STUDIA HERCYNIA XXVIII/2, 85–107

The End of Greek Rule in Soghd. Early Euthydemus Imitations from Bukhara

Aleksandr Naymark

ABSTRACT
The composition of the finds of Hellenistic coins in Sogdiana suggest that Greeks lost control over this country during or right after the revolt of Euthydemus (ca. 230–226 BCE). Yet the standard type of the Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms, on which modern scholars base their dates of "Sogdian independence", was minted around the time of Bactra siege – the peak of the eastern anabasis of Antiochus III (ca. 206 BCE). In other words, there is a gap of some 20 to 30 years between the dates derived from two different categories of numismatic evidence. The current article removes this seeming contradiction by presenting, chronologically arranging, and linking to their prototypes a series of Bukharan imitations that reproduces the early types of Euthydemus' tetradrachms. This numismatic data allows the author to date the collapse of the Greek rule in Soghd to 230–226 BCE.

KEY WORDS
Bukhara; Soghd; Bactria; Greeks; Hellenistic; Diodotus; Euthydemus; Antiochus III; coins; tetradrachms; imitations.

THE PROBLEM

The archaeological exploration of the territory of ancient Soghd (Sogdiana, Sogdia) started in 1874, i.e., exactly 150 years ago, when Major Borzenkov conducted the first amateur excavations on Afrasiab (Shishkin 1969, 10–12). In 1934, the State Academy of Material Culture of the USSR organized the first professionally led archaeological expedition to the Zarafshan Valley (Yakubovskii 1940). And yet, despite the large volume of archaeological works conducted by Soviet, local, and international expeditions on the territory of ancient Soghd for such a long period of time, we still have very little archaeological – and practically no epigraphic – materials pertaining to the Hellenistic period of the country's history. As a result, all recent scholarly reconstructions of the political and cultural history of Soghd from the late 4th to the middle of the 2nd century BCE still rely on the few scattered references in surviving Classical sources. The scarcity and ambiguity of this information resulted in several completely divergent views on the status of this country in the 3rd century BCE (Naymark 2005, 116–118; Naymark 2008, 56, footnote 4). It comes as no surprise, then, that numismatic materials have become the principal historical source for this period of Sogdian history.

The date of the collapse of Greek control over Soghd is just one of a number of important questions that could not be answered on the basis of written sources but can be clarified by the analysis of coins finds. There are two major categories of numismatic materials that are relevant to this discussion.

The finds of Hellenistic copper in the lands of ancient Soghd constitute the first category. Copper coinage had a fiduciary nature and Hellenistic chalkoi, with their negligeable intrinsic value, were not likely to be accepted beyond the geographic limits of the Greek authority

responsible for their minting. The history of money, of course, provides us with multiple exceptions to such "rules" as the limited circulation of token currency. Yet, each of these "abnormal" cases results from a whole set of special circumstances, none of which was in place in Soghd during the 3rd century BCE.[1] In other words, the finds of Hellenistic copper can help us to define the territorial and chronological extent of the Greek presence in Soghd (Zeymal' 1978, 196–197; Naymark 2001, 33–36; Naymark 2005, 135–137).

Revising the list of finds of Hellenistic coins in Soghd two decades ago (Naymark 2005, 129–134), I suggested that: 1) during the Seleucid and Diodotid epoch both silver and copper of these dynasties circulated in the country, while 2) starting with the reign of Euthydemus and down to the end of the Graeco-Bactrian epoch we see almost exclusively silver coins (Naymark 2005, 136). It led me to believe that the Greeks lost control over Soghd right before, during, or immediately after the so-called "revolt of Euthydemus" (Naymark 2008, 56, footnote 4). Many more finds of Hellenistic coins registered in Sogdiana since then confirm this theory (Naymark – Yakovlev 2011a; 2011b; Atakhodjhaev 2013a; 2013b; 2019; 2021; Naymark 2014; 2016; Gorin 2014; 2015).

The general course of events can be reconstructed as follows. The relatively abundant finds of copper minted under Antiochus I and II suggest that the Seleucids maintained control over Soghd throughout the first half of the 3rd century. According to narrative sources, by the end of the reign of Antiochus II (261–246 BC), two Central Asian satraps, Andragoras in Parthia and Diodotus in Bactria, seceded with their provinces from the Seleucid kingdom. From the geographic point of view, it is absolutely impossible that Soghd remained a Seleucid possession after the loss of both Bactria and Parthia, since these kingdoms were situated between Soghd and the centers of Seleucid power in Iran, Mesopotamia, and Syria. As to the actual destiny of Soghd, only three options were possible: 1) the country's elites gained independence; 2) the country was occupied by the nomads from the north; and 3) control over Sogdiana passed from Seleucids to their successors in the east, the Greeks of Bactria. The currently available numismatic evidence – i.e., the fairly numerous finds of Diodotid copper and the lack of local compatible coinage – unambiguously suggest that the country remained under the sway of Bactrian Greeks.

It appears, however, that the situation dramatically changed by the time of the so-called revolt of Euthydemus – Sogdian soil yielded practically no copper of this king. This constitutes a stark contrast with the composition of numismatic finds on the sites of neighbouring

1 There were at least three cases in the history of Central Asia when foreign copper was accommodated *en masse* by local circulation: 1) Roman AE4 of the 4th and early 5th centuries CE in Marw (Hobbs 1995, 97–102; Naymark 2012, 36–37), 2) Byzantine anonymous folles in Ferghana and Semirech'e at the end of the 11th century CE (Naymark 2012, 31–36), and 3) reform copper kopeks of Alexei Mikhailovich in Turkestan and Sairam area (Erzakovich 1986, 51–54). In all three cases we see a very specific situation on the receiving end: the severe deficit of precious metals in circulation and attempts to compensate it by the massive output of poorly (and, sometimes, privately) minted local copper. As to the donor countries, the outflow of coins from them happened in times when the huge masses of their previously overproduced copper were severely devalued on the market or even forbidden to circulate altogether. In order to make the long-distance travel of copper coins profitable, 1) the price of these coins in donor countries + 2) transportation costs + 3) some margin of profit for the merchants responsible for the operation should equal the cost of the production of coins from the copper available on the markets of the receiving country. Also crucial to success would be the security of trade routes. No doubt, phenomena of this type could only occur during crises in the countries with developed monetary economies. Sogdiana of the 3rd century BCE definitely did not belong to this category.

Bactria, where Euthydemus' copper forms one of the two largest groups, competing for the first place with the coinage of Eucratides (Bernard 1985; Rtveladze – Gorin 2015; Gorin – Dvurechenskaya 2018). In other words, the composition of the finds of Hellenistic coins in Soghd suggests that Bactrian Greeks lost their territorial possessions in this country around the time of Euthydemus' enthronement, i.e., sometime between 230 and 224 BCE.

