

doi:10.17746/1563-0110.2022.50.1.099-105

N.A. Berseneva

*Institute of History and Archaeology,
Ural Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences,
S. Kovalevskoi 16, Yekaterinburg, 620108, Russia
South Ural State University,
Pr. Lenina 76, Chelyabinsk, 454080, Russia
E-mail: bersnatasha@mail.ru*

Female Burials with Weapons in the Early Nomadic Kurgans in the Southern Urals (Late 5th to 2nd Centuries BC)

An attempt is made to classify, analyze, and interpret female burials with weapons in the graves of early nomads in the Southern Urals, dating to late 5th–2nd centuries BC. In the Early Iron Age, this vast region was a center of the nomadic elite. The sample includes 23 graves with 24 buried individuals at well documented cemeteries. Only individuals for whom skeletal sex indicators are available have been included. Criteria and opinions are revised. Weapons in female burials include mostly quiver sets; whereas daggers, swords, and spearheads are rare. The placement of weapons was the same as in male burials: bladed weapons were placed on the right side, with hilts directed to the right hand, whereas quivers were found mostly on the left side. The remaining funerary items were exactly like in other female burials: there were numerous ornaments, bronze mirrors, spindle whorls, and stone altars. Female burials with weapons were found in kurgans regardless of social status. Apparently, those women represented all social strata, from elite to low-ranking nomads. Nothing indicates the existence of female military units, which, however, does not imply that women took no part in armed conflicts or did not use weapons to protect themselves and their homes.

Keywords: *Southern Urals, Early Iron Age, early nomads, kurgans, female burials with weapons, “Amazons”.*

Introduction

Female burials with weapons found at cemeteries of various pastoral cultures of the Early Iron Age in Northern Eurasia have been the subject of ongoing discussions among scientists for almost a century. A complete historiographical review of this problem is presented in the works of M.S. Strizhak (2007), S.A. Yatsenko (2015), and T.V. Bogachenko (2017). This article highlights the research that is directly related to the region, and to the chronological period under consideration.

The first works in which the gender-specific aspects of the early nomadic burials were studied in detail (on the

materials of all the Volga-Ural burial grounds accessible to the author) were publications of Strizhak (2006, 2007). Having examined 87 burials of the 6th–4th centuries BC, with skeletal sex indicators, she concluded that “the militancy of the ‘Sauromatian’ women” is greatly exaggerated (Strizhak, 2007: 74), since arrowheads in female burials of this period are rare, and a dagger was found in only one (Ibid.: 75). Almost 10 years later, an article by A.K. Gilmitdinova (2016) was published, who studied the social roles of women of the early nomads of the Southern Urals in the chronological range from the 6th century BC through the 2nd–4th centuries AD. The research base seems to be very extensive: 184 female

burials (with skeletal sex identification), belonging to three periods—Sauromatian, Early Sarmatian, and Late Sarmatian. The author took into account only individual graves. Female burials with weapons were found only on Early Sarmatian sites. The weapons were found in the graves of women of all ages, with a predominance of the “young age” (Ibid.: 67–68).

It is easy to see that, despite the differences in source bases and chronological frames, some of the conclusions made by Strizhak and Gilmitdinova match. First, this is a conclusion about a relatively small number of weapons in the burials of the Sauromatian period. The largest number of female burials with weapons falls on the Early Sarmatian time. Its samples are comparable to those found in male graves. In the burials of women of the Late Sarmatian period, weapons are absent. Both researchers used in their calculations only graves with skeletal sex identification.

The source base on the history of the Sarmatians of the Southern Urals is constantly expanding, and new monuments are being introduced into scientific circulation. In this regard, it has become necessary to return once again to the topic of female burials with weapons, to develop criteria for their selection, and present a summary of such burials in the Southern Urals, which can later be supplemented.

