, a feature that is typical for almost all of the bowls in treasure I and other related pieces. Worth noting is the greater animation of the center leaf of the acanthus calyx in comparison with earlier examples.

The scrolls terminate in entwined flower stems on the companion bowls in Malibu (no. 10) and Boston, a motif that was already known in late Classical times. In the case of bowl no. 1, the scroll ends with small shoots. Italian and Macedonian parallels from late Classical and early Hellenistic times offer at least similar solutions. The ties to the early Hellenistic repertoire suggest a relatively early dating.

The anchor and dolphin emblem in the interior of no. 1 might suggest a date not earlier than the second century. At the moment, the group cannot be defined within close limits of time. The ties to the early Hellenistic repertoire and the lack of later details that define the middle and the late groups point to an earlier dating; consequently an attribution to the second century seems justified. A date in the earlier decades of the second, even in the later years of the third century, seems possible and primarily the emblem with anchor and dolphin can be used to corroborate an attribution to the second century.

In the middle group, both the central calyx and the ends of the tendrils have been modified (nos. 9, 11). The calyx now shows an ornamental form with a horizontal, continuous acanthus leaf with a beaded rib. Behind that there is a small, stiff, upright leaf with a straight
edge. It is framed by two short rolled tendrils of a form that might already have ancestors in the early third century B.C. In contrast to the late Classical and early Hellenistic system, the ends of the scrolls take on the form of long, narrow, entwined acanthus leaves.

To this group should be assigned the bowl in Switzerland (fig. 17A–B), an unpublished vessel in the London art market, and as a variant the bowl in Hamburg (fig. 18). The two Getty bowls vary so greatly in execution that the possibility of a common workshop can be excluded. What we are dealing with is a common repertoire concerning some decisive elements of the tendrils. The bowl with the irregular tendril (no. 9) corresponds with the Swiss phiale in the form of the calyx, but the end of the tendril still follows the convention of the related bowls in Malibu (no. 10) and Boston even though a different flower has been used. The tendril on bowl no. 9 further develops the features observed on no. 10 and on the other member of the pair. Number 11 also belongs to the same stage of development as the Swiss bowl, although it is definitely not by the same hand.

The chronological framework provided by the anchor and dolphin emblem offers only a vague dating. We have to place the middle group earlier than the third one, which can be dated to the first century B.C. A date between the first and the third group in the late second or the early first century seems appropriate.

A few other bowls with a somewhat different scroll decoration also fit into the scheme developed here. The first of them is the bowl in Hamburg (fig. 18), which was supposedly found with the bowl now in Switzerland (fig. 17A–B). The ends of the tendrils, formed of long acanthus leaves, confirm the relationship of both bowls. The source calyx of the Hamburg bowl, however, is quite different. The small, stiff central palmette has a surprising parallel on a calyx cup from Santisteban del Puerto in Spain, which was buried around 100 B.C. (fig. 23). An almost identical palmette can be found on a pebble mosaic in Ai Khanoum in Bactria. The use of this type of palmette was obviously widespread. The details point to a date in the middle or in the second half of the second century B.C. and demonstrate the internationality of the decorative elements.

The bowl at the British Museum (fig. 19) belongs to the context of the early and the middle group of treasure I and has a surprisingly stiff central calyx. The early Hellenistic echoes of the scroll ends confirm the attribution of the bowl, while the blossoms may testify to a different workshop tradition. A date in the later second or earlier first century seems to be an adequate suggestion.

In the late group the tendrils all rise from high acanthus calyces totally different from those of the earlier groups. The middle leaves have been directly developed from the central veins of the lateral leaves. The ends of the tendrils, however, follow the scheme that is set up in the middle group (see chart, p. 244). In one case a wide slit under the middle leaf even recalls early Palmyrene ornaments (no. 13), but a similar calyx has already been found on a tabletop in one of the ruined houses of Pella, which was sacked in the year 168 B.C. The development of interrelated central ribs into a three-leaf calyx is known on some pieces from late Classical times and is therefore nothing essentially new (fig. 26). The form of the calyx is nevertheless a new development in relation to the ornaments discussed here.

In addition, the tendrils of the latest group all have large, pointed shoots or ovaries emerging from the small acanthus knots on the main bodies of the scrolls (nos. 13–16). The feature is especially pronounced on two bowls (nos. 13, 14) and is occasionally to be found on earlier examples as well (nos. 1, 9, 10), but it is not documented in so marked a form and so often. The roots can be traced back to Classical scrolls, and the feature, though of infinitely better quality, occurs on the well-known phialai of the second century from Cività Castellana (fig. 27).

The shape of the bowls from group three is deeper than in the earlier groups. According to its profile, one
bowl with an anchor and dolphin emblem has to be attributed to the third group (no. 2).

The dating in the first century B.C. is given by the Aramaic inscriptions on four bowls (nos. 2, 13, 14, 15). According to R. Degen, bowl no. 14, like the lynx rhyta in treasure II, was signed by a silversmith with an Iranian name (see discussion on page 48). The trefoil frieze used on bowl no. 2 can be found on another damaged silver bowl with an Aramaic weight inscription of the first century B.C. (no. 17) that might be contemporaneous. The slender acanthus leaves at the end of the tendrils are attested in the late first century B.C. or early first century A.D. on the stag rhyton in Malibu (no. 74).

There can be no doubt that these four bowls (nos. 13–16) stem from a different workshop tradition since the stepped Achaemenid friezes of embattlements and the cruciform blossoms typical for other examples are lacking here (types 2, 3, 38). It is also characteristic that the acanthus calyces of the tendrils are always oriented toward the center of the vessel, in contrast to the opposite orientation in the earlier groups. Finally, none of these bowls with tendril decorations bears a central medallion. In this respect, the bowl with an anchor and a dolphin medallion (no. 2) represents an exception whose deeper shape and Aramaic inscription link it to the third group.

In our present stage of knowledge we should avoid setting too precise chronological limits. On the basis of the fairly well-founded dating of the third group in the first century B.C. or in the early first century of the Christian era at the latest, we should place the earliest group in the second, and the middle group in the late second or early first century B.C., still leaving the option that the earliest group could be confined to the first half of the second or even the later decades of the third century at the earliest.

FLORAL TENDRILS WITH IVY AND GRAPE LEAVES

Several details of the decorations, such as the central calyces in the medallions, cannot be analyzed by way of the general composition of the tendril arrangement. Consequently, in this and the following sections we will focus on the other elements of the decorative systems.

One damaged bowl with a tendril ornament of very modest workmanship can be assigned roughly to the first century B.C. on the basis of its central calyx (no. 8). Since there is no source calyx for the tendril, the decoration provides an example of the type of the infinite scroll. These systems are represented several times in the Hellenistic period—for example, on the phalerae from Fedulovo (fig. 3). The frequent use of ivy leaves in the scroll ornament is worth noting. Although ivy and grape vines are used during Classical times in their own scroll systems, they appear in exceptional instances
in other tendril systems apparently not earlier than the third century B.C. As far as I know, there are no examples of early floral scrolls with grape or ivy leaves.

Isolated ivy leaves and grapes are missing completely on the examples from the latest group (types 24, 44). The fact that these pieces stem from a variant-form tradition is documented by this feature as well (nos. 13–16).

The combination of ivy with flower buds, which is to be found on bowl no. 8, is represented on a bracelet from Syria that was discovered along with coins that can be dated no later than 128 B.C., but the central calyx of bowl no. 8 speaks strongly in favor of a first-century date.

SELEUCID ACANTHUS

A glance at the decoration on the bowls shows that, with a single exception (no. 15), the usual serrate Greek acanthus was not used here. Instead we find acanthus with rounded “serrations,” which, on examples of higher quality, are ordered in groups of three or four, analogous to the pointed serrations of Greek varieties. The use of rounded serrations on acanthus leaves also has late Classical ancestors and early Hellenistic prototypes, like the motif on the gold larnax from the “tomb of Philip” in Aigai (Vergina) (fig. 24). It is especially typical of bowls in treasure I and returns on the lion rhyton of treasure II (no. 66).

This Seleucid acanthus type is to be found as well on the masterly bowl from Cività Castellana (fig. 27). Variants with only slightly pointed serrations are to be found in the Bactrian architectural ornament from Ai Khanoum. Echoes of the Seleucid variety can be documented on a cup from treasure II and among the finds in treasure IV (nos. 67, 76). In the West, this kind of acanthus leaf, so popular in the eastern repertoire, is little known. Even the buildings erected during the time of Antiochus IV in Miletus and Athens used the pointed, thorny acanthus, which is also to be documented in the Near East (nos. 75, 76).

THE BLOSSOM REPERTOIRE

The limits of this study prohibit an extended survey of Hellenistic flower forms. This limitation is recommended as well by the sometimes mediocre quality of workmanship of the pieces under discussion. The following analysis adds little to the question of absolute chronology, because many of the blossoms follow simple types already known in the early Hellenistic repertoire and frequently used in the following centuries. In addition, the frequent misunderstandings of Classical and Hellenistic blossom forms that are to be found even on the best examples sometimes permit only a very general determination of the blossom type intended. More important, however, is the distribution of blossom types within the three groups of treasure I. As the analysis will show, group three again follows a somewhat different tradition and can be separated from the earlier vessels.

As the chart on page 244 demonstrates, some of

FIGURE 27. Silver bowl from Cività Castellana, late second century B.C. Naples, Museo Archeologico 35285.

The forms are but vaguely related to others. In general, the chart shows that most of the vessels stem from different hands and in no way reflect a homogeneous repertoire or the production of a single atelier.

As far as similarities allowed, the flowers on the bowls from treasures II and III (nos. 66–68, 72) and from the stag rhyton (no. 74) have been included in the chart. As a superficial examination reveals, we are again dealing with different traditions and only in the case of three bowls (nos. 68, 72, 8) can we trace a very close similarity (type 46). If we try to put this in a more general perspective, it becomes obvious that the eastern Hellenized world was divided into a considerable number of workshop traditions, many of them linked in a retardataire way to the inherited early Hellenistic decorations. Other vessels, such as the pentagonal bowl (no. 72), reveal a repertoire that is connected with earlier forms only in a very few details and stands for a new Hellenistic tradition. Only in cases like this do the flowers offer some clues concerning absolute chronology.

LEAF CALYX BLOSSOMS

Two types of blossoms made up of several individual leaves can be distinguished. The first are the Seleucid cruciform blossoms (type 2, 3).

The flowers on the Getty bowls with their long, schematized leaves widening toward the tips can be explained by reference to a floral tradition that already existed in Achaemenid times (fig. 28). This tradition, which flourished especially in Hellenistic decorations and even on a larger scale as an ornamental system on silver bowls (see fig. 30 and no. 72), can still be traced centuries later on mosaics from Imperial Antioch. The use of serrate leaf ends (nos. 5, 72, 74) may be drawn from a tradition that already existed in the fourth century and was fairly widespread in the third century B.C.

Types 2 and 3 are entirely absent in group three of treasure I but occur not only on the net pattern bowl from treasure III (no. 72), but in a very complex variety combined with a bud on the stag rhyton (no. 74; type 38). Although the general type can be compared, the cruciferous blossoms can be divided into several varieties. We can only state that the type seems to have been typical for many workshops in the Hellenized Near Eastern world. The idea—of combining the crosslike flower with small rounded foliage—might have been drawn from blossoms with long, narrow leaves interspersed with small rounded foliage, which are already known in the Thraco-Macedonian repertoire from the end of the fourth century B.C. (fig. 28A).

We find blossoms, however, similar to this Macedonian variety on the pair of bowls in Boston and Malibu (no. 10; type 17), where the blossoms have broad, rounded leaf petals with narrow, pointed leaf petals standing upright in the interstices. Similar conceptions are repeated on other bowls (nos. 1, 11, 15; types 47–49), although the leaves in the background are sometimes more rounded. It could be that the inspiration for this flower form, which was used widely in Hellenistic times, is to be sought in late Classical blossoms with broad leaves and narrow tips in between.

In the Hellenistic period examples are to be found on a metal bowl from Vani in Georgia and from treasure IV (no. 76). Analogous compositions can even be traced among the early Imperial decorations at Petra (fig. 29).

At least two variants are identifiable among these
blossoms. On pieces from the middle and early group of bowls, narrow leaves have sometimes broad rounded lower ends (type 17). These almond-shaped, schematized leaves call to mind the oriental bowls with an umbo and the vessel medallions that developed from them. Perhaps the Achaemenid form originally inspired this ornament, which would also explain the schematized character of the blossoms.

The silver bowl from Vani in Georgia differs somewhat in the formation of the narrow leaves, but the row of beads on the upper edge of the broad leaf petals of the flowers is closely related to the decoration on one of the Malibu phialai (no. 10; type 47). Similar is the blossom on bowl no. 15. The narrow leaves have lost their schematized form completely and now bear beaded center ribs. They no longer function as mere interspersed tips, but are now real petals. The resulting composition corresponds to the large calyx on a first-century B.C. cup (no. 75) from treasure IV. A similar calyx composition is to be seen a little later on the metopes of the Qasr in Petra.

A motif represented in all of the groups of treasure I is a leaf calyx blossom made up of three ivy leaves, a composition unknown in Classical times (type 45). On two of the bowls of the third group the individual leaves are bent slightly to the side, although there are no overlapping tips (nos. 15, 16). The greater flexibility of composition is possibly to be seen in relation to the typical Hellenistic calyces with leaves bent to the side (see fig. 43).

The three-leaf compositions are abandoned in favor of a four-petaled variety on the pentagonal bowl from treasure III (no. 72; type 45). The idea of four leaves has already been used for the central calyx of bowl no. 4. This might point to a later classification of this bowl, but at present I am reluctant to accept the four-leaf scheme as a sufficient clue toward a late date.

ROSETTES AND PENTAFOLIATE BLOSSOMS

The rosette is related to the leaf calyx blossoms insofar as the rosette is actually the simplest form of small leaf calyx (types 52–64). There are examples with five to more than ten leaves on the bowls in treasures I, II, and III. Although the numerous rosettes on the latest bowls (nos. 13–16) are sometimes very sketchily engraved, they are often characterized as small leaf calyces by central beaded ribs or veining. It is not necessary to dwell on the simplest forms with rounded leaves. A precursor of the variant with a broad, retracted tip (types 54–57) is already to be found in red-figured vase painting in South Italy. The same is true of the occasional depiction of leaf veins. A closer examination of the chart shows that the rosette blossom is represented above all in the third and latest group of bowls and on bowls from treasures II and III, which date in the first century B.C. The design also appears on the likewise late stag rhyton (no. 74).

Among these blossoms there are an unexpectedly large number of pentafoliate examples. Even in the leaf calyx center of a bowl there is a precisely worked five-petal rosette (no. 5; type 56). Such rosettes are occasionally to be found in Classical times as well, but the surprising number of five-petal examples on our limited number of pieces can hardly be a matter of chance, and in fact we do find large numbers of pentafoliate blossom rosettes in the Hellenized East, even in Taxila, and even on Gandharan sculpture. The same applies to treasure IV (no. 76).

Five-petaled central rosettes are also to be found on a silver bowl from the Nihavend Treasure and on a related bowl in Toledo (fig. 30). Another pentafoliate rosette appears on a shallow bowl from the Nihavend Treasure (fig. 31). From the eastern Mediterranean, we can also mention a bronze spoon from Tel Anata in Israel. Numerous blossoms on the Seleucid Civitā Castellana bowl were conceived on a pentagonal base and architectural decorations from the temple of the lion griffins at Petra can be added here as well (fig. 32).
FIGURE 30. Silver bowl, second century B.C. Toledo, Museum of Art 76.15.

As shown by rosettes of the first century B.C. or A.D. from Tillya-tepe in Afghanistan,325 on a glass balsamarium,326 and on a coin from Rhodes,327 the leaves of this period are often depicted as overlapping, a feature that gives the flowers a greater plasticity. This detail also provides the chronological framework for a dating of a silver bowl from treasure IV (no. 76) and examples from treasure III (nos. 69, 70). The same can be recognized on the stag rhyton (no. 74) as well as on the phiale from Nihavend in Iran. How this motif spread, though, remains unanswered. Despite the large number of pentafo1iate rosettes in the latest group in treasure I, examples with overlapping leaves are lacking, but they occur on bowl no. 72. On the basis of the inscriptions, however, the bowls must be dated in the first century B.C. Again we are dealing with different traditions.

If we take the statistics at face value, the use of the pentafo1iate type in the Near Eastern repertoire begins in scattered cases in the second century and increases significantly in the first century B.C. The distribution of this particular trend was thus hindered just as little by the expansion of the Parthian Empire as it was in the Afghan-Pakistani area by the collapse of the Indo-Greek world.

BUD FORMS

Two basic bud forms can be distinguished on the bowls, and both of them have their origins in late Classical times (types 25–40). Buds are part of the ornamental repertoire in all the artistic provinces under Greek influence in the fourth century B.C.328 As on numerous pieces in treasure I (types 25–31), Classical examples emerge from a calyx depicted from the side and made up either of acanthus leaves or of smooth-edged foliage. Some of the buds on bowl no. 4 (type 28) are closely related to the much older flowers on a wooden sarcophagus of the middle of the third century B.C. from Anapa in South Russia (fig. 23).329 On a number of examples, two small side shoots develop from the main calyx of the flower in addition to the long buds (nos. 4, 8–11; types 29, 30), a detail that is related to the more elaborate bud forms (type 32). The simple type is confined to the late and middle groups of treasure I.

The calyces of the more elaborate forms are shown from the top, and the bud is given as if growing out of a second blossom (types 32–34). The stag rhyton depicts even more elaborate versions of this type (no. 74; types 35–38). The fact that this motif developed from the Italian multitiered blossom scheme is demonstrated not least by the small framing shoots or leaves that are clearly distinguished from the rounder leaves of the calyx (nos. 1, 4, 5; type 33).330 The early Hellenistic, multitiered blossom compositions on which they are based are preserved for example on embroidered textiles from the "tomb of Philip" in Vergina331 and on a silver kylix in the Louvre (fig. 26).332 The multitiered composition on the gold larnax from the late fourth century, found in the Philip tomb, is more abstract (fig. 24). Only the edge of the lower blossoms remains. This conception without small
framing shoots is retained until at least into the first century B.C. In the East it is documented not only on three of the late bowls in Malibu (nos. 13, 14, 16; types 33–34) but also on an architectural decoration from Ai Khanoum in Afghanistan.

The repertoire of types from the late fourth and early third centuries B.C. underwent several modifications during the Hellenistic period. The bud can thus be either straight or bent; sometimes it is depicted with the leaf petals at the tip completely closed, and on bowl no. 1 and on the London bowl (fig. 19; type 33), it takes on the form of a turned shoot, a detail that is already to be found on the scroll of the goblet previously mentioned (fig. 25) and was consequently known in the second century.

In addition, we can also sometimes observe the reduction of the number of leaf petals in the calyx of the multiterated compositions to three hanging petals during the second and first centuries B.C. The calyx is also frequently shown with nymphaea-like leaves with retracted tips, a feature that is found only once among the latest group of silver pieces of treasure I (no. 14; type 34).

Finally, in an interesting reinterpretation of two buds, on bowl no. 14 (type 33) the stalk grows into the tip of the bud and not into the lower calyx. This could simply be regarded as a misunderstanding but the buds on this phiale also are shown in their canonical form. There is another example of the “misunderstood” flower type on a tendril decoration of high quality from the first third of the first century A.D. on the temple of lion-griffins at Petra (fig. 33). We are dealing here possibly with a late Near Eastern variant of the bud motif. At the same time, this correspondence provides another clue toward a late dating of the third group of bowls, and it confirms certain relations between the scrolls in Petra and Seleucid ornamental tradition.

OTHER BLOSSOM FORMS

Some other types require only a few short remarks. One blossom on the London bowl (fig. 19; type 31) may be related to an early Hellenistic type of araza and a thick bud form may be likewise seen in the context of late Classical formal traditions (type 30). Blossoms that have only one pointed leaf petal emerging from an acanthus calyx (type 15) find remote parallels in Italian decorations.

For other stylized flower forms such as types 12 and 13, definite ancestors can hardly be cited. The flower on bowl no. 11 (type 13) almost resembles a grape leaf on one of the ivory rhyta from Nisa, but similar forms can be cited in the Italianizing decorations of the sarcophagus from Anapa (fig. 23). That means, however, that the type escapes closer classification.
Another blossom represents a bud emerging from a leaf case (no. 9; type 39). Some of the earliest witnesses to blossoms of this kind are again to be found in the tendrils of the sarcophagus from Anapa (fig. 23) and on a wooden Ptolemaic sarcophagus that demonstrates close ties to Italian decorations; consequently we find parallels on an Etruscan temple, and finally on a bowl from Magna Graecia at the Metropolitan Museum in New York (fig. 16). This means that the “originals” of those decorations go back to the third century.

Other blossoms from the third group of bowls from treasure I (nos. 13, 14; type 41) can be provisionally compared with acanthus blossoms on the phalerae from Fedulovo (fig. 3). Some examples are also known only from a few pieces. A variant of a palmette with an outsized centerleaf (no. 5; type 5) could have been derived from a blossom like that in a scroll on a kylix in Paris (fig. 26).

The precursors of the arazea variant with a long, curved budlike shoot on the Swiss bowl (fig. 17A; type 33) are also to be found on the Anapa sarcophagus (fig. 23) as well as in a Pergamene ornament of the late third or early second century B.C. In contrast to earlier examples, the plate no longer shows the shoot in the form of a bud. The bowl should belong to group two from treasure I and should date to the late second or early first century.

The introduction of ivy (type 44) and grape leaves (type 22) into normal scroll ornament has already been mentioned. Finally, we should refer to the blossoms with serrate leaves that form the scroll ends on bowl no. 9 (type 22). These are very close to flowers that are to be used on an Etruscan mirror of the third century B.C. Even the overlapping at the end of the scroll is analogously formed. Again the decoration on the Getty bowl is considerably later, but the form of the flower might serve to document the dependence not only of the blossom scroll system but also of many flower types on the Hellenizing Macedonian repertoire.

**FLORAL ORNAMENTS: SUMMARY**

The outline provided here makes it possible to draw some conclusions about the repertoires of the different workshops. We are definitely not dealing with products from but one or two ateliers. Notwithstanding some similarities in the choice of details, even a comparison with the decorations from treasures II and III reveals only a few close parallels.

On the basis of the tendril system as well as on the background of the floral types, group three of treasure I can be set well apart from the other two groups. As pointed out, group one should be dated to the second, group two to the late second or earlier first, and group three to the first century B.C. Only in the case of the third group from treasure I can the flowers provide some additional corroboration of the suggested dating.

Although the parallels come from distant regions, it is conspicuous that many of the ornaments seem to be based on early Hellenistic Macedonian decorative art with its influences from Magna Graecia. From the viewpoint of the Hellenistic centers, the repertoire is definitely tardataire. The choice of flower forms also speaks unambiguously for an attribution to the Hellenized Near East in the Seleucid or formerly Seleucid sphere of influence.

**GARLAND MOTIFS**

Three garland variants are to be found on the Getty silver: the belted garland in the Classical tradition; a tightly wound garland that can be combined with the Seleucid repertoire; and, the primary focus of our discussion, the bound trefoil olive leaf garland.

Belted garlands (nos. 24, 30, 31) have their origins in Classical decoration, and the replacement of some of the belts or cuffs by a wound fillet can be documented around 300 B.C. Quite atypical for the Classical period, however, is the change in the garlands themselves—from a scale pattern, for example, to pointed leaves. The dating of this further development cannot be established at present. The use of a garland on the inside of a conical cup, as in the case of no. 24, has a parallel in a vessel that is supposed to come from Mazandaran (fig. 34), thus providing a further argument for the attribution to an eastern workshop.

**FIGURE 34. Silver cup, reported to be from Mazandaran, Iran, second century B.C. London, British Museum 134304.**

The tightly wound garland, closely wound with a fillet or taenia, is only to be found on one bowl among the silver pieces from treasure I (no. 10). The ornamental form is nevertheless to be regarded as a Seleucid-Parthian feature on metal vessels. It is used twice on vessels in the treasure from Nihavend (fig. 31) as well as on a similar bowl in Toledo (fig. 30). The variant is also represented with slight modifications on Gandharan reliefs. Since the Getty bowl belongs to the earliest group, the development of the tightly wound garlands must already have occurred in the second century B.C.

Trefoil garlands appear on several bowls in treasure I (nos. 1, 2, 17). Two of them bear the anchor and dolphin motif, one belonging to the earliest group (no. 1), the other to the late group of bowls (no. 2). The motif is represented also in treasure II (nos. 69, 70) and on the stag rhyton (no. 74).

The development of the trefoil scheme, as suggested in this study, stands in sharp contrast to the recently advanced theory that the earliest known example of this motif is to be found on a coin with the portrait of Eumenes II from Pergamon, allegedly struck around 170 B.C. Whether these earlier examples also employ olive leaves or whether they originally depicted rows of flowers is a matter of no importance for our purposes. The loosely arranged trefoil garlands of olive leaves are encountered in the middle of the third century B.C. on a Ptolemaic silver cup and a faience skyphos. Two details still distinguish this developmental stage from that of the Getty bowls: First, the three leaves are not bound together; and second, the filigree-like tendrils are not yet shown with thick buds or fruits but are simply beaded, a feature that is already found in this simple form on the late Classical bifoliate olive garlands.

Although this early Hellenistic stage is also represented on Ptolemaic faience pottery of the third century, the motif is nevertheless not exclusively Ptolemaic. Trefoil garlands without buds or fruits are even found in Etruria, and there are garlands with thick fruits from the Seleucid levels of Seleucia on the Tigris (fig. 35c). In the Seleucid realm, the lack of the bound leaf motif so popular in later centuries supports the excavators' suggested dating in the earlier third century B.C.

The first appearance of the bound trefoil known to me is on a disk fibula, from a late third-century grave in Kerch. The motif of binding represents most likely a borrowing from the repertoire of bound garlands of other types. In the early second century, the same developmental stage is represented on shield ornaments on the weapons frieze of the Athena precinct in Pergamon (fig. 36).

Three bowls (nos. 1, 2, 17) from treasure I and two bowls (nos. 69, 70) from treasure II along with the stag rhyton (no. 74) show the motif in its bound variety combined with the fine shoots bearing fruits as it is already known from Seleucia on the Tigris (fig. 35c). The monuments prove the long-lasting use of this garland and there is consequently nothing that speaks
against a dating of the earliest silver bowl (no. 1) to the second century B.C. A considerable number of Megarian bowls from Delos as well as finds from Tarsus, Antioch on the Orontes, and from the areas of Hama and Samaria confirm the striking success of this innovation. It is also witnessed by the Seleucid coins and by a large number of trefoil groups on other monuments in the Seleucid realm.

Within the Seleucid (or former Seleucid) sphere of influence, continued use of the motif as an architectural ornament, known to us from the sima decorations of Seleucia, is demonstrated by examples with much more elaborate bound trefoil compositions from Petra, Palmyra, and Baalbek. As far as I see, the use in an architectural context is not documented outside this area.

The bound variety was especially popular in the Hellenized Near East. It is still in evidence around the start of the Christian era on gold clasps and a golden pyxis from Tillya-tepe in Bactria and on Bactrian textiles in Hellenistic style from Noin Ula in Mongolia. Objects of Imperial date from the former Seleucid region must also be mentioned in this context.

In contrast only a few examples of the trefoil motif are to be found on Hadra vases from Ptolemaic Egypt and they are usually not bound, as is the case with a bronze cup from the first half of the second century in Cairo. Only in a late Hellenistic context are a few bound examples documented. The introduction of the bound trefoil version therefore took place much later than in the Seleucid sphere. The bound trefoil motif was only introduced to Greece and the western part of Asia Minor in the second century B.C. and is usually only to be found in the special variant already mentioned. The weapons frieze of the Athena precinct in Pergamon can be discounted as an argument in favor of a Pergamene origin since it depicts captured weapons. Given the popularity of the bound variety in the Hellenized East, the frieze may possibly depict weapons captured by the Attalids, probably in the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C.

The bound trefoil garland cannot be considered Macedonian either. The only example known to me from high-Hellenistic times adopts the early Hellenistic form of the ornament. Among the Megarian bowls from Delos and from Alexandria there is a bound and expanded variety with five leaves, a form also known in the Near East. It is to be found on gold-glass vessels from the Caucasus and from Iran (fig. 37).

On the basis of the objects cited here, their distribution, and their dating, we can tentatively attribute the development of the bound trefoil garland to Seleucid workshops in the second half of the third century B.C. Whether the disk fibula from the Bosporan kingdom, which is of considerable chronological importance, was a Seleucid import or local work based on outside models is a question that cannot be decided at the moment.

The olive variant is certainly not the only variety of Hellenistic trefoil decorations. Already in the middle of the third century, we can trace a tight, garlandlike species with ivy leaves on a Macedonian bracelet (fig. 3). Or on the “Rothschild goblet kantharos” with Italian ivy.

The decoration on the ivory rhyta from the Parthian capital of Nisa lies somewhere between these dense garlands and the looser type found on the Getty bowls. The examples from Nisa cannot be dated earlier than the second century B.C. An allusion to this looser type is possibly meant on some late Hadra vases, although the garlands do not depict real trefoil groups. The dense ivy variant without any binding is finally found on the lion rhyton from treasure II. The complex dates already to the first century B.C. (no. 66). Here we are again confronted with the retardataire use of an early Hellenistic decoration on a late Hellenistic Near Eastern vessel. As a lynx rhyton in New York.
demonstrates, the use of the dense ivy variety was in no way an exception in the Hellenized East. In the case of the lion rhyton, the only concession to later decorations is the taenia that holds the garland together with a huge stone-incrusted loop on the back side of the rhyton. Stone inlays are used also on the garland on the front side of the vessel.

A similar loop but without stones is used on the stag rhyton that could even date in the first century A.D. (no. 74). This might be seen as a corroboration of the late Hellenistic date of the lion rhyton but, like the garland itself, the motif of the huge loop is again to be found as early as the latest years of the third century on a silver pitcher with an oak leaf garland from Panticapaeum and occurs again on a Delian tabletop of the late second or early first century. Consequently, the ivy trefoil motif on the rhyton does not provide a clue to absolute chronology, and we are bound at the moment to date the vessel along with treasure II. It should be noted, however, that the garland would in no way exclude a date in the second century.

**FRIEZES AND BANDS**

**Stepped Battlement or Crenellation Frieze.** The Achaemenid, pre-Hellenistic origins of this motif have already been mentioned. The frieze is not limited to metal bowls and occurs in the mid-second century on a Seleucid bracelet from Syria. The motif appears on five Getty bowls (nos. 4, 6, 9–11) and on vessels in Hamburg (fig. 18) and Switzerland (fig. 17A–B) but, remarkably enough, not on a single bowl from the third and latest group of treasure I (nos. 2, 13–16; see chart, p. 244). This is certainly to be seen in relation to different workshop traditions and not in relation to chronology because the frieze is used on the lion rhyton from the contemporaneous treasure II (no. 66). This already shows that the stepped battlement motif was not used consistently in all workshops in the Seleucid area of influence and is but rarely represented outside this area.

**Narrow Leaf Frieze.** The use of a miniature leaf frieze can be documented for the first time on a Ptolemaic silver cup from the middle of the third century B.C. Two bowls in Malibu bear this motif (nos. 4, 5), although on no. 5 the band has been turned into a narrow leaf frieze with a leaf scale pattern. The wide distribution of such miniature friezes speaks against their attribution to a single artistic province. We can add an example on the bowl from Magna Graecia already mentioned, and there is even a parallel in Spain.

The similarity of the ornament on the Malibu bowls to the early Ptolemaic cup ornament could be seen as an argument in favor of an early dating of the Getty bowls, at least to the second century B.C. and even this date would bear witness to the already mentioned retardataire nature of eastern Hellenized silver.

**Interwoven Band or Guilloche.** The double interwoven band on bowl no. 5 is already part of the repertoire of early Hellenistic toreutic art and recurs on two Iranian silver bowls from Mazandaran. The motif is used also on the phiale depicting a Parthian, which was mentioned previously, in a somewhat altered, provincial form and occurs in the interior of a shallow plate from Magna Graecia now in New York. However, no conclusions as to chronology can be drawn from the motif.

**Wave Meander or Running Dog.** One of the most common Hellenistic decorative motifs, the wave meander appears in somewhat clumsy and misinterpreted form on the silver vessels from treasure I—for example, on bowl no. 3, where the waves are not connected. The only information the ornament provides concerning dating or provenance is that it is seldom found on metalware from the late fourth or the first half of the third century B.C., although the ornament itself was of course known.

The motif is absent on the vessels from treasures II, III, and IV but returns on the lip of the stag rhyton (no. 74), giving again evidence of differences in preferences of workshops and offering no conclusions in view of absolute chronology.
THE MEDALLIONS

Anchor and Dolphin. This motif, which is of considerable importance in both cultural and chronological terms, has already been discussed in another context in this catalogue.421

Feather Scale Medallion. No less than four bowls from treasure I bear this motif (nos. 9–12), and the scale background of the anchor and dolphin emblems could also be seen in the same context (nos. 1–3).

The difference in the quality of the workmanship is reflected in the rendering of the ornament. Only on nos. 9 and 10 are the scales properly placed in alternating rows, but even the open, cut-off leaves on the rim of the medallion on no. 9 are not satisfactory. The quatrefoil rosette in the center, however, is successful from the viewpoint of composition. The problem of finding an appropriate composition for the center of the bowl was avoided by the craftsman of no. 10 and the companion piece in Boston insofar as the circle framed by the garland is left vacant.

The scroll-bordered scale ornament must be regarded as the oldest decorative composition among the emblems on the Malibu bowls. It already appears in analogous form on Attic marble grave loutrophoroi of the late Classical period (fig. 38). Here again we see the close relationship between the ornament on the bowl and the late Classical–early Hellenistic repertoire. It is worth mentioning, however, that the composition is known also on Megarian bowls of the second half of the second century B.C.423

LEAF CALYX MEDALLIONS

The precursors of the elaborate Hellenistic leaf calyx ornament found on numerous metal vessels date from the fourth century B.C.426 The roots of the ornament are to be sought less in toreutics than among large-scale decorations in architecture, mosaics, and painting. The transfer of these compositions to early Hellenistic metal vessels and the role of Ptolemaic craftsmanship in this process has been analyzed elsewhere.427 The adoption of already fully developed leaf calyx systems into the toreutic repertoire led to the canonization of many of them in their original form even in early Hellenistic times, and they are therefore difficult to date on their own merits. For later periods it is often possible to establish the more recent dating only on the basis of details.

The bowls from treasure I illustrate only a limited selection of motifs from the Hellenistic leaf calyx repertoire. There are, for example, no complex acanthus leaf compositions with bent tips.428 This limitation is, however, by no means typical for the Seleucid area or the Hellenized Orient as can be demonstrated with treasures II and IV (nos. 67, 76). The limited nature of the selection of forms does not necessarily bear witness to the provinciality of the workshops as to the ties of the repertoire to early Hellenistic times, a period during which more complicated calyx compositions were known but were not yet very widely distributed.

In view of the Ptolemaic contribution to Hellenistic leaf calyx compositions, we must also note here the absence of the characteristic nymphaea nelumbo leaf with the tip bent forward,429 a motif that is quite typical for Ptolemaic and in general for Hellenistic toreutics, as can be seen on the silver plates from Magna Graecia in New York (figs. 16, 39). The drawn-in contour of the leaves near the top as it is to be seen in its beginnings on bowl no. 6 and in fully developed form on no. 7 can be traced in several variations in the Seleucid sphere (see chart, p. 244) and seems to have no connections in view of development with the Ptolemaic nymphaea.430 The basic form was in our case most likely adopted from a rosette type known already from late Classical grave stele.431

Multitiered Ornaments and Simple Calyx. Complex Hellenistic leaf calyx decorations usually show leaves in rows of increasing size, one behind the other—that is, they usually belong to the group of tiered calyces.432 The arrangement of leaves above and behind one

another is already fully developed in the fourth century B.C. Three bowls (nos. 4, 6, 7) in treasure I follow this compositional principle, and only the craftsman of no. 5 chose such a small rosette for the center that we can no longer speak of a tiered effect. Calyx decorations of this type are also represented in treasures II and IV (nos. 67, 75, 76).

**Acanthus-Lanceolate Calyx without Flowers.** Long, lancet-shaped leaves and acanthus arranged in several tiers around a smaller calyx similar to a rosette are already to be found in the third century B.C. In contrast to the greater number of early Hellenistic lanceolate-acanthus decorations, the leaves of the outer row of the calyx of one bowl (no. 6) stand singly, almost like the points of a star. For this reason alone an early Hellenistic dating seems unlikely. The upper contours of the leaves of the large central rosette calyx are more clearly drawn in than are those on late Classical examples but not as strongly as on a phiale (no. 7) from treasure I. This early stage of development is still known in late Hellenistic times so that it provides only a vague terminus post quem for the ornament.

The irregular beads in the center of the rosette on bowl no. 6 are already to be found on rosette blossoms in the first half of the second century B.C. in Pergamon and on a Syrian sandwich glass cup. The motif is in no way limited to a special repertoire. It can also be found on Ptolemaic decorations. The acanthus of two bowls (nos. 6, 7) follows the Seleucid type previously characterized (fig. 27). There are precursors for the nonserrate, smooth form of the leaf tips even in the late fourth century B.C. (fig. 24). Beaded leaf ribs and edges can also be documented in the early Hellenistic repertoire. The central rosette is likewise given as a miniature leaf calyx with the aid of the leaves’ center ribs.

Finally, in terms of chronology, a related calyx of better quality on a silver bowl of the late third or early second century from Magna Graecia, now in the Metropolitan Museum, should be mentioned (fig. 39). The piece illustrates the wide distribution of this calyx system. The calyx shows two rows and is relatively dense, with acanthus leaves placed behind the lanceolate foliage.

The central rosette on the New York bowl does not follow Greek examples but is based on the Ptolemaic nymphaea nelumbo leaf. The two bowls, although they are from completely different artistic provinces, show both early and late features simultaneously. It would be a mistake to try to establish an all-too-narrow chronological relationship, but given the general situation already sketched, we can assume a dating in the second century B.C. for the phiale in Malibu. It thus belongs to the earliest group of objects in treasure I.

**Acanthus-Lanceolate Calyx with Flowers.** On one of the most elaborately decorated pieces in treasure I (no. 5), the tightly spaced, two-row calyx with a tiny, five-leaf central rosette is in keeping with the tradition of the third century B.C. The center calyces of Macedonian or Macedonian-influenced decorations on mosaics and reliefs are comparable. Here as there we find lenticular, lancet-shaped leaves in the front row, arranged around a tiny rosette. The acanthus with the beaded center rib is of the Seleucid type.

The wide, spindle-shaped center ribs of the lanceolate leaves, twisted like a string, suggest in a way Ptolemaic metalware and faïences, although a Ptolemaic silver cup indicates that the central vein is meant as a narrow leaf. The silversmith of the Getty bowl possibly understood the twisted central ribs to be simply a variation of the beaded rib. The arrangement of the flowers might, however, be seen as another indication that the craftsman was familiar with Ptolemaic decorations, but the few preserved examples form too small a basis for a conclusive judgment.

As the blossoms show, parallels can be drawn to the two earlier groups of bowls (nos. 1, 4, 5, 8–11; see chart, p. 244). The tiny rosette as a central motif on the bowl is also to be found, albeit in quatrefoil form, on one scale pattern medallion (no. 9). Based on our pres-
erent knowledge, I would suggest a date in the second century B.C.

Also related to this decoration is the calyx on the lion rhyton from treasure II (no. 66). Again we find the Seleucid acanthus and the flowers on curved stalks between the tips of the acanthus and lanceolate foliage. Unlike the elaborately decorated bowl (no. 5), however, the lanceolate leaves are placed in the second row of the calyx.

This comparison underlines the difficulties in the field of absolute chronology. With the deplorable lack of datable material, we can only attribute the rhyton along with treasure II to the first century B.C. This could mean, however, that bowl no. 5 must be placed late. Or can we use the flower forms of the rhyton to build a case in favor of a second-century dating of the rhyton? For now we can only give an outline of the options.

Ivy and Lancet Leaf Calyx. We have already discussed the use of the ivy leaf in floral scrolls from Hellenistic times, which originally belonged to a different tendril system. As treasure I shows, ivylike leaves were also used to arrange complicated leaf calyx ornaments as well as three- or four-leaf calyx blossoms (type 45). We can even cite a Hellenistic capital from Istakhri in Iran that bears this leaf form. To my knowledge, this leaf motif is otherwise quite uncommon in larger calyces or in an architectural context.