The second category of numismatic data that can be used as evidence of the collapse of Greek control is the imitative silver produced by three Sogdian mints that emerged after this event (Naymark 2008; Naymark 2022, fig. 1). In fact, the majority of historical and numismatic studies employ the date of "Sogdian independence" derived from the study of Sogdian imitational issues. Since the times of Alotte de la Fuye, it has been a firm conviction in scholarly literature that Sogdian imitations of the tetradrachms of Euthydemus reproduced one of the late types in this king's coinage. Combining this observation with the scarce information of written sources, scholars usually assume that the Bactrian Greeks lost control over Soghd during or soon after the eastern campaign of Antiochus III, i.e. at the very end of Euthydemus' reign. In absolute dates this would be the short span between 206 BCE, when the siege of Bactra ended, and 200 BCE – the year to which scholarly opinion commonly attributes the demise of Euthydemus.

There is a discrepancy of some 20–30 years between the dates based on these two categories of numismatic evidence. Could it result from a gap in the history of local monetary circulation? Or, to put it differently: could there be a coinless period in the history of Bukhara? Such a scenario seems rather unlikely – it is hard to believe that a country once exposed to the benefits of monetary circulation would plunge into a moneyless state right after the departure of Greeks. Meanwhile, there are no finds that could fill up this presumed monetary vacuum. These considerations bring us to the immediate purpose of this article, which is meant to close this yawning gap between two dates derived from two different categories of coins by mobilizing an overlooked and misinterpreted local imitative series.

Before discussing Bukharan coins, however, I should mention here two theories based on other numismatic materials. One of them was put forward by Anvar Atakhodjaev, who suggested that crab/bee coppers with the name of Antiochus, five of which have been found in Samarqand Soghd, should be dated to the time of the anabasis of Antiochus III. In his initial publications, Atakhodjaev hesitated to assign these coins to a particular mint and named various possibilities from the Island of Kos to Susa, and to Samarqand (Atakhodjaev, 2013a, 233–240; Atakhodjaev 2013b, 262–272). Later he accepted the idea of narrowing the attribution of this type to Samarqand (Naymark 2014; Gorin 2014; 2015) but remained convinced that these coins were minted under Antiochus III (Atakhodjaev 2019, 262–272; Atakhodjaev, 2021, 37–48). The acceptance of such a date, however, creates a significant chronological gap between crab/bee coins and the latest Hellenistic chalkoi found in Sogdiana (Diodotid copper). Atakhodjaev smoothed this contradiction assuming that crab/bee coins were produced by a "military" mint of Antiochus during his invasion of Bactria and Sogdiana. I do not agree with this idea and remain convinced, as a decade ago (Naymark 2014), that the crab/bee coins were produced by the mint of Samarqand during the reigns of Antiochus I or II. Yet we do not need to distract from our main topic here to deal with this interesting issue, as a transitory issue from a "military" mint would not change much in our forthcoming discussion.

The second theory was forged in the 1940s by N.N. Zabelina, who suggested that one of the early Sogdian coins imitating drachms of Antiochus carried the name of Euthydemus (Zabelina 1949). Using this observation, the scholar built a picture of a separate Graeco-Sogdian kingdom of Sogdiana ruled by Euthydemus prior to his "revolt" and consequent enthronement in Bactria. Eugene V. Zeymal' put this idea to rest by showing that the distorted

letters on this single specimen from the collection of the Samarqand Museum accidentally looked almost like the severely truncated name of Euthydemus (Zeymal' 1983b, 84–85; Zeymal' 1983c, 68, 160, pl. XVIII:17). In the 1990s, however, Jeffrey Lerner resurrected Zabelina's theory and built around this numismatic "fact" a whole construction of "indirect evidence" derived from written sources (Lerner 1993; 1996; 1999). During the quarter of a century that passed since Lerner's last publication, the number of early Antiochus imitations available for study increased dramatically and it is even more clear now that the distorted lettering on this single specimen acquired a partial resemblance to the name Euthydemus by a mere chance. Nevertheless, Zabelina-Lerner's theory found an eager supporter in Alfiya A. Musakaeva, who initially simply cited these scholars, but recently went further and revised the entire typology of Euthydemus tetradrachms on the basis of the coins of the Tokhmach-tepe hoard (Rtveladze 1983; Kurbanov – Niyazova 1989) and the specimens from the collection of Tashkent Museum (i.e. some 60 coins altogether). According to her, Euthydemus ruled and minted tetradrachms in Soghd starting in the middle of the 3rd century, i.e. parallel to Diodotus and his offspring(s) who, during the same decades, controlled Bactria (Musakaeva 2014, 229–232). I do not think we can afford here any kind of critical assessment of the latter theory.

COINAGE IN SOGHD AFTER THE COLLAPSE OF GREEK POWER: GENERAL REMARKS

The nature of the local coinages that filled the monetary vacuum after the collapse of Greek control over Soghd prompts several tentative conclusions about the identity of the new masters of the country. They issued imitative series, that neglected both aesthetic and proclamative aspects of Hellenistic coin types. Such a profile would hardly fit local Greeks or the representatives of the old Sogdian aristocracy who were well acquainted with the traditions of Hellenistic coinage. These elites lived about three quarters of a century under Seleucid and Diodotid rule, when the country had a monetary economy and even produced coins itself (Atakhodjaev 2013; 2021; Naymark 2014; Gorin 2014; 2015). It seems far more plausible that the new rulers were nomadic chieftains who managed to capture the northern province of the Graeco-Bactrian state during the turmoil caused by the change of dynasty and the accession of Euthydemus. It is quite possible that these were the very same nomads whom Euthydemus described as a great threat to his kingdom while talking to Teleas a couple of decades later (Polybius XI, 34).[2]

On the other hand, the same numismatic material leaves no doubt that the sedentary population of Soghd retained an interest in the monetary economy – at least three different principalities (Samarkand, Bukhara, and Kesh) began to mint their own coins almost immediately after the fall of the Greek power (Zeymal' 1978, 201, pl. II and III; Zeymal' 1983a, 244–245, pl. 19–21; Zeymal' 1983b, 77–92, pl. 9; Zeymal' 1983c, 68–78, 160–162, pl. XVIII–XX; Naymark 2008; Naymark 2022, fig. 1). Moreover, as E.V. Zeymal' has shown, Samarkand minted Antiochus imitations in three denominations: drachm, hemidrachm, and obol (Zeymal' 1983c, 68–75; Zeymal' 1983b, 81–92). This leaves no doubt that we are dealing with a "market" coin meant to meet the needs of a developed trade and economy, and not just with proclamative issues of the new nomadic masters of the country.