Methodological aspects

Until now, uniform criteria for identifying female burials with weapons have not been developed, although this issue has been repeatedly raised (Bogachenko, Maksimenko, 2008: 48–50; Bogachenko, 2017: 182; Sinika et al., 2020: 83–86). The range of opinions is wide. Some researchers consider it possible to classify the ruined grave-pits, graves with single arrowheads, and burials without anthropological sex identification as “Amazon” burials (Fialko, 2015: 60–79). According to others, with whom I generally agree, the presence of skeletal sex identification is mandatory, and burials with single arrowheads or completely looted should not be used for analysis (Sinika et al., 2020: 79–86). Some authors note that more stringent criteria can significantly narrow the range of sources (Bogachenko, 2017: 181–182). One can dispute this. The situation with skeletal sex identification is, of course, far from ideal, but not hopeless. Materials from the early nomadic cemeteries in the Southern Urals make it possible to collect an impressive database of anthropologically sexed burials, most of which have been described in publications and are available for analysis. Using a quality source will lend more support to the conclusions.

I suggest that a burial can be classified as a female one with weapons only if the following conditions are met:

- Skeletal remains must have professional skeletal sex identification;

- The belonging of grave goods (weapons) to a specific individual (woman) must be undeniable. Accordingly, these burials must be either undisturbed individual burials; or disturbed, but with preserved sections; or undisturbed paired or multiple burials, in which personal belonging of the goods is beyond doubt;

- Weapons can be described as an accompanying grave goods. In other words, these must be a separate item (dagger, sword, spearhead, armour, etc.) and/or a complex (quiver set, remains of a quiver) lying *in situ* and accompanying the deceased as personal property or funeral offerings/gifts.

Characteristics of sources

The source base of the work is a sample of female burials (24 individuals, 23 grave-pits), formed on the basis of all materials available to me from the burial grounds of the Southern Urals, which meet the above criteria and chronologically belong to the Early Prokhorovka and Prokhorovka antiquities (see *Table*). Some of them have been published (see (Zhelezchikov, Klepikov, Sergatskov, 2006: 13–15, 26–27; Kuptsov, Kuptsova, 2018; Kurgany..., 1993: 30–31, 48, 1995: 35–36; Morgunova et al., 2003: 138–141, 145–153, 168–173; Smirnov, 1975: 108, 121, 131–132, 136–143; Tairov, Botalov, Pleshanov, 2008; Yablonsky, 2008; 2010: 21–22); Yablonsky, Treister, 2019)), some of them are not yet available in publications (Botalov, 2008; Sirotnin, 2010). Skeletal sex identifications were taken from publications. For the unpublished cemetery of Kichigino I, anthropological identification (skeletal sex indication) was made by E.P. Kitov (Miklouho-Maklay Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Moscow), for the single mound Yakovlevka II by V.V. Kufterin (Museum of Natural History of the Akmulla Bashkir State Pedagogical University, Ufa) and by A.I. Nechvaloda (Institute of History, Language and Literature, Ufa Scientific Center, Russian Academy of Sciences; Museum of Natural History, Ufa).

Research results and discussion

Female burials with weapons were found in almost all large burial grounds, both in elite (Filippovka I, kurgan 1, pit 2) and ordinary (Lebedevka VI, kurgan 34) kurgans. They were located both in the central part and on the periphery of the burial grounds. A number of cemeteries contain kurgans where several such burials were found (Mechetsay, kurgan 8, burial 1 and 5; Shumayevsky II, kurgan 9, burial 8, 11, and 18; Kichigino I,