Closely related in terms of the composition on bowl no. 6 is the small calyx on bowl no. 7. In place of the acanthus, however, we find an elongated leaf recognizable from the veins as a variant of ivy. The lanceolate leaves on both bowls are comparable even in the rows of dots on the inside of the leaf. The same is true for the center rosettes with dotted core. They differ only in the degree to which the center leaves are drawn in. The dotted inner surface of the leaf shows that a bulging edge and an overlapping tip is intended. Leaves with comparable outlines are already found in floral ornaments of the third century B.C. but are known to me as calyx decorations on metal vessels only on the bowl in Malibu. The stiff contours and the lack of a continuous bulging contour in the upper part of the leaves distinguish the roseette leaves from the nymphaea nelumbo of Ptolemaic Egyptian type as used on silver plates from Magna Graecia (figs. 16, 39).

In contrast to the calyx on bowl no. 6, the leaves here are placed coaxially above the foliage of the center rosette. This arrangement is no doubt derived from the late Classical-early Hellenistic motif of the small superimposed leaf. What is new, however, is that both leaves, the large and the small one, are of about the same width. This detail can be identified in its fully developed form on a bowl from Magna Graecia just cited (fig. 39). We can therefore assume that this leaf arrangement was known at least in the second century B.C.

Reflections of this conception of superimposed leaves can be recognized on a phiale (no. 4) and on another eastern silver bowl from treasure IV (no. 76).

The version of the motif with the frontal, deeply drawn-in rosette leaf is also known in the East on gold jewelry from the Saka-Parthian strata at Taxila, and a similar motif can be found on jewelry from Tillyatepe. On the other hand, comparable motifs are documented in Corinth in the second century B.C. as well as on a clay guttus from the Athenian Agora. The acanthus with rounded serrations on this vessel clearly echoes the Seleucid type previously described.

This motif therefore also provides nothing more than a terminus post quern in the second century B.C.

Ivy Calyx. The quatrefoil ivy calyx on another bowl (no. 4) is without parallel among the preserved large-scale leaf calyx ornaments but there is a parallel for the four-leaf arrangement on the pentagonal bowl from treasure II (no. 72; type 45). The ivy occupies the position of the nymphaea nelumbo leaf commonly found otherwise during Hellenistic times. Additionally the craftsman also arranged a deeply incised rosette leaf in front of the superimposed lanceolate leaves, a motif we have already seen on bowl no. 7. The scale pattern of the lanceolate leaves is in keeping with the Hellenistic repertoire of the late third and second centuries B.C., but the characterization and veining of the rosette leaf have been somewhat misunderstood.

The craftsman used less elaborate lanceolate leaves to separate the large overlapping ivy leaves. This arrangement of the calyx is known from the Hellenized East, and it is also to be found on a silver bowl from Magna Graecia. The wide distribution of this motif can possibly be explained with reference to a late Classical and early Hellenistic calyx and blossom composition.

On the basis of the flower types—in spite of the late parallel for the quatrefoil ivy composition (type 45)—and in connection with the use of the small leaf frieze and the band of Achaemenid embattlements, we should combine bowl no. 4 chronologically with the earliest group from treasure I and attribute it to the second century.

Lanceolate Calyx. Bowl no. 8 with its cursorily worked, two-row calyx with lanceolate foliage in the first row and a beaded center almost certainly belongs to the first century B.C. The calyx with a rear row of non-
naturalistically beaded leaves finds close analogies on bowls from treasures II and III (nos. 68, 72; type 46).462

UNDECORATED VESSELS

A flat silver bowl (no. 18) bears the only Greek inscription in the whole of treasure I. The bowl was once in the possession of a certain Bagenos,464 and it is possible that the vessel comes from a different site. On the other hand, the thick, flat-rimmed bowl corresponds to the type represented by two decorated bowls (nos. 1, 10), and this undecorated example might therefore date to the second or early first century B.C.

The conical cups (nos. 22-24) are of a widespread type from the second and first centuries B.C. that was known all the way from Pakistan466 to Spain.467 Examples are also known from South Russia,468 from Thrace,469 and from Greece.470 The first appearance of these conical vessels without a foot and with a flaring rim cannot be determined with certainty but the Ptolemaic realm may have been a leading influence, for there are a considerable number of high-sided vessels without a foot from that region in the third century B.C.471

As shown by a cup from Akhtanizovka Stanitsa in South Russia from the early second century B.C.,472 this type was already fully developed at that time. The sides of these vessels are more strongly flared than are those of the Ptolemaic vessels already cited and of Megarian bowls. As finds in Thrace and Spain show, the number of pieces with a smaller diameter increases significantly in the late second and first centuries B.C., and the profile is more conical in shape than with the Ptolemaic faience vessels of the third century B.C.

A cup with an atypical angularity of the side wall (no. 24) and another that has the same proportions but is decorated on the inside with a molded strip halfway up (no. 22) belong to the early group. One cup (no. 23) is higher and should be attributed to the later examples; this is in keeping with the chronological framework of treasure I. The Iranian origin of number 24 is emphasized by the garland decoration that runs around the inside. It can be compared with another cup in the British Museum that was allegedly found in Mazandaran in Iran (fig. 34).473

A small bowl or cup must have been found with no. 22, as is shown by a circular discoloration on the rounded base.474 Cup no. 22 was therefore deposited with the mouth pointing downward.

The small bowl with one handle (no. 19), as is the case with the bowls without handles in treasure I, was worked with a rounded bottom without a base ring.

The few comparable vessels are distributed over such a wide area that their formal relationships cannot always be substantiated. Very close is a silver bowl in private possession in Frankfurt (fig. 40)475 that is thought to come from northwest Iran. The simple rosette with the dotlike center provides no clues as to dating, but some information is offered by the garland around a rosette with a diagonally ordered fish-scale pattern. This unusual motif is also found in a mixed garland on a copper medallion from the strata of the first century A.D. at Taxila,476 and thus sets a certain chronological fixed point for the bowl in Frankfurt. The parallel suggests that the silver bowl in the Getty treasure also came from the East.

The late dating of the bowl in Frankfurt does not necessarily imply a similar late dating for the piece in Malibu. The zigzag garland on the inside of no. 19 cannot be directly compared with the decoration of the bowl in Frankfurt, and the bird that has been punched in the metal as a medallion with rows of dots eludes chronological classification.

In addition to the piece just described, there are a few other examples of one-handled bowls from the nomadic steppe region that are not so closely related. One example from the end of the fourth century B.C. has a tight handle with a scroll decoration and comes from Archangelskaya Sloboda in the Dnieper region.477 Another late Hellenistic or early Imperial bowl with a movable handle was found in western Siberia.478 It is at least possible, therefore, that the footless, one-handled...
vessels are part of a nomadic, central Asian tradition that was introduced to Iran by the Parthians. The number of parallels known to me is too limited, however, and the simple form too insignificant to allow definite conclusions. This is all the more true as one-handled bowls are also known from the Greek area of influence, although they usually have ring bases.\textsuperscript{479} We will therefore have to content ourselves with the conclusion that there is nothing that, in the case of no. 19, speaks against a date in the first centuries B.C. or A.D. and an attribution to the Partho-Iranian area.

The two small bowls without handles and base rings from treasure I (nos. 20, 21) allow us to draw no particular conclusions as to typology. Bowl no. 20 bears, however, a short Iranian inscription of the Sasanian period that suggests an eastern provenance. Thus, these bowls do not belong to the same period as the other vessels in the treasure. As the discoloration on one large bowl (no. 4) and on one of the conical cups (no. 22) shows, small bowls of dimensions similar to those of nos. 20 and 21 originally lay on top of these vessels.

The agate cup (no. 25) consists of two separately worked pieces, the cylindrical body and the foot, which are held together by metal pins. At present, no typological parallels are known to me. The importance of the cup is indicated primarily by the material of which it is made, since agate vessels are otherwise known from the Ptolemaic circle but found their way even to China.\textsuperscript{480}

JEWELRY

Along with treasure I, the Museum acquired gold jewelry, agate pendants in gold mountings, and rock crystal beads. The gold and the pendants follow unmistakably Near Eastern types and are consequently discussed in connection with treasure I, although—as is the case with the silver bowls from treasure I—they seem not to date to the same period and it cannot be proved if some of them did originally belong to the bowls or the phalerae. In the case of the rock crystal beads, I could see no conclusive evidence that they could have been found with the other objects from treasure I and it seems doubtful that they are necessarily of Near Eastern origin. As with the two bowls mentioned in the introduction, the rock crystal will be omitted from this catalogue.

The faceted gold torque with a thick ridge at one point (no. 38) has two small prisms at the ends with attached loops. The thicker, ridged part of the necklace is also to be found on necklaces and bracelets from Tillya-tepe in Afghanistan\textsuperscript{481} and in the Saka-Parthian levels in Taxila,\textsuperscript{482} and in treasure IV (no. 89), which must be dated to the late first century B.C. or to the first century A.D. The openings of these bracelets are not located at the thinnest point. Instead, the ridge itself was cut through. The corresponding basic forms of the pieces allow us, however, to assume with care that they come from the same cultural area.

Drawing on the evidence of the bronze statue of a Parthian from Shami, the torque can be identified as an ornament for a man.\textsuperscript{483} The Malibu example should be reconstructed with a decorative pendant between the loops. The torque on the statue has an elongated decorative element, slightly curved at the top and more strongly flared at the bottom, an ornament that is found in several instances on the pendants set in gold in treasure I. All of these pendants, however, have vertical eyes through which a thin chain was to be threaded, but two (no. 60, which has traces of eyes on the sides, or possibly no. 65) could have belonged to a torque of the kind portrayed on the statue from Shami. The asymmetrical form of one pendant (no. 60) can be traced back at least to Achaemenid times\textsuperscript{484} and is encountered on objects from tombs at Dura Europos dating to the Parthian period.\textsuperscript{485}

Since the late finds already cited do not correspond fully to the Getty torque, the Malibu piece might be placed earlier and could possibly be regarded as evidence of a long Parthian tradition of such “ridged circlets.”

The gold bracelet (no. 39) has ends that are formed in the shape of panthers’ heads or the heads of lionsesses. The piece belongs to the tradition of Achaemenid animal-head bracelets, a type that is found in the Greek world as well as in the Near East in Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{486} The lack of truly Achaemenid details speaks against a pre-Hellenistic date; however, the oriental, non-Greek origins of this piece are confirmed by the lack of cufflike decorative elements behind the animal heads, a feature that must be regarded as typical for examples from Greek workshops.\textsuperscript{487} Like the torque (no. 38) the bracelet could have been worn by a man since jewelry for men was common not only among nomadic peoples but also in Iran.

The pendants in treasure I are of different forms, most of them made of agate and mounted in gold. The majority have three vertical loops for threading (nos. 40–50). Whether all of the pendants belonged to one chain cannot be ascertained. One pendant (no. 41) is of the “Kohl-tube” type.\textsuperscript{488} Nine pendants have gold settings on the ends but only two eyes (nos. 51–59). Except for nos. 41, 43, 56, 58, and 59, the pendants are made of agate. A rock crystal cylinder that was origi-
nally made to be strung horizontally was reused for no. 56. Other pendants (nos. 48, 49, and especially 50–52) are asymmetrical. One of the agate pendants with three eyes (no. 40) has gold fittings different from those of all the other examples, being worked in the form of animals’ heads. It is possible that the motif was drawn from Hellenistic animal-head necklaces. Concerning chronology, there is a typological parallel to our piece in a carnelian pendant with lion-head finials from a necropolis near Emesa in Syria, in which the burials date from around the beginning of the Christian era.

Of great interest in terms of provenance is an agate pendant that is supposed to have been found southwest of the Caspian Sea. The pendant is of the same three-loop type and the mountings are formed of gold stags’ heads, a motif whose importance to the Parthians has already been mentioned. Pendants with loops but without animal heads are also found on Gandharan sculpture. The similarity of the jewelry illustrates again the ties between the Indo-Kushan and Parthian regions.

In spite of the finds from Emesa and the Gandharan sculptures, several arguments could speak for a somewhat earlier dating for some of our pendants. The decoration of one pendant (no. 41), for example, has an exact parallel on a vial from what is most likely a pre-Achaemenid tomb in the Dalaiman area south of the Caspian Sea. Apart from the chronological question, the provenance of the parallel again corroborates an Iranian origin for our pendants; however, ornamental stones mounted in gold were already known in Achaemenid and Hellenistic times.

Another grave from the Dalaiman area not only contained an agate bead set in gold but also a simple bead on which the gold cuffs and the gold center strip of more costly pieces are indicated by means of simple engravings. We can also cite several other beads from the same site with similar decoration, which could all be from pre-Parthian times. These finds bear out not only the western or northwestern Iranian origins of the jewelry from treasure I, they also confirm that the pendants are part of a much older tradition.

Finally, there are a number of elongated (in some cases cylindrical) beads which could belong to the “pendant chain.” Two of them are strung on bronze wire (nos. 61, 62). The wire is twisted to form eyes on both sides of the beads. There is a parallel for this feature among the Dalaiman finds as well. The elongated beads are to be regarded as ancient Mesopotamian in form and cannot be more precisely dated. Of further interest is a faceted bead (no. 63), which, like the pendants, is also to be found on Gandharan sculptures.

As already mentioned, not all the pieces of jewelry are contemporaneous. The gold torque and especially the bracelet must be placed earlier, possibly in the second century B.C. The agate pendants could belong chronologically to the third group of bowls, although a date in the late first century B.C. or in the earlier decades of the first century of the Christian era is debatable. If the pendants should actually belong to the third group, it could mean that some of the silver plate was buried in early Imperial times. But this has to remain speculative.

As the range of parallels demonstrates, the jewelry definitely belongs to the Hellenized Near East, and in the case of the pendants close analogies could be traced in the area southwest of the Caspian Sea, thus suggesting a possible northwest Iranian provenance for the pendants.

TREASURE I: SUMMARY

As postulated in the introduction, treasure I can be attributed to the earlier Parthian period. The first two groups of vessels, the gold jewelry, and the horse trappings should date for the most part from the second century B.C. and even a date in the latter parts of the third century seems not to be beyond reach for some of the objects. The third group of the vessels can be ascribed to the first century B.C. and the stone pendants in gold mounts might even be placed a little later, at the beginning of the Christian era.

In view of this long span of time and given the variety of workshops involved, the contention that the pieces belong to a single find and form a unit in the archaeological sense of the word can be discounted. It is far more likely that the objects come from tombs spread over several sites. The fact that the treasure was not a hoard can be demonstrated by the presence of the horse trappings, which seem to have been buried along with their leather straps (nos. 30–36), an observation that speaks strongly in favor of tombs and not an ancient treasure containing loot collected because of the highly prized precious metal.

The excellent state of preservation of the vessels and of the phalerae could speak for built tombs. There are only two damaged bowls among treasure I (nos. 16, 17). The fact that the decorated interiors of the bowls are in a far better state of preservation than the exteriors indicates that they were deposited upside down so that water and dirt could not get in. In at least two cases, smaller vessels originally lay on top of larger bowls and cups.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to draw any fur-
ther conclusions about the types of graves involved—that is, whether they were built of wood or stone, or whether they were sunk into the earth or erected under mounds. Nor is it known whether the horse trappings were laid in the graves or whether there were separate horse burials, which are known in the Scythian-nomadic area from the north coast of the Black Sea to the Altai. The latter may be considered in view of the Parthians' central Asiatic origins.

As pointed out, it cannot be determined whether all the objects in treasure I are actually of the same provenance. The third and latest group of bowls in particular differs from the other vessels. But speaking about general provenances we can state that most of the objects from treasure I were most likely found in western or northwestern Iran, even if we cannot exclude with absolute certainty the northern Afghan territories. The best argument against this more eastern (Bactrian) provenance is that some vessels from treasures II and IV demonstrate that the repertoire of the Bactrian sphere as now understood does not correlate with the decorations of group three from treasure I.

Because a provenance in the territory of the former Soviet Union can be discarded, in view of art market conditions in recent times, it seems possible that the finds were made in the provinces of Parthia or Hyrcania, southwest of the Caspian Sea. There were few cities in this area in antiquity, and one is tempted to think of Hekatopylos or Syrinx—the latter fortified by Arsaces I—but this remains mere conjecture.

The remoteness of northwestern Iran would also explain the survival of early Hellenistic forms among the ornaments of the vessels. After the Parthian invasion of Iran, the stream of Greek-trained craftsmen must have slowed down, at least for a time, so that the Graeco-Macedonian ornamental repertoire adopted in early Hellenistic times could have been retained here longer than it was in other areas of the Hellenistic world. Still, the scroll ornaments indicate that new forms reached the now Parthian-controlled workshops during the first two centuries of Parthian dominance.

Especially with the first two groups of treasure I, we find ourselves in early Parthian times, when the nomadic heritage was still intact and when the turn to Irano-Achaemenid culture had not yet taken place.

The phalerae belong to a new class of central Asian, decisively non-Greek, non-Iranian horse decorations that came into use in Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan in the second century B.C. The overall importance of horses and cavalry for peoples of nomadic origin is mirrored in the rich horse trappings of a new type, whereas the workmanship of both the silverware and of the harness ornaments can be attributed exclusively to provincial Hellenized workshops and demonstrates the preference of their former owners for Greek craftsmanship—consistent with the “philhellenos” on Parthian coins. Provinciality and misunderstandings of Greek forms allow us to identify the artists with the indigenous subjects of the new Parthian ruling classes. Influences of the old Achaemenid tradition—which survived for centuries the breakdown of the Achaemenids as a political power in Iran—are almost entirely lacking.

The treasure, although not an archaeological unit, offers a deep insight into the Hellenized repertoire of the Iranian world under Parthian rule. In an archaeological sense the treasure and especially the vessels are representative of provincial Seleucid metalworking. In cultural and historical terms, the objects, especially the phalerae trappings, represent early Parthian culture.
TREASURES II AND III

Although nothing is known concerning their provenance, the vessels of treasure II were reportedly found together. There is no evidence whether they originally belonged to a tomb group or to a hoard that had been hidden under pressure. Notwithstanding these uncertainties, analysis demonstrates that the vessels could actually have formed a unit. The association of the shallow bowl (no. 68) and the lion rhyton (no. 66) is corroborated by the shape of the green oxidation on the rhyton, which suggests that both vessels were in all likelihood found deposited together, the bowl upside down on the rhyton, which was obviously flattened and maybe damaged in antiquity. Other vessels from treasure II include two hemispherical cups with stone inlays (nos. 69, 70) and a deep cup with leaf calyx decoration (no. 67).

LION RHYTON AND RELATED RHYTA

The most impressive piece from treasure II is a huge lion rhyton (no. 66). The other rhyta in the Museum’s collection do not belong to the same unit. One of the lynx rhyta (no. 71) forms treasure III along with the net pattern bowl (no. 72). The remaining two, another lynx rhyton (no. 73) and a stag rhyton (no. 74), reached the Museum without any recorded information. The four vessels rank among the most spectacular Near Eastern silverware and will be discussed together for the sake of comparison.

With regard to type, the lion rhyton from treasure II belongs to a class of vessels that was already known in the early Achaemenid period, although the proportions of these early examples are not entirely retained. The horn is slightly larger and even in comparison to late Achaemenid examples bent in a somewhat sharper angle. The same typological difficulty occurs in the case of the stag rhyton, which will be discussed later. A third Achaemenid group is formed by rhyta with very tall and slender horns, combined with a sometimes small forepart of an animal. Two lynx rhyta in Malibu, dated to the first century B.C. by their inscriptions (nos. 71, 73), can be attributed to this group and clearly demonstrate the unbroken tradition of former Achaemenid types in the Hellenized Near East. In post-Achaemenid times, the lion type is represented not only in the Near East but elsewhere as well, as a fragmentary terracotta rhyton from Ptolemaic Egypt and even early Imperial representations demonstrate.

Although the type of the lion rhyton is unmistakably derived from Achaemenid prototypes, the leaf calyx behind the protome of the animal is unprecedented in the Achaemenid or even early Hellenistic repertoire. The type is rarely represented among ancient silverware and most of the preserved examples only recently found their way into private collections. Two horse rhyta, an example with a sphinxlike female protome, a zebu rhyton and a stag rhyton should be mentioned. Not only the presence of the zebu-bull, but likewise some of the calyx decorations and other ornamental details corroborate their attribution to the Hellenized Near East.

The earliest datable example known to me, however, is a fragmented silver rhyton from Merdzany on the Kuban Peninsula, a tomb group that cannot be placed much earlier than the early second century B.C. The type of its protome is unfortunately unknown. Unlike the lion rhyton, the example from Merdzany bears a figural frieze (fig. 15) that links the vessel to the large group of ivory rhyta from the Parthian capital of Nisa. The date of this group cannot be fixed within close limits of time, but for historical considerations cannot be placed earlier than the late third century B.C. A date in the second century, as suggested by M. E. Masson and G. A. Pugacenkova, is far more likely but the first century cannot be excluded either. The Nisa group of not less than ninety vessels contains a whole series of rhyta with winged and horned lion-griffins but no example with a simple lion protome. This and the lack of figural scenes clearly set our lion rhyton apart from that whole group, leaving as the only, but still important, point of comparison the foliage behind the protome. In contrast to the considerable number of Near Eastern leaf calyx rhyta, no further northern Pontic examples can be cited. With a lone exception from Alexandria, the same holds true for Ptolemaic Egypt.

Although the Nisa and Malibu rhyta belong to the same class, most of their details are treated differently; this is valid even for the trefoil motif. On the Nisa rhyton isolated leaves are used—more a spray of ivy, not the tightly bound garland seen on the Malibu example. Thus the Nisa group can provide us with only a very general “Parthian” date for the leaf calyx class of rhyta, which means later than approximately 200 B.C. In all probability, the type was not entirely confined to Hellenized workshops of the Parthian Empire but it was barely used outside the Near East.

The garland type of ivy trefoil has parallels by the middle of the third century, but the taenia-bound vari-
tery of the trefoil motif is not known earlier than the late third century.\textsuperscript{323} An ivy garland, very close to the Malibu decoration but without the taenia motif, can be found on a lynx rhyton in the Metropolitan Museum, which, on comparison with the inscribed lynx rhyta in Malibu, can be dated in the first century B.C.

The calyx of lanceolate leaves and acanthus on the lion rhyton links the decoration to a bowl from treasure I (no. 5), but the system of the calyx was already known in the early Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{324} The flower types find but insufficient analogies in the first and second groups of treasure I (see chart, p. 244).\textsuperscript{325} but the narrow band of stepped Achaemenid embattlements is represented.\textsuperscript{526} The frieze of embattlements is hidden under the overlapping rim of the rhyton. The outer surface of the lip is barely finished and without any decoration. Is the overlapping rim a later modification? A similar rim can be seen on the previously mentioned lynx rhyton in New York. Hence the detail was not unknown in the first century B.C. and can be traced back to Classical rhyta, but the overlapping rim was more or less limited to Greek workshops and was not an Achaemenid feature.\textsuperscript{527}

The stone inlays of the flowers, a feature already known in the third century, offer no further chronological evidence.\textsuperscript{528} The parallels defy a more precise definition of the chronological framework but a late Hellenistic date in the first century seems probable. The treasure as a unit further reconfirms a burial in the first century B.C.

The two lynx rhyta belong to the more traditional group without calyx decoration (nos. 71, 73). The measurements are very close and they even share Aramaic inscriptions and signatures, which have nonetheless been executed by different hands, a fact corroborated by the different names of the signing artists. The similarity of the rhyta and the very similar syntax of the then unusual inscription speaks for a close relationship between the craftsmen or even for the same atelier. Moreover, the syntax of the inscription is almost identical to the inscription on bowl no. 14. Not only does this reconfirm the suggested dating of the lynx rhyta and of the latest group from treasure I to the first century B.C., it may also point to a similar provenance.

According to R. Degen, the names are Iranian, not Greek, even though the style of the vessels refers exclusively to Greek rather than native Near Eastern traditions. In the first century B.C., Graeco-Macedonian rule over Iran and Bactrian central Asia was nothing but history, although the Greek workshop tradition seems to have lived on almost untouched. The names preserved here clearly demonstrate, however, that the ateliers were staffed primarily by native, if Hellenized, craftsmen.

Although rhyta with slender horns and relatively small protomes are already known in Achaemenid times,\textsuperscript{329} the lynx rhyton is a new type in the Near Eastern repertoire. It is not without interest that, in the quite different field of jewelry, bracelets and earrings with protomes of lynxes make their appearance not earlier than the second century.\textsuperscript{330} Even earrings with simple lynx heads are not represented before the later parts of the third century B.C., and it is of no surprise that both types were especially popular in the Seleucid Near East. We are perhaps justified in seeing the emergence of the lynx rhyta in connection with the increasing popularity of lynx representations in the Hellenized East.\textsuperscript{531}

The Near Eastern tradition can even be recognized in a minor motif, such as the three-pointed whirl rosette engraved on the upper legs of the animals, a detail drawn from living creatures.\textsuperscript{332} Furthermore, the representation of an animal or fabulous creature with a collar has its roots in Achaemenid times\textsuperscript{333} and might be interpreted as an indication that the lynx was used for hunting. A harnessed lynx may also be seen as an allusion to Dionysos and his cart driven by wild animals.\textsuperscript{334} This connection is the more likely, as a very similar rhyton in the Metropolitan Museum\textsuperscript{335} depicts a lynx with a collar and an additional spray of vine and ivy around his shoulders, unmistakably connecting the vessel with the orgiastic god, an attribution that seems very appropriate for a drinking vessel.

The naturalistic rendering of the animal, however, bears no resemblance to Achaemenid formal traditions and must be seen as part of the Greek heritage of the Hellenized East. This holds true even for the concave profile of the rim of the vessel, which is unprecedented among Achaemenid examples and, as far as rhyta are concerned, can be traced no earlier than the third century B.C.\textsuperscript{336}

The rare class of lynx rhyta is represented only by the Getty rhyton, its companion piece (no. 73), the already mentioned example in the Metropolitan Museum (acc. no. 1979.447), and another example formerly in the Norbert Schimmel collection and now at the Metropolitan (acc. no. 1989.281.10).\textsuperscript{337} The last piece closely resembles the Malibu rhyta; even the rim shows a similar profile. Like the Getty rhyta, the Schimmel rhyton is inscribed, bearing the Iranian name Tiridates and the weight, most likely in Parthian drachmas.

A closer examination reveals several differences in the rendering of the details between the Malibu pair and
the rhyton (1979.44?) in New York. The latter does not have laid back ears and the beard around the throat is missing. The furious baring of the teeth is not nearly as accomplished as on the pair in Malibu. We are obviously dealing with a work from a different hand.

The heavy trefoil garland of the example in New York, composed of gilded ivy, links the lynx rhyton in New York to the lion rhyton (no. 66) from treasure II. Even the simple overlapping profile of the rim resembles the lip of the lion rhyton in Malibu. In combination with the Aramaic inscriptions on the two Getty rhyta, the garland corroborates the dating of the whole group to the first century B.C. The reported association of our lynx rhyton (no. 71) with the net pattern bowl (no. 72) confirms a date in the first century B.C.

The stag rhyton leads us back to the leaf calyx group of Near Eastern rhyta. Slender rhyta of a somewhat different type are already known in pre-Achaemenid times, but the combination of an animal protome and a slender horn is but rarely represented among Achaemenid examples. Much more popular was the stag head rhyton, which can be documented in Classical times from Asia Minor to southern Italy. As far as the type of the vessel is concerned, the rhyton documents the unbroken tradition in the Near East, but the leaf calyx behind the protome of the animal places the vessel within the class of Hellenistic leaf calyx rhyta, discussed previously, that came into existence not earlier than the late third or early second century B.C.

Unlike the type proper, rhyta with scrollwork are not represented among pre-Hellenistic examples. The tendril decoration of the stag rhyton rises from a four-petaled acanthus calyx with sharply serrated leaves. The beading of the central vein is in keeping with well-known Hellenistic traditions. The bottom contours of some of the main indentations of the foliage are marked by double incisions, which find parallels on the decorations of the temple of Bel in Palmyra, dedicated in the age of Tiberius in 32 A.D. The conception of the spirally wound pairs of tendrils finds but remote parallels in late Hellenistic or early Imperial decorative art but the idea was definitely known. For the type of a horn covered with tendrils, attention should however be drawn to early Imperial cornucopias. The stag rhyton gives us an idea of what the originals of similarly decorated cornucopias, which are not preserved, must have looked like.

All four interwoven pairs of flower tendrils terminate in two large, crossed acanthus leaves that connect them with the third group of bowls from treasure I. Although the group can be placed in the first century B.C., the inscription on the stag rhyton points to a date in the earlier parts of the first century A.D.

Thin flower stalks are twisted around the main tendrils, and it is sometimes difficult to decide whether the next section of the tendril—following the acanthus knots—is irregularly developed out of the stalks or rising regularly from the acanthus knots. Notwithstanding this irregular conception, the tendrils follow the "companion scroll system," which was already known in late Classical times. In terms of absolute chronology, this detail is, however, of just as little importance as the tiny spirals that spring from the stalks, a feature that can already be documented on bowls from group one of treasure I.

The flower types, such as the five-petaled rosettes (type 56), are in keeping with the Hellenistic Near Eastern tradition. This is valid also for the leaf calyx flower with the dotted row of petals in the second tier (type 46) or the ivy calyxes for the buds (type 35). Unmistakably in favor of Near Eastern workmanship are the crosslike calyxes (type 38), as are the buds springing from small acanthus calyxes, a motif that is represented also in Imperial decorations from Baalbek in Lebanon. Finally, the indented contours of the ivy leaves link the decoration to the late Hellenistic rather than to the early Imperial repertoire, as the indentation has not yet reached the final stage of typological development of the early Imperial period. However, the inscription, as stated above, points to a date in the first century A.D.

The wave pattern at the rim, the so-called running dog, tells us as little about the date and place of origin as the band of palmettes over the trefoil garland beneath the lip. The garland itself, with its lanceolate leaves bound together in groups of three, is in keeping with the Hellenistic Near Eastern repertoire. The trefoil garlands are bound together with a great bow, a motif that is also derived from Hellenistic decorations.

The evidence suggests then that the vessel was manufactured in the late first century B.C. or in the earlier decades of the first century A.D. at the latest, which means more or less within the Augustan period. We can attribute the rhyton to a Hellenized atelier of the Near East, a workshop trained unmistakably in the decorative repertoire of the former Seleucid sphere. The frequent references to Hellenistic motifs demonstrate that these traditions survived the political collapse of the Hellenistic world. The silversmith is not nearly as provincial as the craftsmen of the third group of treasure I, thus speaking perhaps in favor of a Mesopotamian or Syrian atelier rather than of a Hellenized Iranian workshop.
OTHER VESSELS IN TREASURE II

The shallow bowl (no. 68) found with the lion rhyton further vindicates its dating to the first century B.C. The flowers in the three concentric friezes in the interior of the bowl are more or less linked to group three of treasure I. With the exception of the inter-spersed tips, the five-petaled blossoms around the central garland resemble the flowers on bowl no. 14 (type 54). The make of the petals is similar to the central rosettes on two bowls (nos. 6 and 7), thus suggesting a rather late date for these vessels.

The eight-petaled blossoms with pointed tips in between in the second frieze follow a well-known Hellenistic type (type 52). The upper frieze gives two types of flowers (type 46)—one with lanceolate leaves interspaced with dotted shoots in the second tier and a similar variety with tipped foliage with beaded central veins in the second layer. The first type finds close parallels in the central calyx of bowl no. 86 and on the net pattern bowl of treasure III (no. 72; type 46). The latter parallel underlines a date in the first century B.C. not only for the vessel in question but for all of treasure II.

Another vessel attributed to treasure II is of an entirely different making (no. 67). The exuberant calyx decoration on the lower part of the deep cup is partly given in relief and composed of an eight-petaled calyx of four acanthus-like leaves, interspaced with four nymphaea-like leaves. The center of the cup is covered by a small calyx of four elongated leaves, which correspond to the axes of the acanthus foliage and thus belong to the Hellenistic group of calyces with superimposed leaves. The narrow bases of the acanthus leaves are not in keeping with the mainstream of the Hellenistic calyx tradition, which shows almost without exception large, tightly built rosettes as central elements. As suggested by J. Podany, this could indicate a modern restoration.

The lower parts of the nymphaea foliage are covered by small acanthus leaves, a common motif in calyx compositions of the second century. On top of the nymphaea the silversmith has placed elements in the shape of a double crescent, a decorative detail that, in the Near East, can be traced even in early Imperial times. The motif could also be seen as the ornamental tip of the leaves, which, on other bowls, are sometimes even rendered as a pair of small separated leaves. The interior of the nymphaea foliage is covered by an incised scale pattern. Like the whole calyx composition, this motif can be traced back to true Hellenistic traditions of the third and second century B.C.

The large acanthus leaves with their rounded serrations along the edges are closely related to a bowl from treasure IV (no. 76) and can be considered as a special Near Eastern type. The craftsman used two varieties: the first only slightly serrated with stone inlays at the indentations and a second more serrated variant with inclusions in the rounded tips. Only the second variant can be found on the bowl from treasure IV.

The three-dimensional adjuncts rank among the most important features of this decoration. The "frame" around the nymphae and especially the overlapping tips of the acanthus leaves can be found on the bowls from the Faliscan hoard unearthed close to Cività Castellana in central Italy (fig. 27). The provincial Malibu cup corroborates their alleged Seleucid workmanship. The Cività Castellana hoard should belong to the second half of the second century, a date too early for the Malibu cup. Given its similarities to the plate from Nihavend (fig. 31) and to bowl no. 76, as well as in the context of treasure II, our deep cup should be attributed to the first century B.C., maybe even to its latter decades.

The flower tendril that borders the huge calyx finds a close parallel on bowl no. 76. Even some flower types with their stone incrustation have their matching counterparts. The same is valid for the beaded lines in high relief along the scroll.

The cup (no. 67) has been heavily mended, possibly in modern times. The whole centerpiece with almost all the central rosette is a later replacement of minor quality, a fact that can be verified best by the simple cross-hatching within the elongated leaves of the rosette. The preserved original parts bear a scale pattern, very close to the ornamental fill of the nymphaea foliage.

Another "spare part" can be recognized with the help of a stalk that has no joint with the flower and by
an adjacent rudimentary blossom in the flower tendril.

The great differences between the calyx decorations on the lion rhyton (no. 66) and on our cup can hardly be explained by a chronological gap. There can be little doubt that we are dealing with two entirely different Hellenized traditions of workmanship in late Hellenistic Iran, Afghanistan, or Pakistan. With the exception of the stone incrustations, the rhyton is linked more to the decorations of treasure I, a complex that shows close affiliation to traditional Hellenistic ornamental systems. The smaller group around the Getty cup should be seen as representative of a more provincial, distinctly non-Greek version of Hellenistic decorations that can be easily set apart from the workshops responsible for treasure I. At the moment, I would prefer to attribute the cup, the Nihavend plate (fig. 31), and the closely related bowl from treasure IV (no. 76) to the Bactrian sphere of influence, although all of them seem to have been produced after the collapse of the Graeco-Bactrian state as a political power.

Similar to the three-dimensional adjuncts, all the details are derived from true Hellenistic prototypes but rendered in an alien way, thus giving a first insight into an Irano-Bactrian version of Hellenistic decorative art in the former Seleucid sphere of influence.

TREASURE II: SUMMARY

It is possible that, as in the case of treasure I, we may be dealing partly with a collector's treasure—material from different sources united to form this complex. On the other hand, the chronological uniformity of treasure II, particularly as contrasted to the heterogeneous nature of treasure I, speaks strongly against a modern assemblage. As treasure IV or the Nihavend hoard show, the deep cup (no. 67), which definitely belongs to another tradition of Hellenized Iran or the Afghan-Pakistani area, is not impossible in an Iranian complex. Till the opposite is proven, we should therefore consider treasure II as a single unit of the first century B.C.

In light of different Hellenized traditions in the Seleuco-Parthian Near East, it should be noted that despite some affinities of the ornaments used in treasure II with those in the third group of treasure I, there is a clear-cut distinction between the decorative systems. This means not only that our present picture is still incomplete but also that we are just beginning to form an idea of the decorative repertoire of the Hellenized Near East.

The purpose of the treasure deserves no elaborate explanation. Together with a large bronze cauldron in the J. Paul Getty Museum, the vessels must be seen as table silver, used for festivities. Because none of the vessels carries an inscription, our ability to make an ethnic identification of the former owner is limited. Given its Iranian or, less likely, its even more eastern provenance and its date in the first century, we can only state that the treasure represents, in all probability, the Hellenized culture of the Parthian Empire. In view of the Hellenized nature of the treasure, I favor a Parthian rather than a native Iranian nobleman as the owner. From the viewpoint of art history, the metalware represents the provincial Seleucid or maybe Graeco-Bactrian repertoire, a cultural heritage that, even in Iran, Pakistan, or Afghanistan, survived the breakdown of the Hellenistic world as an independent political power.

NET PATTERN BOWL

For treasure III we can again only rely on information from the art market and the fact that the lynx rhyton and the net pattern bowl both seem to belong to the first century B.C. Again we are confronted with table silver, and again we recognize the overwhelming Greek influence that, based on the reading of the inscriptions, has even infiltrated native Iranian workshops. The lynx rhyton (no. 71) has already been discussed, and it remains to look at one of the most spectacular objects included in this catalogue—the net pattern bowl.

The decorative net pattern system of the shallow bowl (no. 72) is composed of staggered pentagonals, a decoration that is rarely represented among ancient silver. The exuberant decoration is arranged around a central leaf calyx. Although the decoration was popular on Hellenistic moldmade Megarian bowls, no example matches the elaborate decoration of the Getty bowl. Unlike the other preserved vessels, the decoration is limited to the interior of the bowl, a confinement that reflects the preference of certain artistic traditions of the Hellenized Near East; however, it cannot be specifically seen as an answer to the demands of the shallow profile of the bowl, because similar shapes were exclusively decorated on the exterior already in Achaemenid times. As far as we can judge from treasures I, II, and III, Hellenized Near Eastern shallow bowls are predominantly decorated on the interior. Notwithstanding this observation, the survival of the Achaemenid or older Greek tradition of exterior design is, for example, demonstrated by the Nihavend plate (fig. 31) and by a shallow bowl from treasure IV (no. 76).
The net pattern is documented already on a gold-glass cup from Gordion in Asia Minor that was unearthed from the destruction strata of 179 B.C.\textsuperscript{585} The glass cup and the other three Hellenistic silver cups with pentagonal decorations known to me more closely resemble Megarian bowls and can be seen more or less as prototypes in precious metal for the pottery bowls. One of the silver cups is in the museum of Odessa\textsuperscript{586} and another belongs to a treasure from Magna Graecia in the Metropolitan Museum,\textsuperscript{587} thus giving evidence of the widespread use of the net pattern system. The Getty bowl exceeds by far the moderate decorations of these cups, although the general outline of the net of pentagonals with enclosed flowers or rosettes is well represented among other Hellenistic net pattern compositions and occurs already on the Gordion gold-glass cup. The combination of the net pattern scheme with a central leaf calyx is hitherto unknown, however.

The general arrangement of the central calyx follows the crosslike Near Eastern type that can be traced back to pre-Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{588} The scheme is also known from the exterior of hemispherical cups such as a second-century bowl from Nihavend in western Iran or another in Toledo (fig. 30).\textsuperscript{589} Instead of the inter­spaced tendrils and slender lanceolate leaves of these cups, the craftsman of the Getty bowl used broad leaves with cordlike contours and superimposed nymphaealike foliage almost half the height of the broad leaves. That we are actually dealing with groups of double leaves and not with a single nymphaea calyx with the contours of the leaves, is documented already in the first group of treasure I (nos. 1, 4, 10; type 65)\textsuperscript{590} and on a much larger scale as a central calyx on another bowl (no. 5).\textsuperscript{591}

Two-tiered flowers are also used for acanthus blossoms (type 67). The leaves in the shape of a triangle with straight veins and beaded central ribs are already part of the early Hellenistic repertoire and offer no clue to the date of the vessel.\textsuperscript{592} The blossom in the shape of a small acanthus calyx, however, is to my knowledge not represented in this period, but that might be circumstantial, as more complex flower compositions are known even in the late fourth century.\textsuperscript{593}

The small “central composition” composed of four rudimentary palmettes with a veined lanceolate leaf in the center is likewise difficult to date (type 69). The curled leaves are represented on a pebble mosaic of mid-second-century date from Ai Khanoum in north­ern Afghanistan\textsuperscript{600} and find a good parallel on an Iranian silver plate of the late second or early first century in Hamburg (fig. 18).\textsuperscript{601} In the same period fall the flowers with thirteen long petals and horizontally curved veins (type 61).\textsuperscript{602}

The flower in the shape of a small acanthus calyx, however, is to my knowledge not represented in this period, but that might be circumstantial, as more complex flower compositions are known even in the late fourth century.\textsuperscript{593}

There are also blossoms of ivy (type 45), one with a second tier of leaves and another variant with rounded leaves in a second layer. Ivy blossoms are already represented in the first group of treasure I (nos. 1, 4, 10; type 45)\textsuperscript{590} and on a much larger scale as a central calyx on another bowl (no. 5).\textsuperscript{591}

Other flowers with twenty-two slender acanthus leaves which rise from a tiny calyx that surrounds the central garnet show again the connection of blossoms and large-scale calyx decorations. Parallels for the compositions are already known in the early Hellenistic period\textsuperscript{590} and thus show that once established the repertoire was sometimes used for centuries.