The composition of the finds of Hellenistic coins in the territory of Soghd makes it clear that the Greeks lost all three major parts of the country simultaneously. And yet the dates of

2 The most recent discussion of the possible identity of these nomads see in Morris 2023, 170–179.

the prototypes chosen by the new rulers of Soghd for their coins spread over many decades: the principality of Kesh minted coins with the types of Alexander and the rulers of Samarkand opted for the drachmas of the Seleucid king Antiochus I Soter, whereas in the Bukhara oasis, they decided to reproduce the appearance of the tetradrachms of the contemporary Greco-Bactrian king Euthydemus. It appears that the early coins chosen as prototypes by the rulers of Kesh and Samarqand possessed some special authority on the Sogdian market due to a complex blend of political and economic reasons. I am planning to address this question in a separate paper, meanwhile it is sufficient to say that all three post-Greek Sogdian coinages started at about the same time, right after the collapse of Greek power.

As the goal of current paper is limited to the question of the date of the collapse of Greek power, we will deal here with the Bukharan coinage only: as the chronological gap between the tetradrachms of Euthydemus and their imitations was the shortest among the three early Sogdian imitation coinages, this imitative series gives us a much better chance to reconstruct the political situation of the time.

BRIEF HISTORY OF STUDY AND THE LOCALIZATION OF EUTHYDEMUS IMITATIONS

Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms first appeared in the pages of a scholarly publication in 1822, i.e., over two centuries ago (Köhler 1850, 5–6). Evidence for the origin of the series arrived on the scene only a few years later: first Thomas Christian Tychsen published specimens from the collection brought from Bukhara by George von Meyendorf, a member of the Russian embassy to the Bukharan Khanate in 1820 (Tychsen 1828, 5–10, Taf. Abt. III: *N. graeci*), and then James Princep presented more examples of this series acquired by Alexander Burnes during his trip to the same city in 1832 (Princep 1834, 464–466; Burnes 1834, pl. "Bactrian and other coins"). Regarding one of the latter specimens Horace Hayman Willson wrote: "This coin may, perhaps, be referred to one of the first barbaric princes who subdued Sogdiana, if not Bactria Proper, and adopted the device of the Bactrian coins" (Willson 1834, 460).

Some of the later vague reports, however, blurred this initially clear picture (for example: Sestini 1831, 112, citing Stuart), and another 60 years had passed until a scholarly publication affirmatively narrowed the origin of the imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms to Sogdiana (Droin 1893). It took almost half a century more before the discovery of a fairly large hoard composed solely of such coins prompted the further narrowing of this attribution down to the Bukharan oasis (Masson 1940). With additional information about a few find spots of such coins in the Bukharan oasis presented by Vadim M. Masson (Masson 1954, 87; Masson 1955, 41), Vasilii A. Shishkin (1963, 47), and Yahya G. Guliamov (1958, 22) the attribution of this imitational series to the Bukharan oasis turned into established fact in Russian numismatic literature (Zeymal' 1978, 201; Zeymal' 1983, 245, pl. 19; Zeymal' – Nikitin – Koshelenko 1985, 431, pl. CXLIII; Zeimal 1996, 362, 363, 366, 367; Rtveladze – Musakaeva 1986, 35–38; Rtveladze 1987, 130, no 37; Rtveladze 1990, 180; Rtveladze 1999, 30–31; Rtveladze 2002, 24, 30; Musakaeva 1990, 20; Musakaeva 1991; Musakaeva 2014, 7–19, 48–113, 263, 264; Naymark 1991, 163; Naymark 2008, 62–68; Smirnova 2005, 165).

Most scholarly, popular, and commercial publications in other European languages, however, continued to attribute these coins to the Yuezhi, to Soghd in general (Kingdom of Sogdiana and Yuezhi principalities in Sogdiana), or even more specifically to Samarqand (Göbl 1978, Taf. 113; Mitchiner 1973, 26–43, pl. IV–VI; Mitchiner 1975, 284, 287–294; Mitchiner 1978, 274–276, 386–387; Alram 1986, 281; Senior 2001, 217). It was only in 1985 that Paul Bernard with a ref-

erence to Zeymal' mentioned that: "Les numismates soviétiques situent la production de ces imissions dans l'oasis de Bukhara" (Bernard 1985, 150). Osmund Bopearachchi followed him in this respect, but, nevertheless, made practically no use of the "Soviet" literature in question and still tried to apply a historical reconstruction based on these coins to the entire country of Soghd (Bopearachchi 1990, 30–31; Bopearachchi 1991b, 12–13). More recently, the work by Bopearachchi influenced Michael Mitchiner, who reconsidered this coinage in the latest of his compendiums and linked it to Bukhara (Mitchiner 2004, 540–546). Still, distinguishing two lines of Euthydemus' imitations, Mitchiner assigned to Samarqand a group of imitations replicating early tetradrachms of the king, which he called the "minor" series. Besides some general considerations, the only justification for this attribution was Rudolph Hoernle's work of 1899, in which Euthydemus imitations are placed broadly in the Samarqand-Tashkent area (Hoernle 1898). Hoernle's information, however, was received from collectors who purchased coins in Samarqand and Tashkent, i.e. in two cities of Russian Turkestan with antiquarian markets. Moreover, it does not refer to early tetradrachms specifically. As far as I can judge, Joe Cribb was the first among "Western" scholars to attribute Euthydemus imitations affirmatively to Bukhara (Cribb 2008, 350).

In recent years, however, the Bukharan origin of this coinage became universally accepted, as it was adopted by the team running Zeno.ru, the magnificent database that became the principal point of reference for the community of people interested in oriental numismatics. Yet the format of the database is not meant to provide argumentation for the localizations of coin series and thus the attribution of our Bukharan coinage turned to be "hanging in air". In order to close this question, I would like to provide here the list of registered finds of such coins.

FIND SPOTS OF BUKHARAN COINS

At least four coins with the type of Euthydemus' tetradrachms came from the site of Varakhsha and from the adjacent zone: three coins gathered during the works of Shishkin's expedition are now held in the collection of the Institute of Archaeology, Samarqand (Coin cabinet nos. 669, 1015, 1115);[3] one more specimen found its way to the Tashkent Museum.[4]

More recently, Alfiya A. Musakaeva published nine coins from the private collection of Alexei Nurullaev – an enthusiast from Sverdlov/Jondor district in the province of Bukhara – as the finds from the environs of Varakhsha (Musakaeva 2014, tab. 6: 1–2, 9: 3–4, 10: 1, 3–4, 12: 2, 21: 2). This provenance information, however, should be understood in a rather broad sense: judging from my interaction with Alexei, his definition of "Varakhsha area" included the entire southern and central "flares" of the lands of ancient irrigation on the western fringes of the Bukahran oasis.