Female burials with weapons from cemeteries in the Southern Urals

Object	Age	Type of burial	Weapons	Localization
Lebedevka V, kurgan 9, burial 5, skeleton 6	25–35	Multiple: skeleton 1 – 15–17 (sex not identified); 2 – 2–5; 3 – 20–25 (fem.); 4 – 12–15 (sex not identified); 5 – 45–55 (male); 7 – 14–16 (sex not identified); 8 – 35–40 (fem.)	AH* (36, quiver), quiver hook	On the chest
Same, burial 3	45–55	Individual	AH (9)	At the left knee
Lebedevka VI, kurgan 34, burial 1	35–45	"	AH (30)	In the area of the right shoulder, in pieces
Pokrovka-2, kurgan 8, burial 5	30–35	"	AH (16, quiver)	At the left arm
Mechetsay, kurgan 6, burial 2b	45–55	"	AH (29, quiver)	At the left shin
Same, kurgan 7, burial 8	<i>Adultus</i>	"	AH (26, quiver)	At the feet
Same, kurgan 8, burial 1	"	Paired, <i>Adultus</i> (male ?)	AH (not less than 50, quiver)	At the left arm
Same, burial 5, skeleton 1	<i>Maturus</i>	Paired, 25–30 (fem.)	AH (10, quiver)	At the left leg
Same, skeleton 2	25–30	Paired, <i>Maturus</i> (fem.)	AH (95, quiver), quiver hook	At the right shoulder
Pokrovka-8, kurgan 1, burial 6	40–45	Individual	AH (18), dagger	Dagger – to the right of the hip, AH – in the area of the left knee and the chest
Same, kurgan 5, burial 2	25–30	"	AH (6), dagger	Dagger – above the right femur, AH – at the left hip
Shumayevsky II, kurgan 9, burial 8	25–30	"	Dagger in sheath, sword in sheath	On the right along the body
Same, burial 11, skeleton 2	16–19	Paired, app. 15 (sex not identified)	SH** with remains of the shaft, belt set	Under the left hand
Same, burial 18	17–25	Paired, infant (in a niche)	AH (34, quiver), quiver hook, dagger	Dagger – on the right hand and the right hip, quiver – along the left leg
Prokhorovka, kurgan B, burial 3	<i>Juvenis</i>	Individual	AH (111, quiver), quiver hook, SH	At the right hip
Kichigino I, kurgan 3, grave-pit 3, burial 2	30–40	"	AH (148, quiver), quiver hook	Along the left forearm
Same, grave-pit 4***	<i>Adultus</i>	"	AH (122, quiver), quiver hook	Along the left leg
Imangulovo II, kurgan 8, burial 1, skeleton 1	25–35	Paired, 6	AH (44, quiver)	Near the right leg
Yakovlevka II, burial 2, skeleton 1	25–30	Paired, 7–8	AH (244, quiver), quiver hook, set of bridles	Along the shin
Same, burial 3	25–35	Individual	AH (133, quiver), quiver hook, iron stiletto	Between the hips
Same, burial 4, skeleton 2	25–35	Paired, 30–35 (fem.)	AH (208, quiver), quiver hook	Behind the head
Same, burial 6	25–30	Paired, less than 1 year	AH (53, quiver), quiver hook	Along the right forearm
Filippovka I, kurgan 1, burial 2	App. 35	Individual	AH (97, quiver), bow fragment	To the right of the body
Same, kurgan 11, burial 1, skeleton 2	20–25	Multiple: skeleton 1 – 30–35 (male); 3 – 20–25 (male); 4 – app. 30 (male)	AH (46, quiver), 4 sets of bridles	At the left elbow, on the mirror

*Arrowheads.

**Spearhead.

***Anthropologically, sex was not identified owing to the poor degree of preservation of the bones.

kurgan 3, burial 3 and 4; Yakovlevka II, single kurgan, burial 1, 3, 4, 6).

The proportion of female burials with weapons (out of the total number of female burials, burials weapons, etc.) can only be calculated with a high degree of conventionality, because there is no certainty that the cemeteries have been fully explored, that such burials were not among the destroyed/plundered/looted, etc. Of the 195 anthropologically identified female burials in the Southern Urals, 24 (more than 12 %) can be considered full-fledged burials with weapons.

In the sample under consideration, six burials were primary. Of these, one is individual (Lebedevka VI, kurgan 34), three are paired (Mechetsay, kurgan 8, burial 5; Shumaevsky II, kurgan 9, burial 11; Imangulovo II, kurgan 8, burial 1), and two are multiple (Filippovka I, kurgan 11; Lebedevka V, kurgan 9, burial 5). The rest of the burials were located on the periphery of the kurgans (18). These are secondary burials, usually individual ones; only four are paired (single kurgan Yakovlevka II, burial 2, 4, and 6; Shumaevsky II, kurgan 9, burial 18).

Of course, there was a relationship between the localization of the burial and its design. In the peripheral grave-pits, pits furnished with special niches (*podboi*), constructed on the longitudinal wall, slightly predominate (11 pits out of 18, 61.1 %). The primary graves are represented by three simple pits with ceilings, a pit with a dromos, and two with *podboi* niches. Nevertheless, there is no connection observed between the localization of a female burial, its design, on the one hand, and the presence of weapons in grave goods, on the other hand. This may be explained by the fact that the choice of burial site was primarily determined by the vertical and/or horizontal status of the deceased.