A further clue toward a regional determination of
our workshop is provided by a flower of a distinctly non-Greek type (type 70) with four clockwise curved taenia-like leaves, alternating with dotted and counter-clockwise bent shoots. The angular shape of the first variety of leaves is repeated on two phialai from central Asia (fig. 41). Given their appearance in a Russian collection and their general central Asian provenance, the plates can be attributed with some certainty to workshops in Bactria or the adjacent areas. This narrows the localization of the atelier of our Getty bowl to northern Iran or perhaps Afghanistan—or in ancient terminology, to the Bactrian sphere.

Answers to the chronological question may be sought in a small blossom with eight lanceolate leaves and interspersed dotted shoots or leaves (type 46) and a variant with lanceolate leaves and pointed foliage with beaded central ribs in a second layer. The first variety finds a close parallel of the first century B.C. in treasure II (no. 68).

A first-century date is further ascertained by five-petaled flowers with nymphaea-like foliage arranged in one or two tiers (types 56, 66). The leaves show horizontally curved veins and wound central ribs and are depicted overlapping each other. The overlapping came into fashion in the first century B.C. (fig. 31). The wound central ribs are used on the Indo-Greek or Indo-Parthian bowl from treasure IV (no. 75), thus giving further evidence not only in favor of a first-century B.C. date but indicating also an Iranian or Afghan-Pakistani provenance for the net pattern bowl.

A final type closely resembles a cobweb (type 65). This blossom is already known in the later parts of the second century and may be compared to some flowers on a shallow bowl from treasure IV (no. 76).

According to the evidence provided by the flowers, any date earlier than the first century B.C. can be excluded, although some similarities to the first group of treasure I point to the second century. As the net pattern design demonstrates, the decoration as a whole is derived from second-century originals, only the details giving away the later manufacture. This proves again the unbroken Hellenistic tradition in central Asia following the eventual collapse of the Seleucid and Bactrian realms. The dating also corroborates the alleged association of the net pattern bowl with the lynx rhyton (no. 71).

In terms of provenance the bonds with the Irano-Parthian and Bactrian-Indo-Greek world strongly suggest a northern Iranian or Afghan-Pakistani atelier. In view of the connection to treasure IV and other central Asiatic bowls, I would favor a Bactrian workshop.
TREASURE IV

As in the case of Treasure I, the fourth treasure is composed of metal bowls and gold jewelry. Again it is doubtful that the bowls and the gold belong to a single find and were used together. But in general, the objects reflect the Hellenized as well as the nomadic traditions of the Afghan-Pakistani area in the first century B.C. and in the following first century of the Christian era.

LEAF CALYX CUP

The parcel-gilt silver cup without a foot (no. 75) bears an engraved five-leaf calyx ornament. The broad leaves are separated by thin, narrow lanceolate foliage, and the upper border of the ornament is formed by a continuous guilloche above the leaves.

The protruding lip is decorated with an inverted Ionian cyma. The rounded body and protruding lip of the cup correspond typologically to a silver vessel from Olbia on the northern Black Sea coast (fig. 42). A closely related piece of better quality in St. Petersburg comes from the trans-Caucasian area or from western Siberia, but it lacks the flaring neck and the molded lip. The Ionian cyma that frames the rim of this piece, however, is also shown inverted. The ornament has taken on a form similar to that of peltae, but the small interspersed tips show that it is actually supposed to be an Ionian cyma. “Inverted cymas” are also to be found on gold-glass vessels from Iranian workshops (fig. 37).

The basis for attributing the cups in St. Petersburg and New York to the Graeco-Bactrian circle and the ornament to the Seleucid or Bactrian sphere of influence has been discussed elsewhere. The typologically related Malibu cup can be drawn upon to confirm this attribution.

Finally, the Seleucid bowls from Civită Castellana confirm the relationship of the vessel to Seleucid craftsmanship. The bowls are only somewhat shallower and correspond to the Malibu cup in the choice of a guilloche as an outer border and in the use of the cyma for the lip (fig. 27). The origins of the basic form of the Civită Castellana bowls as well as the form of the cup in the Getty Museum are already to be sought in the Achaemenid Near Eastern repertoire.

The small lanceolate-acanthus calyx in the middle of the ornament, designed over a hexagon, was already known in early Hellenistic times. As is the case on older examples, lanceolate leaves are used to form the outer row of the calyx. The stiff, serrated acanthus leaf with the beaded center rib is different from the rounded lobes of the Seleucid type. This acanthus type also appears on the phiale (no. 76) acquired with the silver cup that cannot be dated earlier than the first century B.C.

Although the outer leaves of the decoration emerge from a small central calyx in Greek fashion, the composition as a whole must be regarded as atypical for Greek decorative systems. In contrast to the small calyx, the outer calyx intentionally adopts the principle of the five-petaled blossom as it has been defined as typical, especially for the latest group of phialai in treasure I.

In connection with that, the execution of the long lancet-shaped leaves speaks for the cup’s production in an artistic province once under Achaemenid influence. As the gilding shows, the deeply bent leaf-tip, a motif that is already used on a deep phiale from Achaemenid times, was indented. Narrow nymphaea-like leaves appear at the latest in the late third century B.C. in the Greek-Hellenistic repertoire, but they do not achieve the delicacy of the lanceolate decoration on this cup.

It has been shown that the basic conception of the outer calyx with the narrow lanceolate leaves and broad foliage is connected with the ornamental repertoire of the second and first century B.C. (types 47, 54). This rather vague chronological framework is narrowed by the rosette blossoms on a silver plate with pentagonal ornament from treasure III (no. 72; type 66). The pentafoliate blossoms with wound center ribs correspond fully with the broad leaves on the cup in Malibu. The curved, more or less horizontal veining is used already in the second century on a phiale from Civită Castellana.

Figure 42. Silver bowl, reported to be from Olbia, second century B.C. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 22.50.2.
The unusual motif of a wound center rib is also to be found on gold and silver plates in St. Petersburg of alleged western central Asian or Bactrian workmanship (fig. 41). The same holds true for the pentagonal bowl.

The craftsman of the Malibu cup (no. 75) understood the broad rosette leaves and retracted tips of the ornament as foliage whose tips are bent forward, as is indicated by the wound center rib which initially appears under the first horizontal vein beneath the upper edge.

Still to be mentioned is the small foliage at the leaf bases, which is suggested only by means of beaded center ribs. It can be compared with the small leaves at the base of the nymphaea foliage on a cup from treasure II (no. 67), a vessel that could stem from a workshop in the Bactrian sphere as well.

The quality of craftsmanship and the extent of the development of independent traditions of form are in all these cases of high standard, higher than among the provincial workshops responsible for treasure I. This was certainly the result of a stronger Greek presence in Bactria. It should be noted also that the northwestern part of the Indian subcontinent came under Greek influence through Graeco-Bactrian expansion during the period in question. From that time on, Graeco-Bactrian art certainly exercised influence on India. The attribution of the cup to the Graeco-Bactrian sphere therefore opens up a broad spectrum of possibilities with regard to the cup’s provenance. As the parallels demonstrate, our cup should be dated within the first century B.C. The political situation in this century alone is sufficient reason to include Afghanistan or Pakistan as possible provenances.

**LEAF CALYX BOWL**

Like the leaf calyx cup discussed above, this silver phiale was also raised, including the numerous ornaments, in high relief (no. 76). The ornament, which has been developed from a pentafoiliate rosette with interspersed tips, speaks for a dating not earlier than the first century B.C., given the overlapping leaves of the central rosette. The closest parallel both formally and technically is a silver phiale in the Nihavend Treasure from Iran (fig. 31). It was reportedly found with Imperial coins, but the treasure also contained pieces that were obviously much older. In the same tradition of craftsmanship, although differing in the general outline of the calyx, stands the deep cup from treasure II (no. 67).

As on the cup (no. 75) the second row of the calyx on no. 76 is developed asymmetrically from the rosette. The serrate acanthus also finds its best parallels on this vessel. The lower parts of the interspersed lanceolate leaves are covered by smaller superimposed leaves, also a common motif in treasure I. Finally, a nymphaea-nelumbo calyx interspersed with acanthus leaves whose alternate tips are bent rises without axial symmetry from the two-tiered ornament. The calyx composition can be traced back to Macedonian decorative art of the late fourth century B.C. It enjoyed great popularity on metal and glass vessels in the second century B.C. The rounded tips with stone inlays of the acanthus foliage are undoubtedly derived from the special Seleucid type discussed previously and find almost identical counterparts on the already mentioned cup from treasure II (no. 67).

The decoration of bowl no. 76 is completed by numerous blossom scrolls, which rise between the leaves and within the nymphaea foliage. The nymphaea-nelumbo-like leaves thus become filled decorative units, a feature already known in the fourth century B.C. and found especially in the second century B.C. on metal and glass vessels (fig. 27).

The asymmetry of the overall calyx design is illuminated by a comparison with the strict coaxial arrangement of Ptolemaic leaf calyces (fig. 43), and the difference is made even more noticeable by the fact that many individual details recur, albeit in highly mod...
ified form, in both compositions—for example, the rosette with interspersed tips in the center of the bowl, the encircling wreath of acanthus and smooth leaves, as well as the filled nymphaea leaves and the acanthus with the alternately bent tips.

Particularly worth noting in this context are the compositional differences of the bowl from Nihavend (fig. 31) that is technically so closely related to the Malibu plate. There is no second row of acanthus and lanceolate foliage. Eight small, narrow lanceolate leaves, placed in front of the large leaves, have been added, a motif we have already encountered in its late Classical and Hellenistic form. The symmetry of the composition with leaves in the foreground is more advanced, and only the five-leaf rosette could not be integrated. It should be noted here that the principle of symmetry is not an entirely sufficient criterion for attributing a piece to a particular artistic circle. The Seleucid vessels from Cività Castellana are perfectly symmetrical in composition (fig. 27). The leaf calyx ornaments in treasure I are also coaxial (nos. 4, 6, 7). The conscious rejection of unifying elements between the calyxes on the cup (no. 75) and the bowl (no. 76) may point to a particular artistic province or workshop tradition, but the composition is not so often found in the Seleucid repertoire.

When we speak of nymphaea nelumbo leaves on bowls from the Seleucid and Bactrian sphere, we are talking primarily about nymphaea-like foliage that exhibits a bent leaf tip like the Egyptian foliage type represented, for example, on pieces from the group from Fayum-Canosa (fig. 43). Foreign to the actual nymphaea leaf (fig. 16) is the pointed contour of the tip. If, however, we examine the vessels from Cività Castellana (fig. 27) or the cup from treasure II (no. 67), we notice immediately that the suggestion of bent leaf-tips is totally lacking in the case of the nymphaea foliage. The contour of the leaf is curved and evenly rounded in the upper part. This is also true of the silver bowl from Nihavend (fig. 31). The difference between this and Ptolemaic decorations is the more remarkable since Egyptian nymphaea nelumbo leaves were perfectly well known even in the Seleucid-Bactrian sphere.

Compared with the Cività Castellana group (fig. 27) and the Nihavend bowl (fig. 31), the Malibu bowl goes a step further. The rounded inner field is only distinguished from the upright leaf tip by a tiny line, and the stiff contour of the leaf is not related to the curved leaves of the other bowls. Stiff leaves of this type are nevertheless well known and are to be found even on monuments of Kushan times in India—a further indication of the Indo-Greek or Gracco-Bactrian origins of the Malibu vessels (nos. 75, 76). The acanthus on the Getty bowl, which bends to the side without any suggestion of overlapping, is not only to be found on the Nihavend phiale but also on a belt buckle in Taxila.

Two variants of the flower tendril also appear on the Malibu plate. Filigree scrolls, some with tiny Italianizing spiral volutes, rise up between the leaves. The nymphaea-like leaves are filled with similar scrolls but without spirals. Just like on the cup from treasure II (no. 67), there is a continuous blossom scroll with broad accompanying leaves between raised rows of beads in the friezelike zone above the leaf calyx. The broad leaves along the scroll are unusual for a Hellenistic floral scroll.

A late Gnathian bowl depicts at first glance a similar motif but, given the differences in shading, this is without doubt a fillet that is wound around the ivy scroll. The motif recurs in simplified form, perhaps already understood as a scroll, on a Hellenistic emblem bowl of the later third or early second century b.c. from the northern Pontic region. The detail is probably also cited in very alienated form on a scroll ornament from Kurgan 2 in Pazyryk in the Altai, but this might be entirely incidental. In later times, the large leaves appear even on Sogdian wall paintings. At present the floral scrolls on the Malibu bowl can only be seen against the background of this tradition of forms in the Near East. It seems possible that the scheme is simply a misunderstanding of a taenia motif.

The floral repertoire on both types of tendrils on bowl no. 76 is similar but not identical. A feature that is typical for the late stage of development is the use of large numbers of rather flat rosettes, some of them with five leaves—the same type as those on the Nihavend bowl (fig. 31). The same can be seen on the third group from treasure I (nos. 13–16; see chart, p. 244). Worth noting here is a rosette with serrate edges, which should probably be interpreted as a blossom given in back view.

The other blossoms are almost without exception tiered compositions made up of slender buds that emerge from calyx blossoms. Parallels are to be recognized on the deep cup from treasure II (no. 67). In contrast to most of the buds on the bowls from treasure I (types 27–34), the buds are no longer slightly opened at the tip in Classical or Hellenistic fashion. The closed variant is to be found in an ornament from the early Imperial strata at Taxila already mentioned, but blossoms of this kind can be documented at the latest from the second century b.c.

We must distinguish between two variants of tiered blossoms. One is a composition with a calyx seen
at a slanting angle from above, as we know it already from the early Hellenistic-Macedonian repertoire.\textsuperscript{657} The other is the bud developed from three pendant leaves, a calyx shown from the side with leaves bent outward.\textsuperscript{658} The development of this form is clearly recognizable on the bowls from treasure I (types 32–34). The best parallels or rather prototypes for this calyx variant are to be found in the Graeco-Bactrian region.\textsuperscript{659} There the motif is shown in rigid two-dimensionality. As indicated in connection with treasure I, the blossoms with the three pendant leaf petals in no way represent a form exclusively peculiar to the Graeco-Bactrian region although it occurs on the Nihavend plate (fig. 31)—it is also to be found on a bronze basin with Egyptianizing decoration.\textsuperscript{660} The Nihavend bowl, however, depicts the trefoil ivy blossom that is so typical for all of the groups of bowls in treasure I (type 45). This is consistent with the Iranian provenance of the vessel.

The first tiered blossom variant mentioned is to be found in such closely related form on a decoration from Taxila that one could suggest a similar, eastern provenance for our bowl (no. 76) and date it to the first century B.C. or the first century A.D.

HEMSIHERICAL CUP, KETTLE, AND SHALLOW BOWL

The shape of this silver cup (no. 77) is derived from an originally oriental type of hemispherical vessel that was widely used in Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{661} The cup has a partially damaged inscription in Greek that possibly refers to the weight of a pair of cups (only this one preserved). If this interpretation is accepted, the standard of weight used in the inscription accords with that of the Parthian standard of approximately 4 grams per drachma (see catalogue entry).\textsuperscript{662} Consequently, the weight of the vessel does not contradict its alleged eastern provenance.\textsuperscript{663}

Traces of soldering for the handle attachments on a small round silver kettle without a foot (no. 78) provide a certain amount of information toward dating the piece. Whereas one of the attachments of the now missing handle was round, the other was of cordate form with a cross-shaped tip. Comparable attachments are to be found in the eastern Mediterranean in the first century B.C.,\textsuperscript{664} and the vessel therefore fits well into the chronological framework already established for the leaf calyx vessels.

The simple, undecorated shallow bowl (no. 79) fits into the same Near Eastern class of bowls without foot or base ring that is represented by most of the vessels from treasure I (nos. 1–18). Consequently, the bowl confirms in a very general way the suggested eastern provenance of the other vessels from treasure IV. In comparison with the bowls from the first treasure, the rather thick-walled vessel is, however, of rather inferior workmanship. As could be demonstrated, the type was in use also in the first centuries B.C. and A.D.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In terms of the history of their ornament, these vessels (nos. 75–79) should be attributed to the former Graeco-Bactrian sphere. But their positioning in a chronological framework from the middle of the first century B.C. or even early first century A.D. raises several art historical questions when seen in relationship to the suggested provenance from the Pakistani or Afghan territories.

Because in the last third of the second century B.C. the Graeco-Bactrian world finally collapsed under the assaults of nomadic peoples,\textsuperscript{665} leaving independent Greek states only in Afghan-Pakistani regions, we can assume with caution that the repertoire of the Indo-Greek realm of the first century B.C. was identical in its basic features with the Bactrian repertoire of the second century B.C. The same might be valid for the Indo-Parthian and Saka-Parthian periods of the first century A.D.

In the course of the second century B.C., the Parthians finally expelled the Seleucids from Iran. Did the exchange of artistic forms continue unbroken despite the political changes? If we are right to see the bowl from Nihavend (fig. 31) and the cup from treasure II (no. 67) as being in the Graeco-Bactrian tradition, we must again accept a lively interchange of products. It might be that the common traits of this late Hellenistic repertoire go back to the Seleucid and Bactrian traditions of the second century B.C., which perhaps continued to be used after the collapse of Hellenism as a political power in the Indo-Greek as well as the Partho-Iranian area. On the other hand, in view of the similarity of some later details, a certain amount of exchange must have taken place.\textsuperscript{666} The Graeco-Bactrian vessels in Malibu offer some insight into the problem of the continuation of earlier Hellenistic traditions in the field of decorative systems in central Asia.
GOLD CUP

A cup made of thin gold sheet (no. 80) was acquired along with the silver vessels (nos. 75–79) and the gold jewelry (nos. 81–125). No precise parallel to this cup is known to me, although it can be attributed to a cultural sphere with a relative degree of certainty. The high foot, the narrowing below the lip, and the fact that it has no handles suggest cuplike pottery bowls from Ai Khanoum and Tepai-Sach in Bactria, although the outlines are not exactly the same. The bulging contour below the lip is also known from deep bowls of the same provenance. Comparable late Hellenistic and early Imperial bowls in the eastern Mediterranean, from Delos, Tarsus, and Athens, however, often have handles and a far more flaring shape and more pronounced lip.

The gold cup thus fits well into the Graeco-Bactrian cultural context that we have been able to establish for the vessels that were acquired along with it. The form of this vessel is known only in a much higher and more slender version among the finds from Taxila.

It seems advisable not to choose too close limits for the chronological attribution, but a dating between the later second and the first centuries B.C. or even in the first century of the Christian era seems probable.

INDO-SCYTHIAN JEWELRY

Along with the vessels just discussed, the Museum acquired a number of pieces of gold jewelry of similar date that fit into a different ethnic horizon. Unfortunately, it is not clear whether the vessels were found with the gold objects. What can be said with certainty is that the gold in particular is part of the nomadic, central Asian cultural horizon that is identifiable in Afghanistan and Pakistan in the later decades of the second century B.C. down to the first century A.D. The following analysis will clarify the strong connections of the former owners to areas of nomadic central Asia.

BRACELETS AND NECKLACES

This group includes three bracelets and a torque with “trumpet-shaped ends” (nos. 89–92). The typological precursor of the latter is possibly to be seen in the torque from treasure I (no. 38). The largest of the pieces, approximately 15 centimeters in diameter, can be identified as a torque (no. 89). A parallel exists, along with a coin of Tiberius, in the inventory of Grave 3 in Tillya-tepe in northern Afghanistan and another was found in Taxila in the treasures of the first century A.D. from houses of the late Saka-Parthian period. One of these treasures contained besides a torque a silver bowl, which, according to the inscription, must have been in use in the first third of the first century A.D. It is worth mentioning that, unlike the Getty torque, two of the three examples known from Taxila were worked in two pieces.

Three slender bracelets, or anklets, of the same type, which are only 6 to 8 centimeters in diameter (nos. 90–92), are known in similar form from Tillya-tepe and Taxila. There the bracelets or rings seem to be always heavier and some of the pieces from Taxila were also worked in two halves. In any case, according to the finds from Tillya-tepe and Taxila, the bracelets and the larger torque can be dated at the earliest to the end of the first century B.C. or, more likely, to the first century A.D.

BELT MOUNTS

Among the metal fittings, decorative pieces for use on belts figure prominently. The variety of pieces that can be identified as buckle mounts could be an indication that they stem from different contexts or burials.

The numerous thin gold sheets cut in rhomboid and zigzag lamellae of various sizes seem at first glance to have been used as decorations for belts as well. Their variety also suggests that the pieces come from different burials (no. 109). It is curious, however, that holes for sewing them on are missing, although this difficulty would exist for any other suggested use as well. Exact parallels in gold sheet are not known to me. We can point here, however, to a set of appliqués with pointed edges on a belt from Bactria that must have made a very similar impression when it was sewn on.

Possible analogies for lamellae made of other materials can also be cited. Textiles cut in overlapping zigzag form were found in the sixth kurgan in Noin Ula in Mongolia. The Noin Ula finds provide several parallels for the Malibu gold and thus the comparison gives a certain chronological point of reference. S. I. Rudenko has suggested an interpretation of the textiles as flags and banners. The zigzag and rhomboid decoration remotely recalls Siberian bronze pieces and a Siberian gold buckle. In general, there can be little doubt about the connection between the Getty lamellae and costume ornaments from central Asia.

A further clue as to the dating of these pieces is provided by two simple, looplike buckles or hooks, which
were also found in the sixth kurgan in Noin Ula. The burial dates to the earlier first century A.D., as mentioned previously. But as similar as the buckles are, the tightly compressed examples in Malibu (nos. 102, 103) make doubtful the use of a tongue and resemble closely the likewise tongueless buckles or loops from Tillya-tepe. These loops and a simple gold loop (no. 104) are most likely companion pieces to the round belt buckles with a hook (nos. 96–101). Again, early Imperial parallels from Tillya-tepe can be cited.

The undecorated, rectangular gold sheets, one of them with a hook, should also be interpreted as mounts for belt buckles (nos. 107, 108). Another pair bears a representation of a falling horse (nos. 105, 106), its body twisted, a motif that is known from a number of Siberian gold objects (fig. 44). The humble sheets, hammered over a mold, reveal several misunderstandings of the central Asian motif. The horse seems to have a small, waving wing, which might be a waving mane. The depiction of the horse’s twisted hindquarters seems to have been beyond the craftsman. Although the representation does not approach the quality of Siberian goldwork or in technical respects the comparative material from Tillya-tepe, it unmistakably demonstrates the owner’s close ties to the animal style of art from the steppes. The pieces also provide clues to the dating of the Siberian gold objects, an issue that will not be discussed here, however.

A gold buckle with two juxtaposed ram’s heads (no. 95) also points unmistakably to the sphere of Siberian goldwork. The basic type of the buckle is documented among Siberian examples as well as in Bactria, although no exact parallels are known to me. The heads can be compared with two ram’s heads in mirror-image scenes with attacking animals on a decorated buckle in the Metropolitan Museum. Most closely related are the form of the horns and the beards inlaid with stones.

A connection to iconographic themes from the art of the steppes is further illustrated by two ornamental metal plaques for belt buckles in the form of wolf’s heads with laid back ears and wrinkled noses that would normally suggest the animal is baring its teeth (nos. 93, 94). In spite of the slightly open mouth, however, the teeth cannot be seen. There is a circular boss in the lower jaw of the wolf on no. 94 that might have had something to do with the clasp. This detail and the wrinkles that, in contrast to no. 93, are laid back toward the base of the nose as in nature seem to me to speak against J. Frel’s suggestion that this piece is a forgery. Even though there are no known exact parallels for these wolf’s heads, wolves as motifs in groups showing attacking animals in Siberian art are sufficiently documented.

Close bonds to central Asian art are also illustrated by a gold sheet whose use is at present unknown (no. 110). Its pierced, curvilinear ornament reveals connections with finds from early Hellenistic graves in the Altai. It cannot be denied that this comparison would lead us away from the dating of the gold objects postulated here, unless it could be demonstrated that such motifs were used over an unusually long period of time.

**APPLIQUÉS FOR TEXTILES**

The large number of small decorated gold disks can be interpreted by analogy as ornaments for elaborate robes. There are again parallels for the small, round gold disks (no. 121) in burials from Tillya-tepe. A number of small, lenticular disks can be arranged to form a pattern—for example, a five-petal blossom (nos. 122, 123). The preference for pentafoliate rosettes in the Hellenized Orient has already been mentioned. The arrangement of such a rosette is, however, only one of several different possibilities. Another is illustrated by the so-called statue of Castana (fig. 45A). The statue belongs to the Gandharan sculptures and is chronologically later than the appliqués in Malibu, but the comparison does point to the same cultural background and—given an Afghan or Pakistani provenance for the Malibu pieces—to the same geographical area.

There are also parallels of much better quality in Tillya-tepe for the over one hundred small appliqués in the shape of small, quatrefoil ivy calyxes (no. 120) as...
well as similar objects in the burials at Noin Ula (fig. 45b). The Tillya-tepe appliqués are depicted as real calyces with pistil pendants. The ivy calyx is also part of the ornamental repertoire in treasure 1 (type 45). The question arises as to whether this ornamental form was introduced into the East from the West. In the early Hellenistic tombs in Pazyryk there are also quatrefoil appliqués, but they do not yet follow the ivy type. In view of the western imports found in the graves in Tillya-tepe and Noin Ula, we may tentatively trace the use of small ivy chalices on objects of various kinds to contact with the West. The use of the motif as an appliqué is, as far as I know, unknown before the graves in Noin Ula, and the appliqués in Malibu can therefore scarcely be dated earlier than the late first century B.C. An attribution to the first century A.D. seems much more likely.

**Four-Blossom Stars.** The most frequent decorative motif among the Malibu appliqués is a lotus blossom star made up of four separate flowers. It is to be found on four rectangular gold-sheet appliqués framed by bead and reel ornaments (no. 117). Even smaller than these appliqués of about 3 square centimeters are eighty appliqués of only about 12 millimeters that have been hammered over a mold and depict cut-out, star-shaped blossoms (no. 119). There are also twenty-five large, star-shaped blossoms cut from thin metal sheets that measure more than 9 centimeters (no. 118).

The use of quatrefoil star-shaped blossoms as a motif for gold appliqués seems to have its origins in the Scythian-nomadic repertoire. Numerous appliqués of this type were already part of the find from Maikop that dates to the fifth century B.C. They represent the most simple form of the blossom with florets and a pistil. The sheath leaves are more tightly curled than on the examples in Malibu.

The rather nonnaturalistic representation of the blossoms on the Maikop appliqués, whose stems literally divide to frame the center of the composition, is still to be found in analogous form on the four rectangular gold appliqués whose beaded frames already suggest western models (no. 117). This frame motif can be documented in central Asia at the latest from the time of the Pazyryk graves and most certainly reflects early Hellenistic influence. It is therefore not surprising that the floral cross is already to be found on a textile from the fifth grave in Pazyryk (fig. 45d). Large circles form the center of the composition and the flowers are placed directly on the circle without stems, as is the case on the largest appliqués at the Getty Museum (no. 118). In Scythian and Scythian-influenced grave inventories in the northern Pontic region, there are appliqués with four much more elaborate blossoms, and we can also assume western models for this particular blossom composition. The palmettelike filled blossom seen there also found its way into central Asia.

In view of the connections between the Malibu gold and elements of the nomadic repertoire, it is of particular interest that a related though not identical star-shaped blossom with buds within a beaded and reel frame is also to be found on a scabbard for the sword of a statue of the famous Kushan king Kanishka (fig. 45d), a detail to which we will return. No convincing parallel for the smallest of the star-shaped blossoms in Malibu is known to me (no. 119). It must, however, be regarded as a simplified form of the larger star-shaped lotus flower.

The composition of the floral cross is also to be found on a late Hellenistic textile from Kurgan 6 in Noin Ula in Mongolia (fig. 45e). As far as I know, star-shaped blossoms are no longer to be found at this time in the western Scythian region. The lotus star was retained for a far longer time in India and is still to be found on Gandharan sculptures. The dating of these sculptures is subject to controversy, however, since the dating of the Kushan Dynasty—for example, of Kanishka—varies from between the first to the third century A.D.

Lotus blossom stars are not only to be found as an isolated decorative motif on the textile from Noin Ula already mentioned. Similar though more complicated stars form a netlike decoration on the costume of a rider depicted on another textile fragment. Small, circular decorative elements like the Malibu appliqués (no. 121) also reappear. It is not possible to determine whether the costume of the rider, who is seated on a horse with Parthian, central Asiatic phalerae, represents an embroidered robe or a piece of clothing decorated with gold-sheet appliqués.

In view of the recurring connections between the gold objects in Malibu and the inventory of the graves from Noin Ula, it is not surprising that the physiognomy of the riders depicted on the textiles has been compared with Gandharan sculpture.

**Round Appliqués.** One round appliqué framed by a cord (no. 111) has a pentalophate calyx of nymphaea-like leaves. Leaves with a double contour have been encountered on bowls in treasure I (nos. 6, 7). The inner outline is evidently supposed to indicate a broad leaf. The radial lines visible over the leaves represent a contradiction to the Hellenistic leaf type. On the appliqué, they might represent traces of fastenings for small eyes, which were originally used for attaching the appliqué.

qués. It is also conceivable that the craftsman regarded the ornament as a composition in which five ivy leaves are shown with their tips turned inward. The radial lines would then have to be understood as leaf stems. Two coarse holes in the framing cord are later repairs.

The use of small rosettes or small leaf calyces, although not with nymphaea-like foliage, as an appliqué decoration is already encountered in the northern Pontic region in pre-Hellenistic contexts, but a very similar rosette decorates the foot of a glass skyphos in the tomb of Siverskaya Stanitsa on Taman (fig. 45F), a grave of the second half of the second century that has already yielded a three-loop phalera of Parthian, central Asiatic type. Close comparisons for the circular, pentafoil calyx appliqués guide us again to the tombs from Tillya-tepe, where the petals are partly inlaid, partly cut out. These tombs seem not to be earlier than the first century B.C. and are consequently later than the Siverskaya skyphos. In view of the Tillya-tepe pieces it offers no surprise that the nymphaea-like foliage is also to be found in Taxila and even in Noin Ula. Comparable floral calyces are also known in Gandharan art. For our Malibu appliqué, a date in the late first century B.C. or in the first century A.D. is advisable, but we should keep in mind that the motif itself is definitely older.

Of the other round appliqués in Malibu, only one can be regarded as a miniature leaf calyx (no. 115). In this piece an eight-pronged calyx of narrow, drop-shaped leaves around a large center is framed by a guil-
loche. A stone once decorated the center.

The second row of leaves in the calyx is made up of much broader, crosshatched leaves. Different treatment of the two rows forming the calyx has already been encountered on bowls from treasures I, II, and III (nos. 8, 68, 72; type 40), but the leaves in the second row on the bowl are different in shape. The use of a broader second row of foliage in the caliche is already found in Hellenistic times but it seems doubtful that this special feature of some Hellenistic calyx compositions is the basis for the Malibu appliqué. In the case of the Malibu appliqué it seems doubtful whether the craftsman was aware of the fact that the ornament was actually supposed to represent a leaf calyx. The resulting semicircular dissolution of the edge of the ornament could also be interpreted as something other than a leaf calyx, but the hatching on the second row of leaves seems to me to speak for an interpretation as a two-row chalice. Caution is in order here, however, since the crosshatching in the spaces between the leaves on another appliqué (no. 114) is possibly only to be interpreted as background and not as a second row of leaves.

Appliqué no. 115 and its center are framed by a simple guilloché of a type already known in pre-Hellenistic times. The frame occurs also on most of the other circular appliqués in Malibu (nos. 111, 112). One appliqué (no. 112) belongs to a simple star type that is cut out like those on circular appliqués from Tillya-tepe.

A comparable arrangement with a frame is used on pendants of the first century A.D. from Seleucia on the Tigris, but the idea of a string-bordered rosette can already be traced in the second half of the second century on skyphoi from Siverskaya Stanitsa in southern Russia (fig. 45f). The Seleucia piece can be seen, however, as evidence for a somewhat later dating of the appliqués from treasure IV, and this view is vindicated by a set of openwork pieces with six-pointed stars from Grave 2 at Tillya-tepe. In connection with the other parallels already cited, we should therefore date the Malibu appliqués as contemporaneous with the Tillya-tepe finds.

In general, appliqués with a star ornament are known from the northern Pontic, Scythian region, but star appliqués are also to be found among the decorative repertoire of Macedonia. Among the latter examples, the stars are usually conceived of in several rows, a feature that recurs only on appliqué no. 116. In view of the ties of the entire Malibu complex to central Asiatic finds, it seems likely that the motif was derived from the nomadic decorative tradition, but a relationship to Macedonian motifs cannot be excluded as a possibility in the Hellenistic Orient. A certain relationship of the star appliqués (nos. 112, 113, 114) to western prototypes is confirmed in general by the points with rounded bottoms.

Finally, the round Malibu appliqués also include three undecorated pieces (no. 124). Parallels provide little information because of the lack of ornament, but we can refer here by way of comparison to undecorated examples from Tillya-tepe or the northern Pontic region.

The limited number of round examples (nos. 111–116) and of square, lotus-star appliqués with head and reel frame (no. 117) is striking. Among the round examples, in fact, no two pieces are identical. In view of the Scytho-Bactrian or Indo-Scythian context of the pieces, a glance at the “statue of Castana” and its belt decorated with different kinds of ornamented round and rectangular appliqués is in order. In contrast to the appliqués in the Getty Museum, several of the statue’s appliqués, however, are decorated with figurative representations. In addition, the statue wears clothing with a broad hem decorated with lotus stars. Small, lenticular leaves that have close parallels in the gold examples of the Getty complex (nos. 122, 123) are also represented (fig. 45A).

Given the chronological difficulties with Gandharian and Kushan sculpture and in view of the parallels to Tillya-tepe and Taxila, the ornamental plaques in Malibu must be earlier in date than the statue, but the costume could be reconstructed by analogy to it. An alternative for the individual application of the round appliqués (nos. 111–116) would be their use on a scabbard, as is to be seen on the statue of Kanishka. Both round and square examples were used here as well. The parallels to the so-called statue of Castana seem to be more extensive, however. At the same time, it should be emphasized that it cannot be proved that the appliqués belong to a single find. For example, the use of the large lotus stars (no. 118) in the same fashion as on the textile from Noin Ula (fig. 45b) seems likely.

Whatever the case may be, parallels from central Asia and comparisons with Gandharan art emphasize once again the connections of the Malibu complex to the nomad-influenced art of the steppes, which, because of nomadic incursions into Bactria and the Indo-Pakistan region, can be assumed to have existed in these areas as well.
CAMEL RIDER

Connections with central Asia are confirmed in addition by the small silver sculpture of a rider on a central Asian—that is, Bactrian—camel that is too small in relation to the figure of the rider (no. 126). The only thing that can be said about the rider is that his long hair recalls the hairstyles on the textiles from Noin Ula, but one should not attach more importance to this feature.

It is of more significance that such miniature sculptures of riders, stags, and other animals are not only to be found in other central Asiatic contexts but even in the Treasure of the Oxus and in the collection of Peter the Great. They usually have small bases or at least the suggestion of a baseline, a detail that is lacking in the case of the rider in Malibu.

BLOSSOM

There are no parallels known to me for the blossom of paper-thin gold sheet (no. 125), and its purpose is unclear. In general the idea recalls the elaborate golden "plants" from Tillya-tepe.

HARNESS ORNAMENTS

Ornamental Buttons. Along with the costume appliqués there are also pieces that can be identified with a sufficient degree of certainty as harness ornaments. The first group (nos. 85–88) includes four more or less hemispherical appliqués that depict a reclining griffin in high relief. The griffin was originally decorated with stone inlays. The buttons were most likely attached at the cross point of the harness straps by means of a crossbar on the inside, in a fashion similar to that of the small medallions in treasure I (nos. 27–29). The prototypes of our buttons are already to be found in the Altai graves in Pazyryk (fig. 45b). The four examples are decorated with appliqués in low relief but with three-dimensional animal heads. One of the sets of harnesses from Kurgan 1 even depicts eagle-griffins (fig. 45h), but it does not yet show the influence of the griffin’s head of a Greek type, nor is a group with an attacking animal depicted. The bird, Rudenko’s “mythological eagle,” is shown without prey but with spread wings. As has already been mentioned, harness appliqués with three-dimensional animal heads are encountered also in northern Pontic contexts.

In central Asia, the Greek griffin’s head with the serrated comb is adopted on the well-known appliqué...
from the collection of Peter the Great in St. Petersburg. The adoption of Greek forms is documented in the addition of a cordlike frame of coverts (feathers) on the wings. In view of its size, the St. Petersburg appliqué should also be interpreted as a harness ornament. This piece and a group cut out of leather also depicts the scene of attacking animals for the first time.

In contrast to the splendid example in the collection of Peter the Great, the combs of the Malibu appliqués vary considerably from the Greek type (fig. 453). Instead of serrations, there are individual flamelike elements. This ornamental motif could have developed from the rows of stylized bird’s heads of Scythian-nomadic fabulous beings, or it could simply be a forerunner of the crenellated mane. In any case, the detail is not known in Hellenistic art. These pieces should be dated along with the other gold objects in the complex. In spite of the use of the Greek griffin’s head, the “mythological eagle” points unambiguously to pictorial ideas from central Asia and the nomadic world, and it is worth mentioning that the eagle-griffin has already been encountered in Pazyryk.

Treasure IV: Summary

The gold jewelry and harness ornaments in treasure IV can be classified both chronologically and culturally. The finds were made most likely in the Afghanistan-Pakistan area, and the nomadic origins and central Asian ties of their former owners cannot be doubted. The owners were among those nomads whose forebears had overrun the Graeco-Bactrian Empire and several generations later the Indo-Greek and Indo-Parthian states. We can associate them with the same peoples who founded the Kushan Empire. Notwithstanding the open question—whether the gold and the bowls from treasure IV do indeed come from the same site—we can identify the former owners with some caution as Indo-Scythians. The gold jewelry and ornaments, and possibly the camel rider, can be dated on the basis of parallels to other objects to the first century a.d. or, allowing for a certain latitude, to the late first century b.c.

In contrast to the central Asian goldwork, the vessels are ultimately bound to a Graeco-Bactrian or, at least in their roots, a Seleucid tradition. The silver vessels (nos. 75–79) should primarily be dated to the first century b.c. or the earliest decades of the Christian era at the latest.

Medallion Bowl with Dionysos and Ariadne

The silver medallion bowl (no. 127) is of a Hellenistic type that has only recently received scholarly attention. U. Hausmann has cited a number of pottery parallels from the Greek mainland and a silver bowl from the Fayum. He cautiously interpreted the pieces as pyxis lids, arguing that the type is to be dated to the third century b.c. He traces the relief in the interior back to older originals, an interesting observation that is in some respects confirmed by the Malibu bowl.

To the group of monuments from Greece, Egypt, and Italy already cited by Hausmann, a few other examples can be added. A silver bowl of excellent quality with a satyr and a nymph from Asia Minor has a tendril and a leaf calyx on the underside that point to a dating in the second century b.c. A glass bowl, probably Alexandrian, from Tresilio in Calabria dates to the early second century; its medallion shows a hunting scene. Also related is a bronze “fish plate” from Bagram, whose lip is decorated by an Ionian cyma, a choice that is typical for metal bowls of our type. The Lesbian cyma on the bent rim could be compared with late Classical or early Hellenistic examples, but given the find site and the possibly retardataire repertoire of Near Eastern pieces, we must be cautious about assuming all too close a chronological connection with ornaments from distant areas. The fins of the fish in the interior are movable. The motif speaks strongly in favor of the use of the vessel as a bowl and not as a pyxis lid. This is confirmed by the fact that not a single piece of this kind has been found with a pyxis to which it could belong.