3 Elena A. Davidovich listed no. 1115 as a genuine tetradrachm of Euthydemus (Davidovich 1956, 155). This attribution was accepted by Vasilii A. Shishkin (1963, 47) and Tamara S. Ernazarova (1974, 170). Paul Bernard, however, expressed his doubts about this attribution, suggesting that this coin might have been an imitation of Euthydemus' tetradrachm (Bernard 1985, 139, n. 1). Indeed, my visual examination of this specimen in the collection of the Samarqand institute of Archaeology (Coin Cabinet, no. 1115, collection 5, no. 1) confirmed that it was an early imitation (Naymark 2005, 128). Alfiya A. Musakaeva qualified my "revision" of the initial attribution as a "strange story" (Musakaeva 2014, 17, beginning of the last paragraph). She provided, however, no critical basis for this negative assessment of my re-attribution, and herself included the very same specimen into the category of imitations in the very same book of hers (Musakaeva 2014, 291, tab. 3).

4 A certain citizen Rubo found it near the "fortress Varakhsha-kuduk" in 1949 (Musakaeva 1990, 20, no. 29; Musakaeva 2014, tab. 16, no. 4, 342).

During the last two and a half decades, I heard several more reports from private collectors about finds of Euthydemus imitations in the Varakhsha area. Unfortunately, most of this information was neither specific enough nor could be substantiated by the "physically existing" coins or their images.[5]

Six more finds of Euthydemus imitations come from the specific sites situated on the western fringes of the Bukhara oasis. One specimen was recorded from Qala-i Mallyabek (Guliamov 1958, 22) while another one comes from Kampirak-tepe.[6] In 2002, Tashkent collector Vladimir Shagalov informed me that two imitations of Euthydemus were picked up in the late 1990s from a present day surface at a distance of 70–100 meters from the site of Tall-i Subuk-tepa.[7] One specimen was said to be found in Ramitan situated to the north-west of Bukhara (Masson 1954, 87) and another one was found during the archaeological works on Kyzyl-qyr in the northern section of the western border of the oasis (Guliamov 1956, 160; Nil'sen 1959, 77, footnote 17; Suleimanov 1979, 18).[8]

5 One should be extremely cautious even with some of the "well illustrated" claims about the finds of Hellenistic coins in Soghd. For example, a label to one of the coins illustrated in Musakaeva's book says: "photo from internet, supposedly found on Varakhsha?" (Musakaeva 2014, 305, pl. 17:1, 342). I do not know what the source of this provenance information was, but the image itself is taken from Zeno (no. 140448), where it came from a "Sogdia" article in Wikipedia (unless Musakaeva borrowed this photo directly from the latter). Meanwhile, the caption supplied to the Wikipedia image says: "Cabinet des Medailles. Personal photograph 2006." In reality, however, these are the obverse and the reverse of two different specimens from the collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, which were on display in 2006, when they were photographed for Wikipedia. Cabinet de Medailles itself does not have any information about the find spots of these two specimens. It is noteworthy that Musakaeva had already reproduced both coins with their actual reverses and obverses in the very same monograph of hers (Musakaeva 2014, 306, pl. 18: 2; 312, pl. 24: 1) using images from an old publication in Revue Numismatique (Allotte de la Fuye 1910, pl. III: 2 and 3).

6 Unpublished. Found during the survey conducted by the archaeological team of the Moscow Museum of Oriental Art in 1987 and resides in this institution.

7 No photos were available at that time, but in his message Shagallov described these specimens as carrying a "simple portrait – not the Bukharan one", the latter apparently being the reference to the late "king in tiara" type. According to Shishkin, who visited the Subbuk-tepe site in 1937 and reported that "there was a great variety of pottery fragments on the surface of the site", and that in general they belonged "to the same types as those on Varakhsha" (Shishkin 1940, 22). Varakhsha served as a border fortress from the 3rd century BCE to the 1st century CE, and then entered a period of severe decline, when life continued only on the central elevation (if anywhere) (Naymark – Atakhodjaev 2023, 164–165). The site was resurrected in the 5th century CE and acquired special importance starting with the very end of the 7th century, when Vardan Khuda Kanuk usurped the throne of Bukhara and built for himself a palace at Varakhsha (Naymark 2003).

8 Shishkin and following him Abdullahat R. Mukhamedzhanov mentioned two finds of Euthydemus imitations from this site (Shishkin 1963, 229; Mukhamedzhanov 1978, 81; *Kul'tura* 1983, 32). Unfortunately, it is impossible to check the correctness of these statements: the current location of this/these specimen(s) is unknown, just as there is no information about whereabouts of any other coins found in the course of Guliamov's expeditions. As the original publications of the excavation materials described only one specimen, it is likely that Shishkin's (and consequently Mukhamedzhanov's) mention of two coins was probably the result of confusion. It is noteworthy that the preceding paragraph of Shishkin's book also mentions two original tetradrachms of Euthydemus from Varakhsha and in doing so contradicts page 49 of the very same publication, which reports a single find. In any case, we can abstain here from the final solution of this problem, as for our current purposes the actual number of coins found on each site has only secondary importance. It is mostly the presence of such coins in the Kyzyl-kyr area that matters, because we are interested here mainly in the geographic distribution of finds.

Four more Euthydemus imitations came from two separate small oases situated to the south of Bukhara: two from Paykand (Adylov 2000, 26, 116, fig. 28; *Otchet* 2011, fig. 112: 7–8; Omeľchenko 2011, 48–49) and two from Qum-Softan (Naymark 1991, 163, no. 241).[9] One more specimen was found during the excavations of Kyzyl-tepe burial grounds situated to the north-east of Bukhara (Obeľchenko 1974, 206; Obeľchenko 1992, 53, 127 and ill.).

To sum up, altogether 24 stray finds of such coins were recorded from sites situated along the fringes of the Bukharan oasis.

Finally, we should return here to the aforementioned hoard, which was said to consist of some 100 specimens. The jar with the hoard was found in the fall of 1937 on the ancient site Tal-i Murdapartow by the irrigators straightening the bed of Shahrud canal. This find spot lies in the very heart of the oasis, just a few kilometers to the east of the city of Bukhara itself (Masson 1940). The coins were dispersed, but within the autumn of 1937 the Bukharan museum was able to acquire five portions of its coins from different individuals (altogether 86 specimens). In February of 1939, Samarqand Museum purchased two more specimens from a certain G.F. Novoselov in Bukhara (the documents associated with this acquisition state that these coins were found "near Bukharan Shirabuddin by a worker from Shahrudstroi" (Zeimaľ 1990, 14–16). Tashkent Museum also acquired one specimen from a certain "citizen Ivanov", who related that it was found "in the area of Sharafuddin/Shirabuddin", which in conjunction with the type and condition of this specimen makes it more than likely to be from the very same hoard (Musakaeva 1990, 20, no. 32; Musakaeva 2014, tab. 25, no. 11, 343). It is also possible that one more specimen ended up in Dushanbe Museum (Zabelina 1952, 76, no. 5, 81, pl. I, no. 4). In other words, altogether 89 or 90 coins survived from the original find that was reported to contain about 100 pieces (Zeimaľ 1990, 13). All surviving coins of this hoard belong to the terminal stage of the Bukharan imitational coinage. One further episode in the history of this hoard was detected by Eugene V. Zeimaľ: 12 of the specimens that originally belonged to the Bukharan museum eventually found their way to the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow (Zeimaľ 1990, 14–16; see also: Kurbanov 2001, 92–93). The portion of the hoard preserved in the Bukharan Museum (74 specimens) was a subject of a preliminary publication (Rtveladze – Musakaeva 1986, 35–38).[10]