Despite the general Sarmatian canon of the funeral rite, the burials under consideration are variable. Among the individual burials, there are primary and secondary, relatively modest and elite. The quiver set from an elite female burial (Filippovka I, kurgan 1, burial 2) can, perhaps, be interpreted as a ceremonial weapon, part of the funeral gifts. This can be confirmed by its localization in the grave-pit (at some distance from the body, next to the silver vessels).

Four of the paired burials have women buried with children. In two cases, these are infants—a newborn and a child died before reaching its first year. Two other women were buried with children aged 6 to 8. Babies were not accompanied by their own goods; all items were associated with women. A six-year-old child (Imangulovo II) had a quiver with arrows placed on his chest and an iron dagger (*akinak*) to the left of his body (Kuptsov, Kuptsova, 2018: 147). A child of 7–8 years old (Yakovlevka II) was accompanied by adornments.

Teenagers were buried in one of the paired burials (Shumaevsky II, kurgan 9, burial 11, central). Both were lying on a stretcher, but only the female skeleton (No. 2) was accompanied by the goods that included many adornments, a belt set, and an iron spearhead (Morgunova et al., 2003: 152). Two grave-pits have two women buried in each: Mechetsay, kurgan 8, burial 5 and Yakovlevka II, burial 4. In the first case, quivers accompanied both of them, in the second, a quiver set and numerous other items were found in one, the other deceased had no goods. The only paired burial of a man and a woman is Mechetsay, kurgan 8, burial 1 (Smirnov, 1975: 133). The man was accompanied by an iron sword, and the woman by a quiver of arrows.

A large primary multiple burial (Lebedevka V, kurgan 9, burial 5) contained the remains of eight people: a child, three teenagers, three women, and a man. One of the women had a quiver with arrows placed on her chest (skeleton 6). No other weapons were found (Zhelezchikov, Klepikov, Sergatskov, 2006: 14). The multiple burial in kurgan 11, Filippovka I, was destroyed, only the remains of two people (a man and a woman) remained undisturbed. The latter was accompanied by a quiver with arrows and four sets of horse harness (Yablonsky, 2008: 170–171).

The preponderance of the sample consisted of burials of young and middle-aged women (25–35 years old), generally belonging to the *Adultus* category—17 deceased (70.9 %). Five burials belonged to older women—from 35 to 55 years old (20.8 %). In two burials (8.3 %), young persons (up to 25 years old) were found, both in kurgan 9, Shumaevsky II.

Weapons in female burials are presented in the absolute majority of cases by arrowheads (22 burials, 91.6 %). As a rule, arrows were in quivers, supplemented with quiver hooks. Only in two burials (Shumaevsky II) were there no arrowheads, and the dead were accompanied by a sword, dagger, and spear. In general, in the studied burials, in addition to arrowheads, four iron daggers, a sword, a stiletto, and two spearheads were found (see *Table*). They were deliberately placed in the grave, and were battle weapons.

The tendency, common in the world of the early nomads, to replace bronze arrowheads with iron ones and to increase the proportion of bladed weapons can also be observed in the female burials. Weapons in the female burials of the early cemeteries of the Trans-Urals and Cis-Urals Kichigino I, Yakovlevka II (burial 2), Filippovka I (late 5th–4th centuries BC) are represented only by quivers with bronze arrowheads. In a number of burials (Yakovlevka II, Kichigino I), these are very large quiver sets, consisting of more than 100, and in the case of Yakovlevka, more than 200 arrows (see *Table*).

In female burials of a later period (4th–2nd centuries BC) (Shumaevsky II, Pokrovka-8,

Prokhorovka), bladed and pole iron weapons (swords and spears), as well as iron arrowheads, begin to appear. Large quiver sets with bronze items disappeared. The types and sizes of weapons are similar to those recorded in the contemporaneous male graves. For example, the length of the iron spearhead from the female burial of the Shumaevsky II cemetery (kurgan 9, burial 11) is 29 cm, and the surviving part of the shaft is 70 cm (Morgunova et al., 2003: 152). The sword from burial 8 of the same kurgan is 78 cm long, and the dagger is 38 cm (Ibid.: 141). The length of the daggers from the burials of Pokrovka-8 is 28 and 40 cm (Kurgany..., 1993: 48).