None of the known examples is combined with a context earlier than 200 b.c. Forerunners of the medallion bowl with an egg and dart lip could be assumed to have existed in the third century, however, since a bronze bowl with handles and a small relief head in the center and a cyma around the lip is known from late Classical times. The history of this type seems not to have ended in late Hellenistic times, for a lead imitation of Imperial date is known from Parthian Dura Europos. In addition, there is a group among the numerous stone bowls from the Gandharan circle that is scarcely imaginable without the Hellenistic prototypes. Pieces that are on the whole formally comparable are known from Palmira and Egypt. The stone bowls from Afghanistan bear witness to the popularity of this vessel form, especially in the Hellenized Orient, a fact that...
should be emphasized.

The medallion of the Malibu bowl depicts Dionysos with Ariadne surrounded by grape vines, both figures facing left. A himation-clad Silenus is shown seated on a rock to the right, turned away from the couple. Dionysos' thyrsos staff is leaning against the rock separating the divine couple and Silenus.

The young and somewhat heavy-bodied Dionysos has approached Ariadne, put his right arm around her shoulder, and is touching her chin with his left hand. The gesture was originally undoubtedly intended to be a tender one as we know it from early Hellenistic bronze hydria attachments depicting Eros and Psyche. Like Psyche, Ariadne has turned her head away from Dionysos. While Eros is gently touching Psyche with his fingertips, the craftsman who made our bowl has interpreted the scene in quite a different fashion: The god has taken Ariadne's jaw in his hand, as if he wanted to force her to turn her head. The almost dancelike step of the god is also at variance with the composition of the hydria.

Another detail found in the representation of Psyche is used for Ariadne—each has one hand on her hip. The gesture suggests a more reflective attitude in the case of Psyche, and gives an almost provocative impression in the case of Ariadne. The pose used for Ariadne is consistent with the Hellenistic statuary type of Aphrodite with a naked breast. The reflective motif found in representations of Psyche has been turned into a pose that concentrates on the exhibition of feminine beauty. Although certain features common to the early Hellenistic Eros-Psyche attachments and to our relief can be recognized, there are no known ties to later Eros-Psyche groups.

The emphasis on the Aphrodisian sphere is reinforced by the mantle wound around the hips of the figure like a towel, leaving Ariadne's left leg almost entirely exposed. The mantle is not draped over the bent arm but is possibly meant to be held in the left hand, which is not visible. The whole drapery gives an almost nonantique impression. The stance of Ariadne is also remarkable, for the silversmith did not distinguish between a weighted and an unweighted side.

Finally, the relationship of the figure of Ariadne to the sphere of Aphrodite is also emphasized by her rich gold jewelry. A snake bracelet and a bracelet around the upper arm are frequent details in representations of Aphrodite, or Eros. The snake bracelet follows an early Hellenistic model, but the somewhat simpler form with smaller coils is also to be found in the second century. In dealing with such details, we must naturally keep in mind the limited format of the representation. The thigh band in the form of a chain with large pendants might again provide an indication of the origin of the piece. Chains with large, vessel-shaped pendants are to be found in the Syro-Parthian region.

The attribution of the piece to a workshop in the Hellenized East might also explain the peculiar pose of Ariadne, for similar compositions recur on an appliqué from the Punjab and on a medallion from Taxila. Both date most likely from the early first century A.D., although a late first-century B.C. date cannot be excluded with certainty. In comparison with our Getty medallion, the appliqué from the Punjab gives Dionysos in mirror image. Ariadne's head is shown in profile and the feet are crossed, but in general the composition is rather close to the medallion bowl. The small medallion from Taxila repeats more or less the motif of the appliqué. The eastern parallels not only speak strongly in favor of an eastern workshop for the Getty bowl; it seems even possible to see the Malibu bowl as a forerunner of the altered compositions from the formerly Graeco-Indian sphere. In view of the late date of the eastern redactions, one could posit a date in the first century B.C. for the Malibu bowl. But based on the background of the material from Taxila and Tillya-tepe it seems doubtful that an eastern atelier of the first century B.C. in Bactria or Pakistan still worked in such a true Greek style. Consequently I would prefer an attribution to the second century B.C.

Finally, Silenus demonstrates again in very obvious fashion the ties of the craftsman to the early Hellenistic repertoire. The figure has been added to the group as a kind of attribute. The head is very similar to Silenus-head attachments on late Classical and early Hellenistic bronze vessels. The seated figure has precursors in Classical times and corresponds in its basic features to the drapery of early Hellenistic figures of philosophers. The almost frontal orientation of the figure of Silenus, remarkable for a relief, would not speak against an early dating. It seems almost doubtful that the body and the head are derived from a single original, since the head appears to be large and the body is of a type that is not normally associated with Silenus. The himation and the sandals are also somewhat unusual. The assumption that an older model was used for the Silenus is in keeping with the observations on the pose and jewelry of Ariadne and reaffirms in a way the similar conclusions drawn for the pottery bowls by Hausmann.

The framing grapevine scroll is developed as a "companion" scroll, but it is not to be regarded in the
The tendrils emerge out of the earth without a basic calyx. The grape leaves have no eyes and are therefore not consistent with the widespread type known in the late fourth and third centuries B.C. A hint as to dating is possibly provided by the two shoots of the tendrils joined above the heads of the Dionysian couple. The interwoven shoots correspond in terms of form to those found on bowls in the second and third groups of treasure I (nos. 11, 13–16; see chart, p. 244). Since the curled ends of the tendrils issue neither leaves nor grapes, the comparison is not entirely satisfactory. The way the scroll ends are formed, however, suggests an eastern workshop in the Seleucid sphere of influence and perhaps a date not earlier than the later second century.

In summary, the bowl belongs to a type that came into use in the late third or early second century B.C. and was used in the Near East even in Roman times. The figural types, although drawn from earlier prototypes that can be traced back to early Hellenistic traditions, suggest a date in the second or first century.

BULL’S HEAD CUP

In 1987 the collection of silver rhyta with animal protomes in the J. Paul Getty Museum was augmented by a bull’s head cup of excellent quality. Although this isolated vase has no recorded provenance and comes from a different art market source than the other vessels listed in this catalogue, the cup terminating in the head of a bull calf can likewise be attributed to the Hellenized East.

The vessel pictures in vigorous detail the head of a bull calf with budding horns. The frothy curls, so typical of grown bulls, already show. The dull and somewhat clumsy appearance of the calf is well captured, although some of the details, such as the somewhat pedantic rendering of the fur by simple parallel lines, betray the superficial style of the ancient craftsman.

The head was raised from a single sheet of silver and functions as a casing for an undecorated inner liner without the help of solder. The rim of this second, undecorated, vessel forms the lip of the combined vase.

As A. Oliver has pointed out, this “two-part construction,” as in the case of the silver plates from Civitá Castellana (fig. 27), is well attested, especially since the second century B.C., having ancestors even in the Achaemenid Near East. The “double construction” is not limited to a single type or class—examples are known among footless bowls, kantharoi, and skyphoi as well as among pyxides, from the late third or early second century B.C. down to early Imperial times. A container, a bit deeper than the liner of our bull’s head cup, with a flaring rim comes from a hoard of Augustan silver from Asia Minor.

Consequently, the chronological span covers more than two centuries, but the closer we come to the early Imperial period, the more extensive the use of this technique seems to become. The closest analogies for the liner with a flaring rim stem from the Augustan period. Against this background, a date in the first century B.C. or even A.D. seems by far more likely than a dating of our vase to the preceding century.

The analogies for this double construction are not limited to a special artistic province, and reference can be made to examples in Italy or even from the northern provinces of the Roman Empire. Thus, our tentative determination of the chronological options has little bearing on the localization of the workshop.

Our head vase is linked to the various types of animal head rhyta of the Near Eastern and Greek reper-
In the early fifth century, possibly under the influence of spoils from the campaign of Xerxes, the type was adopted by Greek potters, but they immediately changed the vessel by adding a vertical handle. However, a unique horse's head vase of silver that belongs to later Achaemenid times should be mentioned.

In the early fifth century, possibly under the influence of spoils from the campaign of Xerxes, the type was adopted by Greek potters, but they immediately changed the vessel by adding a vertical handle. Although our class of head vessels was subsequently known in the Greek world, in the fifth and fourth century B.C. the type played obviously no role in the repertoire of those ateliers whose sway covered northern Greece, Thracia, and Asia Minor, the latter at that time under Achaemenid rule. This situation doubtlessly reflects the restricted popularity of this class even in the Achaemenid world. That does not mean, however, that the type did not survive the eventual collapse of the Achaemenid Empire, for even the rare horse variety is again represented in a Sasanian vessel.

Graeco-Hellenistic examples from the Mediterranean are not known to me, and it must be assumed that the class survived only in the former heartlands of the Achaemenid Empire. Our unique bull's head cup, possibly of the first century B.C. or A.D., bridges this enormous gap between the rare Achaemenid examples and the unique Sasanian follower.

Given the scattered evidence, little can be said about typological developments. Rather tall, flaring vessels, in comparison to the size of the animal heads of the pre-Achaemenid examples, recur again in the early Achaemenid ram's head cup from Siberia. In view of the considerably later horse's head example and our cup, it seems probable that there occurred a subsequent reduction of the cylindrical parts of the vessels. This observation is corroborated by the Sasanian horse's head example.

In the case of our bull's head vase, its typology and parallels point unmistakably toward a Near Eastern atelier. That we are dealing with a post-Achaemenid vessel, however, is moreover ascertained by the absence of any reflections of the Achaemenid style. Instead of stylized, unnaturalistic details in the rendering of eyes and muscles, instead of artistic curls of fur, we find an overwhelming desire for naturalistic representation. This tendency certainly evidences the dominating Greek influence, also attested to by the Greek belted garland around the animal's neck.

The garland proper belongs to the stage of development we have already analyzed for the phalerae (nos. 30 and 31), but the taeniae with their knot is rather unusual for a belted garland and is clearly derived from the trefoil garlands, as represented on the lion- and stag rhytons (nos. 66, 74). This leads again to the first century B.C. of A.D.

As already pointed out, among the Near Eastern head vessels known, our cup with its head of a bull calf seems unique. The picturing of bulls or bull calves was, however, widely known in Achaemenid art and most likely has a religious connotation. As a Hellenistic Near Eastern bull rhyton that is unmistakably reminiscent of Achaemenid examples demonstrates, the use of the bull was not limited to the Achaemenid period. The choice of a bull or a bull calf was nothing new to the repertoire of Near Eastern silversmiths.

To summarize, our typologically Near Eastern vessel was crafted in an entirely Greek but nevertheless somewhat provincial style. This blend of two worlds is easily explained in the context of the Hellenized Near East. If we speak of the Greek-trained craftsman's preference for naturalistic representation, the already mentioned graphic element in the rendering of the details can scarcely be overlooked. Not only the stereotypical engraving of the fur and the graphic picturing of the eyes and veins but also the sharp and unfleshy incisions of the dewlap provide ample evidence of the silversmith's limited understanding of the three-dimensionality of sculpture. His graphic style shows, however, no influences from the highly stylized animal...
representations of Achaemenid art. Although entirely committed to naturalism, he has “drawn” the details rather than chased and sculpted them in the round—an observation that could be made for all the other animal representations of treasures I and II.

This struggle with naturalism is all the more obvious if we compare two bull-calf rhyta, one from the northern Pontic region and one from Erebouni in Armenia. Both date from the latter parts of the fifth century B.C. and represent Greek workshop traditions in Asia Minor. Especially the figural scenes on the necks of the vessels are undeniable evidence of second-rate artists, but the pieces nevertheless reveal a much deeper understanding of artistic naturalism and stylization than is evident on the Malibu vase.

Given the evidence at hand, everything seems to point toward a Near Eastern, probably Iranian, atelier of the first century B.C. or the subsequent century, with a slight chance that the cup was made in the late second century B.C. Consequently, we are dealing again with one of the ateliers of the Hellenized Near East, in the Parthian-Arsacid period. Artistically the bull's head vase shows the transformation of a Near Eastern type in provincial Greek style, thus demonstrating again the long-lasting influence of the Greek view and understanding of art that was implanted in the formerly Achaemenid Near East under Alexander the Great and his successors.
NOTES


2 On southern Russian phalerae of the type under discussion here, see Spizyn (1909), pp. 18–29, figs. 25, 41, 47, 49; Rostovtzeff, Iran., pp. 135–138, 232, n. 10, pl. 27; idem, in Excavation of a Kurgan at the Great Bliznitsa near Varna, Bulgaria (1873), pp. 24–25, pi. 2.4 (from Mount Mithridates); M. M. Kobilina, Terrakotov'ie Statuetki Pantikapej i Fanagorii (Moscow, 1961), p. 120, (four phalerae). See also note 75, below.

3 See below, notes 10, 26, 27.


5 R. Ghirshman, IrAnt 14 (1979), pp. 172, 176, pl. 2.2, 3. Perhaps the motif is here understood as a suggestion of muscles. See pls. 2.3, 3.4.


16 In addition to the flat type there are deep, almost bowl-like examples of later date, which can be disregarded here. See Spizyn (1909), p. 27, figs. 58, 61.

17 For example, the deep phalerae (see above, note 16) and the examples from Akhtanizovka (see below, note 20). These pieces were made for harnesses different in type from those of the Getty phalerae.

18 See text corresponding to note 63.


22 See the Palmyrene reliefs cited above, note 13.

23 See above, notes 2, 4, 6, 9, 12.

24 Listed here are representations of Scythian harnesses in southern Russia in late Classical and early Hellenistic times. Chersonesos amphora in St. Petersburg, Hermitage Dn 1863.1/166; Arzamonow, *Goldschätze*, p. 12, pl. 175. Silver vase from Solokha, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Dn 1913.1/40; Arzamonow, *Goldschätze*, p. 47, pls. 154, 155. Silver rhyton, Paris, Musée du Louvre Bj 2226: M. Pfrommer, *Trophäen* (St. Petersburg, 1849), pl. 4.1. See also the rhyton of the late third or early second century from Merdzany, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Ku 1876.1/9 (for the rhyton, see below, notes 195, 517). The construction of the straps is, of course, hypothetical.

25 For Akhtanizovka Stanitsa, see above, note 20. For Jančekrak, see Spizyn (1909), p. 28, fig. 81; Ebert, *RV*, vol. 13 (Berlin, 1929), p. 101, pl. 41.C.a. For the pair with the Mithridates inscription in Paris, Cabinet des médailles: F. Drexel,
Jdl. 30 (1915), pp. 14–16, fig. 7 (inscription authentic); Ros­
tovtzeff, *Iranians*, pp. 116–137, pl. 27–1, 2 (inscription not auth­entic); idem in *Recueil N. P. Kondakov* (Prague, 1926), p. 245, 257; Ghirshman, *Iran*, p. 260, fig. 337 (second century B.C.). Larger than the Paris pair (diameter: 15.53 cm) is a sty­listically similar example from Raermond, in Leiden, Rijks­

28 For the helmet, cf. the coins of the Bactrian king Eu­kra­


30 For a representation of an Indian elephant in Ptolemaic faience, see below, note 101.


33 In Scallard (note 27) the Parthians are not even listed in the index.

34 Illustrative of these relations is the fact that Euthydemos during the siege of Bactra threatened Antiochos III with the nomads (Polybios 11.34.5). See Tarn, *Greeks*, p. 117.


On the basis of unambiguous echoes of Greek forms, G. Azarpay (Arūsas Asie 22 [1959], pp. 313–339) suggested a chronological framework of the early fourth to the third quar­ter of the fourth century B.C.—in any case prior to Alexander the Great. While his “Classical” parallels are in part from Imperial times (ibid., fig. 1) and others are not necessarily rele­vant in terms of absolute chronology, there can be no doubt about the strong presence of Greek elements. In my opinion, they are conceivable to this degree only after the establishment of Greek settlements in Bactria. A similar dating was sug­gested by Ditrich, *Tierkampf*, pp. 99, 160–168, 192, 240–247, nos. 1, 47–55, 75, 115–115, 118 (end of fourth century as ter­minus post quem or third century in the case of no. 75).

37 St. Petersburg, Hermitage Z-548: Rudenko, *Sammlung*, p. 61, pl. 22.8. 9. That the phalera came into fashion in Bac­tria is moreover evidenced by the small team of golden horses
from the Oxus Treasure. London, British Museum 123908: Dalton, *Treasure*, pp. 3–4, no. 7, pl. 4. The phalerae are very small, however, and the strap arrangement does not entirely follow the central Asiatic scheme. For a representation of a horse without phalerae from the treasure (British Museum 123947): Dalton, *Treasure*, p. 18, no. 46, pl. 13. Precursors of the phalerae fashion, also without the typical strap arrangement, can be seen on some of the horsemen on the golden sword sheath from the treasure (British Museum 123923): Dalton, *Treasure*, pp. 9–11, no. 22, pl. 9. This point will be discussed in another context.


40 For the already Classical motif, see Pfrommer, *Studien*, p. 38.


49 See below, note 53.

50 Gold stags from Kostromskaya, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Ku 1897, pl. 43: Artamonow, *Goldschatz*, p. 29, pls. 62–64, and from Kul Oba, St. Petersburg, Hermitage K-O 120: Artamonow, *Goldschatz*, p. 73, pls. 264–265.

51 See above, note 50. It should be noted that this feature is lacking among the Pazyryk finds. Compare from Tomb 1, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, *Tombi*, pls. 165, 169, 170.

52 On belted garlands, see above, note 40. This frame recurs on a high–Hellenistic silver medallion from Syria, Craw-cow Museum XI–443 (formerly Collection Czartoryski): J. de Witte, *GazArch* 6 (1880), pp. 141–142, pl. 24 top; Reinsberg, *Toraütik*, p. 149 (Imperial in date); Pfrommer, *Studien*, p. 138 (not later than second half of third century). The motif is occasionally also to be found in southern Russia (see notes 39, 25 [Volodarka], above, and 56 below). Related is the guilloche on the phalera from Vozdvizhenskaya Stanitsa (see above, note 25). At present, the garland motif is not known from Ptolemaic finds either. Compare other frames from platter casts from Memphis/Mit Rahine in Hildesheim, Pelzeaus Museum 1109/10; L142; 2952: Reinsberg, *Toraütik*, p. 294, no. 3, fig. 4 (egg and dart); p. 306–307, nos. 26–27, figs. 36–37 (beading); p. 314, no. 42, fig. 61 (woven band).

p. 120, fig. 58; p. 129, fig. 66; p. 173, figs. 87, 88.
p. 229, fig. 108. In keeping with the local fauna, there is an elk

54 St. Petersburg, Hermitage: M. P. Griaznov and E. A. Golomtshok, AJA 37 (1933), p. 37, pl. 2A; Rudenko, _Tombs_, p. 229, fig. 108. In keeping with the local fauna, there is an elk

55 See, e.g., St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, _Tombs_, p. 120, fig. 58; p. 129, fig. 66; p. 173, figs. 87, 88.

56 Ornamentally decorated prometopidia or objects that could be interpreted as prometopidia are sometimes pre-Hellenistic. Plaques from the Kaban area (Maikop), Berlin, Antikensammlung Misc. 30595 a-b: Greifenhagen, _Schmuckarbeiten_, vol. 1, p. 56, figs. 31, 32 (fifth century B.C.). Mold for clay "imitations," Würzburg, Martin von Wagner H 4993; Münzen und Medaillen AG, Basel, "Sonderliste E 24" (August 1962), no. 57 (fifth or fourth century B.C.). For a phalera with an ornamental decoration, see an example of the second century from Üspenskaya Stanitsa, Kaban (leaf calyx framed by a belted garland); Spizyn (1903), p. 53, fig. 77; Rostowzew, _Skythien_, p. 583; Pfrommer, _Studien_, p. 257, KdB 78.


58 In southern Russia (if not otherwise noted, St. Petersburg, Hermitage): Gold plaques from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Tombs, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Z-556 (from western Siberia): Rudenko, _Sammlung_, p. 62, pl. 22.12. On the problem of a possible Parthian animal style, see a bone carving and a bronze handle from Dura Europos: M. I. Rostovtzeff, YaleCL 5 (1933), p. 222, fig. 33; C. Hopkins in _Dura Europos_, vols. 7 and 8 (New Haven, 1939), pp. 376–381, pl. 39, F. Altheim, _Die Kritze der alten Welt_, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1943), p. 20, pls. 2, 3; Altheim-Stiehl, p. 460.

59 See above, note 20.


61 For nos. 30–31, see text corresponding to note 45. On nos. 32–33 see text corresponding to note 54.

62 Rostovtzeff, _GWHW_, vol. 1, text to pl. 62.3.

63 For nos. 30–31, see text corresponding to note 45. On nos. 32–33 see text corresponding to note 54.

64 On the historical background, see J. Wolski in F. Altheim and J. Behork, eds., _Der Hellenismus in Mittelastien_ (Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 188–254, esp. pp. 230–251 with nn. 151, 152. See also text corresponding to note 53.

65 See text corresponding to note 52.


67 On phialai with egg and dart decoration at the lip, see text corresponding to notes 613–617.


69 For nos. 30–31, see text corresponding to note 45. On nos. 32–33 see text corresponding to note 54.


71 Small gold plaque from Kul Oba, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: M. I. Rostovtzeff, _GWHW_, vol. 1, text to pl. 62.3.

72 Rostovtzeff, _GWHW_, vol. 1, text to pl. 62.3.

73 Rostovtzeff in _Reuill N. P. Kondakov_ (Prague, 1926),
Julian, see: Rostovtzeff, vol. 4 (New loop type in the regions east of Panticapaeum and the Don. Altertümer südrussischen Fundorts aus dem Besitz des Herrn A. Griechische Panticapaeum as well (Boehlau in M. Cramer, in mind that there is no specified provenance given in the cat-

beginning of the second century (Harmatta [note 2], pp. 10-

in Anapa in the Bosporan Kingdom, St. Petersburg, Hermit­
galogue and that this collection housed terracottas from Kerch/
museum), was actually found at Olbia, but it should be kept

tral Asiatic origin, seem to have menaced Olbia as early as the


75 Harmatta (note 2), p. 35, saw a concentration of the phal­
erae in the western part of the Scythian world but—like Ros­
tovtzeff—he did not realize the concentration of the three-

loop type in the regions east of Panticapaeum and the Don.

On the other hand, Sarmatian tribes, or at least peoples of cen­
tral Asian origin, seem to have menaced Olbia as early as the

beginning of the second century (Harmatta [note 2], pp. 10–

It is possible, therefore, that a terracotta staquette of a

mounted boy whose horse bears phalerae, formerly in the

Collection Vogell in Olbia (now Bonn, Akademisches Kunst-
museum), was actually found at Olbia, but it should be kept

in mind that there is no specified provenance given in the cat-

logue and that this collection housed terracottas from Kerch/

Panticapaeum as well (Boehlau in M. Cramer, Griechische

Alt­rümmer südrussischen Fundorts aus dem Besitz des Herrn A. Vogell [Kassel, 1908], p. 66, no. 709).

76 Harmatta (note 2), p. 39, sees a dependence of the finds

from southern Russia on Indo-Scythian phalerae, a theory that

can be discarded here because the Indo-Scythian examples are

definitely of a more recent date than the earlier examples from

the northern Pontic region.

77 In Bactria proper the first objects that might be seen as

phalerae can be dated in the Hellenistic period (see above, note 39).

78 This name is transmitted by Xenophon (πεταλούντας)

12.8 in general, in the Cyropæides 6.4.1 and Anabasis 1.8.7

specifically for Persian horses. Even Heliodorus (260.3) uses

this name for a front ornament of unknown form in his

description of Parthian cavalry: F. Altheim, Die Krise der Alten

tions of Parthian horsemen by Ammianus Marcellinus and

Julian, see: Rostovtzeff, Duna: Preliminary Reports, vol. 4 (New


79 The making of even precious metal objects for use in

burials was quite common. See, e.g., the finds from a tomb in

Anapa in the Bosporan Kingdom, St. Petersburg, Hermit-


the Scythians, this does not necessarily apply, despite the con-

clusion drawn by K. Schefold, Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher


80 The rhomboid type seems to have been almost unknown

in the central Asian steppes. A possible exception might be a

rhomboid bronze plaque of the "Ordos-group" in Stock-
holm, Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities: Reneden, Novin Ula, p. 153, fig. 57b.

81 See an oval appliqué from Akhanizovka with Athena

that could have belonged to a prometopidion (St. Petersburg,

Hermitage: Spizyn [1909], p. 25, no. 39, fig. 43) but should

rather be interpreted as the cover of a lenticular fibula (Pfrö-

mmer, Goldschmuck, p. 260, no. 2196f, FK 114).

82 See Pfrömmer, Goldschmuck, p. 271, no. 2389, 2391–

2392.

83 M. Andronicos, Virginia: The Royal Tombs and the Ancient

City (Athens, 1984), p. 109, fig. 66; the reconstruction (p. 115, no. 70) is not entirely correct. Here we can exclude rhomboid gold mounts from Macedonia which were found in graves on the

casts of the dead: I. Venedikto, BIABulg 27 (1964), p. 89, fig. 20. This is also applicable to the grave in Cornyan: V. Mikov, BIABulg 11 (1937), pp. 209–210, no. 4, fig. 190. H.

Donder, Zwei Funde aus dem suddrussischen Fundort (St.


southern Russia are also usually very large, but different in

shape, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Dn 1912, 1/42–47; Dn

92 Compare trappings from the Kiev region: H. Schmidt, Pulpudeva, p. 434, vol. 3, pt. 2 (Berlin and Copenhagen, 1960), p. 552, no. 37 (160-150 B.C.); Donder (note 83), p. 95 with n. 42. The use of this non-Greek trapping speaks in favor of an Eastern connection for the patron. A Scythian connection is unlikely, because the prometopidion is entirely in Greek-Hellenistic style, a point that cannot be discussed in this study.

93 From Kavarna: A. Mincev, Pulpudova 4 (1983), pp. 310-312, fig. 1. I owe the information concerning this group to E. Künd (Mainz).


95 This late date for the burial was already inferred by Barnett (1968), pp. 38, 51 (on the basis of the coins).


97 Heermann (note 96), pp. 139-144, pls. 39, 43.1.

98 On this tradition, see Heermann (note 96), pp. 139-140. It is still to be found in the paintings of a grave in Marissa, Pal­ estine, that has been dated according to its inscriptions around 200 B.C.: J. P. Peters and H. Thiersch, Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa (Maresalh) (London, 1955), p. 23, pl. 6; Rostovtzeff, GWHH, vol. 1, pl. 58. The horse does not have Achaemenid mane decoration, however.

99 Istanbul, Archaeological Museum: A. Schober, Der Fries des Hekateions von Lagina, IstitForsch, vol. 2 (Baden bei Wien, 1933), p. 40, no. 224, pl. 17. It is not quite certain whether an ellipsoid example is not meant after all.
Sammlung, p. 56, pl. 19.1, 2; K. Jettmar, Die frühen Steppenvölker (Baden-Baden, 1964), p. 192, fig. on p. 191.

113 Rostovtzeff, *GWH*, vol. 1, text to pl. 62.3.


120 If not otherwise noted, St. Petersburg, Hermitage. Oguz Kurgan: N. A. Ojaniko, *Antichnyj import v pridneprov’e i stepnovoj region* (Baden-Baden, 1964), p. 106, no. 5000, pl. 46. Chmyreva Mogila: ibid., p. 106, no. 496k, pl. 42. Great Bliznitsa, burial of the third woman from 1868: L. Stephani, CR 18 (1894), p. 33, pl. 12. For a typologically identical wooden appliqué from the Great Bliznitsa, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: L. Step­hani, *CR* (1895), pp. 72, 89, pl. 3.10, 11, 30, 31. Also as framed appliqué: Sabatier (note 24), pl. 5.5. This variant appears to derive from an Achaemenid type that is crouching to spring, however, see: J. Boardman, *Iran* 8 (1970), pp. 34, 43, pl. 6, no. 129 (St. Petersburg, Hermitage); pl. 5, no. 116 (Paris, Bibl. Nat. de Luynes 117); pl. 5, no. 118 (London, British Museum WA 115354); pl. 5, no. 122 (Cambridge E2.2509.1954); pl. 5, no. 122 (Munich A 1398); pl. 6, no. 133 (Paris, Bibl. Nat. M 5990); pl. 6, nos. 135, 138 (Boston 13.231: 01.1003).

121 Compare an Achaemenid seal in private possession: J.
NOTES 77
127 Cf. even the chain on the bearded sphinx on the Ptolemaic faience inlay (see above, note 140, Brooklyn).

128 London, British Museum 123928 (see above, note 125). On the dating of the treasure, see note 95.

129 See above, note 121. For sphinxes without beards, see a seal in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale M 6360: J. Boardman, Iran 8 (1970), p. 34, no. 125, pl. 5 right. Appliqué from the Oxus Treasure, London, British Museum 123927 (see above, note 127).

130 Ghirshman (note 47), p. 413, fig. 243 (beardless servant).

131 The fact that the bearded sphinx was known in the Parthian period as well is indicated indirectly by male sphinxes from Sasanian times: Baer (note 125), p. 22, pl. 21.38; Lukonin, Persien, p. 97, figs. 72, 74, 75, 77, 78.


135 Not all of the pieces have braids that swing so far to the side. Compare the example from Toroni, northern Greece (see above, note 153).

136 Small diadems in the hair above the forehead are often recognizable (see above, note 153, Toroni). Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, Fogg Art Museum 1949:99; D. G. Mitten and S. F. Doeringer, Master Bronzes from the Classical World, exh. cat., Fogg Art Museum, City Art Museum of St. Louis, Los Angeles County Museum of Art (1967), pp. 108–109, no. 108 with ill. Worth noting on the siren on our prometopidion is the hair that covers the forehead without a part in the middle. For this motif, see a bronze head from Iran: Atli (note 138), dust jacket illustration.

137 Compare earrings from Dushanbe and India (see above, note 143).


139 See above, note 112 (Pishchane).

140 The latest Greek example known to me is an already modified piece from the late fourth or early third century B.C.: Hartford, Connecticut, Wadsworth Athenaeum 1917.825; Diehl, Hydria, pp. 37, 220, B 168, pl. 20 (erroneously dated to the last quarter of the fifth century); D. V. Bothmer, Gnomon 37 (1965), p. 603 (with references); Pfommer, Studien, p. 261, KBk 109.

141 On the hydria in the find, see above, note 152. On a basin with siren attachments: W. Fuchs, Boreas 1 (1978), p. 114, pl. 20.2, 3. On a situla see my comments in Ifd 98 (1983), pp. 253–254, fig. 11. The bucket dates from the second half of the fourth century. For a succinct discussion of the local, mercantile aspects: R. Rolle, Die Welt der Skythen (Lucerne and Frankfurt, 1980), pp. 100–101 (erroneously dated to the fifth century B.C.). A hydria in St. Petersburg (Hermitage P 1836.4) that is supposed to date from the fifth century and that is thought by S. Reinach (ABC, p. 94, pl. 44.7) to have come from the third-century kurgan of Kul Oba does not, according to E. Diehl (Hydria, p. 219, B 139), stem from the famous burial (she draws on information provided by the museum). A hydria is, however, sketched in on the plan of the tomb (Reinach, ABC, plan A, o).


165 Bronze feet from vessels: Baer (note 125), p. 25, pl. 23.43; J. Lerner, Iran 13 (1975), p. 167, n. 18, pl. 2.9 (Nisa). In addition, see Ghirshman, Iran 8 (1970), p. 184, pl. 2a (votive offering in a temple of Herakles, Masjidi-Soleyman).

166 Baer (note 125), p. 46, pl. 33.61.

167 Ivory from Begram: ibid., p. 26, pl. 23.44.

168 Ibid., 44, pl. 33.60; J. Lerner, Iran 13 (1975), pp. 166–167, pl. 2.8.

169 Compare the repair on the prometopidion (see text corresponding to notes 78–79).


174 See the medallions from Ordzhonikidze (see below, note 177).

175 For a loop through which two straps could pass, see Pernice (note 88), pp. 29–30, fig. p. 27 right.

176 Compare the late Classical horse cited in note 173 above or the harness from Panagyurishte, Sofia, Archaeological Museum; B. Filow, *RomMitt* 26, figs. 17, 18. For the medallions, see above, note 179.


180 Plaster casts from Memphis/Mit Rahine of medallions that could probably also be interpreted this way, Hildesheim, Pelizaeus Museum 1177, 1118, 1121, 1138 Reinsberg, *Toruł*, pp. 305, 310, 312, 316, nos. 23, 33, 38, 45, figs. 19, 42, 53, 54.

181 See below, note 182.

182 See text corresponding to notes 49–50.


184 See text corresponding to notes 65, 255.


189 Head with a cloak and diadem on the fulcrum of a kline in London, British Museum 1908.4–10.2: G. M. A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London, 1966), p. 57, fig. 306; Pf rommer, Studien, p. 200, KP 119. For a fulcrum our bust would have to have a medallion-like form.


191 Cleveland Museum of Art (see above, note 11). For the lenticular gold-sheet appliqués of the ornamental saddle decoration, see below, note 739.

192 E. Schmidt, *Der Große Altar zu Pergamon* (Leipzig, 1961), pl. 15 (Hecate); pl. 19 (with a horn); pl. 23 (Eos); pl. 27 (Dionysos); pl. 40 (Aphrodite).


195 St. Petersburg, Hermitage Ku 1876,1'/9; M. Rostovtzeff, *Izvestia Imperatorskoj Archeologiceskoj Kommissii* (St. Petersburg), 49 (1913), pp. 134–136, pls. 10.1; 11.1; Ebert, *RV*, vol. 13, p. 68, pl. 29A (s.v. “Südrussland”); W. Blawatzky in *Le rayonnement des civilisations grecque et romaine sur les cultures périphériques, 8e congrès international d’archéologie classique, Paris 1963* (Paris, 1966), p. 199, fig. 93.31; Artamonow, *Goldschätze*, p. 85, pl. 311. On the dating of Merdzany, see Rostovtzev, *Skythien*, p. 554. The helmet and the appliqués (Ebert, pl. 29B.2, 10) are closely related to examples from Akhtanizovka (Spizyn [1909], figs. 1, 9). On the dating of Akhtanizovka, see above, note 20.

196 For the type of the leaf calyx rhyton, see text corresponding to note 517.


199 Schmidt (note 192), pls. 55, 56, 58.


204 Metal vessels are not known from Egypt, but there are a number of faience imitations of metal originals, such as the example in Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 48.367. Also from Sciatbi in Alexandria, Greek and Roman Museum JE 16696: E. Breccia, *La necropoli di Sciatbi*, Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes (Cairo, 1912), p. 184, fig. 115; Adriani (1967), p. 109, pl. 2A. On the chronology of Sciatbi: Pfrommer, *Studien*, p. 64, n. 352. The fragment dates not earlier than the late third century. Also a fragment from Hadra, Alexandria, Greek and Roman Museum JE 16703: Adriani (1967), p. 109, n. 2, pl. 3, 1, 2. Also from the rue d’Aboukirk: idem, *Annaire du Musée Greco Romain* (1925–39), p. 82, fig. 39 top middle. From Egypt, Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 1976: C1A Pays-Bas, Musée Schouman, vol. 1 (Paris, 1927), I, c.d, pls. 1, 6, 2, 1; E. v. Mercklin, *AA* (1940), p. 12, fig. 10. For a Seleucid example of the arrangement of the calyxes in two rows, see a gold-glass bowl from Iran in Teheran, Fororugh Collection: L. Byvans, Quarels van Ufford, *BABesch* 47 (1972), pp. 46–49, figs. 3, 4. The use of a taenia garland points to a Ptolemaic prototype (see Alexandria JE 16791). On the motif in the third century, see Pfrommer, *Studien*, pp. 13, 103, 118, 177, nis. 69, 1270.


207 Private collection. *Arbeitsbericht: Römisch Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz* (second quarter 1984), p. 36, fig. 19. My thanks are owed also to E. Künzl for providing photographs.


211 The reading and dating of the inscriptions were kindly provided by Professor R. Degein, University of Munich, who dated them in the first century B.C. The suggested chronology for Aramaic weight inscriptions in the first and second century A.D. (Harper [1987], p. 351) is therefore not valid for the bowls from treasure I (see below, note 537). For the stepped embattlements, see text corresponding to notes 410–414.

212 Although there are no framing snakes, it might be possible that the scale pattern is an allusion to the aegis of Athena.


214 See above, note 205.


217 P. Bruneau, *Les monnaies, Exploration archéologique de Delos*, vol. 20 (Paris, 1975), pp. 72–73, 156–159, no. 68, figs. 55 bottom, 57 (badly damaged, use of the anchor not totally certain); pp. 209–211, no. 166, fig. 135 (on fig. 136 a trident and a dolphin); pp. 261–263, no. 228, figs. 211, 213 (fig. 214 with trident); pp. 274–275, no. 261, figs. 228, 229.

218 C. Picard, *Syria* 14 (1933), p. 120. Picard interpreted the anchor or the trident and the dolphin as a Syro-Phoenician symbol, and Tarn (Greeks, p. 329; see below, note 259) agreed. This view was questioned by P. Bruneau (note 217), pp. 72–73.


inscriptions of the first century B.C. on some of the bowls
in the J. Paul Getty Museums, Malibu, Calif. (1985)—can be entirely excluded on
the basis of the Hellenistic examples for the anchor and dol­
phins medallions and on the background of the Aramaic
inscriptions. (See the catalogue entries.)

For the anchor of Seleucid coinage, see A. Houghton, Coins of the Seleucid Empire from the Collection of
Arthur Houghton (New York, 1983), p. 2, no. 21, pl. 1 (An­
thochus I); p. 120, nos. 1302–1303, pl. 78 (Seleucus I); p. 48, nos.
567–570, pl. 32 (Demetrius II). In contrast to these represen­
tations are small votive anchors (?) from Delos: W. Deonna,
Le mobilier Délén, Exploration archéologique de Délos, vol.

Appian, Syr. 56; Justin, Epit. 15.3–4. B. Fehr, AA
p. 610; H. U. Insinnsky, Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus,
Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, vol. 16
(Baden-Baden, 1962), pp. 17–18; H. R. Baldus, Chiron 8 (1978),
p. 198–199. I am indebted to R. Fleischer for references.

From Uruk-Warka, Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum
VA 3163: J. Jordan, Uruk-Warka (Leipzig, 1928), p. 65, no. 27,
pl. 88.1; M. Rostovtzeff, YaleCIST 3 (1932), p. 47, no. 80, pl.
8.11 (anchor with a horse's head); no. VA 6136 erroneously as
pl. 8.10. Rostovtzeff further cites VA 6100. Chicago,
Museum of the Oriental Institute A 4066: ibid., p. 41, no. 58, pl. 8.9 (in
the catalogue erroneously numbered 8). From Seleucia on
the Tigris: R. H. McDowell, Stamped and Inscribed Objects from
Seleucia on the Tigris (Ann Arbor, 1935), pp. 43–44, pl. 1.5
(anchor with horse's head). McDowell cites four further
examples. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Kelsey
Museum 35716: Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, exh. cat., Kelsey
Museum, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, 1977), p. 19,
no. 7, fig. on p. 18 bottom left (with six further examples).

Compare H. Seyrig, Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth 8
(1946–48), p. 39, nos. 1, 2, p. 40, no. 4; p. 42, no. 6; p. 45,
no. 2, 4, 5; p. 47, no. 12 [on this piece, see Rostovtzeff, GWHV,
vol. 1, text, and pl. 55.2 (framed by small dolphins)];
p. 48, nos. 13, 14, pls. 1.1; 3.2. Also M. Dothan, A. H. Spal­
don, Bar-Ilan, vol. i, text, and pi. 55.2 (= Atiqot, vols. 9 and 10)
(Jerusalem, 1971), p. 68, fig. 30.6, pl. 25.7.

E. T. Newell, The Coinage of the Eastern Seleucid Mints
(New York, 1938), index, p. 304, s.v. "anchor." Idem, The
Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints (New York, 1941), index,
p. 444, s.v. "anchor." Houghton (note 222), nos. 1.2, 51, 300,
422, 432, 435, 567–572, 683–686, 896–897, 917, 919–920,
1189–1191, 1304, 1309 (all inverted); nos. 914–916, 1032–
1036 (diagonal), pls. 1, 3, 17, 23, 24, 32, 40, 53, 54, 71, 76, 77.
I am indebted to A. Houghton for these references.