In order to strengthen the argumentation *pro* Bukharan attribution, I should mention here that no finds of such coins have been registered in other parts of Soghd.[11] The complete lack of such finds in the middle and upper Zarafshan valley as well as in the basin of Kashka-darya would look especially remarkable, if we took into consideration that heavy silver coins of this series were capable of long distance travel. Indeed, four specimens belonging to it have been recorded far beyond the territory of Soghd. The closest of the finds was made in Ferghana Valley in the Osh region of Kyrgyzstan (Kamyshev 2002, 64, fig. 97, 65, 123, entry 97; Kamyshev 2008, 61). Another specimen was discovered in the middle of the 19th century in the Krasnoufimsk district of the Perm governorship (in the Kama area, far north in Russia)

9 The second specimen remains unpublished and is held among the finds from Qum-Softan/Kum-Sultan in the collection of the Museum of Oriental Art in Moscow.

10 Osmund Bopearachchi mistakenly describes this find as two separate hoards (Bopearachchi 1991b, 11).

11 The only specific reference to the *find* of a coin belonging to this series in the area of Samarqand (Ernazarova 1974, 166, pl. 3:172) resulted from a confusion: Zeimaľ showed on the basis of the documentation preserved in the archive of the Samarqand Museum, that the specimen mentioned by Ernazarova as found near Samarqand, in reality came from Tal-i Murdapartou hoard (Zeimaľ 1990, 13, n. 14).

and acquired by the Hermitage Museum in 1852 (Smirnova 2005, 140).[12] One more coin was found near the village of Pasanauri situated on the Georgian Military Road 90 km north of Tbilisi (Kazamanova 1961, 120).[13] The fourth one was unearthed on the island of Hortitsa in the Dnepr River in the modern territory of Ukraine (Vasmer 1929, 285, 41).

Finally, it should be mentioned here, that *all* the recorded *early acquisitions* of such coins (Tychsen 1828; Burnes 1834/II, pl. 3; Kostenko 1871, 65–67) were made *in the bazaars of Bukhara*. It was only after the Russian conquest of Turkestan, that coins of this series started being reported as coming from the Zarafshan valley in general and even more specifically from Samarqand (Hoernle 1899, 23; Kastal'skiy 1940, nos. 3–4, 347; Masson 1950, no. 4, 159). Yet, as Eugene V. Zeymal' already rightfully pointed out, these claims were certainly based on the place of purchase, not the find (Zeymal' 1990, 13). Indeed, all Samarqand purchases date to the times when a serious antiquarian trade had already developed in this city and its numismatic market had started attracting coins from the Bukharan Khanate (Naymark 2005, 121–126; Naymark 2015, 139–126).

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE EARLY BUKHARAN COINAGE IN THE SCHOLARLY LITERATURE

While the problem of localization appears to be finally solved, the chronology of the Bukharan coinage with types of Euthydemus is far from being settled. The problem, as always, is in the deficiency of the sources – there is no direct evidence that could help us to decide the matter.

The composition of the only known hoard provides no help, as its surviving part consists exclusively of the coins belonging to the terminal stage of our coinage and contains no admixes. Also, as the hoard was not initially properly recorded, its find spot has not been archaeologically explored at all.[14]

The archaeological contexts of the individual finds coming from professional excavations have very vague dates. There is no precise information about the stratigraphy of a find from Kyzyl-kyr. Meanwhile the site has a complex history. In the foundation of it lies a burial mound

12 Until a few years ago, information about the find of such an early Sogdian coin in Kama area would necessarily invoke all kinds of doubts. Recently, however, exactly the same area produced two roughly contemporary coins from Central Asia: 1) a copper coin struck under Kujula Kadphises (Kostikov – Shirinkin 2015, 44, no. 10) which was more than likely to pass Sogdiana on its way to the north (cf. Atakhodzhaev – Naymark 2021, 55–58), and 2) Kanishka's copper unit with Khorezmian S-shaped countermark (Kostikov – Shirinkin 2015, 45, no. 11). We should also consider a mention of an earlier find of a coin of Kujula Kadphises in the Kama area by Frederick Teggart (1969, 204). These three finds of copper Kushan units suggest the direct contact between Kama area and the core lands of Central Asia in the 1st and the 2nd century CE and by doing so make the information about the Perm origin of the silver imitation of Euthydemus' tetradrachms much more credible.

13 In a more recent work by Mariusz Mielczarek, the conditions of this find were mistakenly given as "an inhumation grave covered with stones" (Mielczarek 1997, 131–132). The Russian article by Kazamanova, to which the English text of Mielszarek refers, says only that it was an chance find: a man found this specimen while making a bonfire in the ditch running along the side of the road (Kazamanova 1961, 120).

14 Excavations that Makhsuma Niyazova (Bukharan Museum) conducted on the site of Tal-i Murdapartou in mid 1980s showed that the site was continuously occupied from antiquity (apparently, from at least the first centuries BCE) to the early Middle Ages (at least to the 8th century CE). Unfortunately, the find of 1939 could not be linked to a particular spot and consequently cannot be related to a stratum on the site.

of the 1st century BCE – 1st century CE. In the late 3rd or more likely in the 4th century CE this elevation was used to build a castle which then went through several significant rebuilding--renovations (Guliamov 1956, 160; Niľsen 1959, 77, footnote 17; Suleimanov 1979, 18).

Another coin was discovered in the catacomb of mound 12 in the Kyzyltepa burial ground on the eastern outskirts of the Bukhara oasis (Obeľchenko 1992, 52–54, 97–98, illus.). Apparently, several sequential burials were made in this catacomb over a prolonged period of time. With every new inhumation the remains of those previously buried were moved to the walls of the chamber, where they formed piles of human bones. There were remains of at least nine people in these heaps. This is without counting the full skeleton lying at the entrance in anatomical order – apparently the last of the buried. The "coin of our interest was found in the rubble of bones" near the western wall. According to the archaeologist who conducted the excavations, the coin "can only testify to the presence of earlier burials" (Obeľchenko 1992, 97–98). Meanwhile, he dates this burial ground as a whole to the 2nd–4th centuries CE. For our current purposes, this level of precision is already not sufficient. I suspect that a revision of unpublished materials from this mound, which are stored in the Bukhara Museum, could help clarify the date of both the burial itself and of the entire burial ground, but this would require a separate, strictly archaeological project.