In most female burials, weapons were located in the same place where they were usually placed for men. As a rule, bladed weapons were located to the right of the interred, or were placed on the body of the deceased, with hilts directed to the right hand. Quivers were most often (11 cases, i.e. half of all the burials with quivers) placed on the left along the body, less often on the right, at the legs, behind the head, on the chest, or between the legs (see *Table*). Notably, in all the female burials (with the exception of three), the goods fully corresponded to the female gender and included a large number of ornaments (including those made of precious metals), beads, bronze mirrors, spindle whorls, and various utensils.

Female burials with weapons have been recorded in all pastoral cultures of the Early Iron Age in the Eurasian steppe (Berseneva, 2012: 56–57). The article by R.S. Bagautdinov and V.N. Myshkin (2013) provides a brief summary of the occurrence of various categories of grave goods in the burials of nomads in the Samara-Ural region from the 6th to 2nd centuries BC. The authors are inclined to explain the presence of quivers in female burials (only five were taken into account) by the high social status of the deceased (Ibid.: 46). In general, this sample is not complete enough and did not allow more definite conclusions to be drawn. The number of female burials with weapons in the Lower Volga region can be judged from the summary given by M.A. Balabanova and co-authors (2015: 18–31, tab. 7). Six burials with quiver sets were recorded, and iron swords were found in three (Ibid.: 28–29). Researchers note that full-fledged weapons are presented only in the burials of women of the *Juvenis-Adultus* category, i.e. up to 35 years old. The exception is a sword in the burial of a woman of an older age cohort (Ibid.: Tab. 7). In total, 9 % of female burials in the Lower Volga region contained weapons, including graves with single arrowheads (Ibid.: 28).

Female burials with weapons in the Don region were discussed in the article by T.V. Bogachenko and V.E. Maksimenko (2008), as well as in the monograph by T.V. Bogachenko (2017). The authors tabulated authentic female burials of the Lower Don region, with skeletal sex identifications proven at the time of publication of the

article (Bogachenko, Maksimenko, 2008). In this sample, there are 11 burials dating to late 5th to 2nd century BC, but in three of the graves only fragments of arrowheads were found; so only eight should be taken into account. Weapons are represented by quiver sets, three swords, a dagger, five spears, projectile points, and an armour. The authors note that the sample “is dominated by deceased of 25–35 years of age” and the rest of their goods can be characterized as “typically female” (Ibid.: 54). These conclusions are fully consistent with those made on the Ural materials.

Despite the fact that the cemetery Novy on the Don River dates back rather to the Middle Sarmatian period, researchers tend to attribute its materials to Early Sarmatian (Vdovchenkov, 2013: 289). E.V. Vdovchenkov notes: “16 % of women at the age of 16 to 35 buried at the cemetery Novy have weapons (sword, arrows, dagger). The burials of women with a child (20 %) are also equipped with weapons” (Ibid.: 291). Unfortunately, there is no detailed description of these burials, nor the criteria for their identification. Nevertheless, the source seems to be of high quality, and in general, the presence of female burials with weapons is not in doubt.

The presence of weapons in the female burials of the Scythians was reliably recorded in a number of burial grounds, but there is no unanimity among researchers regarding the criteria for their identification and, consequently, their numbers (see (Sinika et al., 2020; Yatsenko, 2018: 203–204)). It seems that the figures given in the work of E.E. Fialko are greatly overestimated (2015: 90–91). A more or less substantive comparison of Sarmatian and Scythian female burials with weapons is not yet possible.

Returning to the Sarmatian materials, we can state that a unique feature of the burials in the Southern Urals, especially of the early period (late 5th–4th centuries BC), is the absolute predominance of quivers with arrows among weapons in female burials. At the same time, it is from this territory that the largest quiver sets (up to 200 arrows) originate; these were recorded in the Trans-Urals (Kichigino I, Yakovlevka II). In terms of other parameters (age groups, the presence of paired and communal burials, ornaments, and other goods), the considered sample of female burials fits well into the overall picture of the funeral rite of the early nomads of Eastern Europe.

Conclusions

Weapons in the female burials at cemeteries of the Southern Urals are represented mainly by quivers with arrows. Bladed weapons are rare.