Houghton (note 222), p. 1, nos. 1, 2, pl. 1.

Ibid., p. 48, nos. 567–572, pl. 32.

Ibid., p. 94, nos. 917, pl. 54.
horse has a nomad harness!). Harness from Tsimbalka, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Dn 1868, 1/8–10; 1868, 1/31–33: Artamonow, Goldschmied, p. 59, pls. 186, 187. Here the small fins are themselves in the shape of dolphins. Golden fish from Volkovsky in Kiev, Museum of Historical Treasures: Ebert, RV, vol. 13 (Berlin, 1929), p. 96, pl. 39E (s.v. “SüdruSSLand”).

244 Fish in London, British Museum 123917: Dalton, Treasure, p. 7, no. 16, pl. 6 (length: 24.2 cm). London, British Museum 123942: ibid., p. 17, no. 41. pl. 12 (dolphins on the rim of the appliqué).

245 Kabul Museum: Saranidi, Bactria, pp. 104–107, 254–255, no. 6.4, pls. 48–50 (goddess with fish); pp. 144–145, 231, no. 2.5, pl. 85 (erotes riding on dolphins); pp. 146–147, 226, no. 1.1, pl. 86 (male god with dolphin); pp. 148–149, 236, no. 3.2, pl. 87 (children mounted on dolphins).

246 See text corresponding to note 693. This question will be discussed in detail in another context.

247 St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombi, p. 247, figs. 51, 121. See also pl. 167D.

248 St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noit Ula, figs. 60, 70, 73, pls. 57–59 (among them also dolphlinike animals). Note also fish representations among Sarmatian finds. Ak-Bulak Kurgan: K. F. Smirnov, Vorzeitne Savromatov, Materiali i Issledovanija po Archeologii SSR, vol. 101 (Moscow, 1961), p. 33, fig. 9, 7, 8.


251 This strange preference for the dolphin was already noted in passing by Masson (note 8), pp. 74, 76.


254 The use of the anchor in Nisa (see above, note 238) is, for example, seen by H. v. Gall in relationship to the forced marriage of the daughter of Demetrios II, who had been taken prisoner, to Phraates II, in 141 (H. v. Gall, Iran 15 [1980], p. 249 with n. 34). Our anchor and dolphin emblems would in fact be an ideal symbol for an occasion like that. It would be hard to explain, however, why the symbol was used even among the late Indo-Greeks. I would therefore favor a more general understanding of the motif.


256 This slow move towards absolute power is best documented in the coin legends. Arsaces I never called himself king (see Sellwood [note 238], pp. 279–280, pl. 1.1). It is with Mithridates I, who reigned after 171 B.C., that we find the title of king for the first time in coin legends and, finally, the full titulature “Basileos Megalou Arskou Philhellenos,” the friend of the Greeks (ibid., pp. 281–282, pl. 1.4, 10).

257 Tarn, Greeks, p. 325. See the summary given by Mitchiner (note 216), pp. 182–190, from the numismatic viewpoint.

258 Tarn, Greeks, pp. 328–329. See above, note 213. I can see no evidence that the “Phoenicians had passed this symbol across Asia.”

259 Tarn, Greeks, pp. 330–331, assumed that the coin issue indicated that there was a period of peace.

260 It should be noted that the trident, anchor, and dolphin occur in two cases on the same pavement in Delos (see above, note 217). This emphasizes the primarily maritime significance of the Delian motifs. On the popularity of the dolphin in Delian architecture, see Ph. Bruneau and G. Siebert, BCH 93 (1969), p. 278. On the trident with the dolphin carved around it, in general, see a gem in Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung: E. Brandt and E. Schmidt, AntiKe Gemmen in deutschen Sammllungen, vol. 1, pt. 2 (Munich, 1970), p. 45, no. 801, pl. 92. Also F. Oswald, Index of Figure-Types on Terra Sigillata (Saman Ware), Supplement, Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology (Liverpool, 1936–1937), p. 151, no. 2410, pl. 88. Terracotta statuette: Auctiones AG, Basel, “Auction 14” (December 2, 1983), p. 41, no. 198, ill. 40. Capital in Gubbia Museum 224: Mecklen (note 234), pp. 212–213, no. 518, fig. 983. Capital from Pompeii in Naples, Museo Nazionale: ibid., p. 214, no. 522a, b, figs. 993, 994 (rudder?).

261 On the type, see Pfrommer (1982), p. 128, figs. 2, 9; idem, IstMitt 36 (1980), pp. 86–90, figs. 3.1–3.4.1–4.


263 Ibid., p. 125, fig. 26.

264 Ibid., p. 125, fig. 27.


269. See above, note 209.

270. See above, note 208.

271. See above, note 209.


274. See above, note 273.

275. This figure is also to be found on a simple calyx from the middle of the third century on the thymiaterion from Tárrentum: Pfrommer, Studien, p. 37, K T52, pl. 32c (drawing). For the earlier second century, see an unpublished tabletop in the museum at Pella (see below, notes 308, 313) and an ivory rhiton from Nisa: Masson-Pugacenkova, p. 81-83, fig. 157, pl. 60.1. On the dating, see ibid., p. 53.

276. See above, note 272 (Tégée).

277. See above, note 273 (larnax, Thessaloniki).


280. In addition to the entwined solution cited in note 276, above, there is also a variant with two scrolls that meet, cf. M. Schede, Antikes Traufleisten-Ornament (Strasbourg, 1909), p. 70, pl. 6.34-36 (Leonidaien, Olympia). For another solution, see the Pergamnon altar, ibid., p. 99, pl. 9.52. It must be noted, however, that the acanthus leaves as scroll ends are already suggested in Italian red-figure vase painting, although for spiral and not for flower tendrils (pelike, Kassel Museum 561: K. Schauenburg, JdI 78 [1963], p. 310, fig. 15).

281. See text corresponding to note 269.


283. Salzmann (note 267), p. 82, no. 2, pl. 70.1. There is an excellent illustration in P. Bernard, Spectrum der Wissenschaft (= Scientific American), March 3, 1982, p. 71, fig. 8 (see text corresponding to note 600).

284. See above, note 208. Rigid calyces are known in Per­gamnon in later Hellenistic times; see C. Börker, Jdl 88 (1973), pp. 296, 315, fig. 6 (his dating of the frieze cannot be discussed in this context).


286. For a Palmyrene example: Pfrommer, GettyMusJ 13 (1985), p. 17, fig. 12A. The tableau from Pella is almost unpublished. A detail is illustrated in S. Droguon, Egnatia 1 (1989), pp. 75-76, pl. 390, fig. 3.

287. The motif is not known to me on early Hellenistic floral tendrils. For the interspersed tips in Classical times, see for example akroteria on the companion sarcophagi of the Alex­ander sarcophagus, Istanbul, Archaeological Museum: O. Hamdy Bey and T. Reinach, Une nécropole royale à Sidon (Paris, 1892), pls. 39.3, 7-11. Marble loutrophoros: Galerie Koller und Spink & Son, Zurich, “The Ernest Brunner Collection: Ancient Art, vol. 2” (October 16-19, 1979), pp. 194-195, no. 608 with ill. Tarentine bracelet in private possession: H. Hoffmann and P. F. Davidson, Greek Gold: Jewelry from the Age of Alexander, exh. cat., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, the Brooklyn Museum, and Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond (Mainz, 1965), pp. 166-167, no. 60, fig. 66b. For the Hellenistic period, see a gold cup in St. Petersburg (see below, note 451) and an example in Madrid (see above, note 282). For the Imperial period in the East, see scrolls from Pal­myra R. Amy and H. Seyrig, Syria 17 (1936), pp. 239, figs. 7, 10, 15.

288. On the dating: Pfrommer, Studien, p. 112, KBk 123, 124, pl. 56b.

289. See text corresponding to note 547.

290. See text corresponding to note 496.

291. See above, note 19. For a further example, see a silver kylix from Chmyryeva Mogila, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Dn 1909,2/43: B. Pharmacowsky, AA (1910), p. 220, fig. 19; Onajko (note 120), p. 101, no. 400, pl. 15.

292. For an example of the late Classical ivy and grape leaf tendril, see the ornament on the krater from Derveni in Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum B 1: G. Daux, BCH 87 (1963), p. 802, pls. 16, 17; The Search for Alexander (note 273), pp. 164-165, no. 127, color plate 20 left. For the intrusion of the ivy in alien tendril systems, see the pendants from Kul Oba, St. Petersburg, Hermitage K-O 5: Artamonow, Goldschatze, p. 70, pls. 214, 215 (tendril bordering the medallion).
On the date of the tomb, see Pfrommer, *Goldschmuck*, pp. 283–284, FK 153.

293 Chicago, Oriental Institute A 29788: Hoffmann and Davidson (note 287), p. 159, no. 56, fig. 56a–d.

294 Compare, for instance, grave stelai in Athens, National and Epigraphic Museums: Möbius (note 272), pls. 11b, 18a.


296 Sarcophagus from Anapa (see above, note 268), flower bottom left.

297 See text corresponding to note 524.

298 Guillaume (note 278), pl. 26B–E.

299 Compare a capital from Chelidoni on the Peloponnesos: G. Daux, * BCH* 87 (1963), p. 795, fig. 10. Also a silver cup found close to the Bulgarian-Greek border: T. Kraus, *Mog­nische Befeh im Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum zu Mainz* (Mainz, 1951), p. 18, pls. 4, 5; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 265, KBk 126.


303 Compare (unpublished) p. 197, no. 299, fig. 19b. In addition to the monuments cited there, see the gold wreath from Arminto in Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen: J. Sieveking, *Antike Denkmäler*, vol. 4, nos. 3–4 (Berlin, 1931), pp. 80–83, pl. 43 (filled blossoms, right).


306 The type cannot be dated within close limits of time. A decoration of Kushan times: G. Fussman (note 31), p. 31, fig. 9 left. See also the blossoms on a late Macedonian tomb of the first half of the second century in Vergina: G. Touchais, *BCH* 106 (1982), p. 574, fig. 74. Compare the blossoms on bowl no. 16 in this catalogue.


310 On the Qar il-Firaun, see Schrammen, *Der Große Altar, der obere Markt*, AvP, vol. 3, pt. 1 (Berlin, 1906), pl. 11 (right first and third blossom); pi. 12.2 top right. Tabletop, Pella Museum (see above, note 286).

311 Compare a silver bowl with four bosses, Tiffs Museum: J. I. Smirnov, *Der Schatz von Achalgori* (Tiffs, 1934), pp. 44–45, no. 61, pl. 8. The form of the blossom was used for a long time, cf., e.g., a Sasanian bowl in St. Petersburg, Hermitage: J. Orbeli and C. Trever, *Orfèvrerie sasanide* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1935), pl. XXI, pl. 27.


313 A similar composition is used on a dagger or sword sheath from Tomb 4 from Tillya-tepe in Afghanistan, Kabul Museum: V. Sarianidi, *Mesopotamia 15* (1980), p. 14, figs. 50–52; idem, AJA 84 (1980), p. 129, pl. 21, 17, 18; idem, *Bacchus*, pp. 220, 221, 248, no. 4.9, pls. 162, 163. The broad, nymphal-like foliage is given with indented upper contours. Whether the narrow leaves are called "interspersed" or regarded as narrow foliage is a matter of judgment. Narrow leaves are intended on the following monuments. Appliqué from Antigoneia, Albania: D. Budina, *Iliria* 2 (1972), p. 342, pl. 30 middle left. Mosaic-glass fragments: G. D. Weinberg, *JGS* 15 (1973), pp. 48–49, fig. 7 (with references). Terracotta blossom from Amisos, Musée du Louvre CA 2340: S. Besques, *Musée Nationale du Louvre: Catalogue raisonné des figurines et reliefs en terre-cuite grecs, étrusques et romains*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1972), p. 80, no. 478, pl. 105b. Only on this piece is it certain that the narrow leaves are placed over and not between the broad leaves. This is also intended on a tabletop from Pella (see above, note 286).

314 See above, note 310.

315 On calyxes of this type, see below, note 426.

316 See above, note 278.

317 Apulian situla in Ruvo, Museo Jatta J. 1372: Sichertmann (note 295), p. 52, K 75, pl. 133 left, next to the Nike. Lucanian amphora with blossoms with suggestions of veins, Naples, Museo Nazionale B 2530: A. D. Trendall, *The Red-

318 For example the amphora from Chertomlyk (see above, note 58; behind the Pegasos). Grave stele from Eleusis: J.-P. Michaud, BCH 96 (1972), p. 623, fig. 90 (in the anthemion).


322 See above, note 102. Remarkably enough, the choice of blossom for the central rosette with the nymphaea nelumbo leaves corresponds to Prolemaic silver cups in Munich, Antikensammlichgen 4336, 4337: D. Ahrens, bildenden Kunst 19 (1968), pp. 232-233, figs. 5, 6; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 263, KBK 117, 118 (our fig. 43). The Toledo cup shows five leaves, the others, eight.


329 Sarcophagus from Anapa (see above, note 268), flower second row from left, second bud from bottom. We must ignore the leaf calyx depicted beneath it on the sarcophagus.

330 On the type of the tiered blossom: Pfrommer (1982), p. 126, fig. 1b. For an early Hellenistic tiered composition with a bud with framing shoots: ibid., p. 131, fig. 42a. The scheme with framing shoots cannot be confined to a certain period. See a high-Hellenistic medallion from Syria (see above, note 52).

331 On blossoms with framing acanthus foliage: Pfrommer (1982), p. 145, fig. 8; p. 180, fig. 20c.

332 See above, note 285.


334 Bent buds are but rarely used in Classical decorations. For straight examples of the late fourth century compare the larnax from the “tomb of Philip,” Vergina, Thessaloniki, MDAFA, vol. 21 (1952), p. 106, pi. 19b (the concept of the settlement dates before 75 B.C.).

335 This feature is still to be found on a decoration from Taxila: Marshall, Taxila, vol. 2, p. 603, no. 400, pl. 178a.

336 See the goblet cited above, note 282 (scroll to the right, third blossom from the calyx).

337 Bernard (note 333), p. 201, no. 28, fig. 44 (no. 048). See my text and note 656. Compare this blossom with one on a plaster cast from Memphis/Mit Rahine in Hildesheim, Pelizaeus Museum 2379: Reinsberg, Toreutik, pp. 67, 101-104, no. 20, fig. 33. The decoration has probably been dated too late by C. Reinsberg (second half of second, beginning of first century).

338 See a medallion from Syria (see above, notes 52, 330), and a gold bowl in St. Petersburg (see below, note 451).

339 The problem of Seleucid influence in Petra will be discussed in another context.

340 Mosaic from Sikyon: M. Robertson, JHS 87 (1967), pp. 133-134, pl. 24 (bottom right); Salzmann (note 269), p. 112, no. 118, pls. 20, 21; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 129. See below, note 442.

341 See the late Classical sarcophagus from Zmeinyj (Kerch), St. Petersburg, Hermitage Zm 1: Vaulina and Wasowicz (note 43), pp. 52-58, no. 2, pl. 15 (center left and right). In addition, see Hellenistic textiles from Mongolia. St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ilu, pp. 94-95, pls. 64, 65.2.

342 Volterra, Museo Etrusco 89: C. Albizzati, RömMitt 30 (1915), p. 151, figs. 12, 13; E. Fiumi, Volterra: Il museo etrusco e i monumenti antichi (Pisa, 1975), p. 61, no. 89, fig. 105.

343 For example: Masson-Pugasenbergova, p. 119, no. 8, fig. 16, pl. 108. Above all ibid., pp. 81-82, no. 76, pl. 45.2, 3.
J. E. Curtis, BMQ Pfrommer (1982), p. 129, fig. 28 bottom right. For the motif see Pfrommer, p. 114, pi. 57c knotted fruit ends in a small blossom (second row, lower phalera, see text corresponding to note 19.

Bothmer (1984), pp. 54-55, no. 92, ill. p. 54 left.

For example, the second blossom from the top. On the phalera, see text corresponding to note 19.

121 From the calyx, second blossom in each case. On the kylix, see note 285.

121 Left row, top blossom. The tendril emerging from the knotted fruit ends in a small blossom (second row, lower right). For the motif see Pfrommer, Studien, p. 114, pl. 57c (6-8).

121 C. Börker, Jdl 88 (1973), pp. 296, 315, fig. 6 (lower left and center below).

121 See text corresponding to notes 205, 281-282.

121 See text corresponding to note 292.

121 Florence, Museo Archeologico 84/66 (from Bonazzò) L. A. Milani, Il R. Museo Archeologico di Firenze (Florence, 1912), p. 143, pi. 38. The same blossom on the fragments of a silver vase from the area near Lake Van now in Berlin, Antiken­sammlung; R. Zahn, Jdl 82 (1967), p. 24, figs. 4-6. The post-Achaemenid date of its handles in the shape of ibexes will be dealt with in another context (Paris, Musée du Louvre A. O. 2748 and Berlin, Antiken­sammlung 8180: A. Greifen­hagen, Antike Kunstwerke, 2nd ed. [Berlin, 1966], p. 54, pls. 98, 99). At first glance, the fan-shaped, serrate blossoms would seem comparable, e.g., the gold cup in St. Petersburg: R. Zahn, Jdl 82 (1967), pp. 15-16, fig. 1 (top right, next to the large bud; see below, note 451) or a silver cup in New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 22.40.2: Bothmer (1984), p. 51, no. 87 with ill. (left of the large bud; see below, notes 451, 460). These blossoms are made up of several leaves, however.

121 On this type: Pfrommer (1982), p. 179, fig. 19b.

121 See above, note 40.


121 Alexandria, Greek and Roman Museum JE 10479: Breccia (note 204), pp. 80-81, no. 231, pl. 45-65; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 20, n. 86.

121 The definition of the ornament is based on: G. Kopcke, AthenMitt 70 (1964), pp. 48, 62, no. 231, Beilage 39-5.


121 Bronze cista from Paestum in Copenhagen, National Museum 778: Greece, Italy and the Roman Empire: Guides to the National Museum (Copenhagen, 1968), ill. on p. 93 (on the lid). For the late Republic, see painted emblem bowls in the Villa dei Misteri (near Pompeii): J. Engemann, Architekturndarstellungen.
The fruits develop from the framing leaves. (Ann Arbor, 1972), pp. 132-133, figs. 44-46. The Tigris was under Seleucid control in the second century. Worthy of mention are the silver rhyton (catalogue no. 74) and a terracotta rhyton also in the J. Paul Getty Museum (83.AE.119; see below, note 520). The similarity of the garland on a gold-glass cup in Corning, New York, Corning Museum of Glass (71.1.5) points to a Seleucid workshop as well; JGS 14 (1972), p. 153, no. 3, ill. p. 152. The same is valid for a sandwich glass bowl from Italy (see below, note 414).

For the frieze of the Khazne Firaun, Petra: A. Schmidt-Colinet, BonnJb 180 (1980), p. 217, fig. 32.

H. Seyrig, Syria 21 (1940), pp. 285-289, fig. 5, pls. 29-30, 30 left.

B. Schulz and H. Winnefeld, Bâblek, vol. 1 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1921), pl. 26 left; D. Krencker, T. v. Lüpke, and H. Winnefeld, Bâblek, vol. 2 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1923), pls. 47 left, 36 top right.


St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Ebert, RV, vol. 8 (Berlin, 1927), pp. 54-547, pl. 181b, e (e.v. “Nein Ula”); Rudenko, Nein Ula, p. 95, pls. 65, 66. The trefoil groups are made up in part of serrated leaves. The binding is indicated by dots.


Callaghan (1980), pp. 37, 45, fig. 1.1-5. See below, note 495.

Cairo, Egyptian Museum JE 13640: K. Parlasca, Jdl 70 (1955), p. 144-145, fig. 7; M. Pfrommer, GettyMusJ 13 (1985), p. 15, fig. 9; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 234, KBk 60, pl. 61 (with references).


See above, note 366. Compare also fragments of Megarian bowls from Pergamon; J. Schäfer, Hellenistische Ke-

394 See above, note 376.

395 See text corresponding to note 87.

396 See above, note 376.

397 See above, note 377.


400 St. Helens, Lancashire, Pilkinson Glass Museum 1974/21: *JGS* 7 (1975), p. 169, no. 2, fig. 2. The companion piece to this cup, probably from the same tomb, is in Columbia, University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology 77.198.1. I owe this reference to J. M. Burgoyne of the Pilkinson Glass Museum. Both museums generously provided me with photographs. In contrast to the excellent cup in St. Petersburg (see above, note 399), the five-leaf motif is here misinterpreted. The buds or shoots emerge from between the side leaves.

401 See above, note 374. This type of fibula was known throughout the Greek world and therefore allows no attribution to a particular artistic province.


405 Callaghan (1980), pp. 37, 45, with n. 79, figs. 1.2, 1.3. His late dating of this group to the second century should be considered.

406 See text corresponding to notes 511–522.

407 See text corresponding to note 524.


409 Tabletop: W. Deonna, *Le mobilier Délitien*, Exploration archéologique de Délis, vol. 18 (Paris, 1938), pp. 60–61, fig. 87, pl. 26, fig. 188.


412 See text corresponding to notes 289–290, 296.

413 Achaemenid stepped embattlements are lacking on all vessels from treasures III and IV. This is all the more remarkable as this motif was known in Taxila, Pakistan (Marshall, *Taxila*, vol. 2, pp. 629, no. 75, pl. 1946) and Tillya-tepe, Afghanistan (Kabul Museum: Sarianidi, *Bactria*, pp. 77, 232, no. 2.13, pl. 17). The Greek motif of embattlements is also used on the cup from Mozdok (see above, note 399). On the distribution of this motif, see Pfrommer (1982), p. 180, n. 306.

414 A sandwich glass bowl from the tomba degli ori at Canosa di Puglia can be ascribed with certainty to the Seleucid sphere. Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 40.058: E. Lippolis in M. De Julis, ed., *Gli Ori di Taranto in Etì Ellenistica* (Milan, 1984), pp. 350, 448, no. 38, ill. p. 351 top; on the trefol garland see above, my text and note 383. The ornament excludes a date earlier than the late third century B.C. On a diadem from the same tomb group, see below, note 649. On the narrow frieze of embattlements, see a silver bowl, reported to have been found in Italy, in Berlin, Antikensammlung 30981: U. Gehrig, *Berliner Musen 23* (1973), p. 45, fig. 18 (no. 30977 by mistake). Also see a fragment of a gold-glass bowl in New York, Metropolitan Museum (see above, note 375). Given the stepped embattlement, the fragment in all likelihood stems from a Seleucid workshop.


417 Madrid, Museo Arqueologico Nacional 28466: Radtack (note 282), p. 251, no. 4, fig. 22–7, pl. 59.3.


419 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 1981.11.21: Bothmer (1984), p. 55, no. 94 with ill. Also a hemispherical cup with a guilloche on the exterior from the same treasure (see below, note 587).


421 See text corresponding to notes 212–260.
422 Loutrophoroi, Athens, National Museum: A. Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1906), p. 369, nos. 1736, 1736a with ill. Also an example formerly in the E. Brummer Collection (see above, note 287).

423 Laumonier (note 377), p. 78, no. 3, pl. 17; p. 188, no. 871, pl. 41; p. 220, no. 187, pl. 49.

424 Pfrohmer, *Studien*, pp. 92, 96, pl. 54c.


426 Pfrohmer, *Studien*, pp. 111-116, KBk 117-128, pis. 56, 57a, b, 58a-c.


428 See below, note 455.

429 Conze (note 422), p. 337, no. 1584, pl. 137. Used on a stone plate from Pella; C. Makaronas, *Deltion* 16 (1966), p. 82, pl. 81.

430 On tiered calyces, see Pfrohmer, *Studien*, pp. 93-105.

431 Compare the calyx spread over the lid of the pyxis of the treasure from Tarentum: Pfrohmer, *Studien*, p. 262, KBk 113, pl. 33, or the hanging calyx on the stem of the kantharos “Rothschild”: ibid., p. 260, KBk 101, pl. 31. The basin from Chertomlyk displays a typical tiered calyx only with a central calyx and acanthus, St. Petersburg, Hermitage On 18683, 1/167: Artamonov, *Goldschmuck*, p. 52, pl. 179; Pfrohmer, *Studien*, p. 257, KBk 77, pl. 53c.

432 See text corresponding to note 439.

433 See text corresponding to note 316.


435 On the origin and distribution, see Pfrohmer, *Studien*, pp. 101, 262, KBk 111, pl. 53b. See also, note 455.

436 See text corresponding to note 292.

437 See above, note 278. Compare also the plate in Hamil­

438 See text corresponding to note 292.

439 E. E. Herzfeld, *Iran in the Ancient East* (New York, 1941), p. 279, pl. 90; Glushman, *Iran*, p. 23, fig. 29; D. Schlumberger in *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 3, pp. 2 (1983), p. 1035, pl. 54 (Seleucid origin uncertain). The question of whether it is Parthian or Seleucid depends on the dating.


441 On this motif, see Pfrohmer, *Studien*, pp. 106, 113, 116-120, 123.

442 See text corresponding to note 634.


444 Kabul Museum: Sarianidi, *Iran*, pp. 79, 242, no. 3.51, pl. 19. In contrast to bowl no. 7, the indented foliation follows true the Ptolemaic in the type (see above, note 428).


447 See text corresponding to notes 294-300. For an example of the special emphasis on the indentation of the acanthus between the round lobes, see bowl no. 5.

448 Vase in Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 3397 (see above, note 447). See text corresponding to notes 573, 624. For the motif in general, see Pfrohmer, *Studien*, pp. 115, 119f.

449 Gold cup in St. Petersburg, Hermitage (see above, note

NOTES 89


See above, note 465 (Raddatz).

A dating of the gold bowl to Hellenistic times seems perhaps more probable.

499 Faience beads from Ghalekuti, Grave C-I: Egami (note 496), pls. 34.6; 77.106 (probably also no. 105). Compare also pl. 77.108 with catalogue no. 53, and ibid., pl. 77.109 with catalogue no. 54.


501 Berlin, Museum für Kunde von Ägypten und Äthiopien (note 497), p. 109, pl. I36d; Ghirshman (note 47), p. 109, pl. I36d. The damage seems not to be caused by a falling stone. The damage seems not to be modern.

502 Paris, Musée Guimet: Hallade, *Bds. d. Arch. Orient. Ant.* 19, pt. 3 (1958), p. 11, fig. 11, pl. 33.1. 78.139–144 (supposed to be pre-Achaemenid). For beads with a middle ridge like no. 64, see Ghalekuti: Egami (note 496), pls. 33.1. 78.139–144 (supposed to be pre-Achaemenid).


504 Even at present, new vessels are constantly appearing on the art market. For one of the horse rhyta and the example with a female sphinxlike creature, see M. Pfrommer in D. v. Bothmer, ed., *Glories of the Past: Ancient Art from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Collection* (New York, 1990), pp. 190–194, nos. 137, 139 with ill. (attributed to the Hellenized Near East). The second horse rhyton and the stag rhyton were in the New York art market in 1990. A zebu rhyton was recently acquired by the Toledo Museum of Art. The vessels will be extensively discussed in another context. For ivory rhyta with protomes picturing half-men, half-zebu bulls, see examples from Par thian Nisa: Masson-Pugacenkova, pls. 24.1, 40.1, 75, 76, 78.2, 102.1, 115, 221, fig. on p. 222; Ghirshman, pp. 252, 416, fig. 306. For a female sphinxlike creature, see M. Pfrommer in D. v. Bothmer, ed., *Glories of the Past: Ancient Art from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Collection* (New York, 1990), pp. 190–194, nos. 137, 139 with ill. (attributed to the Hellenized Near East).

505 Nos. 4, 22. See text corresponding to note 474.

506 On the nomad origins of the Parthians: Colledge, *Parthians*, pp. 24–27; J. Weiskel in F. Altheim and J. Rehork, eds., *Der Hellenismus in Mittelasien* (Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 243–247; Altheim-Stiehl, pp. 448–452. Justinus 41.3 speaks of the bodies of the deceased left out in the open for the dogs and the birds. The bones were then gathered for the burial: Altheim-Stiehl, p. 457, n. 5. Actual burials are known for the Parthian kings (Altheim-Stiehl, p. 457, with a reference to Isidorus Charax mans 13).

507 See Rudenko, *Tombs*.

508 On the nomad origins of the Parthians: Colledge, *Parthians*, pp. 24–27; J. Weiskel in F. Altheim and J. Rehork, eds., *Der Hellenismus in Mittelasien* (Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 243–247; Altheim-Stiehl, pp. 448–452. Justinus 41.3 speaks of the bodies of the deceased left out in the open for the dogs and the birds. The bones were then gathered for the burial: Altheim-Stiehl, p. 457, n. 5. Actual burials are known for the Parthian kings (Altheim-Stiehl, p. 457, with a reference to Isidorus Charax mans 13).


510 Ibid., p. 448.


512 For an example with a very tall horn, compare the griffin rhyton from Erzinjan in London, British Museum 124081: Dalton, *Treasure*, p. 42–43, no. 178, pl. 22. The type with a lower horn is represented in the treasure from Tisch el-Karamus in Cairo, Egyptian Museum JE 38903: Pfrommer, *Studien*, pp. 150, 156, 158, 266, KTK 1, pl. 1.

513 For the fifth century compare the goat rhyton from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Brothers Group in St. Petersburg, Her-
JNES 9 (1950), pp. 53-54, pi. 2; E. D. van Buren, JNES 9 figs. 3-7, with additions and corrections by D. M. A. Bate, 52 (1937), pp. 266-274, pi. 59 (the RomMitt key, Paris, Musée du Louvre A.O. 3093: P. Amandry, a half drachma, thus leading to a drachma of 3.7 grams, rather spout). The author suggests that the bridle was only used to support the spout.

2 The Nymphaeum of Kafizin: Museum K 523: T. B. Mitford, The Search with the head of a stag from this very treasure, see Mitford, pp. 251-252, 272-273; Pfrommer, vases, see Mitford, pp. 251-252, 272-273; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 184, FK 64 (second half of third century B.C.).

3 Slender, high terracotta animal rhyton with bent (“Achaemenid”) legs (see above, note 313) from Kafizin on Cyprus. The protome is broken and lost; Nikosia, Cyprus Museum K 523: T. B. Mitford, The Nymphaeum of Kafizin: The Inscribed Pottery, Kadmos, suppl. 2 (Berlin and New York, 1980), p. 248, K 523 with ill. For the dating of the Kafizin vases, see Mitford, pp. 251-252, 272-273; Pfrommer, Studien, p. 184, FK 64 (second half of third century B.C.).

37 Harper (1989), p. 350, n. 4, fig. 97. The weight is 570.5 grams. The weight inscription gives 147 drachmas and a half drachma, thus leading to a drachma of 3.7 grams, rather close to the Parthian standard (see text corresponding to notes 211, 662). For the dating of the inscriptions in the first or even second century A.D., see Harper (note 211).


39 Silver rhyton, probably found close to Erzurum, Turkey, Paris, Musée du Louvre A.O. 3903; P. Amandry, AntK 2 (1959), p. 52, pl. 39, 3 (end of fifth, beginning of fourth century). Silver rhyton from the northern shore of Turkey with bent forelegs like the latter, private collection, unpublished. The rhyton belongs to a treasure of the later fifth century B.C. For a head rhyton in the George Ortiz Collection with the head of a stag from this very treasure, see The Search for Alexander (note 273), pp. 128-129, no. 53, color pl. 6.

40 For an example, see above, note 539. For the type in general, compare my remarks in Jdl 98 (1981), pp. 265-285, figs. 31, 33.

41 See text corresponding to notes 516, 517.

42 See text corresponding to note 278.

43 H. Seyrig, R. Amy, and E. Will, Le Temple de Bel à Palmyre (Paris, 1975), p. 49, pl. 66, for the dedication, see p. 149.


46 For the type of the flower tendril, see note 261.

47 See text corresponding to note 289.

48 See text corresponding to note 266.

49 See text corresponding to notes 264-265.

50 See text corresponding to notes 318-327.

51 See text corresponding to notes 463-464. These calyxes are, however, not combined with buds.

52 For ivy calyxes in general, see text corresponding to notes 459-462. The information concerning the date and meaning of the inscription was kindly provided by R. Deegen (Munich).

53 See text corresponding to notes 301-308.


55 Palmyra, temple of Bel: Seyrig, Amy, and Will (note 543), p. 36, pl. 45 (above left).

56 For an example, see above, note 451. For the type in general, compare my remarks in Jdl 98 (1981), pp. 265-285, figs. 31, 33.

57 Compare H. J. Kantor, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 255-267, figs. 3-7, with additions and corrections by D. M. A. Bate, JNES 9 (1950), pp. 53-54, pl. 2; E. D. van Buren, JNES 9 (1950), pp. 54-55; H. J. Kantor, JNES 9 (1950), pp. 55-56.

58 Compare for example the griffin rhyton, see above, note 512.

566 See text corresponding to notes 325–327.

567 See text corresponding to notes 374–383.

568 See text corresponding to notes 452–453, 634.

570 Bowls from Civita Castellana in Naples, Museo Nazionale 25284/85: Pfrommer, Studien, p. 264, KBk 123–125, pls. 56, 57a, b. Bowl in Toledo, Museum of Art 75.11: Pfrommer, Studien, p. 265, KBk 128, pl. 58a.

571 Compare necklaces from Tillya-tepe (Kabul Museum): Sarianidi, Bactria, pp. 116–119, 252, no. 5.3, pls. 64, 65 (Tomb 5); from Taxila: Marshall, Taxila, vol. 2, p. 627, nos. 56–58, pl. 193. For the typology: M. Pfrommer, IstMitt 36 (1986), pp. 74–76, fig. 3-3, pl. 22.3.


573 See the vase in note 459 above and the quoted bowls in note 570 above.

574 See text corresponding to notes 299, 637.

575 See above, note 570.


577 See above, note 360.

578 See the bowls cited in note 360.

579 See text corresponding to notes 529–537.


581 As examples for many, see H. A. Thompson, Hesperia 3 (1934), pp. 381–383, D 38, fig. 69; Launomier (note 577), no. 9109, pl. 12; no. 4034, pl. 39; nos. 4095, 4096, 4058, 4061, 4064, pl. 44; no. 8312, pl. 51; nos. 4089, 4078, 4083, 8996, pl. 112; Rottroff (note 454), p. 92, nos. 403, 404, pls. 69, 89 (net pattern bowls).

582 For Hellenistic examples from Magna Graecia, see figs. 16, 39.


584 See text corresponding to notes 611–612.


588 See text corresponding to note 301.

589 See above, note 302.

590 Plaster cast from Mit Rahine/Memphis, Hildesheim, Pelzczus Museum 1134: Pfrommer, Studien, pp. 101–102, 262, KBk 111, pl. 53a (around 300 B.C.). Bronze cup in Cairo, Egyptian Museum JE 3060: K. Parlasca, JdI 70 (1935), pp. 144–145, fig. 7; Pfrommer, Studien, pp. 120–121, 254, KBk 60, pl. 61 (high Hellenistic).

591 See text corresponding to note 445.

592 See bowl from Civita Castellana, Naples, Museo Nazionale 25285: Pfrommer, Studien, p. 114, KBk 123, 124, pl. 57c (1). See also the flower chart on p. 244, flower types 2 and 3 (catalogue no. 10).

593 See text corresponding to note 453.

594 See text corresponding to notes 301, 588.

595 See text corresponding to note 303.

596 See text corresponding to note 315.

597 That could mean that bowl nos. 4 and 5 belong already to the first century B.C. In this context, the special rendering of the central vein should be noted (see text corresponding to note 591).

598 For triangular acanthus leaves of the third century, compare alabastra from Asia Minor in Copenhagen, National Museum 15093 (Pfrommer, Studien, p. 261, KBk 102, pl. 57a), b) and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1976.70 (Pfrommer, Studien, p. 261, KBk 103, pl. 51c).

599 Flowers on the mosaic by Gnosis in Pella: Pfrommer (1982), p. 131, fig. 3d.

600 See above, note 283.

601 See text corresponding to notes 206, 280–281.

602 For the horizontal arrangement of the veins, see text corresponding to note 593.

603 Compare the calyx on the basin from Chertomlyk, St. Petersburg, Hermitage Dt 1863, i/167: Pfrommer, Studien, pp. 105–106, 257, KBk 77, pl. 53c. Compare also a plate from Tuch el-Karamus in Cairo, Egyptian Museum JE 38115: Pfrommer, Studien, pp. 107–108, 256, 268, KBk 75 (TKT 16), pl. 18b.

604 St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Smirnov, Serebro, p. 13, no. 22, pl. 8; Ackerman in Pope, Survey, vol. 1, p. 461, fig. 123; Trever, Panjaituki, p. 99, no. 21, pl. 29; E. H. Minns, JHS 63 (1943), p. 124; Lukonin, Persien, p. 70, fig. 33. Compare another phiale that evidently is a companion piece to the first, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Smirnov, Serebro, p. 13, no. 23, pl. 8; Trever, Panjaituki, p. 101, no. 22, pl. 30; E. H. Minns, JHS 61 (1941), p. 124. On the bowls, see below, note 627.

605 To the best of my knowledge, significant objects from Russian sources are not represented on the art market.

606 See text corresponding to notes 453, 551, 561–564.

607 For the type of foliage, see text corresponding to notes 318–324.

608 See text corresponding to notes 325–327.

609 See text corresponding to note 625.

610 Compare similar flowers but without veined foliage on
the fragments of the famous amphora rhyton in Berlin, Antikensammlung Charlottenburg 8180: R. Zahn, *JdI* 82 (1967), pp. 24–26, figs. 4–6. The post-Achaemenid date of this vessel will be discussed in another context.

611 See text corresponding to note 653.

612 See text corresponding to note 579.

613 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 22.50.2 (see above, note 460).

614 See above, note 613.

615 See above, note 460.

616 The attribution of this cup is controversial. The Bac- 
trian origin has been suggested above all by K. V. Trever (*Punjiastu*, pp. 67–71, no. 14, pl. 14). The ornament lends support to a connection to the Seleucid repertoire (Pfrommer, *Studien*, p. 263, KBk 119) and, given the provenance, a Bac
trian origin seems likely.

617 A row of beads as a border to the ornament is to be found on the glass cups cited above in note 400.


619 See text corresponding to notes 442–443.

620 See text corresponding to notes 294–300. For the se
rated Greek type, see for example the Bouleuterion from Mil

621 See text corresponding to notes 632–634.

622 See text corresponding to notes 318–324.


625 See text corresponding to note 609.

626 See Visconti (note 324), pl. 2 (above, blossom top right).

627 See above, note 604.

628 See text corresponding to note 570.

629 Here we can recall, for example, the coins in Bactria and the Indo-Greek realms (see above, note 28). In addition, we can cite the quality of the architectural decorations in Ai Khanoum (see above, notes 333, 337).


631 See text corresponding to notes 325–327.

632 See above, note 321.

633 On the treasure, see above, note 117. For a possibly much earlier object, see a medallion in Munich, Antikensammlungen SL 661c; Oliver, *Silver*, p. 71, no. 36, fig. 36.

634 See text corresponding to notes 452–453, 568.

635 See Pfrommer (1982), p. 111, fig. 3d.


637 See text corresponding to notes 299, 574.

638 On this type of scroll, see text corresponding to note 261.

639 Basin from Chertomlyk (see above, note 431).

See the five-petaled rosettes with overlapping leaves (see text corresponding to notes 325–327).


See the five-petaled rosettes with overlapping leaves (see text corresponding to notes 325–327).


On this type of vessel see J.-C. Gardin, *Gardin (note 667)*, pp. 143–144, nos. 63–66, fig. 17.1, (see text corresponding to notes 325–327).


For the tomb, see below, note 692.

For the tomb, see above, note 689.

For the tomb, see below, note 690.

See also a plaque: V. Griessmaier, *Artemis Asiae 7* (1937), p. 152, figs. 18, 19.

The reference is to the "hook" that emerges from the horse’s back beneath its mouth. A wing like that of the lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, *Hermitage 1727–1/5; 1/6* (see above, note 691) would be unusual. The detail probably represents a part of the mane, as on a bronze plaque: V. Griessmaier, *Artemis Asiae 7* (1937), p. 152, fig. 19. The position of the horse on the Malibu gold sheet is far more twisted.