Both specimens coming from the excavations of Paykand happened to be re-deposits from the earlier to the upper strata (Adylov 2000, 26, fig. 28, 116; Omeľchenko 2011, 48–50).

To sum up, all the dates currently circulating in scholarly literature are based on indirect circumstantial evidence and reflect drastically diverging scholarly *opinions* on the history of this coinage. Given this situation and the limited size of this contribution I would like to concentrate on the question of dates as the second most important aspect of the attribution, while other important questions related to this series will have to wait for another occasion.

THE INCIPIENT DATE OF THE BUKHARAN COINAGE

BRIEF HISTORIOGRAPHIC SURVEY

It is obvious that the dates of the original tetradrachms of Euthydemus that served as the prototypes for the Bukharan imitations should be treated as the *terminus post quem* for the starting point of this coinage. As the Graeco-Bactrian king stayed in power for a long time and his coinage includes multiple distinct types, there is a definite possibility of adjusting the incipient date of the imitational coinage further by linking it to a particular prototype. Allotte de la Füye was first to realize this: he demonstrated that the type of the most common series of Bukharan imitations was derived from the tetradrachms carrying a portrait of middle-aged Euthydemus and a rho-kappa monogram (Füye 1910, pl. I), i.e. from a type that was minted towards the end of this king's rule. This made the scholar believe that Bactrian Greeks lost control over Sogdiana upon the death of Euthydemus (Füye 1925, 330).

Allotte de la Füye was followed by Michael Mitchiner who offered his own reconstruction of the historical situation, but initially also assigned the beginning of the series to 200 BCE (Mitchiner 1973, 26, pl. IV; Mitchiner 1975/IV, 284, 288). Later, Mitchiner slightly modified his point of view: he argued that the "parallel" die axis of Sogdian imitations reveal their origin from the tetradrachms minted after Euthydemus' "coinage reform" that was carried out in 206/205 BCE, and consequently he suggested that "the split between Bactria and Sogdiana [...] took place about 205 BCE" (Mitchiner 1978, 274).

Eugene Zeimal' placed the beginning of this coinage approximately to 200 BCE (Zeymal' 1978, 201; Zeymal' 1983, 244–245; Zeymal' – Nikitin – Koshelenko 1985, pl. cxliii on p. 431).[15] In my earlier publications I stuck to his opinion (Naymark 1991, 163; Naymark 2001, 41–44).

Originally Edvard V. Rtveladze dated the beginning of Bukharan imitation coinage to the 2nd century BCE (Rtveladze 1990, p. 180) and Alfiya A. Musakaeva followed him in this regard (Musakaeva 1990, 20). Later, however, Rtveladze adjusted his views: "The Bukharan oasis became independent [...] sometime during the second half of the second century BC", and after that the coinage started of the "silver imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms" (Rtveladze 1999, 30). Most recently, Musakaeva suggested that "the date of the appearance of early imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms becomes clear from the analysis of the political situation of 180s–170s BCE" (Musakaeva 2014, 233).

In 1990, Osmund Bopearachchi addressed the question of the date of what he called "Sogdian independence" in a talk presented at a symposium in Samarqand (Bopearachchi 1990, 30–31) and then in a special article devoted to this question (Bopearachchi 1991b, 1–19). The final outcome of his study was very close to that of Mitchiner: Bopearachchi suggested that Sogdiana broke away from the Hellenistic world during the anabasis of Antiochus III. Yet the foundation upon which Bopearachchi rested his conclusions was now different – it was Bopearachchi's own newly modified classification of Euthydemus' coins (Bopearachchi 1991a, pl. iii). The "main" series of Sogdian imitations followed the type that he marked in this new taxonomy as Group 6. Bopearachchi assigned this group to the time of the siege of Bactra during the eastern campaign of Antiochus III (Bopearachchi 1991a, 48; Bopearachchi 1991b, 12–13). As the lifting of this siege is usually dated to 206 BCE, Bopearachchi proclaimed this year the "day of Sogdian independence." (Bopearachchi 1991b, 12–13). The Mitchiner/Bopearachchi point of view gained broad recognition and there were even further elaborations on the historical circumstances and significance of this event by other scholars (for example: Holt 1999, 134–136; Widemann 2009, 55–58).

IMITATIONS OF THE EARLY TETRADRACHMS OF EUTHYDEMUS IN SCHOLARLY LITERATURE

It may sound strange, but during the last four decades, when this slow "discussion" about the incipient date of the Euthydemus imitation coinage kept festering, numismatic materials were available that contradicted the commonly recognized wisdom. Indeed, in as early as 1976 Michael Mitchiner took special notice of the imitations reproducing early types of Euthydemus' tetradrachms. Unfortunately, while publishing these coins he ignored the obvious imitation traits such as, for example, the blundering of inscriptions, and explained the low weight and "severe" style of these coins by suggesting that these were "Euthydemos' prototype issues struck on the Persic weight standard for circulation in Sogdiana, ca. 205–200 BCE" (Mitchiner 1975/iv, 287, type 477).

15 Somewhat confusing is an entry in the catalogue of the Vienna exhibition *Weihrauch and Seide*: the section featuring these coins is called "Frühsogdische Münzen nach gräko-baktrischen Vorbild der Tetradrachmen des Euthydemos", but the first coin in this section is not an imitation – Zeimal' included it in the catalogue as a Graeco-Bactrian prototype. The latter is clear from the fact that this particular description does not contain the line describing the coin as "Buchara-Sogdien" which is invariably present in all later entries. In other words, the date given to this specimen ("zwanziger Jahre 3./Anfang 2. Jh. v. Chr.") should not be understood as Zeimal''s revision of his earlier opinion on the incipient date of this coinage (Zeimal' 1996, 366, no. 21).

Fifteen years later Osmund Bopearachchi included the same coins into the later part of his typological sequence of the Bukharan imitations (Bopearachchi 1991b, 21, nos. 61–62).

In his publication of 2004, Michael Mitchiner labelled the imitations of the early tetradrachms of Euthydemus as a "minor series" and, as has already been mentioned above, attributed them to Samarqand (Mitchiner 2004, 541, 542, no. 1593–1594).