Most of the women buried with weapons (more than 2/3) died young (25–35 years). No consistent pattern was found between the age of the deceased and the categories

of weapons. However, in order to establish the dynamics of the relationship between the age of the died women and the presence of weapons, it is necessary to conduct research within age groups.

Female burials with weapons were found in kurgans of all status levels—from the modest mounds of Pokrovka and Lebedevka to the “royal” kurgans of Filippovka I. This partly answers the question often asked by researchers about whether the “Amazons” constituted a certain social stratum or armed formations on a constant basis. Obviously, the women of the early nomads in the Southern Urals, who were buried with weapons, did not represent either one or the other, and had a different vertical social status, i.e. belonged to various strata of society, from the elite to low-ranking nomads. A significant part of them was found in multiple and pair burials, including those with children.

The main question is: what exactly did the weapons symbolize in the burials of women: profession, social status, participation in armed conflicts? Archaeological materials do not give a definite answer; there are plenty of explanations, and almost all of them are warranted (Bogachenko, Maksimenko, 2008: 55). However, it seems that the women of the early Sarmatians undoubtedly knew how to handle ranged weapons, and some, probably, even were skilled with the contact ones. The life of nomadic herdsmen was full of dangers, and mastering the skills of handling weapons increased the chances of survival for both the woman and her offspring.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Project No. 20-09-00205) and RFBR-Chelyabinsk (Project No. 20-49-740005). I express my deep gratitude to S.V. Sirotin and A.D. Tairov for the opportunity to use the unpublished materials from the excavations at the cemeteries of Yakovlevka II and Kichigino I.

References

- Bagautdinov R.S., Myshkin V.N. 2013**
Muzhskoy i zhenskiy nabory veshchey u kochevnikov Samaro-Uralskogo regiona v VI–IV vv. do n.e. *Vestnik Samarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, No. 2: 44–48.
- Balabanova M.A., Klepikov V.M., Korobkova E.A., Krivosheev M.V., Pererva E.V., Skripkin A.S. 2015**
Polovozrastnaya struktura sarmatskogo naseleniya Nizhnego Povolzhya: Pogrebalnaya obryadnost i antropologiya. Volgograd: Izd. Volgograd. Gos. Univ.
- Berseneva N. 2012**
Armed females of Iron Age Trans-Uralian forest-steppe: Social reality or status identity? In *Tumuli Graves – Status Symbol of the Dead in the Bronze and Iron Ages in Europe*. Oxford: BAR, pp. 53–60. (BAR Intern. Ser.; No. 2396).
- Bogachenko T.V. 2017**
Istoricheskiye osnovy skazaniy o zhenshchinakh-voitelnitsakh yuzhnorusskikh stepey. Rostov-na-Donu, Taganrog: Izd. Yuzh. Feder. Univ.
- Bogachenko T.V., Maksimenko V.E. 2008**
Pogrebeniya “zhenshchin s oruzhiyem” epokhi rannego zheleznogo veka na Donu (metodologicheskiye aspekty problemy izucheniya). *Nizhnevolzhskiy arkheologicheskiy vestnik*, iss. 9: 48–61.
- Botalov S.G. 2008**
Otchet ob okhrannykh arkheologicheskikh issledovaniyakh kurgannogo mogilnika Kichigino I v Uvelskom rayone Chelyabinskoy oblasti v 2007 godu. Chelyabinsk. *Arkhiv IA RAN*. F-1, R-1, No. 44550.
- Fialko E.E. 2015**
Amazonki vo vremeni i prostranstve. *Arkheologiya i davnya istoriya Ukraini*, iss. 4: 46–100.
- Gilmitdinova A.K. 2016**
Sotsialniye roli zhenshchin v obshchestve rannikh kochevnikov Yuzhnogo Urala. In *Problemy sarmatskoy arkheologii i istorii*. Orenburg: Izd. Orenburg. Gos. Ped. Univ., pp. 66–69.
- Kuptsov E.A., Kuptsova L.V. 2018**
O dvukh zhenskikh pogrebeniyakh IV v. do n.e. iz Orenburgskoy oblasti. In *Muzhskoy i zhenskiy mir v otrazhenii arkheologii: Materialy Vseros. nauch. konf., g. Ufa, 19–21 noyab. 2018 g.* Ufa: Izd. IYAL UFIC RAN, pp. 146–151.
- Kurgany levoberezhnogo Iлека. 1993**
Moscow: Izd. IA RAN.
- Kurgany levoberezhnogo Iлека. 1995**
Moscow: Izd. IA RAN.
- Morgunova N.L., Golyeva A.A., Kraeva L.A., Meshcheryakov D.V., Turetsky M.A., Khalyapin M.V., Khokhlova O.S. 2003**
Shumayevskiy kurgany. Orenburg: Izd. Orenburg. Gos. Ped. Univ.
- Sinika V.S., Lysenko S.D., Razumov S.N., Telnov N.P., Lukasik S. 2020**
Kurgan 11 gruppy “Sad” v Nizhnem Podnestrovye i sovremennoye “mifotvorchestvo” o skifskikh “amazonkakh”. *Nizhnevolzhskiy arkheologicheskiy vestnik*, vol. 19 (1): 64–101.
- Sirotin S.V. 2010**
Otchet ob arkheologicheskikh raskopkakh v Khaybullinskom rayone Respubliki Bashkortostan v 2009 g. Sterlitamak. *Arkhiv IA RAN*. F-1, R-1, No. 38018.
- Smirnov K.F. 1975**
Sarmaty na Ilege. Moscow: Nauka.
- Strizhak M.S. 2006**
K voprosu o differentsirovaniy zhenskikh i muzhskikh kompleksov v “savromatskoy” kulture na territorii Yuzhnogo Priuralya i Nizhnego Povolzhya. *Nizhnevolzhskiy arkheologicheskiy vestnik*, iss. 8: 35–49.
- Strizhak M.S. 2007**
O zhenskikh pogrebeniyakh s oruzhiyem kochevnikov Priuralya i Povolzhya v VI–nachale IV v. do n.e. In *Vooruzheniye sarmatov: Regionalnaya tipologiya i khronologiya*. Chelyabinsk: Izd. Yuzh.-Ural. Gos. Univ., pp. 71–75.