Fabulous animals with twisted hindquarters on pendants from Tomb 2, Kabul Museum: Sarianidi, *Bactria*, pp. 242–243, no. 3.54 with ill. (top). Tomb 3, found with a coin of Tiberius. For the tomb, see below, note 692.

See also a plaque: V. Griessmaier, *Artemis Asiae 7* (1937), p. 134, figs. 18, 19. The reference is to the "hook" that emerges from the horse’s back beneath its mouth. A wing like that of the lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, *Hermitage 1727–1/5; 1/6* (see above, note 691) would be unusual. The detail probably represents a part of the mane, as on a bronze plaque: V. Griessmaier, *Artemis Asiae 7* (1937), p. 152, fig. 19. The position of the horse on the Malibu gold sheet is far more twisted.


Buckles from Déréstuj: Rudenko, *Noin Ula*, p. 66, pl. 32.4, as well as a pendant from inner Mongolia, Stockholm: J. G. Anderson, *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities 4* (1924), p. 267, pl. 24.2; Rudenko, *Noin Ula*, p. 66, fig. 55b. Note the straight edge and the hook at the highest point of the bulge as well as the opening beneath it. The type seems to have reached Einesa, Syria, with the Parthians, Damascus Museum 7204; H. Seyrig, *Syria* 29 (1952), pp. 240–241, figs. 18–19, pl. 27.1.


See catalogue no. 94.

4.20, pi. 3 (Tomb 4); p. 255, no. 6.11 with ill. (Tomb 6).

p. 249, no. 4.17 with ill. (Tomb 4); p. 255, nos. idem, Bactria, 4 (1979), p. 123, fig. 2; idem, AJA 84 (1980), p. 126, pi. 17.3; idem, Bactria, p. 234, no. 2.23 with ill. (Tomb 2); pp. 234, 236–237, nos. 3.4–6, pl. 25 (Tomb 3); pp. 249, 249, no. 4.20, pl. 3 (Tomb 4); p. 255, no. 6.11 with ill. (Tomb 6).

See text corresponding to notes 325–327, 666.

Mathura Museum: Rosenfield, Kusana, pp. 145–146, fig. 3. According to Rosenfield’s chronology, the statue dates from the second century A.D. Note should be taken, however, of the controversy over the dating of the history of the Kushans (see below, note 716).

Kabul Museum: Sarianidi, Bactria, pp. 159, 233, no. 2.21, pl. 101 (Tomb 2).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, pp. 72, 110, fig. 270, p (wood). Comparable finds of bronze from Ivolginisk and Sudzinsk: ibid., p. 72, pl. 32.3, 5. The blossom is also to be found on a finial for a post in Noin Ula (ibid., p. 75, pl. 33.4) and on an elaborately decorated wooden pedestal (ibid., p. 75, pl. 34.3).

Tomb 5, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 236, pl. 167A.

Cf. the textiles referred to in note 7, above.

Berlin, Antikensammlung 10221 u: Greifenhagen, Schmuckstücken, vol. 1, p. 60, pl. 37.1 with the related pieces in New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (ibid., p. 55, fig. 6).

For beaded frames, see text corresponding to note 137.

Cf. the rectangular fields with a beaded border represented on textiles from Tomb 5. They should be seen as representations of “sewn on” appliqués, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 300, fig. 141, pls. 174, 175.


See above, note 710 (Ryzhanovka and Buznitsa).

Highly stylized in Pazyryk, Tomb 3, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 300, fig. 141. The motif itself was originally Achaemenid–Near Eastern, but it is often encountered in the Greek repertoire afterward: Pfommer, Studien, p. 153, n. 982.

Rosenfield, Kushans, p. 144, fig. 2a right. On the chronological problem, see below, note 716.

See text corresponding to note 740.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 91, fig. 71, pls. 57, 58.

Rosenfield, Kushans, pp. 145–146, fig. 3d left (see above, note 701); ibid., pp. 144–145, fig. 12 (King Vima Kad-phases). The proposed dating of the Kushan kings varies greatly. See, e.g., the comments of Rosenfield (Kushans, pp. 253–258) on the “Kanishka Era,” in which he proposes a beginning between A.D. 110–115, and the analysis of Altheim-Stech, pp. 685–703, which places the reign of Kanishka I in the first half of the third century A.D. The latter view seems to be corroborated by the Kushan coinage: R. Göbl, System und Chronologie der Münzprägung des Kusanreiches (Vienna, 1984), pp. 57–70.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 93, pls. 62, 63. In this context, note also the flower star on the sword scabbard of Kanishka mentioned above in note 713.

See the parallels from Tillya-tepe (see above, note 699).

See text corresponding to note 7.


On the leaf type, see text corresponding to notes 318–324. For the drawn-in contours of the leaves, see text corresponding to notes 449, 454–455.


Kabul Museum: Sarianidi, Bactria, pp. 81, 227, no. 1.12, pl. 26 (Tomb 1, inlaid); p. 229, no. 1.24 with ill. (Tomb 1); pp. 69, 232, no. 2.12, pl. 11 bottom left (Tomb 2, cut out).

Marshall, Taxila, vol. 1, p. 160, no. 2; Taxila, vol. 2, p. 612, no. 99, pl. 191w. Five-leaf calyx with a leaf star that has a double contour, with an Eros sitting in the center of the calyx. This motif has clearly been derived from the well-known Hellenistic motif of a figure in a leaf calyx: H. Jucker, Das Bildnis im Blätterkelch (Lausanne and Freiburg, 1961), p. 192, fig. 108 (with parallels).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 113, fig. 40f (silver).

Paris, Musée Guimet: Hallade, Indien, p. 106, fig. 73. There are flowers on the base on the right and left.

As an example, a mold from Athens (Phye): L. Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford, Babesch 34 (1959), pp. 59–60, fig. 1.

A similar border is to be found on a gold-glaze medallion acquired in Egypt: Adriani (1967), p. 112, fig. 1; L. Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford, Babesch 45 (1970), p. 129. I would consider the similarity as circumstantial because the tongues obviously refer to the Hellenistic shield decorations. See text corresponding to note 463 (see chart, p. 244, type no. 46).

Kabul Museum: Sarianidi, Bactria, pp. 69, 232, no. 2.12, pl. 11 top and bottom right (Tomb 2).

4b (inv. 4890: pentafoliate nymphaea rosette). For the nymphaea calyx, see above, note 72. For the tomb, see above, note 21.

Kiev, Museum of Historical Treasures: Mozolevs‘kij, pp. 92, 224, pl. 11d.

Moscow, Pushkin Museum: K. F. Smirnov, Severskij Kurgan (Moscow, 1933), pp. 9–10, pl. 42 (inv. 4889); p. 10, pl. 4b (inv. 4890: pentafoliate nymphaea rosette). For the nymphaea calyx, see above, note 72. For the tomb, see above, note 21.

Colledge, Parthians, pp. 92, 224, pl. 11d.


Kiev, Museum of Historical Treasures: Mozolevs‘kij, pp. 227, 236, no. 2.37, pl. 21 (Tomb 2); p. 240, no. 3.38 with ill. (Tomb 3). On the Skythian, see above, note 730.

Rosenfield, Kushans, pp. 81, 236, no. 4.5–7, pis. 148–152 (Tomb 4). See also the examples from Minusinsk, St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/16, no. 112, fig. 73 (dated much too early in the fourth century B.C.). A further example is in New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (L. 1983), 119.41.


St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 112, pl. 35.1. On the dating, see above, note 688.

Six pieces in Tilley-tepe (see above, note 752) and Zubov’s Barrow (see above, note 750).


St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 112, pl. 35.1. On the dating, see above, note 688.

Four pieces in Tilley-tepe (see above, note 752) and Zubov’s Barrow (see above, note 750).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/1, 1727–1/13, 1727–1/16: Rudenko, Sammlung, pp. 51–52, pls. 4.1, 5.2 (the tail of the captured animal is very similar to the tails of the Malibu griffins).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 112, pl. 35.1. On the dating, see above, note 688.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, pp. 112, 247, nos. 4.5–7, pls. 148–152 (Tomb 4).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 112, pl. 35.1. On the dating, see above, note 688.

Six pieces in Tilley-tepe (see above, note 752) and Zubov’s Barrow (see above, note 750).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, pp. 112, 247, nos. 4.5–7, pls. 148–152 (Tomb 4).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Noin Ula, p. 112, pl. 35.1. On the dating, see above, note 688.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/1, 1727–1/13, 1727–1/16: Rudenko, Sammlung, pp. 51–52, pls. 4.1, 5.2 (the tail of the captured animal is very similar to the tails of the Malibu griffins).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 261, figs. 130–132. Figs. 130 and 131 with a bird’s head that is not of the same type as the Greek griffin’s head.

London, British Museum 123924: Dalton, Treasure, pp. 11–13, no. 23, fig. 46, pl. 1; Barnett (1968), p. 44, pl. 8.3; Rudenko, Sammlung, p. 22, fig. 14.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 249, pl. 149a. The motif is also to be found on a lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/5, 1/6 (see above, note 691).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 249, pl. 149a. The motif is also to be found on a lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/5, 1/6 (see above, note 691).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 249, pl. 149a. The motif is also to be found on a lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/5, 1/6 (see above, note 691).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 249, pl. 149a. The motif is also to be found on a lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/5, 1/6 (see above, note 691).

St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 249, pl. 149a. The motif is also to be found on a lion-griffin in St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/5, 1/6 (see above, note 691).

763 Mozolevskij (note 42), p. 35, fig. 21.4; p. 116, fig. 100.

764 See above, note 112 (Hermitage 1727–1/131).

765 See an example the rhyton (see above, note 759).

766 St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, p. 259, pl. 130L.

767 From Pazyryk, St. Petersburg, Hermitage: Rudenko, Tombs, pp. 262–263, figs. 130, 131. For examples from Sib-erian goldwork, see St. Petersburg, Hermitage 1727–1/11, 1727–1/12: Dittrich, Tierkampf, p. 109, no. 11 with ill.: Rudenko, Sammlung, p. 52, pl. 6.3, 4.

768 O. Maenchen-Helfen, Central Asiatic Journal 3, no. 2 (1957), pp. 85–138. A Chinese horse statuette is rather closely related: see ibid., p. 119, fig. 27. The comparison is, however, of doubtful value given the very late dating of the statuette.

769 See above, note 762.

770 Rudenko (1958), p. 104, fig. 1b; idem, Tombs, p. 231, fig. 113.


773 New York, Porcelain Collection: A. Oliver, Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 19 (1977), pp. 16–20, figs. 3, 4; idem, Silver, p. 90, no. 53, fig. 53 (late second century B.C.).

774 Oliver, Jahrbuch (note 773), pp. 16–17. He compares the scroll on the thymiaterion from Tarentum (see above, note 255). The comparison is valid insofar as both are floral tendrils, but the floral repertoire is entirely different. Similar to a decoration from Pergamon, the tendril on the bowl bears a spiral volute: Pfrommer (1982), p. 174, nn. 267, 268 (I dated the tendril cited in n. 267 too early)—it may be from the late second century B.C., according to the Lesbian cyma of the decoration. For the late type of ivy used on the bowl: Pfommer, Studien, p. 114.

775 Compare the glass bowl from the Foroughi Collection (see above, note 204).


777 For cymatia with leaves having longer, pointed tips, see M. Pfommer, IstMitt 37 (1987), pp. 148–159, pls. 43.2–5; 44–46.

778 For cymatia with leaves having longer, pointed tips, see M. Pfommer, IstMitt 37 (1987), pp. 148–159, pls. 43.2–5; 44–46.

779 Private collection, said to have been found in Galaxidhi close to Corinth: K. Schebold, Meisterwerke griechischer Kunst (Basel and Stuttgart, 1960), p. 232, no. 319 with ill.; The Search for Alexander (note 273), suppl. New York, p. 15, no. S 53 with ill.


782 Ibid., pl. 50B.


785 M. Bieber, Ancient Copies (New York, 1977), pp. 49–50, pl. 32, figs. 177, 178; pl. 33, figs. 180–183 (Bieber interprets the statuary type as a nymph). See above, note 390.


790 This band cannot be compared with the necklaces with animal head finials, which have erroneously been interpreted as thigh bands (Pfrommer, Goldschmuck, p. 82).

791 Sotheby’s, London (July 12, 1971), p. 25, no. 65 with ill. (Parthian). Italy, which also knew large pendants, can be excluded here, since the representation and the scroll point to the Hellenistic Near East.

792 Appliqué: W. Speiser, Vorhersaesische Kunst (1952), pl. 113 right (now lost). The appliqué was reportedly found with a bracelet of the first century A.D. in Rome (see above, note 742). The date is reconfirmed by the similarity of the bracelet to the Tillya-tepe finds. Medallion with carnelian in gold setting from Taxila, Sirkap: Marshall, Taxila, vol. 2, p. 681, no. 30, pl. 207.11. The first-century date is corroborated by the necklace from the same complex, which finds parallels in Tillya-tepe (see above, note 371). For a much later example
of our composition, see a relief: Hallade, Indien, p. 68, fig. 50.


976 Compare the frontality of Ariadne on the krater from Derveni, Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum B 1: The Search for Alexander (note 273), pp. 164–165, no. 127, pl. 20 (left). For an example from the third century b.c., see the pyxis in the treasury from Tarentum: Pfrommer, Studien, p. 262, KBk 113, pl. 31.


978 See text corresponding to note 266.


980 See text corresponding to notes 264–265.

981 On this type see Pfrommer, Studien, p. 71.

982 Oliver, Silver, p. 79, no. 43, with reference to the Cività Castellana group. For this treasury, which contains no less than three vessels of the construction in question, see text corresponding to notes 324, 626. Another vessel of this type, belonging to a Ptolemaic hoard, was recently in the art market.


984 Among these examples are a krater, a cup whose foot and handles are missing, several kantharoi, and a pair of originally foot- and handleless cups from the Hildesheim Treasure, buried in early Imperial times, Berlin, Antikensammlung 3779, 5–6; 3779,9; 3779,10–14; 3779,62/63: E. Pernice and F. Winter, Der Hildesheimer Silberfund (Berlin, 1901), pp. 28–40, pls. 6, 7, 9–16. Also a pair of kantharoi from a group of silver of late first century b.c. or early first century a.d. date, J. Paul Getty Museum 75.AI.54 and 75.AI.55; A. Oliver, GettyMusJ 8 (1980), pp. 155–159, figs. 2–9, esp. fig. 5 (inner liner). Also a bowl of the same date with canes in Malibu, 72.AI.33: L. Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford, GettyMusJ 5 (1977), pp. 79–84, figs. 1–5. Pyxides, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 1982.11.11A–C: Bothmer (1984), p. 57, no. 101 with ill. (from Magna Graecia). A counterpart is likewise in the Metropolitan Museum (1984, ill. 3). See also the lid and the container of a pyxis reportedly from Asia Minor in Berlin, Antikensammlung 1967,3 (Oliver, Silver, p. 88, no. 51 with ill.).

985 Toledo, Museum of Art 61.9: Oliver, Silver, pp. 116–118, no. 76 with ill. and reference to a similar container in the Museum of Kayseri in central Turkey (ibid., p. 118, fig. 75a).

As examples for representations of bulls in Achaemenid style, compare the well-known capitals from Persepolis: R. Ghirshman (note 47), pp. 215–217, figs. 264, 266. See also a bull rhyton from the first half of the first century B.C. from the Borowko Treasure in Bulgaria in Russe, Historical Museum II–359; *Gold der Thraker* (note 1), p. 146, no. 290, ill. on p. 136.

See text corresponding to notes 356–358.


In 1990 in the New York art market.


NOTE TO THE READER

Unless otherwise noted, all objects in the catalogue were purchased on the European art market. Within the entries, the indication “see chart” refers to the chart of flower types on page 244. In the drawings, areas in gray normally indicate gilding. Only in the case of the tendril decorations on the bowls from treasure I (nos. 1–17) did it seem advisable to make an exception to this practice. The tendril friezes, medallions, and other ornaments are all gilt, and in these drawings the backgrounds of the scroll friezes have been shown in gray only in order to facilitate the reproduction of the overall decoration. The tendril friezes have not been foreshortened to suggest perspective but have been drawn as if flat to show, as far as possible, the actual size relationships. All vessel profiles, which are grouped together at the end of the catalogue section, are reproduced 2:3. Photographs of the objects are not reproduced to any consistent scale but have been proportioned to reflect their relative size within the context of the entire group.

The translations and dating of the Aramaic inscriptions were provided by Professor R. Degen, University of Munich. The technical remarks concerning the bowls from treasure I are based on the observations of Jerry Podany, Conservator of Antiquities at the J. Paul Getty Museum, and David Scott, Head of Museum Services, the Getty Conservation Institute.
Plate 5
1 Bowl with Anchor and Dolphin Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 185–186.5 mm; Height: 43 mm; Thickness: 1 mm; at the lip, 3 mm; Weight: 407.8 g
81.AM.84.1

Description: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. One of the best-made vessels in treasure I. On the inside an inverted Seleucid anchor and a dolphin on a scale pattern medallion, framed by a groove. Except for the anchor and dolphin, the emblem is gilt. The anchor was one of the most important dynastic emblems of the Seleucid dynasty and consequently points to a workshop in the Seleucid sphere of influence. The dolphin and anchor motif occurs first in the second century B.C., and it seems possible that the dolphin can be interpreted as a symbol for the nomadic Parthians that invaded Iran in the later third century and, after a period of alliance, finally ended the Seleucid dominance over the Iranian territories in the second century (see the introduction). The combination of both motifs might refer to this historical situation.

The central medallion is bordered by a floral tendril of the "companion tendril" type. For the flower types, see chart. The scroll belongs to the first group of the tendril decorations that can be dated to the second century B.C. The tendril is framed by two grooves and is gilt. The inner molding of the lip is also gilt.

In contrast to all the other bowls in treasure I, this example is also decorated on the outside, though only modestly. Beneath the lip there is a gilt trefoil garland with bound trefoil groups that are especially typical for the Hellenized Near East and occur for the first time in the late third century B.C. There are also turned, gilt grooves in the center of the vessel. This vessel and the others in treasure I give lively evidence of the strong influence of Greek-Hellenistic forms in the Hellenized Near East even after the eventual breakdown of the Seleucid and Graeco-Bactrian rule.

Condition: The interior of the bowl, including the gilding, is in an excellent state of preservation. The first 25 millimeters below the rim on the outside is shinier than the rest. Almost no traces remain of the gilding on the bottom of the bowl’s exterior.

Date: Second century B.C.

Bowl with Anchor and Dolphin Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 265–269 mm; Height: 71 mm; Thickness: 0.5 mm; at the lip: 3.5 mm; Weight: 628.8 g
81.AM.84.2

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside an inverted Seleucid anchor and a dolphin on a scale pattern medallion (see no. 1). The vessel proves that this emblem motif was still in use after the breakdown of the Seleucid dominance over Iran. The emblem is gilt as is the trefoil garland with bound trefoil groups (see no. 1). Gilt wave meander beneath the lip. The gilding on the garland and on the emblem does not conform to the edges of the ornament. Because of its deep profile, the bowl should belong to the third group from treasure I (first century B.C.).

INSCRIPTION: Length: 62 mm; Height: 13 mm. In Aramaic (first century B.C.), on the exterior, below the lip: zwyzn

“Zwyzn” indicates a unit of weight and corresponds most likely to the Parthian drachma, which varied between about 3.7 and 4.3 grams. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 4.16 grams (628.8:136).

CONDITION: Cracks in the middle and near the rim, no parts missing. Gilding has come off in places on the rim and to a more limited extent in the medallion. The surface of the exterior is darker than the interior and has a few splotchy, blackish discolorations. The vessel was most probably deposited upside down in antiquity, resulting in better conservation of the interior.

DATE: First century B.C.
Bowl with Anchor and Dolphin Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 209–210 mm; Height: 48 mm; Thickness: 1 mm; at the lip, 4.5 mm; Weight: 420.1 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside an inverted Seleucid anchor and a dolphin on an irregularly patterned scale medallion (see no. 1). The emblem and the wave meander beneath the lip are gilt. Gilding only cursorily applied, as on no. 2. Exterior undecorated.

**INSCRIPTION:** Length: 48 mm; Height: 12 mm. In Aramaic (first century B.C.) on the exterior beneath the rim: zwzyn 105

For the meaning of “zwzyn” see no. 2 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 4.0 grams (420.1:105).

**CONDITION:** Fully preserved, only slightly bent. Small areas of gilding have flaked off. About 20 percent of the original surface on the exterior now lost. As the discoloration on the exterior shows, another vessel with a diameter of about 195 millimeters (which corresponds more or less with the diameter of nos. 4 and 22) originally was placed upside down on top of this one. The second vessel eventually slid off, as can be inferred from the uniform damage on the entire surface of the exterior.

**DATE:** According to the inscription, first century B.C.
4 Bowl with Leaf Calyx Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 197 mm; Height: 45 mm; Thickness: 0.5 mm; at the lip, 2.5 mm; Weight: 240.6 g
81.AM.84.4

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. Decorated on the inside with a medallion, a quatrefoil ivy calyx rising from an eight-leaf lanceolate calyx. Four of the lanceolate leaves are decorated with a scale pattern, and with small superimposed nymphaea-like leaves. The flowers between the tips of the ivy (see chart) make an attribution to the early group of treasure I likely.

The background between the blossoms is dotted to a somewhat higher degree than the leaves of the ivy. The medallion is framed first by a turned groove and then by a wave meander. The emblem, including the meander, is gilt. An “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” beneath the lip suggests a workshop of the Hellenized Near East. Below the embattlements but not with coinciding axes runs a miniature leaf frieze. The exterior is undecorated. The traces of the incised decoration appear in negative on the exterior.

CONDITION: There are numerous cracks, but except for a small missing fragment, the piece is fully preserved. The bowl is bent slightly. The original surface of the exterior is partially lost. With the exception of minor damage, the gilding is fully preserved. As the discoloration on the exterior shows, a small vessel of 113 millimeters in diameter originally lay on the reversed bowl.

DATE: First century B.C.
5 Bowl with Leaf Calyx Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 204–210 mm; Height: 57 mm; Thickness: 1 mm; at the lip, 3 mm; Weight: 419.8 g
81.AM.84.5

Description: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. As a medallion on the inside center, six lanceolate leaves and six acanthus leaves form a calyx around a small five-leaf central rosette. Seleucid acanthus leaves with round serrations are used for the back row of the calyx. The flowers between the tips of the leaves favor an attribution to the first group of bowls from treasure I (see chart).

A beaded line and a wave meander border the medallion. Except for the lanceolate leaves, the emblem is gilt. Beneath the lip runs a guilloche, a wave meander, and a miniature leaf frieze. The background of the wave meander is left ungilded in both cases. Exterior undecorated.

Condition: The bowl is somewhat bent, as is the rim. There is a long crack in the wall. The gilding in the medallion zone is almost fully preserved. The exterior was partly covered with incrustations (before cleaning), which suggests that the vessel was deposited upside down.

Date: Second century B.C.
6 Bowl with Leaf Calyx Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 198–201 mm; Height: about 50 mm; Thickness: 0.5 mm; at the lip, 2.5 mm; Weight: 260.7 g
81.AM.84.6

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. An eight-leaf, single-row lanceolate and acanthus star inside as a medallion. The star emerges from an eight-leaf rosette. Seleucid acanthus (see no. 5). All of the leaves are gilt. Beneath the lip there is a gilt “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” (see no. 4). Exterior undecorated.

CONDITION: Several cracks. With the exception of minor damage, the gilding is preserved. Surface damaged in several places.

DATE: Second or first century B.C.
7 Bowl with Leaf Calyx Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 191–194 mm; Height: 61 mm; Thickness: 0.3 mm; at the lip, 2 mm; Weight: 245.9 g

81.AM.84.7

Description: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. Decorated with a medallion inside, an eight-leaf lanceolate ivy calyx that develops out of an eight-leaf “nymphaea calyx.” The edges of the leaves are beaded and the leaves themselves are gilt. The ornament is framed by a gilt wave meander. The gold leaf is not carefully cleaned according to the contours of the ornaments. Beneath the lip there is a gilded “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” (see no. 4). Exterior undecorated.

Condition: Large cracks in the middle of the vessel but no parts missing. Traces of blackish discoloration on the exterior. Interior well preserved. Minor damage to gilding.

Date: Second or first century B.C.
**Bowl with Leaf Calyx Medallion and Tendril Frieze**

Silver; Diameter: 174–178 mm; Height: 51 mm; Thickness: 0.3 mm; at the lip, 2 mm; Weight: 135.5 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside as a medallion a gilt, sixteen-leaf star on a dotted background that relates the vessel to no. 68 and points to a date in the first century B.C. The back row of leaves is beaded but without any indication of ribs. The calyx was very cursorily worked. Framing, “endless” ivy and blossom tendril. For the flowers, see chart. The tendril frieze and the background are gilt. There is also a gilt strip beneath the lip. Exterior undecorated.

**CONDITION:** Several large cracks. The metal shows greenish discoloration on the outside that suggests the vessel was deposited upside down, protecting the interior from the discoloring agent. Interior gilding well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C.
Bowl with Scale Medallion and Tendril Frieze

Silver; Diameter: 159–163 mm; Height: 49 mm; Thickness: 1 mm; at the lip, 3.5 mm; Weight: 287.9 g
81.AM.84.9

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside a gilt scale medallion with a rosette in the center. The rows of the fish scale pattern are staggered. The medallion is framed first by a narrow silver strip and then by a gilt “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” (see no. 4). Above the frieze there is a floral scroll framed by a gilt wave meander. The tendril places the vessel in the second group of treasure I; for the flower types, see chart. The tendril is also gilt. Seleucid acanthus (see no. 5). Beneath the lip of the vessel there is a gilt “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze.” The ornamental frizes are set off by turned grooves. Exterior undecorated.

INSCRIPTION: Length: 25 mm; Height: 4 mm. Traces of an Aramaic inscription on the exterior beneath the rim.

CONDITION: Fully preserved, but with a partially reddish, partially grayish coating on the outside. About a third of the rounded lip is roughened and the stepped frieze beneath it is damaged. The interior is otherwise well preserved, but in a few places, the gilding has flaked off.

DATE: Late second or early first century B.C.
Silver; Diameter: 230–244 mm; Height: 63 mm; Thickness: 0.7 mm; at the lip, 4 mm; Weight: 459.3 g
81.AM.84.10

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. Decorated with a scale medallion with an empty center in the interior, framed by two Seleucid garlands, which suggest a Near Eastern workshop. The gilt emblem is bordered by a floral tendril, which places the bowl in the first group of treasure I and speaks in favor of a second-century date. The scroll rises from a small calyx of Seleucid acanthus (see no. 5) and is framed by gilt wave meanders running in opposite directions. For the flower types, see chart. The background of the tendril is gilt. Beneath the lip there is a gilt “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” (see no. 4). The ornamental friezes are set off by turned grooves. In addition to these grooves, the broad silver strips are also somewhat recessed. Exterior undecorated.

CONDITION: Several cracks. Surface badly damaged both inside and out; in many places the gilding has come off.

DATE: Second century B.C.
**11  Bowl with Scale Medallion and Tendril Frieze**

Silver; Diameter: 240–245 mm; Height: 60 mm; Thickness: 0.3 mm; at the lip, 4 mm; Weight: 504.6 g

81.AM.84.11

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside an irregular, very worn scale medallion framed by an “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” (see no. 4). The medallion is bordered by a flower tendril that places the bowl in the second group of treasure I and speaks for a dating in the later second or earlier first century B.C. For the flower types, see chart. The frieze is framed by wave meanders running in opposite directions. The medallion and frieze were originally gilt, as were the engraved wave meander beneath the lip and the “Achaemenid stepped battlement frieze” (see no. 4). Exterior undecorated.

**CONDITION:** A crack about 20 centimeters long, repaired in modern times. Minor damage to the surface of the exterior. Gilding almost totally lost.

**DATE:** Later second or earlier first century B.C.
12  Bowl with Scale Medallion

Silver; Diameter: 213–218 mm; Height: 53–55 mm; Thickness: 0.7 mm; at the lip, 3 mm; Weight: 462.2 g
81.AM.84.12

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside an irregular, gilt scale medallion. One-half of each scale showing veins. The gold leaf is not carefully cleaned according to the contours of the ornaments. A gilt wave meander beneath the lip. Exterior undecorated. Although contemporaneous with the third group from treasure I (see chart) according to its inscription, the shallow profile of no. 12 does not follow the bulging type represented by nos. 14–16.

INSCRIPTION: Length: 53 mm; Height: 13 mm. An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. on the outside of the bowl beneath the lip: zwzyn 114

For the meaning of “zwzyn,” see no. 2 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 4.0 grams (462.2:114).

CONDITION: Exterior surface partially damaged. Gilding well preserved, though there is very limited loss on the wave meander.

DATE: First century B.C.
13 **Bowl with Tendril Frieze**

Silver; Diameter: 222–224 mm; Height: 52 mm; Thickness: 0.7 mm; at the lip, 5 mm; Weight: 552.1 g

**81 AM.84.13**

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. Inside, a gilt floral scroll framed by two gilt wave meanders running in the same direction. The tendril suggests an attribution to the third group of treasure I and a date in the first century B.C. The wave meanders set off from the tendril by a narrow silver strip. For the flower types, see chart. The frieze is gilded all over. Beneath the lip there is a gilt wave meander. Exterior undecorated. Although contemporaneous with the third group from treasure I according to its inscription (see chart), the shallow profile of no. 12 does not entirely follow the bulging type represented by nos. 14–16.

**INSCRIPTION:** Length: 81 mm; Height: 14 mm. An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. on the outside beneath the lip: zwyn 136

For the meaning of “zwyn,” see no. 2 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 4.0 grams (552.1:136).

**CONDITION:** On the outside, the surface is rough in some places. Blackish brown discoloration on the outside and also, but to a more limited extent, on the inside. The plate was most likely deposited upside down. The gilding has flaked off in most of these places. About a third of the surface of the lip is severely damaged.

**DATE:** First century B.C.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Pfrommer, *GettyMusJ* 13 (1985), p. 17, fig. 12A (detail; dated too early).
Bowl with Tendril Frieze

Silver; Diameter: 225–258 mm; Height: 79 mm; Thickness: 0.7 mm; at the lip, 3.5 mm; Weight: 681.4 g

81.AM.84.14

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside a gilt flower tendril framed by two wave meanders running in opposite directions. The tendril suggests an attribution to the third group of treasure I and a date in the first century B.C. The meanders are set off from the scroll by means of narrow, silver strips. For the flower types, see chart. The scroll is gilded all over. Gilt wave meander below the lip. Exterior undecorated. The rather bulging profile of the vessel is repeated by nos. 2, 15, and 16.

INSCRIPTION: Length: 125 mm; Height: 11 mm. An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. below the rim: 'bd (followed by an indecipherable Iranian personal name) zwzyn igo

The meaning of “’bd” is “has made”; thus the Iranian name must be interpreted as the name of the silversmith. For the meaning of “zwzyn,” see no. 2 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 3.5 grams (681.4:190).

CONDITION: Exterior surface damaged, traces of blackish discoloration (cf. no. 13). Interior nearly undamaged, gilding very well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C.
15 Bowl with Tendril Frieze

Silver; Diameter: 233–235 mm; Height: 61 mm; Thickness: 0.5 mm; at the lip, 3 mm; Weight: 614.5 g

81.AM.84.15

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside a gilt flower tendril frieze, framed by two gilt wave meanders running in the same direction. The latter are set off from the scroll by means of narrow silver strips. The tendril suggests an attribution to the third group of treasure I and a date in the first century B.C. For the flower types, see chart. The frieze is gilded all over. Circular lines are to be found in some of the gilt frieze parts of the ornament, evidently a rejected first outline for the frieze parts of the ornament. Beneath the lip there is a gilt wave meander. Exterior undecorated. The rather bulging profile of the vessel is repeated by nos. 2, 14, and 16.

INSCRIPTION: Length: 102 mm; Height: 10 mm. An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. on the outside beneath the rim: zwzyn 157

For the meaning of “zwzyn,” see no. 2 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 3.9 grams (614.5:157).

CONDITION: One part of the side was broken and has been restored. The lip is fully preserved, though it is damaged in part of the surface. The interior, however, is well preserved, including the gilding.

DATE: First century B.C.
Bowl with Tendril Frieze

Silver; Preserved diameter: 185–191 mm; Preserved height: 47 mm; Thickness: 0.5 mm; Weight: 201.2 g

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside a gilt floral tendril frieze framed by two wave meanders running in the same direction and set off from the scroll by narrow silver strips. The tendril places the bowl in the third group of treasure I and suggests a date in the first century B.C. For the flower types, see chart. The frieze is gilded all over. Above the tendril there is another gilt wave meander. Exterior undecorated. The preserved lower parts of the damaged bowl show a rather bulging profile, which can be compared with other vessels in the third group of treasure I (nos. 2, 14, 15; see chart).

CONDITION: Lip completely lost, cracks in the sides. Only a few traces of the upper wave meander are preserved. Blackish discoloration of the exterior surface, suggesting that the vessel was deposited upside down. Gilding only partially preserved.

DATE: First century B.C.
**Bowl with Trefoil Garland**

Silver; Former diameter and height unknown; Thickness: 0.7 mm; at the lip, 4.5 mm; Weight: 537.7 g  
81.AM.84.17

Description: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside a bound and gilt trefoil garland (see no. 1). Beneath the lip runs a gilt wave meander. Exterior is left undecorated on the parts preserved.

Inscription: Length: 85 mm; Height: 10 mm. An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. on the outside beneath the rim: zwzyyn 206

For the meaning of “zwzyyn,” see no. 2 above. Given that the Parthian drachma weighed between 3.7 and 4.3 grams, the weight of 206 given here means that the undamaged bowl weighed between 762 and 886 grams.

Condition: Lip fully preserved but bent completely out of shape. Only about half the wave meander and about 12 centimeters of the garland preserved. Gilding partially missing. Exterior more highly polished than the inside.

Date: First century B.C.
18 **Bowl**

Silver; Diameter: 181–183 mm; Height: 56 mm; Thickness: 0.75 mm; at the lip, 3 mm; Weight: 297.4 g

**81.AM.84.18**

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of silver.

**INSCRIPTION:** Greek inscription on the outside below the lip giving what is possibly a former owner’s name: **BATHNOY.** The second part of the inscription possibly gives a weight: 173.

**CONDITION:** Crack in the side, edges pushed outward. About a fourth of the exterior covered by blackish brown discoloration. Interior even more strongly discolored.

**DATE:** Second or first century B.C.
19 Bowl with Handle and Bird Emblem

Silver; Diameter: 126 mm; Height: 36 mm; Thickness: 0.3 mm; at the lip, 2 mm; Weight: 97.9 g
81. AM. 84. 25


CONDITION: Very well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
Bowl

Silver; Diameter: 113–115 mm; Height: 29 mm; Thickness: about 0.3 mm; at the lip, 1.5 mm; Weight: 73.4 g
81. AM. 84. 19

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of silver.

**INSCRIPTION:** Length: 26 mm; Height: 4 mm. An indecipherable Iranian inscription on the outside beneath the rim.

**CONDITION:** Cracks in the sides, also dents. The original surface partially destroyed. Blackish discoloration in some places along the cracks.

**DATE:** Sasanian?
21 Bowl

Silver; Diameter: 117–119 mm; Height: 45 mm; Thickness: about 0.5 mm; at the lip, 2.5 mm; Weight: 113.9 g

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver.

CONDITION: Well preserved, only a few small dents. Part of the exterior shows dark discolorations.

DATE: Second or first century B.C.?
Conical Cup

Silver; Diameter: 194 mm; Height: 84 mm; Thickness: 0.5 mm; at the lip, 4 mm; Weight: 521.6 g

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, originally parcel-gilt. On the inside, traces of gilding on the molding. A vessel of this size lay originally on top of bowl no. 3 and a third vessel was placed on cup no. 22.

INSCRIPTION: Length: 27 mm; Height: 9 mm. On the outside beneath the rim a Greek monogram (owner's mark?) and an indication of weight: 129. Given that the Parthian standard of weight (drachma) was about 4 grams, this number indicates a Near Eastern provenance.

CONDITION: Blackish discoloration both inside and out. The cup lay with the opening facing downward since traces of discoloration indicate that a vessel about 102 millimeters in diameter originally lay upside down on the rounded base. The smaller vessel most probably slid down later since a corrosive liquid partially destroyed the surface in the center of the rounded base on the outside. The blackish discoloration was partially dissolved by this liquid. There are calcareous deposits all over the outside of the cup. The vessel therefore could not have lain directly in the ground.

DATE: Second century B.C., perhaps first half.
23 Conical Cup

Silver; Diameter: 167–168 mm; Height: 82 mm; Thickness: about 0.3 mm; at the lip, 4 mm; Weight: 362.4 g
81.AM.84.22

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver.

CONDITION: Surface in part badly damaged. About a third of the body of the vessel lay, at least for a time, in water or wet soil. In this area, the surface and especially the mouth are very heavily damaged.

DATE: Later second or first century B.C.
24 Conical Cup

Silver; Diameter: 157–163 mm; Height: 68 mm; Thickness: 0.3 mm; at the lip, 2 mm; Weight: 227.5 g

81.AM.84.23

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. On the inside a gilt belted garland is held together additionally by a fillet, a decoration that finds a parallel among Near Eastern silver and suggests an eastern workshop. Beneath the rim a gilt wave meander. Exterior undecorated.

CONDITION: Wall somewhat dented but well preserved otherwise, including the gilding.

DATE: Second century B.C., possibly first half.
25  **Agate Cup**

Agate; Height: 98 mm; Diameter: at the top, 69 mm; at the widest part of the rim, 73 mm; Diameter of the ring base: 53 mm; Weight: 430.4 g

81.AM.91

**DESCRIPTION:** Made from two parts, the ring base and the bottom being separate from the walls. Previously most likely held together by four rivets but only three holes are preserved since part of the base is missing. The vessel is relatively well polished.

**CONDITION:** The separate parts have been glued together in modern times.

**DATE:** Hellenistic?
26 Prometopidion or Forehead
Ornament from a Horse Trapping of
Greek-Hellenistic Type

Silver; Length: 255 mm; Widest point (reconstruction): 93 mm; Width: top, 30 mm; bottom, 31 mm; Weight: can no longer be determined due to restoration and mounting on a plastic base.

81.AM.89

description: Raised from a single sheet of silver. The relief was originally held on a setting. Holes (diameter: 0.5 mm) for rivets and the impression made by the fold of the setting are still visible. At the bottom are two larger rivet holes made for repairs (diameter: 2.5 mm). In the center is a siren of the type found on Classical (fifth century B.C.) handle attachments on metal vessels. Above that in a field framed by an astragal is a sphinx of Achaemenid type. Beneath the siren is an eagle attacking a stag, a motif clearly derived from the nomadic-central Asian animal style. Although the type of the prometopidion is derived from Greek-Hellenistic prototypes, the choice of themes is in keeping with nomadic-Parthian ideas and suggests a non-Greek Parthian patron. The blend of both traditions narrows the location of the workshop most likely to Hellenized Iran.

condition: Several cracks and lost parts, among them the right wing of the siren.

date: Late third or second century B.C.

Three Medallions from a Set of Harness of Greek Type

Silver; Diameter: 58 mm; Height: 65 mm; Thickness of the metal: about 2.5 mm; Weight of the complete set: 11.1 g 81.AM.85.1-.3

DESCRIPTION: Each medallion raised from a single sheet of silver. The medallions served as ornaments for the cross straps of a harness at the horse’s head and possibly belonged to the prometopidion (no. 26). The harness type belongs entirely to the Greek repertoire. The original set must have had at least one, possibly three more pieces. The harness type was known in Hellenized central Asia. The fragile medallions must have originally been fastened in fittings. The medallions depict female heads with elaborate hairdos with curls that hang down to the shoulders. The bust is indicated on nos. 27 and 29. The heads bear earrings with pyramid-shaped pendants, misunderstood and depicted as curls on nos. 28 and 29. The type of earrings for the rather provincial medallions points to a Greek original of the middle of the third century. No. 27 still has the rivet holes that were made for repairs.

CONDITION: No. 29 is fully preserved. A large part of the edge of no. 28 is missing. No. 27 is considerably bent and there are pieces missing from the edge.