About the same time, I suggested that these coins constitute a separate imitation series, as evidenced by the gradual distortion of the legend and the progressive transformation of the royal coiffure. Yet no single find of a coin belonging to this series had been registered in the Bukharan oasis and thus there was no evidence for the localization of this series (Naymark 2008, 62, note 37).[16]

The most recent work dealing with the subject of early Euthydemus imitations – which, at the same time, is the only article devoted specifically to this problem – was published by N.M. Smirnova. According to her, "the early imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms are almost indistinguishable from their prototypes and are often incorporated into catalogues as coins belonging to the coinage of this king. Yet their reduced weight and alterations in the characters of the legend do not allow one to support such interpretations" (Smirnova 2008, 72). She discerned two main groups of imitations. The first one included specimens with the portrait of the young king (Smirnova 2008, 73–74, fig. 2), bearing monogram 40 (Bopearachchi 1993, 350, tab. 3) found on the coins of mint A, groups I–III (Glenn 2020, 72–75, 80–81). The other consists of coins with the portrait of the king in his middle age (Smirnova 2008, 74–75, fig. 3) with monogram 62 (Bopearachchi 1993, 350, tab. 3), found on the coins of mint C, groups IV–VI (Glenn 2020, 79–81). She also noted, that some of the early imitations, mostly in the first group, were not subject to "further stylistic development", i.e., they were singular types and did not form part of a line of mechanical reproduction, which is characteristic of imitational coinages. Smirnova cautiously abstained from the discussion of the place of the origin of these early imitations – she preferred to talk vaguely about "territories adjacent to Greek-Bactrian kingdom" (Smirnova 2008, 72, 79, fig. 3).

NEW INFORMATION PROMPTING THE RECONSIDERATION OF THE INCIPIENT DATE

What allows us to return here to the question of the place and time of the coinage of imitations of Euthydemus reproducing the early types of tetradrachms of this king? First of all, of course, it is the full revision of old and the accumulation of new information about finds of Hellenistic coins in Sogdiana, prompting a conclusion that the Bactrian Greeks lost Soghd at the very beginning of Euthydemus' reign, sometime between 230 and 225 BCE. As was mentioned above, this new date of the collapse of Greek power in Sogdiana opens at least a twenty-year gap in the numismatic history of Bukhara, as the imitation types reproducing tetradrachms with the middle-aged Euthydemus and the RK monogram (No. 62) could be minted only after

16 This statement did not take into consideration the last modification in the views of Michael Mitchiner: although the publication where my article appeared is dated 2008, the text itself was written in 2003 for the Igor Pichikian Memorial Volume – a project which due to the merciless terminal disease of the editor, late Dr. Anthony Green, never saw the light of day (see Curtis 2012). I would like to use this opportunity to express my gratitude to N.M. Smirnova, who took the initiative to translate my initial English text into Russian and after dividing it into two pieces published them separately in a collection she edited and in a journal publication of a roundtable she organized (Naymark 2005; 2008).

208–206 BCE. As a result, there is now an empty space that calls for the early imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms to fit in.

Secondly, we have much better understanding of this early series itself. Despite the fact that imitations of the early tetradrachms of Euthydemus from the British and Ashmolean Museums were published almost half a century ago (Mitchiner 1975, 287, type 477), and that we now have a full catalogue of all the Hermitage imitations of Euthydemus (Smirnova 2005, 165–171), the currently known specimens of the early series of imitations have never been examined systematically. Bringing them together creates a "critical mass" of numismatic material sufficient to distinguish in it a quite certain, albeit not yet very long, imitational series.

An important catalyzing factor for the classification of our imitations and determining the sequence of production of their different series was the appearance of a new, more detailed, and much better working typologies of coins of Euthydemus himself (Kritt 2001; 2015; Glenn 2020).

Finally, two new discoveries removed the single most significant obstacle for the Sogdian attribution of the imitations of the early tetradrachms of Euthydemus, namely the complete lack of information about the find spots of such coins. One of the coins brought by Alexander Burns from Bukhara (Burnes 1837, pl. "Bactrian and other coins": No. 1), which had always figured in literature as an authentic tetradrachm of Euthydemus, upon a close examination turned out to be an early imitation (Bracey – Naymark 2024). Based on the history of the numismatic market and coin collecting in the Bukhara oasis (Naymark 2005, 121–122; Naymark 2015, 140), one can be sure that all the specimens bought by Alexander Burns at the Bukharan market and said to come from the site of Khoja-Ubon (Burnes 1837, 319–320) had local, Bukharan origin (Naymark 2003, 9–10).

Furthermore, in 2016, a specimen of the Bukharan imitation coinage appeared with precise provenance information: according to the testimony received directly from the finder, this specimen was picked up from the modern-day surface in the Varakhsha region. Unfortunately, it was not possible to include it in the plates in this article; I was not able to get permission to publish a photo of this coin. However, this is not a major loss – this specimen is typologically very close to the coin from the collection of Dmitry Markov, which we are able to consider here due to the courtesy of the owner (**Pl. 1/1: 3**).

TYPOLOGY OF EARLY IMITATIONS

SERIES 1 AND 2 (FORMATIVE STAGE)

N.M. Smirnova rightfully complained that the earliest Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus coins are virtually indistinguishable from the original tetradrachms of this king (Smirnova 2008, 72). Indeed, the only way we can single out these early imitations is by finding on them certain features, that are otherwise known exclusively on later imitations. The most noticeable diagnostic feature of the earliest coins, that can be considered exclusively imitational (Series 3), is the S-shaped lock placed horizontally above the forehead. Formed by two partly parallel and partly intertwining lines, it developed from the very specific Ω-shaped lock characteristic of the early tetradrachms of Euthydemus struck at mint A (Kritt 2001, 116, no. 7; Glenn 2020, pl. 2–8: 1–129). This diagnostic feature appears on two earlier specimens linked to two different groups of Euthydemus tetradrachms.

The first of them (**Pl. 1/1:1**) belongs to the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg (Smirnova 2005, 166, no. 4 and tab. xxi: 4; Smirnova 2008, 73, figs. 2: 5). The images on this coin follow

a model used at Euthydemus' mint A (Glenn 2020, pl. 2–8: 1–129). The fact that this is an imitation, and not a genuine tetradrachm of Euthydemus, is proven not so much by the low weight of this specimen (15.5 g), which at least partially can be attributed to the wear and tear of the coin, as by errors in the inscriptions: the initial β of the royal title turned into two parallel dashes, while A and Δ lost their crossbars. In addition, there is no monogram on this coin, while the final sigma of the title is lowered and sits below the line as if it was meant to replace this missing control mark.

The second specimen (**Pl. 1/1:2**) is also held in the collection of the State Hermitage Museum (Smirnova 2005, 166, no. 4 and tab. xxii: 24; Smirnova 2008, 76, fig. 4: 2). The monogram placed to the left of Heracles' head on its reverse unmistakably identifies the prototype as an early tetradrachm struck at mint B (Kritt 2001, 140; Glenn 2020, no. 129, 271–276; cf. Zeno. ru 30591). The conclusion about the imitative nature of this specimen is supported 1) by its low weight (14.65 grams), which can be partially attributed to the poor state of this coin, and the 2) distorted shapes of letters in the legend: delta without a lower crossbar and sigma, in which the dots of the original marking were connected incorrectly.