Tairov A.D., Botalov S.G., Pleshanov M.L. 2008

Issledovaniya kurgannogo mogilnika Kichigino v 2007 godu (predvaritelnye rezultaty). In *Ranniye kochevniki Volgo-Uralskogo regiona*. Orenburg: Izd. Orenburg. Gos. Ped. Univ., pp. 139–145.

Vdovchenkov E.V. 2013

“Muzhskoye” i “zhenskoye” v pogrebalnom obryade i obshchestve sarmatov Podonya (po materialam kurgannogo mogilnika Noviy). *Prepodavatel XXI veka*, No. 4: 287–294.

Yablonsky L.T. 2008

Noviye raskopki Filippovskogo mogilnika i problema formirovaniya rannesarmatskoy kultury Yuzhnogo Priuralya. In *Ranniye kochevniki Volgo-Uralskogo regiona*. Orenburg: Izd. Orenburg. Gos. Ped. Univ., pp. 170–176.

Yablonsky L.T. 2010

Prokhorovka: U istokov sarmatskoy arkheologii. Moscow: Taus.

Yablonsky L., Treister M. 2019

New archaeological data on Achaemenid influences in the Southern Urals. In *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia*, No. 25. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, pp. 79–161.

Yatsenko S.A. 2015

Sarmatskiye zhenshchiny-voitelnitsy: Istoriograficheskiy mif i arkheologicheskaya realnost. In *Vysshye obrazovaniye dlya XXI veka: XII Mezhdunar. nauch. konf.* Moskva, 3–5 dek. 2015 g. Moscow: Izd. Mosk. Gos. Univ., pp. 6–15.

Yatsenko S.A. 2018

Zhenshchiny-voiny u rannikh kochevnikov: Sotsialniy status, ekipirovka i kostyum. In *Muzhskoy i zhenskiy mir v otrazhenii arkheologii: Materialy Vseros. nauch. konf., g. Ufa, 19–21 noyab. 2018 g.* Ufa: Izd. IYAL UFIC RAN, pp. 203–213.

Zhelezchikov B.F., Klepikov V.M.,**Sergatskov I.V. 2006**

Drevnosti Lebedevki (VI–II vv. do n.e.). Moscow: Vost. lit.

Received June 30, 2021.