DATE: Late third or second century B.C.
30, 31  Pair of Parthian Phalerae with Relief Decoration of an Attacking Animal Group (Harness Ornaments)

Silver; Diameter: no. 30, 150 mm; no. 31, 152 mm; Height: 22 mm; Thickness of the metal: 3 mm; Weight: no. 30, 137.3 g; no. 31, 140.3 g (including plastic filling)

81.AM.87.3-.4

DESCRIPTION: Each piece raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. This type of three-looped phalera came into use not earlier than in the late third century. Although both bear attacking animal groups in Greek style, these three-looped phalerae belong to a central Asian harness type that was used in the second and first centuries B.C. especially by peoples of central Asiatic origins such as the Parthians in Iran, the Sarmatians in the steppes north of the Black Sea, or even the Kushans in Afghanistan and Pakistan in the first centuries of the Christian era. As in the case of the prometopidion (no. 26), the blend of traditions—Greek and central Asiatic—speaks in favor of a workshop in Hellenized Parthian Iran. On the back of each piece there are three loops up to 45 millimeters long for the straps of the harness. A single strap went upward from the horizontal chest strap of the horse. The phalerae were attached in front of the saddle. For the strap arrangement, see nos. 34, 35.

The decoration is a group scene, showing a lion attacking a stag that has collapsed on the ground; on one, the lion is springing to the right, on the other to the left. The eyes of the stag were originally inlaid with stones. Small details such as the eyes of the stags or the elongated hooves echo the nomadic animal style. The image is framed by a belted garland. The groups with attacking animals, the garlands, and the strips along the edges are gilded.

CONDITION: Well preserved, including the gilding. Metal slightly torn. The relief group is somewhat dented on no. 31. The medallions have been filled from behind with plastic to give them greater stability.

DATE: Second century B.C.
32, 33  
Pair of Parthian Phalerae with Relief Decoration of an Attacking Animal Group (Harness Ornaments)

Silver; Diameter: 126 mm; Height: 9 mm; Thickness of the metal: 3 mm; Weight: no. 32, 98 g; no. 33, 104 g
81.AM.87.1-.2

DESCRIPTION: Each piece raised from a single sheet of silver, front side gilded. On the back there were originally three loops of up to 45 millimeters for the straps of the harness; the loops were attached with rivets. For the type and the way of attachment, see nos. 30, 31. Both are decorated with a lion attacking a stag, on one piece oriented toward the left, on the other toward the right. Three lizards are between the legs of the stag. The pieces are much more provincial than the first pair (nos. 30, 31) and composition and details point again to a workshop of Hellenized Parthian Iran. The surface of the phalerae is dotted without much regard to differentiating between the bodies of the animals and the background. The front is completely gilded.

CONDITION: The surface, including the gilding, is well preserved. In front of the chest of the stag on no. 33 there are cracks in the metal. On no. 32, only one of the loops on the back is preserved.

DATE: Second century B.C.
34, 35  Pair of Parthian Phalerae in the Form of Omphalos Bowls (Harness Ornaments)

Silver; Diameter: 172 mm; Height: 14 mm; Thickness of the metal: 3 mm; Weight: no. 34, 153.9 g; no. 35, 167.0 g
81.AM.86.2-.1

DESCRIPTION: Each piece raised from a single sheet of silver. The phalerae follow phialai mesomphaloi of Greek type. Omphaloi in the middle of the disks (26 × 7 millimeters). The molded rims imitate perhaps vessels with molded rims. There were originally three bronze loops of about 60 millimeters riveted onto the backs. The striped discolorations of about 12 to 15 millimeters in width on the back of no. 34 show that the phalerae were buried with the straps of the harness. In addition, the discoloration indicates how the straps were originally arranged. A single strap went upward from the horizontal chest strap. The phalerae were attached in front of the saddle (see nos. 30, 31).

CONDITION: In an excellent state of preservation; however, all the loops (except one on no. 34) are lost.

DATE: Second century B.C.
Parthian Phalera (Harness Ornament)

Bronze; Diameter: 119 mm; Height: 6.5 mm; Weight: 97.0 g
81.AC.88

Description: Raised from sheet bronze. Raised rim. Three loops, up to 51 millimeters in length, on the back of the piece for the straps of the harness. For the way the piece was attached, see nos. 30, 31. Close parallels are known from Hellenized central Asia.

Condition: Ancient surface lost in many places but all of the loops are preserved. The underside of the rim is filled with organic material.

Date: Second century B.C.

Back view, reduced
Small Relief Bust of a Woman

Silver; Height of the bust: 48 mm; Width at the bottom: 43 mm; Weight: 153 g
81.AM.95

Description: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. Small bust of a woman with a high, gilt stéphané decorated with a tendril. The frontality as well as details of the dress speak for a date in the second century. The strict frontality and symmetry of the bust seem to be forerunners of similar trends in Near Eastern sculpture of Imperial date. The hair is gilded, parted, and pulled back from the face. The woman is wearing a crepe chiton with a wide border. Her mantle is pulled up over the back of her head and hangs down in the front over her shoulders. The turned border of the mantle is gilded, indicating that the inside of the fabric is supposed to be a different color than the outside.

Condition: Well preserved, including the gilding. The face is dented, suggesting a slight turn to the side. The reverse of the piece is partially covered with a blackish coating.

Date: Second century B.C., probably first half of the century.
38  Torque

Gold; Diameter: about 190 mm; Diameter of the metal: 4–18 mm; Weight: 378.4 g
81.AM.90

DESCRIPTION: Five-sided gold torque with a thick ridge. Eyes at both ends, probably originally used for attaching a pendant. Similar torques are documented in Parthian sculpture. Vertical molding and a prismlike element in front of the eyes. The torque could be the forerunner of ridged torques and bracelets of the first century A.D. in the Afghan-Pakistani area.

CONDITION: The torque has been bent apart with force and then bent back into shape. Except for the damage that resulted from this, the piece is excellently preserved.

DATE: Second or first century B.C.
39 Animal-Head Bracelet, Oriental Type with Heads of Lionesses

Gold; Diameter: 77 mm; Thickness of the metal ring: 5.5 mm; Weight: 78.1 g

81.AM.94

DESCRIPTION: The type of the animal-head bracelet is already known with slightly different details in pre-Hellenistic times but can be traced down to the end of the Hellenistic period in the Hellenized Near East.

CONDITION: Deep nick in one place on the bracelet, otherwise well preserved.

DATE: Second century B.C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Pfommer, Goldschmuck, pp. 100, 297, n. 859, TA 92, fig. 16.20.

40 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 132 mm; Diameter: middle, 21.5 mm; ends, 19 mm; Weight: 92 g

81.AN.92.2

DESCRIPTION: Gold end cuffs in the form of simple animal heads made of raised gold sheet. Parallels from Syria and northwestern Iran point to a Near Eastern workshop. The edges of the cuffs are decorated with a twisted gold wire. Ears and horns of the heads have been made separately and attached. The eyes are raised and outlined with a row of granulation. The gold central cuff is edged with a twisted gold wire and with chased bosses.

CONDITION: Fully preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
41 Pendant for a Chain

Glass; Length: 82 mm; Diameter: 13 and 14 mm; Weight: 26.3 g
81.AN.92.1

description: Pendant in form of a "Kohl tube" with gold end cuffs, gold center cuff with a double eye. The tube was reused for the pendant. The outer cuffs have end plates. Decorated with S-shaped scrolls and triangles of granulation. The edges of the cuff in the middle are decorated with twisted gold wire.

condition: Completely preserved.

date: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

42 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 118 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 20 and 17 mm; at the ends, 16 and 17 mm; Weight: 78.4 g
81.AN.92.3

description: The end cuffs are of gold sheet and have end plates. Decorated with gold wire tongues and meandering S-spirals, which are soldered on. The cuffs are fastened to the stone with metal pins. The center cuff originally had three stone inlays, but only one orange stone is preserved.

condition: Except for the two missing stone inlays, well preserved.

date: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
43  Pendant for a Chain

Black stone; Length: 90 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 12.5 mm; at the ends, 9 mm; Weight: 35.4 g
81.AN.92.4

description: End cuffs of gold sheet without end plates. Edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation. The center cuff was evidently added later and has a simple, chased, dotted decoration on the edges and a boss-shaped center ornament. The three eyes are on top of flat eyes of the same type, probably an ancient pastiche.

condition: Well preserved.

date: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

44  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 117 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 16 mm; at the ends, 15 mm; Weight: 59.4 g
81.AN.92.5

description: End cuffs of gold sheet with end plates. Both the end cuffs and the center one edged with tongues made of gold wire. The end cuffs are fastened to the stone with metal pins.

condition: Well preserved.

date: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
45  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 104 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 14 mm; at the ends, 13 mm; Weight: 38.7 g
81.AN.92.6

DESCRIPTION: Cuffs as on no. 44 and decorated in like fashion except that there are gold wire circles soldered to the end cuffs, which may originally have been settings for gem stones, as is the case with no. 42.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

46  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 92 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 33 mm; at the ends, 24 and 25 mm; Weight: 157.9 g
81.AN.92.7

DESCRIPTION: End cuffs of gold sheet with end plates, edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
47  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 65 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 22 mm; at the ends, 10 mm; Weight: 62.8 g
81.AN.92.8

DESCRIPTION: Decorated in same fashion as no. 46.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

48  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 98 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 25 mm and 12 mm; at the ends, 17 and 12 mm; Weight: 57.1 g
81.AN.92.9

DESCRIPTION: Stone is oval in cross section. End cuffs of gold sheet with end plates, edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation. Center cuff simply worked, decorated with chased fluting. The center cuff was probably substituted later. The eyes of the cuffs, however, are of a similar type as on no. 43; they are soldered onto small gold sheet rings.

CONDITION: One outer cuff is missing, otherwise well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
49  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 88 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 25.5 and 10 mm; at the ends, 15 and 10 mm; Weight: 34.8 g
81.AN.92.10

DESCRIPTION: Stone is oval in cross section. End cuffs of gold sheet with end plates. Cuffs attached to the stone with metal pins. Outer cuffs edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation. The gold cuff in the middle is of a different type and had an edge of beaded gold wire.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

50  Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 71 mm; at the bottom, 75.5 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 26 and 14 mm; at the ends, 19 x 14 mm and 18 x 14 mm; Weight: 54.0 g
81.AN.92.11

DESCRIPTION: Stone is oval in cross section. End cuffs of gold sheet with end plates. End and center cuffs edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation. The end cuffs do not fit on the stone, raising the question of whether they might have been added in modern times.

CONDITION: Well preserved, but it is not completely certain that the elements belong together.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
51 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 68 mm; at the bottom, 74 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 27 and 18 mm; at the ends, 12 and 18 mm; at the added cuff, 16 and 18 mm; Weight: 53.6 g
81.AN.92.12

DESCRIPTION: Two different cuff types of gold sheet. One cuff has an end plate and an eye. Edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation. Attached to the stone with metal pins. The second cuff has no end plate and the eye is missing. Edged with beaded gold wire and decorated with tongues of gold wire and with a few larger, drop-shaped elements. The second cuff was unquestionably worked for a stone of the type used here. For the type of ornament, see no. 53. The repair was possibly carried out in antiquity.

CONDITION: The eye and possibly an end plate are missing from the later cuff.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

52 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 89 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 36 and 19 mm; at the ends, 19 x 19 mm; Weight: 92.5 g
81.AN.92.13

DESCRIPTION: Stone is irregular in cross section. End cuffs of gold sheet with end plates. Cuffs attached to stone by means of metal pins; protruding wire spiral on one side. Cuffs edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation.

CONDITION: Well preserved. It can no longer be determined whether the wire spiral originally ended in an eye.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
53 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 71 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 21 mm; at the ends, 16.5 mm; Weight: 48.5 g
81.AN.92.14

DESCRIPTION: End cuffs of gold sheets with end plates, attached to stone by means of metal pins. One cuff is edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation. The second cuff corresponds in type to the second cuff on no. 51, with beaded gold wire around the edge and drop-shaped ornaments as well as gold wire tongues. We can assume that this is also a replacement for a missing cuff.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

54 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 73 mm; Diameter (oval): in the middle, 17 and 13 mm; at the ends, 13 and 10 mm; Weight: 25.1 g
81.AN.92.15

DESCRIPTION: Gold-sheet cuffs with end plates, attached to the stone by means of metal pins. The cuffs are edged with twisted gold wire and decorated with triangles of granulation.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

55 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 45 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 17 mm; at the ends, 15 mm; Weight: 23.8 g
81.AN.92.16

DESCRIPTION: Gold-sheet cuffs as on no. 52.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
56 Pendant for a Chain

Rock crystal; Length: 39 mm; Diameter: 15.5 mm; Weight: 9.9 g
81.AN.92.17

DESCRIPTION: Gold-sheet cuffs as on no. 52. The rock crystal is pierced all the way through from the side. The gold sheet end plates are pierced, but the pins are not preserved. The large diameter of the hole in the crystal speaks for its having been strung originally and perhaps only reused with the cuffs.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

57 Pendant for a Chain

Agate; Length: 35 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 12 mm; at the ends, 10 mm; Weight: 10.1 g
81.AN.92.18

DESCRIPTION: Gold-sheet cuffs as on no. 52.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.

58 Pendant for a Chain

Slate with coarser inclusions; Length: 35 mm; Diameter: 8 mm; Weight: 7.8 g
81.AN.92.19

DESCRIPTION: Gold-sheet cuffs with end plates. Edged with simple gold wire. Decorated with gold wire tongues that have been soldered on in the same fashion as on the replacement cuff on no. 53.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.
59 *Pendant for a Chain*

Slate; Length: 38 mm; Diameter: 8 mm; of the stone, 6.5 mm; Weight: 6.9 g
81.AN.92.20

**DESCRIPTION:** Stone cut in eight facets. Gold-sheet cuffs as on no. 58.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. or first century A.D.

---

60 *Pendant*

Agate; Length: 52 mm; Diameter (oval): 15 and 8.5 mm; Weight: 14.9 g
81.AN.92.21

**DESCRIPTION:** Gold-sheet cuffs with end plates, edged with row of beads in granulation. The gold sheet backing the stone decorated with granulated rows of beads, granulated triangles, and gold wire. Holes for attaching eyes on the small sides.

**CONDITION:** The eyes necessary for hanging the pendant are lost. Otherwise well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. or first century A.D.?

---

61 *Pendant*

Length: 22 mm; Diameter: 9 mm; Weight: 3.9 g
81.AN.92.23

**DESCRIPTION:** Strung on gold wire which has eyes at both ends.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. or first century A.D.
62 Pendant
Agate; Length: 59 mm; Diameter: 10.5 mm; Weight: 13.2 g
81.AN.92.24
DESCRIPTION: Strung on bronze wire with eyes at both ends.
CONDITION: Well preserved.
DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.?

63 Bead
Amethyst; Length: 36 mm; Diameter: 18 mm; Weight: 19.8 g
81.AN.92.22
CONDITION: Minor chips.
DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.?

64 Bead
Agate; Length: 63 mm; Diameter: in the middle, 21 mm; at the ends, 8 mm; Weight: 29.4 g
81.AN.92.25
DESCRIPTION: Pierced lengthwise. Diameter of the hole about 1.5 millimeters.
CONDITION: Chips on the small sides.
DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.?

65 Pendant
Agate; Length: 46 mm; Height: 29 mm; Thickness: 6.5 mm; Weight: 15 g
81.AN.92.26
DESCRIPTION: Pierced horizontally.
CONDITION: Well preserved.
DATE: First century B.C. or first century A.D.?
TREASURE II

66 **Lion Rhyton**

Silver; Height: 270 mm; of the lion, 95 mm; Diameter of rim: 180 mm; Weight: 793.9 g

86.AM.754.1

**DESCRIPTION:** Parcel-gilt. Slender, Hellenistic rhyton with forepart (or protome) of a male lion. The animal and the horn of the vessel are worked in separate parts and joined with a rounded cuff. Stone inlays have been placed in the otherwise gilded eyes with “Laokoon brows.” The entire mane and the ears have been gilded over as have the veins on the front paws. An eight-petaled calyx of Seleucid acanthus and lanceolate leaves covers the lower part of the horn behind the cuff and places the vessel in the Hellenistic group of leaf calyx rhyta. The vessel itself follows more or less Achaemenid prototypes, although leaf calyx rhyta are not known before the late third or early second century B.C.

The calyx type is drawn from the early Hellenistic repertoire but the Seleucid acanthus can be first documented in the second century (see no. 1). Flowers with stone inlays on curved stalks are interspaced between the tips of the leaves (for the flower types, see chart). The acanthus, the central ribs of the lanceolate foliage, and the flowers with their stalks are all gilded over. A beaded line marks the upper edge of the floral decoration.

Below the overhanging lip of the horn runs a gilded ivy garland, composed of overlapping trefoil groups. Right above the lion six stones form the central motif of the garland, which is fastened at the back with a taenia. The knot is again elaborately decorated with semiprecious stones. The taenia motif is not known before the end of the third century. Right below the lip is a narrow frieze of “Achaemenid stepped battlements,” which points to a Near Eastern workshop. According to the green oxidation, a slightly bent plate (no. 68) was likely buried in contact with the rhyton, which was already damaged in ancient times. Along with other items in treasure II, a date in the first century B.C. seems reasonable but an attribution to the later second century is not impossible. The rhyton along with treasure I demonstrates the strong Hellenistic influence in Iran after the breakdown of the Seleucid empire.

**CONDITION:** The lion is well preserved. The thin silver is worn through in places with some small modern restorations. Several strain cracks are in the thin silver of the horn, which was flattened out when found. At the back of the calyx almost all the gilding has come off and most of the ancient surface of the silver destroyed. The gilding of the ivy garland is fairly well preserved with the exception of a small section (length: 45 mm) on the right side of the central stone inlay.

**DATE:** First century B.C.
Deep Cup with Leaf Decoration

Silver; Diameter: 138 mm; Height: 90 mm; Weight: 549.5 g
86.AM.754.4

Description: Raised cup. Gilded all over. Deep bowl with subconical shape and three-dimensional leaf decoration on the exterior. The interior is left undecorated. Several ancient repairs. The exuberant calyx decoration that covers the lower half of the body is composed of an eight-petaled calyx of four acanthus-like leaves with three-dimensionally bent tips. Interspaced are four nymphaea-like leaves that function as frames for an incised scale pattern. All the tips of the foliage are made separately and have been soldered on. Blossoms with stone inlays grow on curved stalks between the tips of the calyx. The whole decoration rises from a four-petaled rosette with elongated leaves and a single stone in the center. The upper part of the exterior is decorated with a flower tendril with huge accompanying leaves framed by two three-dimensional beaded lines. The blossoms bear stone incrustations.

The bowl forms a link between treasure II and the Indo-Greek bowl from treasure IV (no. 76) and seems to have been manufactured by an atelier from the Bactrian or former Graeco-Bactrian sphere of influence, whereas the rhyton (no. 66) and the bowl (no. 68) reflect more the Hellenized traditions that dominate the repertoire of treasure I. Although produced in a provincial central Asian atelier, the general outline of the decoration is drawn from Greek bowls of the second century B.C. and demonstrates the remarkable Greek influence in the Hellenized East.

Condition: The upper parts of the cup are fairly well preserved, including the gilding. Some of the stone inlays are lost. According to J. Podany, the center of the vessel is possibly a modern restoration and the green patina of the interior is of doubtful authenticity.

Date: First century B.C.
68 Shallow Bowl with Three Friezes of Rosettes

Silver; Diameter: 181–206 mm; Height: 60 mm; Thickness of the lip: 2 mm; Weight: 380.2 g
86.AM.754.5

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. The outside is left undecorated. In the interior incised and gilded rosettes or blossoms are arranged in three friezes set apart by wheel-cut grooves. A garnet decorates the center of the bowl. The vessel was in all likelihood found upside down on the side of the lion rhyton (no. 66). The flowers find close analogies on vessels from the third group of treasure I.

CONDITION: The bowl is slightly bent, with most of the gilding preserved.

DATE: First century B.C.
Two Hemispherical Cups with Stone Inlays

Silver; Diameter: 103 mm; Height: 57 mm; Weight: no. 69, 253 g, no. 70, 278 g.
86.AN.754.2--3

DESCRIPTION: Hemispherical bowls without any base ring. Raised from sheets of silver, parcel-gilt. Interiors left undecorated. In the center of the exterior of each a five-petaled rosette around a garnet. Each rim is bordered by a frieze of two trefoil garlands with bound trefoil groups running clockwise and counterclockwise, a motif that was especially popular in the Hellenized Near East (see no. 1). The central rosettes and the lanceolate leaves of the garlands are gilded. A pair and a set of four stones mark the beginning and end of the garlands in each case. On bowl no. 70 two of the garnets have been replaced by green glass inlays. The hemispherical bowl with a rosette in the center is already part of the Achaemenid repertoire and demonstrates the long-lasting native traditions in the ancient Near East, although all the decorative elements have been drawn from the Greek-Hellenistic repertoire. The overlapping leaves of the five-petaled rosettes speak for a date not earlier than the first century B.C. The bowls define, along with cup no. 67, the chronological limits of treasure I.

CONDITION: Most of the gilding preserved but the ancient surface lost in places.

DATE: First century B.C.
TREASURE III

71 Lynx Rhyton

Silver; Height: 240 mm; Diameter of the rim: 121 mm; Length of lynx: 88 mm; Height of lynx: 100 mm; Weight: 724.5 g

DESCRIPTION: Parcel-gilt. Slender rhyton with forepart (or protome) of a lynx. According to J. Podany, both the horn and the animal protome have been raised from single sheets of silver; only the legs of the lynx were cast separately. The animal and the lip of the rhyton are gilded all over. The high slender horn fits into a narrow cuff behind the body of the lynx protome. The slender horn is derived from the old Achaemenid prototypes but the lynx is a Hellenistic addition to the Near Eastern repertoire of animal rhyta.

A spout between the forelegs of the lynx was used to pour out wine into the user’s mouth. The animal itself is shown spitting, in full attack, modeled in vigorous detail with outstretched paws and open muzzle. The teeth are showing and the ears are laid back in fury. Some of the hairlocks are accentuated in triangular engravings and the beard under the throat is given in low relief. The remaining fur is just indicated by stippling with the exception of the three-pointed whirl rosettes on the thighs. A collar around the neck characterizes the lynx as a half-tamed animal, perhaps used for hunting purposes; the collar could also indicate that we are dealing with the sacred animal of Dionysos. Said to have been found with the net pattern bowl (no. 72). Notwithstanding the entirely Greek-Hellenistic style, the Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. on the lip demonstrates that we are dealing with a native Iranian silversmith. The rhyton gives evidence for a considerable Hellenization of native workshops even after the breakdown of the Seleucid Empire.

INSCRIPTION: An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. is incised in dotted lines on the lip: "bd" (followed by an indecipherable Iranian personal name) zwzyn165.

The meaning of “bd” is “has made”; thus the Iranian name must be interpreted as the name of the silversmith. For the meaning of “zwzyn,” see no. 2 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachma weighing 4.3 grams (724.5 g). Not from the same hand as the almost identical, with the exception of the name, inscription on no. 73.

CONDITION: Most of the gilding on the lynx and of the lip of the vessel has been preserved, with the exception of the shoulders and the cheeks of the animal.

PROVENANCE: Private collection, New York.

DATE: First century B.C., probably second half.

J2 Net Pattern Bowl

Silver; Diameter: 202–205 mm; Height: 51 mm; Weight: 433.8 g
86.AM.752.3

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt. Stone inlays. Shallow bowl of a shape predominating in treasures I and II, decorated exclusively on the interior. The exuberant decoration is primarily composed of a net of two rows of eight staggered pentagons, arranged around a central leaf calyx of Near Eastern type. Each individual pentagonal frames a rosette-like flower with a garnet in the center (for the flower types, see chart). Another garnet marks the center of the bowl. The pentagons with the flowers and the leaves of the central calyx are gilded all over, as is the inner lip of the vessel. The broad silver strips that separate the pentagons and the four groups of tongues in the central leaf calyx contrast to their gilded surrounding.

The pentagonal or net pattern composition is entirely part of the Greek-Hellenistic repertoire and came into use in the second century B.C. As the calyx and the flowers prove, however, we are dealing here with the work of a Hellenized Near Eastern atelier. The flower types speak for a date in the first century B.C. and for an attribution to a workshop in the formerly Graeco-Bactrian sphere.

CONDITION: The bowl is slightly bent but otherwise in an almost perfect state of preservation.

PROVENANCE: Private collection, New York.

DATE: First century B.C.

RELATED RHYTA WITHOUT CONTEXTS

73  Lynx Rhyton

Silver; Height: 245 mm; Diameter of the rim: 122 mm. Length of lynx: 95 mm; Height of lynx: 105 mm; Weight: 817.6 g
86.AM.752.2

DESCRIPTION: Same as no. 71.

INSCRIPTION: An Aramaic inscription of the first century B.C. is incised in dotted lines on the lip: ḫd (followed by an indecipherable Iranian personal name) zwyn 188

See discussion under no. 71 above. In this case, the silversmith seems to have used as his standard a Parthian drachm weighing 4.3 grams (817.6:188). Not from the same hand as the almost identical, with the exception of the name, inscription on no. 71.

CONDITION: Most of the gilding on the lynx and on the lip of the vessel has come off.

PROVENANCE: Private collection, New York.

DATE: First century B.C., probably second half.


190 CATALOGUE
**Stag Rhyton**

Silver; Height: 274 mm; Diameter of rim including profile: 126 mm; Length of stag: 123 mm; Height of stag: 220 mm (horns to hooves); Weight: 899.6 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Slender rhyton with forepart (or protome) of a stag. According to J. Podany both the horn and the protome of the stag have been raised from a single sheet of silver. Feet, ears, and horns were cast separately and soldered on. Eyes inlaid with glass paste and black stones. The floral decoration of the vessel is raised. Incised wave patterns on the lip. Gilded all over. The animal is given with vigorous but somewhat ornamental details and only a few elements like the orbitals over the eyes or the elongated hooves are rendered in a more stylized fashion. Naturalistic veins are shown on the bony skull, but in contrast to this, the artist made no effort to achieve a naturalistic characterization of the fur. A hole between the legs formerly held a spout that is now lost.

The raised, exuberantly decorated horn is joined to the animal with a small cuff. The rich decoration is entirely floral (for the flower types, see chart) and speaks for a date in the late first century B.C. or in the first decades of the Christian era. An elaborate tendril pattern rises from an acanthus calyx that is held together by the cuff. The rhyton thus belongs to the class of leaf calyx rhyta that came into being in the Hellenistic period (see no. 66). The stag rhyton without tendril decoration was already part of the Achaemenid toreutic art and as such is no new element in the eastern repertoire.

Close to the rim is a narrow frieze covered with a trefoil garland with bound trefoil groups. This motif was especially popular in the Hellenized Near East and can likewise be traced in the Imperial Near Eastern repertoire. The frieze is bordered by beaded lines and crowned by a frieze of palmettes. The overlapping lip is decorated with an incised wave pattern.

**INSCRIPTION:** An inscription in Aramaic letters (possibly Persian) of the first century A.D. on the belly of the animal.

**CONDITION:** Almost perfectly preserved. Only the gilding on one side of the vessel has come off in some places.

**PROVENANCE:** Private collection, New York.

**DATE:** Late first century B.C. or the earlier decades of the first century A.D.

TREASURE IV

75  Cup with a Leaf Calyx Decoration

Silver; Diameter: 126 mm; Height: 53 mm; Thickness: 1.3 mm; at the lip, 3.75 mm; Weight: 298.4 g

82.AM.103.2

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver. Incised ornament, parcel-gilt. A small, twelve-leaf lanceolate and acanthus calyx with lancet-shaped leaves in the first row from which emerges, though without axial symmetry, a ten-leaf calyx of slender lanceolate leaves and broad, veined nymphaea-like foliage. Except for the inner fields of the large lanceolate leaves, the entire leaf chalice is gilded. Above the calyx there is a triple guilloche framed by rows of beads. The lip is decorated with an inverted Ionian cymation. Interior undecorated.

The decoration is entirely derived from the eastern Graeco-Hellenistic repertoire, thus documenting the dominance of the Graeco-Macedonian repertoire in the Near East in the first century B.C. The type of vessel finds eastern parallels as well. The five-leaf composition with nymphaea-like foliage with curved central veins is paralleled on the pentagonal bowl from treasure III (no. 72). It not only corroborates the dating to the first century B.C., but the calyx-flower composition speaks for an atelier in the former Graeco-Bactrian sphere.

CONDITION: Well preserved, including the gilding. The surface shows blackish discoloration.

DATE: First century B.C.
Silver; Diameter: 135 mm; Height: 53 mm; Thickness: about 2 mm; at the lip, 3.5 mm; Weight: 368.4 g
82.AM.101.5

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver. Originally gilded. In the center there is a ten-leaf rosette and nymphaea-like foliage. From this calyx emerges a one-row, eighteen-leaf lanceolate and acanthus calyx, without axial symmetry. Rounded leaves in front of the lancet-shaped foliage. A calyx of large, pointed leaves without axial symmetry, with filled floral tendrils and acanthus whose leaf tips bend toward each other in pairs. Between tips of the leaves there are blossoms.

An endless flower scroll above the leaf calyx is placed between rows of beads. All of the leaves of the calyx ornament, all of the blossoms, the large leaves of the flower tendril, and the framing row of beads are represented in more or less high relief. There were originally stone inlays in all of the blossoms, in the rounded leaves of the small calyx, and in the lobes of the acanthus. All the other parts of the ornament are incised. Small traces indicate that the outside of the bowl was once completely gilded. Interior undecorated.

The overlapping leaves of the central rosette suggest a date not earlier than the first century B.C. (see no. 69). In technical and stylistical respect, the bowl is closely related to a cup from treasure II (no. 67) and must be attributed to a workshop tradition in the former Graeco-Bactrian sphere (see no. 75).

CONDITION: Gilding lost except for small traces. The majority of the stones are missing. Otherwise well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C.
Silver; Diameter: 123–124 mm; Height: 69 mm; Thickness: 1.5 mm; at the lip, 4.5 mm; Weight: 374.0 g
82.AM.103.3

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver. Gilding on the inner profile of the lip and on the inside on a double strip below the lip. The cup belongs to a Hellenistic Greek type.

INSCRIPTION: Partially illegible Greek inscription on the outside beneath the rim in letters 2.5 to 3 millimeters high, including an indication of weight: 194.

Given the cup's actual weight of 374 grams, the standard used here would have been no more than 1.83 grams per drachma. However, according to Iannis Touratsoglou (Athens, National Numismatic Museum), the inscription should be reconstructed as ΑΥΤΟΣ ΤΟ ΖΕΥΓΟΣ ΔΡΧ and refers to a pair of cups (ΖΕΥΓΟΣ = pair) that together weigh 194 drachmas. If we assume that the weight of the lost cup was about the same as that of the preserved example, the approximate total weight would be 748 grams, indicating a standard of about 3.8 grams, which is in accord with the Parthian standard of 3.7 to 4.3 grams per drachma (see no. 2 above).

CONDITION: Parts of the inscription are damaged, otherwise well preserved. On the lip, two places, each about 10 millimeters wide and across from one another, are more highly polished than the rest; possibly traces left by recent attempts to clean the vessel.

DATE: Probably first century B.C.
Silver; Diameter: at the mouth, 91–93 mm; at the largest point, 99 mm; Height: 68 mm; Thickness: about 2 mm; at the lip, 5.5 mm; Weight: 410.9 g
82.AM.103.4

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of silver. The vessel originally had a handle with one heart-shaped attachment with a cross tip and one simple, round escutcheon. This special type of attachment is documented in late Hellenistic contexts.

CONDITION: The handle is lost and only traces of soldering remain of the attachments.

DATE: First century B.C.
79  *Bowl*

Silver; Diameter: 137–139 mm; Height: 43 mm; Thickness at rim: 2 mm; Weight: 143.85 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Shallow bowl without foot or base ring. Raised from a single sheet of silver, parcel-gilt.

**CONDITION:** Restored from several fragments.

**DATE:** First century B.C.?
Cup on Footstand

Gold; Diameter: 113 mm; Height: 79 mm; Thickness: 0.2 mm; Weight: 73.6 g
82.AM.97

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. The type of the vessel finds parallels in pottery in Ai Khanoum (Afghanistan) and in Taxila (Pakistan) and corroborates the alleged provenance of the whole group (see no. 75).

CONDITION: Several breaks in the sides. The edge is somewhat bent, but the vessel is completely preserved.

DATE: First century B.C.
81—84 Appliqués: Eagle-Griffin

Tearing a Hare (Harness Ornament)

Gold; Plaque: 60×40 mm; Height: 40 mm; Weight: 8.9—11.1 g
82.AM.99.3.a-d

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold, except for the griffin’s head and neck, which were cast. Ears and combs of the griffins are individually worked. Four eyes on the back of each plaque for attaching the pieces. Several other coarsely made holes (for instance, in the wings) speak for a later reuse of the plaques. The eyes of the eagle-griffin, the feathers of the wings, its thighs and feet, and the eyes and ear of the hare were originally inlaid with stones (i.e., turquoises). There was originally a lapis lazuli inlay in the chest of the eagle-griffin.

This type of appliqué has a long tradition among nomadic finds from the western Scythian region north of the Black Sea to the Altai in central Asia. The earliest examples belong to the fourth century B.C. The parallels have exclusively been used as harness decorations. The eagle-like creature in full attack belongs to the central Asian animal style. The Getty appliqués form the latest pieces known to me and corroborate the central Asian connections of their former owners, reflecting the nomadic dominance over the formerly Graeco-Bactrian sphere in the first centuries B.C. and A.D.

CONDITION: The inlays are for the most part lost. Except for the holes made for reuse, well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.
85—88  Buttons with Curled Griffins  
*(Harness Ornament)*

Gold; Diameter: 24 mm; Height: 14–15 mm; Weight: 11.8–12.6 g  
82.AM.99.4.a–d

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. Reclining griffin with hooves turned toward the back and curled up. Eyes and ears originally probably inlaid with stones. The tail ends in a small griffin’s head. There is a horizontally placed pin for fastening the buttons on the inside.

The buttons decorated in all probability the crossing points of a horse’s harness straps. The hooved animal is a fabulous being from the central Asian repertoire. The type of the button itself belongs to the same cultural ambience as the appliqués (nos. 81–84) and dates to the same period.

CONDITION: Well preserved, although none of the inlays that may once have been present are now preserved. The inside is filled with an organic substance (resin?).

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.

89  Torque

Gold; Diameter: between 157 and 140 mm; Weight: 36.4 g  
82.AM.98.3

DESCRIPTION: Torque with trumpet-shaped ends. The type as torque and bracelet is well documented in nomadic horizons in Afghanistan and Pakistan in the late first century B.C. to early first century A.D.

CONDITION: The torque was bent into a spiral at the time of purchase; otherwise well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.
**90—92  Bracelets**

Gold; Diameter: between 67 and 68 mm; between 69 and 63 mm; between 86 and 80 mm; Weight: 50.5 g; 49.3 g; 50.7 g
82.AM.98.2.a–c

**DESCRIPTION:** Three bracelets with trumpet-shaped ends (see no. 89).

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

---

**93  Mount in the Shape of a Wolf's Head (Fitting for a Belt Buckle?)**

Gold; 115 × 47 mm; Weight: 30.4 g
82.AM.99.1

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of gold. Head of a wolf with a wrinkled nose and ears laid back. Small rivet holes on the neck and a larger one in the mouth. The wolf is a popular animal in the central Asiatic animal style and thus is in keeping with the cultural sphere mentioned previously (see nos. 81–84).

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
94 Mount in the Shape of a Wolf’s Head (Fitting for a Belt Buckle?)

Gold; 111 x 46 mm; Weight: 29.7 g
82.AM.105

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. Decoration like that of no. 88. Once suspected by J. Frel of being a modern copy of no. 88, but presumed genuine after visual examination by Adolph Greifenhagen and Wolf Rudolph in 1984. As far as I can see there is no reason to doubt the authenticity.

CONDITION: Well preserved including three small gold rivets in the rivet holes.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.

95 Mount for a Belt Buckle (?) with Rams’ Heads

Gold; 55 x 48 mm; Weight: 45.9 g
82.AM.99.2

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. Juxtaposed rams’ heads with horns and beards. Horns, eyes, and jaw, as well as beards, originally inlaid with stones. The type of buckle belongs to the same cultural sphere described in nos. 81–84.

CONDITION: Well preserved except for discoloration of the few stone inlays preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.
96—99 Belt Buckles

Gold; Diameter: 24 and 28 mm; Weight: 12.0 and 12.4 g
82.AM.98.1.a–d

**DESCRIPTION:** Four buckles made of gold wire soldered together. Rings with tongues. The type of buckle belongs to the same cultural sphere described in nos. 81–84.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

100, 101 Parts of a Belt Buckle

Silver; Diameter: 32 mm; Weight: 15.5 g
82.AM.104.1–2

**DESCRIPTION:** Thick silver wire soldered together, as nos. 96–99.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

102, 103 Belt Hooks

Gold; Length: 33 mm; Weight: 3.8 g
82.AM.98.6.a–b

**DESCRIPTION:** Two hooks made of gold wire, soldered together. The type of buckle belongs to the same cultural sphere described in nos. 81–84.

**CONDITION:** The tongues of the buckles are missing, otherwise well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
104  **Belt Hook and Part of a Buckle**

Gold; Length: 16 mm; Weight 1.5 g  
82.AM.102.2

**DESCRIPTION:** Hammered gold in the shape of a horse-shoe with rivets at the open end.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

---

105, 106  **Metal Mounts from Belt Buckles (?) with Representations of a Horse Curled Up**

Gold; 91 × 52 mm; Weight: 18.6 and 20.7 g  
82.AM.98.4.4a–b

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of gold. The curled horse is a typical motif of the central Asian animal style and belongs to the same cultural sphere described in nos. 81–84.

**CONDITION:** Two holes were made at a later time in the metal of one piece but the emblem was taken into consideration. Two rivets preserved in the second piece.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
107, 108  **Metal Mounts for a Belt Buckle**

Gold; 59 × 32 and 58 × 32 mm; Weight: 14.7 and 16.6 g
82.AM.98.4.c–d

**DESCRIPTION:** In front of a rectangular notch in the sheet there is a peg, as on nos. 91–96.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved. Three of the eight original gold rivets are preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

---

109  **Metal Mounts for Belts**

Gold; Height: between 15 and 50 mm; Length: 21.5–6.7 mm; Weight: 1.1–8.4 g
81.AM.116

**DESCRIPTION:** Cut from gold sheet. Overlapping gold sheet plaques that guarantee the flexibility of the belt. Elements are cut in rhomboid and zigzag shapes. Given the size and nature of the preserved fragments, there must have been at least seventeen separate pieces. Similar but not identical motifs can be traced among central Asian finds.

**CONDITION:** Seven plaques completely or almost fully preserved, five plaques preserved to a large extent, five plaques preserved in fragments of different sizes.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
110 Metal Mount with Geometrical Ornament

Gold; 115 x 80 mm; Weight: 17.4 g
82.AM.100.2

DESCRIPTION: Cut from gold sheet. Ornament consisting of two volutes that are not entirely symmetrical. Similar decorations can be found already in early Hellenistic contexts in central Asia.

CONDITION: Well preserved, bent in only a few places.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.

111 Round Appliqué with Pentafoliate Rosette

Gold; Diameter: 37 mm; Weight: 3.0 g
82.AM.100.1.a

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. Pentafoliate rosette of nymphaea-like leaves with inner contour parallel to the edge of the leaf. Above each bent tip an embossed line. The rosette is framed by a cord. Two holes for later reuse. The type of the rosette finds parallels in the Hellenized Near Eastern repertoire (see chart).

CONDITION: Somewhat bent, but with the exception of a small crack, fully preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.

112 Round Appliqué with Eight-Pointed Star

Gold; Diameter: 35 mm; Weight: 2.4 g
82.AM.100.1.b

DESCRIPTION: Cut from gold sheet. Star has a raised center. The appliqué is framed by a simple woven band. The type of the appliqué belongs to the same cultural sphere described in nos. 81-84.

CONDITION: Some of the points of the star were broken off by the woven band, which also has two cracks.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.
113  Round Appliqué with Seven-Pointed Star

Gold; Diameter: 26 mm; Weight: 1.4 g
82.AM.100.1.f

DESCRIPTION: Cut from gold sheet. Star has a small raised center and long radiate points. A thin silver rod, soldered to the center of the back, extends through one point.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.

114  Round Appliqué with Seven-Pointed Star

Gold; Diameter: 38 mm; Weight: 3.6 g
82.AM.100.1.d

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. Irregular seven-pointed star with a raised center. Background with cross-hatching.

CONDITION: Well preserved.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.

115  Round Appliqué with Eight-Pointed Star

Gold; Diameter: 42 mm; Weight: 2.5 g
82.AM.100.1.e

DESCRIPTION: Raised from a single sheet of gold. In the center of the star there was originally a gem surrounded by a woven band. There are eight raised spikes in the outer row of the chalice and behind them eight broad spikes with cross-hatching. The star is framed by a simple woven band.

CONDITION: About a third of the outer woven band and parts of the star are missing.

DATE: First century B.C. to first century A.D.
116  *Round Appliqué with Eight-Pointed Star*

Gold; Diameter: 25 mm; Weight: 1.7 g
82.AM.100.1.c

**DESCRIPTION:** Raised from a single sheet of gold. Two-row star with raised spikes and center. The spikes in the first row are rounded at the center. There are four pairs of holes for attaching the piece.

**CONDITION:** The star is very dented, but the appliqué is fully preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

117  *Square Appliqués with Blossoms*

Gold; 31 × 31 mm and 32 × 31 mm; Weight: 0.8–0.9 g
82.AM.100.3.a–d

**DESCRIPTION:** Four appliqués raised from sheets of gold. Appliqué with beaded frame; lotus blossom star organized diagonally around a large center. Each piece has four holes for sewing on the appliqué. The four-blossom star is a common type for appliqués in nomadic central Asia.

**CONDITION:** Almost all of the corners badly damaged. Numerous cracks. The center is missing from one of the pieces.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
**Lotus Blossom Stars**

Gold; Diameter: 91–99 mm; Weight: 5.5–5.9 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Twenty-five stars raised from sheets of gold. Four simple lotus blossoms arranged around a center. Four small holes for sewing on the stars. The type belongs to the same cultural sphere described in no. 114.

**CONDITION:** Twenty-three more or less fully preserved pieces and two in fragments.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
119  *Lotus Blossom Stars*

Gold; Square, length of one side: 12 mm; Weight: 0.4 - 0.5 g
82.AM.101.2

**Description:** Eighty stars raised from sheets of gold. As for no. 118, except that the blossoms are more abstract here. Four small holes in each for attachment.

**Condition:** Well preserved.

**Date:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

120  *Appliqués in the Shape of Small, Four-Lobed Ivy Leaf Calyces*

Gold; Length of one side: 15 – 16 mm; Weight: 0.3 – 0.4 g
82.AM.101.3

**Description:** One hundred seventy-one appliqués raised from sheets of gold. Four small attachment holes in each. The type finds parallels not only in the Hellenized Near Eastern but also in the central Asiatic repertoire.

**Condition:** Well preserved except for some missing parts.

**Date:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
121 **Round Appliqués**

Gold; Diameter: 8 mm; Weight: 0.1–0.2 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Eighty-seven appliqués raised from sheets of gold. Edges of appliqués bent back. The type finds close parallels in tombs of the late first century B.C. to early first century A.D. in Afghanistan and belongs to the same cultural sphere described in nos. 81–84.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

---

122 **Small Plaques**

Gold; Length of one side: 20 mm; Weight: 0.3 g

**DESCRIPTION:** Five plaques raised from sheets of gold. The pieces could be arranged as a five-pointed star without a center. Each plaque has two holes for attachment.

**CONDITION:** Somewhat crumpled but otherwise well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

---

123 **Small Plaques**

Gold; Length of one side: 10 mm; Weight: 0.1 g

**DESCRIPTION:** One hundred eighteen plaques raised from sheets of gold. The pieces could be arranged as a five-pointed star without a center. Each has two small holes for attachment.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved, with a few minor cracks.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
Gold; Diameter: 31–50 mm; Height: about 5–13 mm; Weight: 1.8–3.9 g
82.AM.98.5.a–h

description: Eight appliqués raised from sheets of gold. Several small holes for sewing them on.
condition: Crumpled but otherwise well preserved.
date: First century B.C. to first century A.D.
125  **Blossom**

Gold; Height: 33 mm; Weight: 1.4 g
82.AM.102.1

**DESCRIPTION:** Individual parts cut from gold sheet.

**CONDITION:** Somewhat crumpled but otherwise well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.

126  **Statuette of a Camel Rider**

Silver; Height: 42 mm; Weight: 15.6 g
82.AM.104.3

**DESCRIPTION:** Parts cast and soldered together. Rider seated on a Bactrian camel that is too small in scale. The type of the camel is in keeping with the cultural sphere described in nos. 81–84.

**CONDITION:** Well preserved.

**DATE:** First century B.C. to first century A.D.
BOWL

127 Bowl with a Medallion Depicting Dionysos and Ariadne

Silver; Diameter: 144 mm; Height: 32 mm (originally probably 3–4 mm lower); Diameter of the bowl without the rim: 111 mm and 105 mm; Thickness: about 0.3 mm; Diameter of the emblem: 103–105 mm; Height of the relief: about 13 mm; Weight: total, 129.3 g; bowl (with the fragments belonging to it), 83.7 g; medallion, 45.4 g

83 AM 389

DESCRIPTION: The bowl is raised with gilded moldings on the inside. There is likewise gilding on the Ionian cymation on the rim. In the medallion, there is a youthful Dionysos and Ariadne, facing right. Turned away from the couple there is a seated Silenus, facing right. Next to him is the thyrsos staff. The field is framed by a grape leaf tendril. The ground, draperies, hair, jewelry, thyrsos staff, and the tendril are all gilded.

The type of the vessel occurs first in the late third or early second century B.C. and was used in the Hellenized East even in Imperial times. For the figurai scene on the medallion, the silversmith cited and reinterpreted earlier Hellenistic prototypes, such as representations of “Eros and Psyche.” The details suggest a date in the second century B.C. and a workshop in the Hellenized Near East.

CONDITION: About a third of the rim and the wall of the bowl are missing. The thin silver of the medallion broke several times during the working of the ornament, but on the whole it is well preserved. The relief was originally filled from the back with organic material.

DATE: Second or first century B.C.
128  *Bull’s Head Cup*

Silver; Diameter of rim: 90 mm; Diameter of bull’s head: 77 mm; Height of head: 92 mm; Height of inserted cup: 58 mm; Weight: total, 276.98 g; bull’s head, 181 g; cup, 95.98 g

87.AM.58.1—2

**DESCRIPTION:** Both parts are raised from single sheets of silver. Only the ears are separately worked and soldered on. The eye sockets originally carried inlays. The vase pictures the head of a bull calf with wide-open eyes, small budding horns, and upright ears. The removable cup, intended to hold the liquid, is undecorated and fits inside the head. A belted garland, bound with two tightly knit fillets or taeniae, runs beneath the rim. The fur is indicated by engraved lines and there are vigorous curls on the forehead and around the horns. As in reality, the center of the forehead is marked by a huge whirled curl. The dewlap is characterized by heavy grooves.

**INSCRIPTION:** on the outside of the rim of the inserted cup, a weight in drachmas: 67.

The total weight of the animal head and the cup (276.98 g), therefore, corresponds to a drachma of 4.13 grams. Thus, although the craftsman of the bull’s head cup used the Greek and not the Aramaic numbering system, the standard used is entirely in keeping with the Parthian standard of 3.7 to 4.3 grams already mentioned (see no. 2 above).

**CONDITION:** Heavy incrustation covers one side of the head of the animal and the inlays of the eyes are lost. Otherwise well preserved, including the gilding. Only minor incrustations below the rim on the cup.

**DATE:** First century B.C. or first century A.D.
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Alexandria, Greek and Roman Museum

JE 6740: stucco flower from Alexandria, n. 435
JE 6741: stucco flower from Alexandria, n. 435
JE 9815: terracotta rhyton, n. 520
JE 10479: faience skyphos from Alexandria, n. 504
JE 16696: fragment of a faience bowl from Alexandria, n. 204
JE 16703: fragment of a faience bowl from Hadra, n. 204
JE 17776: stucco flower from Alexandria, n. 435
JE 25586: terracotta rhyton from Egypt, n. 514
fragment of a faience bowl from the rue D'Aboukir, Alexandria n. 204
terracotta horse head from Alexandria, n. 89

Alexandria, private collection

fragments of Megarian cups from Alexandria, n. 398

Alma Ata, Museum of Archaeology

gold-sheet appliqués from the Tenlik Kurgan, n. 26

Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum

1976: faience bowl from Egypt, n. 204
1992: faience appliqué, n. 140
3397: vase MacGregor, nn. 447, 459
7011: bull's head earring, n. 100
7014: faience fragment, n. 371
7616: faience appliqué, n. 140

Amsterdam, Collection R. A. Lunsingh Scheurleer

581: faience elephant, nn. 30, 101

Ancona Museum

gold torque from Montefortino, n. 451

Ankara Museum

Achaemenid censer from Iik Tepe near Usak, n. 32

Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Kelsey Museum

14210 and 15678: terracotta statuette of a horseman from Seleucia on the Tigris, n. 4
15007 A, 16137: terracotta mold and medallion from Mesopotamia, n. 197
35776: seal impression from Seleucia on the Tigris, n. 224

Art market

Achaemenid seal, nn. 121, 124
bracelet with large, vessel-shaped pendants, n. 791
ram's head vase, n. 814
silver bull rhyton, n. 821
silver cup from Usak in Asia Minor, n. 365

Athens, Agora Museum

P 1496: bowl from the Athenian Agora, n. 671
P 15027: clay guttus from the Athenian Agora, n. 457

Athens, National Museum and Epigraphic Museum

grave stele, nn. 273, 294

Athens, National Museum

loutrophoroi, n. 422

Athens, Kanellopoulos Museum

140, 246, 253: gold appliqués from Asia Minor (?), n. 366
294: gold appliqué, n. 134
pendants, n. 190
silver kylix, n. 357

Athens, National Museum

medallions from Carpenisi, Thessaly, n. 188

Baghdad Museum

terracotta statuette of a horseman from Seleucia on the Tigris, n. 4
pendants from Seleucia on the Tigris, n. 731

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery

48, 367: faience bowl, n. 204, 371
bronzes of Prolemos I from Tarentum, n. 190

Basel, Antikenmuseum

BS 464: Apulian krater by the Baltimore Painter, n. 328
silver prometopidion from Tarentum, n. 57

Basel, Collection H. Erlenmeyer
terracotta appliqués from Tarentum, n. 42

Bergama Museum

marble slab from Pergamon, n. 442

Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz,
Antikensammlung

29 x: silver cup, n. 418
1967.3: pyxis from Asia Minor, n. 804
3779, 5–6; 3779, 10+14; 3779, 62/63: silver vessels from the Hildesheim Treasure, n. 804
7806: handle attachment from a hydria from Epireos, n. 784
8180: fragments of a silver vase (amphora rhyton?) from the area near Lake Van, nn. 355, 610
8166: silver unguentarium, n. 447
11863, 100 D–F: appliqué, n. 136
11863, 108: appliqués depicting birds or eagles from South Russia, n. 120
30219, 378: earring from the Pangasion in Macedonia, n. 451
30221 S1–14: appliqués depicting deer from the Maikop complex, n. 119
30221 u: appliqués with quatrefoil star-shaped blossoms from Maikop, n. 796
30284: bronze bowl from the Maikop complex, n. 565
30987: silver bowl from Italy, n. 414
31330: earrings from northern India (Punjab), nn. 145, 156
31425: silver cup from the Nihavend Treasure, nn. 302, 360

Mediterranean Museum

Misc. 7366 (= GI 372): gold appliqués with female scroll goddess from South Russia, n. 161
Misc. 7839: gold fish from Vettersfelde, nn. 44, 242
Misc. 11863, 117/118: appliqués with stars from South Russia, n. 734
Misc. 11863, 119: undecorated appliqués from South Russia, n. 737
Misc. 30219, 1095: gold button (from harness) from Zubov’s Barrow, n. 730
Misc. 30595 a/b: plaques from the Kuban area (Maikop), n. 56
Achaemenid seal, n. 121
Berlin, Pergamonmuseum
7050: terracotta reliefs from Tanagra, n. 86
female portrait bust from Pergamon, n. 186
Pergamon altar, nn. 192, 199
relief from Pergamon, lion on the back of a bull, nn. 42, 61
weapons frieze from the sanctuary of Athena Polias in Pergamon, nn. 87, 88, 138, 376
Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum
VA 3163: seal impression from Uruk Warka, n. 224
VA 6190: seal impression from Uruk Warka, n. 224
terracotta statuettes of horsemen from Aleppo and Syrian art markets, n. 4
Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum
terracotta statuette of a mounted boy from Olbia (?), n. 75
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts
03.1003: Achaemenid seal, n. 122
13.231: Achaemenid seal, n. 122
48.253: silver cup, n. 413
60.535: silver bowl from Sinope, n. 623
1974.138: silver alabastron from Asia Minor, n. 598
terracotta statuette of a horseman, n. 4
Corning, New York, Corning Museum of Glass
71.1.5: gold-glass cup, n. 383
Cracow, Museum
XI–443 (formerly Collection Czartoryski):
silver medallion from Syria, nn. 52, 330, 338
Cureglia, Lugano, Collection Frhr. H. v. Schoen
terracotta appliqués from Tarentum, n. 42
Damascus Museum
9157: carnelian pendant with lion’s head finials from Emesa, n. 491
9159: medallion from Emesa, Tomb 11, n. 185
9160: medallion from Emesa, Tomb 11, n. 185
9204: buckle from Emesa, n. 694
9218: fibula from Emesa, n. 324
10436: medallion from Emesa, Tomb 11, n. 185
medallion from Emesa, Tomb 11, n. 185
Delphi Museum
gold appliqué, n. 133
Dresden, Albertinum
Zg.–Vz. 791: medallion from Zagazig in Egypt, n. 185
Dushanbe Museum
earring with sphinx from the area of Dushanbe, nn. 145, 156
phalera from the area of Dushanbe, n. 27
Essen, Museum Folkwang
RE 86: terracotta bowl, n. 203
Florence, Museo Archeologico
84806: Etruscan mirror from Bomarzo, n. 355
Frankfurt, art market
lynx phalera, n. 6
Frolov Collection
wooden appliqué, n. 127
Geneva Museum
65/20722: Achaemenid seal, n. 122
Gordion Museum
3165 G 172: glass cup from Gordian, n. 585
Gubbio Museum
224: capital with trident and dolphin, n. 260
Guennol Collection
silver bowl from Mazandaran, n. 210
Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe
1969.113: silver bowl from Luristan, nn. 206, 438
Hartford, Connecticut, Wadsworth Atheneum
1917.825: handle from a bronze hydria, n. 159
Harvard University, Fogg Art Museum
1949.89: bronze hydria, probably from the island of Chalke, n. 155

Heidelberg, Sammlung der Universität
wooden Ptolemaic sarcophagus from Abusir, n. 346

Hildesheim, Pelizaeus Museum
1109/10: plaster cast from Memphis/Mit Rahine, n. 52
1115: plaster cast (prometopidion) from Memphis/Mit Rahine n. 57
1117: plaster cast of a medallion from Memphis/Mit Rahine n. 180
1118: plaster cast of a medallion from Memphis/Mit Rahine n. 180
1114: plaster cast from Memphis Mit Rahine, nn. 446, 590
1118: plaster cast of a medallion from Memphis/MIT Rahine n. 180
1142: plaster cast from Memphis/Mit Rahine, n. 52
1145: plaster cast (prometopidion) from Memphis/MIT Rahine n. 57
1153: plaster cast of a medallion bowl from Memphis/MIT Rahine, n. 776
2379: plaster cast from Memphis/Mit Rahine, n. 337
2952: plaster cast from Memphis/Mit Rahine, n. 52

Houghton, A., Collection
Seleucid coins, nn. 222, 226-229, 382

Istanbul, Archaeological Museum
2263: marble horse’s head from Lindos, n. 91
4521: Achaemenid gem from Sardis, n. 164
4530: asymmetrical pendant from Sardis, n. 484
4652: gold appliqué from Sardis, n. 122
4653: gold appliqué from Sardis, n. 121
Achaemenid seal from Sardis, n. 124
Alexander sarcophagus, nn. 96, 287
Lagina frieze, n. 99
terracotta from Nippur, n. 197

Kabul Museum
57.77: bronze bowl from Begram, n. 777
58.1.201: elephant with trappings on an ivory carving from Begram, n. 94
appliqués, gold disks, from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 2-4, 6, n. 699
appliqués, gold nymphaea calyces, from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 1 and 2, n. 723
appliqués, quatrefoil ivy chalices, from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 2, n. 702
appliqués, undecorated, from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 2 and 3, n. 736
appliqués with stars from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 2, n. 730
buckle from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 4, n. 117
buttons (from harness), from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 4, nn. 752, 754
calyx from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 3, nn. 455, 644
clops from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 3, n. 387
coin of Tiberius from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 3, n. 675
deities with “dolphins” from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 1-3, 6, n. 245
golden “plants” from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 2, 4, n. 747
necklace with double crescents from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 5, n. 711
pendants from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 2, n. 693
rosettes from Tillya-tepe, Tombs 1, 2, n. 325
stepped embattlement appliqués from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 2, n. 413
sword sheath from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 4, nn. 267, 313
torques with “trumpet-shaped ends” from Tillya-tepe, Tomb 3, n. 675

Kansas City, Nelson-Atkins Gallery
35-37/2: silver bowls from Mazandaran, n. 210

Kassel Museum
561: Apulian pelike, n. 280

Kayseri Museum
silver container, n. 805

Kiev, Museum of Historical Treasures
AZS 2273: earring with sphinx from the Three Brothers Kurgan, n. 142
AZS 2493: gold scabbard from Tolstaja Mogila (Ordzhonikidze), n. 42
AZS 2494: pectoral from Tolstaja Mogila (Ordzhonikidze), n. 58
appliqués with female scroll goddess, n. 161
appliqués with sphinxes from Tolstaja Mogila (Ordzhonikidze), n. 141
appliqués with stars from Tolstaja Mogila (Ordzhonikidze), n. 734
bronze basin from Pishchane, n. 160
bronze hydria from Pishchane, nn. 152, 153, 158, 160
bronze situla from Pishchane, n. 160
golden fish from Volkovtsy, n. 243
appliqués from horse trappings from Tolstaja Mogila (Ordzhonikidze), nn. 174, 177
prometopidion from Tolstaja Mogila (Ordzhonikidze), n. 163

La Haye, Cabinet royal des médailles
1378, 1412, 1423, 1441-43, 1481: clay bullae, n. 197

Lahore Museum
116, 2340: Gandharan reliefs, n. 9

Leiden, Rijksmuseum
phalerae from Raermond, n. 25

Leningrad, see St. Petersburg

Liverpool, City Museum
M 8691: Achaemenid seal, n. 121

Loo, C. T., Collection
bronze plaque, attacking animal group, n. 111

London, British Museum
36–9-3.122: terracotta statuette of a horseman from Nimrud, n. 4
1857.12-20.238: marble horse from the mausoleum in Halicarnassus, n. 173
1887.4–2.1: Etruscan terracotta sarcophagus from
INDEX
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New York, Kouchakij Collection (formerly)
silver cup, n. 418

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
06.1021.122: red-figure pyxis, n. 367
06.1127; 06.1128: medallions from horse trappings from
Elis, n. 178
59.221.12: bronze hydria, n. 152
17.190.1672: gold buckle, n. 695
17.190.2055: buckle from the Nihavend Treasure, n. 117
22.40.2: silver cup from Olbia, nn. 355, 451, 460, 613,
616
23.160.76: gold-glass fragment, nn. 375, 414
37.11.11-12: bracelets from the region of Thessaloniki,
n. 402
47.100.87: horse's head vase, silver, n. 815
56.142.1: gazelle's head vase, terracotta, from Ziwiye,
n. 808
1972.118.163: silver bowl from Prusias, Bithynia, n.
312
1979.447: lynx rhyton, silver, n. 524
1980.11.12: Achaemenid censer from Ikiz Tepe near
Usak, n. 32
1981.11.19: silver net pattern cup from Magna Graecia,
n. 587
1981.11.20: silver bowl from Magna Graecia, nn. 203,
357, 420, 451
1981.11.21: silver bowl from Magna Graecia, nn. 203,
419, 420, 439
1982.11.11A-C: silver pyxides from Magna Graecia, nn.
804
1984.11.3: silver pyxides from Magna Graecia, n. 804
L 1983.119.41: gold button (from harness), n. 751
L 1984.41.4: silver bowl from Asia Minor, n. 365
appliqués, gold, with deer from the Malikop complex,
n. 119
appliqués, gold, with quatrefoil star-shaped blossoms
from the Malikop complex, n. 706
appliqués, gold, with stars, n. 735
diadem from Madytos, n. 186
Gandharan relief, n. 9
rhyton with winged lion, gold, from Hamadan, nn.
511, 527

New York, Pomerance Collection
bronze plaque, attacking animal group, n. 111
medallion plate, silver, n. 773
ram's head vase, silver, from Kaplanu, northwestern
Iran, n. 811

New York, Dolores Selikowitz Collection
ram's head vase from Iran, n. 811
silver sheet from the Dalaiman region of Iran, n. 43

Nicosia, Cyprus Museum
K 523: terracotta animal rhyton, n. 536

Odessa Museum
5296: silver net pattern cup, n. 586

Olympia Museum
terracotta plate with medallion, n. 771

Ortiz, George, Collection
silver stag's head rhyton, n. 539

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale
1248: Tarentine rhyton, n. 45
5069: Achaemenid seal, n. 121
Chabouillet 2877: silver cup, n. 418
M 5990: Achaemenid seal, n. 122
M 6560: Achaemenid seal with sphinx, n. 148
M 6598: Achaemenid seal, n. 121
de Luynes 198: Achaemenid seal, n. 122
phaelae from South Russia with Mithridates inscription,
n. 25
Sasanian silver plate, n. 11

Paris, Musée Carnuichi

Paris, Musée Guimet
MG. 18599: Gandharan relief(?), n. 9
appliqué with bird or eagle (Ordos group), n. 120
Gandharan sculpture, nn. 320, 494, 502, 726

Paris, Musée du Louvre
A.O. 2196: Palmyrene relief, n. 198
A.O. 2748: fragments of a silver vase from the area near
Lake Van, n. 355
A.O. 3093: silver rhyton from the area of Erzurum, n.
539
A.O. 10221: terracotta statuette of a horseman from
Palestine, n. 4
A.O. 27909: silver ram's head vase from Ziwiye, n. 811
Bj 2034: silver ladle from Boscoreale, n. 580
Bj 2417: silver kylix, nn. 285, 350
Bj 2206: silver rhyton, n. 24
CA 2340: terracotta bloom from Amisos, n. 313
N. 1000: faience rhyton, n. 511
Sb 2757: silver bowl from Susa, n. 565
pendants and stones mounted in gold from Susa, nn.
496, 501
terracotta statuette of a horseman from Cappadocia, n.
4

Pella Museum
stone bowl from Pella, nn. 67, 429
tabletop from Pella, nn. 275, 286, 308, 313

Peshawar Museum
Gandharan relief, n. 25
452 M: bronze reliquary, n. 645
1719: Gandharan relief, n. 9
1847: Gandharan relief, n. 320
gold bracelet of "Siberian style," n. 742

Oxford, Ashmolean Museum
1885.471: undecorated appliqués from Nymphaion, n.
737
1913.434: terracotta statuette of a horseman from Ain
el-Beda, Syria, n. 4
1913.766: bronze bowl from Deve Hüyük, n. 365
1913.793: faience cup, nn. 445, 471
1972.805: silver medallion, perhaps from Antioch or
Anatolia, n. 185
1976.70: silver alabastron from Asia Minor, n. 598
1976.76: silver cup from Syria (?), n. 565
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petra Museum</td>
<td>bust of a woman from Petra, n. 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum</td>
<td>Babylonian Section 12284: terracotta from Nippur, n. 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Babylonian Section 15487: terracotta statuette of a horseman from Nippur, n. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Babylonian Section 15452: terracotta from Nippur, n. 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nippur B. 2349: Achaemenid glass cup from Nippur, n. 381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appliqués, gold, from the Maikop complex, n. 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appliqués, gold, with female scroll goddess, n. 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plovdiv Museum</td>
<td>1517: horse rhyton from Bashova Mogila, nn. 513, 527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton, University Art Museum</td>
<td>54–124: bronze bowl, n. 565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plaster cast (prometopidion), n. 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>1777: glass cup from Pyllos, n. 470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos Museum</td>
<td>1517: horse rhyton from Bashova Mogila, nn. 513, 527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1777: glass cup from Pyllos, n. 470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggio di Calabria Museum</td>
<td>gold-glass bowl from Tresilico, n. 776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Villa Albani</td>
<td>figural capital, n. 234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terracotta decorations from the temple “Lo Scasato” in Falerii, n. 347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothschild Collection</td>
<td>gold-glass cup from Syria, n. 434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silver kantharos from Tarentum, n. 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silver pyxis from Tarentum, nn. 431, 796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silver thymaterion from Tarentum, nn. 275, 774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russe, Historical Museum</td>
<td>II–359: silver bull rhyton from the Borowo Treasure, n. 818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruvo, Museo Jatta</td>
<td>J. 423: Apulian amphora, n. 205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. 1372: Apulian situla, nn. 205, 317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. 1613: Apulian plate, n. 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsun Museum</td>
<td>group with lions felling a stag, n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Museum of Art</td>
<td>78.4.11: marble horse’s head, n. 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffhausen, Museum zu Allerheiligen</td>
<td>cameo, n. 545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schimmel, Norbert, Collection</td>
<td>silver rhyton, n. 538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Ray Winfield, Collection</td>
<td>glass, n. 392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia, Archaeological Museum</td>
<td>51 bibl: silver cup from Varbitza, n. 418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3559: harness from Panagjurishte, n. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6453: gold appliqués with rosettes from Mal Tepe, n. 722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6755: silver bowl from Sredna Mogila, n. 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8215, 8216: silver appliqués from Lukovit, Thrace, n. 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silver horse trappings from Panagjurishte, n. 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silver pectoral from Varbitza, n. 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helens, Lancashire, Pilkinson Glass Museum</td>
<td>1974/21: gold-glass cup from Iran, n. 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg, Hermitage</td>
<td>1727/1–11: gold buckles, attacking animal groups, nn. 112, 765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–4: gold buckles, attacking animal groups, n. 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/5–1/6: gold belt clasps, nn. 691, 692, 758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–11, 1727/1–12: gold buckles, attacking animal groups, n. 767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–13: gold buckle, attacking animal group, n. 755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–16: gold buckle, attacking animal group, n. 755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/2–32, 1727/1–33, 1727/1–49, 1727/1–50, 1727/1–90, 1727/1–93, 1727/1–94, 1727/1–97, 1727/1–98, 1727/1–99: gold buttons (from harnesses), n. 751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–1/100: gold buckle with zigzag ornament, n. 686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–131: gold agraffes, nn. 112, 764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1727/1–1/132: gold appliqué from Siberia, n. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2495/17, 2495/28: appliqués depicting birds or eagles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the Kurdzhips Kurgan, n. 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AXT 18: silver phalerae from Akhtanzovka, nn. 17, 20, 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 44–46: gold appliqué from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 49: gold appliqués with female scroll goddess from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 72–74: wooden sarcophagus from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 77, 78: bracelets from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 78, 80: harness from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1793, 1/19, 20: sword sheath from the Melgunov Treasure nn. 141, 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1863, 1/257: appliqué with sphinx from Chertomlyk, n. 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1863, 1/66: silver amphora from Chertomlyk, nn. 44, 46, 58, 71, 272, 308, 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1863, 1/66: silver amphora from Chertomlyk, nn. 44, 46, 58, 71, 272, 308, 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1863, 1/174: appliqué from Chertomlyk, n. 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1863, 1/435: gorytos from Chertomlyk, nn. 58, 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1863, 1/448: sword from Chertomlyk, n. 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1868, 1/8–10: prometopidion and harness from Tsimbalka nn. 80, 163, 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1868, 1/31–33: prometopidion and harness from Tsimbalka, nn. 89, 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1897, 5/2: pendant with sphinx from the Deev Kurgan, n. 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1909, 2/43: silver kylix from Chmyrrev Mogila, n. 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1912, 1/42–44: prometopidia from Solokha, n. 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1913, 1/24: silver vase from Solokha, n. 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dn 1912,1/42-47: gold prometopidion from Solokha, n. 89
Dn 1913,1/40: silver vase from Solokha, n. 24
Dn 1913,1/48: gold bowl from Solokha, n. 58
Dn 1913,1/49,51: gory tus from Solokha, nn. 46, 58
GK/N-21,22: appliqué with sphinx from Nymphaion, Kurgan 17 n. 141
Gp 1882.45: sarcophagus from Anapa, nn. 268, 296, 329, 334
K 35636: gold-glass cup from Mozdok, nn. 399, 413
Kek 9: wooden sarcophagus from Taman, nn. 43, 46
K-O 3,4: bracelets from Kul Oba, n. 58
K-O 5: pendants from Kul Oba, n. 292
K-O 19: bracelets from Kul Oba, n. 142
K-O 32, 33: sword scabbard from Kul Oba, n. 58
K-O 46: gold appliqué from Kul Oba, nn. 71, 136
K-O 48: gold appliqué from Kul Oba, n. 136
K-O 50: gold appliqué from Kul Oba, n. 136
K-O 51: gold appliqué from Kul Oba, n. 136
K-O 70: gold appliqués with female scroll goddess from Kul Oba, n. 161
K-O 97: silver vase from Kul Oba, nn. 43, 58
K-O 100: golden stag from Kul Oba, n. 50
Kr 1892,2/10: appliqué from Dort Oba, Kurgan 2, n. 141
Ku 1876,1/9: rhyton from Merdzany, nn. 24, 195, 517
Ku 1888,1/78: rhyton from Karagodeuashkh, nn. 267, 272, 328
Ku 1897,1/1: golden stag from Kostromskaja, n. 50
Kr 1903,1/27: mirror from Kelmers, n. 141
P 1836.4: bronze hydria from Kul Oba (?), n. 160
SBr IV-3: goat rhyton from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Brothers Group, nn. 513, 527
SBr IV-5: gold appliqué from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Brothers Group, n. 58
SBr IV-7: gold appliqué from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Brothers Group, nn. 42, 58
SBr IV-8: gold appliqué from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Brothers Group, n. 128
SBr IV-117: gold appliqué from Kurgan 4 of the Seven Brothers Group, n. 115
SBr VI-2: appliqué with sphinx from Kurgan 6 of the Seven Brothers Group, n. 141
St-1957,2/13: buttons (from harnesses) from Minusinsk, n. 751
St. 1838: red-figure lekanis, n. 367
Z-546, Z-547: golden statuettes of animals, n. 746
Z-548: golden statuette of a horseman, nn. 37, 746
Z-550: golden statuette of an animal, n. 746
Z-556: golden statuette of a stag, nn. 61, 745, 746
Z-559, Z-185: golden statuettes of animals, n. 746
Zm 1: sarcophagus from Zmeinyj (Kerch), n. 341
Achaemenid seal, n. 124
Anapa, finds from, n. 79
appliqués, gold, from Akhtanizovka, n. 195
appliqués, gold, with birds (eagles?) from Akhtanizovka, n. 120
appliqués, gold, with birds (eagles?) from Chmureva Mogila n. 120
appliqués, gold, with birds (eagles?) from the Great Bliznitsa (1868), n. 120
appliqués, gold, with birds (eagles?) from Karagodeuashkh, n. 120
appliqués, gold, with female scroll goddess from Chersonesos, n. 161
appliqués, gold, with floral cross from Akhtanizovka, n. 710
appliqués, gold, with floral cross from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 710
appliqués, gold, with rosettes from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 722
appliqués, gold, with sphinxes from the Great Bliznitsa, n. 124
appliqués, gold, with sphinxes from Kul Oba, n. 141
appliqués, gold, with stars from Akhtanizovka, n. 734
appliqués, gold, from Merdzany, n. 195
appliqué, silver, from Pazyryk, Tomb 2, n. 135
“appliqués,” textile, with quatrefoil chalices from Pazyryk, Tomb 5, n. 704
appliqués, wooden, from bridles from Pazyryk, n. 760
appliqué with Athena from Akhtanizovka (prometopidion or fibula), n. 81
appliqués, silver, with nymphaea-like foliage from Noin Ula, n. 725
appliqués with quatrefoil ivy chalices from Noin Ula, n. 703
belt hooks from Noin Ula, n. 687
blossom, palmette-like, filled, from Pazyryk, n. 712
bowl, silver, from Bori (Georgia), n. 358
buckle found in the northern Pontic region, n. 47
bull calf rhyta, silver, from the northern Pontic region n. 822
buttous (from harnesses), gold, from the Kurdzhips Kurgan, n. 750
buttons (from harnesses), gold, from Noin Ula, n. 753
buttons (from harnesses), wood, from Pazyryk, n. 749
buttons (from harnesses), gold, from Zubov’s Barrow, nn. 750, 754
conical cup, silver, from Akhtanizovka, n. 468
cup, gold, from western Siberia (or Transcaucasia), nn. 287, 338, 355, 451, 460, 616
curvilinear ornament from Pazyryk, Tomb 3, n. 698
disk, silver, from Noin Ula, Kurgan 6, n. 7
eagle attacking a goat (?), leather, from Pazyryk, Tomb 2, n. 766
eagle-griffin from Pazyryk, n. 770
fabulous beings with bird heads from Pazyryk, Tomb 2, n. 767
fibula, gold, from Kerch, n. 374
finial for a post with quatrefoil ivy chalyx from Noin Ula n. 703
fish tattooed on body of deceased in Pazyryk, n. 247
helmet from Akhtanizovka, n. 195
helmet from Merdzany, n. 195
hooved animals with birds’ heads from Pazyryk, n. 756
jug, silver, from Kerch, Panticapeum, n. 408
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medallion from horse trappings from Karagodeuashkh, n. 176
medallion from South Russia, n. 185
medallions from horse trappings from Vasjurinskaja Gora, n. 177
phalerae, silver, from Fedulovo/Cherkassy, nn. 19, 25, 349
phalerae, silver, from Janchekrak, n. 25
phalerae, silver, from Novouzensk, n. 25
phalerae, silver, from Uspenskaja Staniza, n. 56
phalerae, silver, from Siberia, n. 26
phalerae, silver, with elephants, n. 27
phiale, gold, from Central Asia, n. 604
phiale, silver, from Central Asia, n. 604
plaques, wood, from Pazyryk, n. 36
ram’s head vase, silver, from western Siberia, n. 814
saddle decoration with attacking animal groups from Pazyryk, nn. 42, 48, 51, 53-55, 58, 109
Sasanian silver vessels, nn. 11, 311
scroll ornament from Pazyryk, Grave 2, n. 651
textiles, attacking animal groups from Noin Ula, n. 110
textile, Hellenistic, from Noin Ula, Kurgan 6, nn. 7, 341, 388
textiles in zigzag form from Noin Ula, n. 683
textile from Pazyryk (ram’s head surrounded by a griffin comb), n. 71
textile with floral cross from Noin Ula, n. 715
textile with floral cross from Pazyryk, Tomb 5, n. 709
textiles with male portraits from Noin Ula, nn. 720, 744
textiles with representation of appliqués from Pazyryk, n. 708
textiles with representations of fish from Noin Ula, n. 248
vase, gold, from western Siberia, n. 358
wall hanging from Pazyryk (horsemen), Tomb 5, nn. 35, 38
wall hanging from Pazyryk ( sphinx), Tomb 5, nn. 38, 144, 758
Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet
MM 1974:37: silver cup, n. 302
Stockholm, Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities
pendant from inner Mongolia, n. 694
bronze plaque, attacking animal group, n. 111
bronze plaque with zigzag ornament, n. 685
rhomboid bronze plaque (Ordos group), n. 80
Switzerland, private collections
silver bowl, n. 205
silver rhyton, n. 539
Taranto, Museo Nazionale
2.407: gold earrings from Ginosa, n. 183
22.437: gold diadem from the “Tomba degli ori” in Canosa, n. 649
40.058: gold-glass cup from the “Tomba degli ori” in Canosa, nn. 383, 414, 649
Gnathian bowl, n. 648
Taxila Museum
appliqués with rosettes from Taxila, nn. 319, 434
appliqués with stepped embattlement, gold, from Taxila, n. 413
bowl, silver, with inscription from Taxila, n. 678
bracelets, gold, with “trumpet-shaped ends” from Taxila, nn. 680, 681
buckles, copper, from Taxila, nn. 138, 646
conical cup, silver, from Taxila, n. 466
earrings, gold, from Taxila, n. 319
jewelry, gold, with dolphins and rosettes from Taxila, nn. 249, 454
medallion with carnelian in gold setting from Taxila, n. 792
medallion, copper, from Taxila, n. 476
necklace, gold, with double crescents from Taxila, nn. 571, 792
phalera and horse trappings, iron and silver, from Taxila, n. 10
tendril decoration, copper, from Taxila, n. 335
torques with “trumpet-shaped ends,” gold, from Taxila, n. 676
Teheran Archaeological Museum
2069: silver phiale from Ardebil, n. 324
2811: ivory comb from Susa, n. 126
bronze head of a Parthian from Shami, n. 131
bronze phalera from Haslanlu, n. 70
female bust, n. 193
gold antelope rhyton, n. 812
gold rhyton with winged lion from Hamadan, nn. 511, 577
terracotta ram’s head rhyton from Ziwiyeh, n. 808
Teheran, Foroughi Collection
antelope rhyton, bronze, n. 812
gold-glass bowl from Iran, nn. 204, 775
Thessaloniki Museum
115: krater from Olynthos, n. 367
523: hydria from Toroni, nn. 153-155
8076, 8416: gold plaques from Sindos, n. 83
B II: krater from Derveni, nn. 202, 796
B 11: silver cup from Derveni, n. 462
gil terracotta appliqués with birds or eagles from Sedes, n. 120
gilt terracotta appliqués with stars from Sedes, n. 735
gold gorytus from Vergina, n. 120
gold larnax from Vergina, nn. 273, 277, 328, 334, 657, 735
gold tendril with spirals from Vergina, n. 265
Tiflis Museum
silver bowl with four bosses from the Achalgori Treasure, n. 311
silver bowl from Vani, n. 309
gold-sheet medallions, in the shape of Achaemenid phalai, from the Achalgori Treasure, n. 67
Toledo (Ohio) Museum of Art
61.9: silver container, insert for a cup, n. 805
75-11: silver bowl, n. 370
76-15: silver cup, n. 302
Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum
910 x 197.16; 916.1.576/578-580: bronze handles from Egypt, n. 664
Tübingen, Archaeological Institute Collection
5188/25: cast of a faience cup from Egypt, n. 624

Tunis, Bardo Museum
bronze statuette of Eros from Mahdia, n. 788

Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum
19 (IX a 63): cameo, n. 545
V 2897: terracotta appliqués from Tarentum, n. 46
Volterra, Museo Etrusco
89: krater from Volterra, n. 342

Voronezh Museum
bronze hydria from Mastjugino, n. 162
silver phalerae from Voronezhskaja Staniza, n. 25

Washington, Bliss Collection
harnessed panther, n. 534

Washington, Dumbarton Oaks Collection
40.3: silver cup, n. 661

Witsen, N.C., Collection (formerly)
nn. 478, 743

Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum
H 4993: terracotta mold, n. 36

Yale University
1938.5174: stag pendant from Dura Europos, n. 61
1938.5190: stag pendant from Dura Europos, n. 61

Zurich, art market
bronze bowl from Iran, n. 565
terracotta appliqués from Tarentum, n. 42

Zurich, Museum Rietberg
Gandharan sculpture, n. 494
This chart provides an overall view of all the flower types found on the vessels from treasures I, II, and III as well as on some related pieces in other museum and private collections. Each horizontal section of the chart is devoted to the floral elements found on a single vessel, while each numbered vertical column represents a particular type of flower or calyx (similar floral elements have been grouped under a single heading). This detailed analysis allows for a closer study of the similarities and dissimilarities evident in this group of bowls and provides evidence of the varying styles of individual craftsmen within the limits of a more or less established decorative canon. For a further discussion of this repertoire, see pp. 26–37.

For the sake of comparison, profiles of the bowls in the Getty Museum collection that do not have complicated tendril friezes have been incorporated into the chart at the far left.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. Nos.</th>
<th>Early Group</th>
<th>Middle Group</th>
<th>Late Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Mus. (fig. 19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private coll. (fig. 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg Mus. (fig. 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private coll. (fig. 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art market I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art market II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>