The use of several different original coins as prototypes and the composite nature of the imagery are common phenomena at the formative stages of imitational coinages. This happens because die-cutters customarily fished out the prototypes from the circulating mass. In most cases, however, the production of the imitational mint relatively soon started dominating in local circulation. This contracted the pool of available prototypes and eventually narrowed the choice down to the single most successful local design, thus turning the imitational coinage into a single mainstream line of gradually degrading imagery.

It is quite obvious that any conclusions regarding this formative stage of Bukharan coinage are at best tentative – after all, we have only two coins representing two different series. Yet, there is an indirect confirmation that the attribution of these two specimens to the formative stage is right – the main features of these two types blended into the coins of our Series 3.

It is worth mentioning here an interesting specimen that combines an obverse portrait typical of Mint A, Group 1 with the reverse image of Mint B, Group 1 (Glenn 2020, 205, pl. 8, no. 129). There are obvious "irregularities" in its legend and even in the monogram. Could this lightweight specimen (15.57 grams) be an early imitation? This coin does not have the diagnostic S-shaped lock, but one can easily imagine how the Ω-shaped lock seen on this specimen could eventually develop into one. There is, possibly, indirect evidence that this speculation might be correct – a coin of this type had been found by Alexei Nurullaev in Varakhsha area in the fall of 2020. Unfortunately, I received from him photos of this specimen, but no metrological data, and I cannot exclude a possibility that it can be a genuine tetradrachm (like: Glenn 2020, 214, nos. 271–275).

The most important conclusion that can be derived from the two discussed coins/series of the "formative stage" is that the Bukharan imitation coinage started *already at the very beginning of Euthydemus' reign*. Indeed, both specimens (Series 1 and 2) replicate the appearance of early tetradrachms of the king, in fact, of the two early issues of two different Bactrian mints.

SERIES 3

The progressive degradation of the Heracles figure and the blundering of the inscription on the reverse allow us to organize coins of Series 3 into a chronological sequence. The correctness of this progression is corroborated by the gradual reduction of weight within the Series: 13.67 g, 13.43 g, 11.63 g.

The earliest specimen (**Pl. 1/1: 3**) leaves no doubt about the sources of its imagery. The royal effigy on the obverse is an improved version of the portrait from the coin of Series 2 (**Pl. 1/1: 2**), which, as we saw earlier, reproduced the type of Group 1, Mint B in Glenn's classification. This is evidenced by the coiffure: the shape and arrangement of locks on the crown of the head and, especially, the two rows of locks at the back of the head, behind the ear.

As to the reverse imagery, some of its features point to a prototype in Mint A, Group 1: 1) the pose and the general proportions of the Heracles figure and 2) the general composition with a slanting "ground" line under hero's legs. Yet, the gradually changing position of the right hand and the club within this Series suggest that die carvers still used more than one model for the reverse.

There is also another sign that this Series was not just a linear imitational sequence. While all other properties clearly suggest that our three coins should be arranged in a chronological sequence in the way it is done in plate 1, there is a delta in the royal name on coin 5 that was omitted in the legend of specimen 4.

A very serious blundering of the inscription and a rather significant drop of weight from 13.67 g to 11.63 g could not have been a very fast process. It is likely that our three specimens stand for a protracted coinage which possibly went through a couple of decades of gradual transformation.

SERIES 4

The portrait on the coins of the fourth Series (**Pl. 1/2: 6** and **7**) quite faithfully reproduces facial features of the ruler depicted on the last specimen of the third Series (**Pl. 1/1: 5**). Yet the hairstyle on these coins is completely different – it is borrowed from the tetradrachms of Euthydemus that were minted much later. Osmund Bopearachchi designated Euthydemus' coins with this type of coiffure as Série 10 in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale (Bopearachchi 1991a, pl. 3), and as group 6 in his article on "Sogdian independence" (Bopearachchi 1991b, 5–6, 18, nos. 23–27). He attributed their minting to 208–206 BCE and based his judgement about the date of succession of Sogdiana on the fact that later Bukharan imitations reproduced the very specific shape of curls that appear on such coins above king's forehead (Bopearachchi 1991b, 12). According to Brian Kritt, this peculiar hair style was characteristic of the production of mint B in 210–206 BCE (Kritt 2001, 143, B14 and B15). In Glenn's taxonomy they belong to Group V of mint B (Glenn 2020, 79, pl. 21–22: 412–454). While Simon Glenn assigns no specific date to this Series, from the position he assigns to it in his arrangement it is still clear that he attributes it to a later part of Euthydemus' reign.

SERIES 5

Two known specimens of Series five (**Pl. 1/2: 8–9**) are in such a bad state that it is hard to draw definite conclusions about some of the elements of their design. It is clear, however, that these coins continue to reproduce the type of the previous Series, although the images become more schematic and the legends on the reverses are progressively blundered. These coins had to be distinguished as a separate series because the lower end of the club held by Heracles has moved from the cliff to hero's knee. This is undoubtedly an attempt to collate the image on the reverse of our imitative issues with the new type of authentic tetradrachms of Euthydemus. According to chronology elaborated by Brian Kritt, the version of the iconography of the reverse with Heracles resting his club on the knee appears on the coins of mint A only after 206 BCE, while at the court B it was used from 215 until the end of the reign of

Euthydemus. Since the king's hairstyle on the front side of the imitations of the fifth Series is borrowed from the tetradrachms issued by the mint B in 210–206 BC, it must be assumed that the imitations of the fifth Series began to be minted no earlier than the last decade of the 3rd century BCE.

As N. M. Smirnova has already noted, the moving of the club to the knee of Heracles on the coins of the fifth imitational Series – which makes the rock an unnecessary element of the image – is not immediately followed by the elimination of the rock (Smirnova 2005, 168, var. 6, no. 21). On specimens 7 and 8, the club already rests on hero's knee, while the rock is still depicted. It looks like this illogicality exists only in the Bukhara imitative coins, whereas it is absent from the main coinage of Euthydemus, which shows the opposite process: the club has not yet completely moved to the knee, but the rock has already been practically removed (Kritt 2001, 143, B14, and B15; Glenn 2020, nos. 331, 335).

SERIES 6

The dies of the two coins constituting our Series 6 (**Pl. 1/2:10–11**) were not the work of a single die-cutter and were combined here in one series; this is mainly because of the remarkable similarity of the depiction of the coiffure, in particular, of the arrangement of the locks at the back of the head. The latter undoubtedly reproduced all the peculiarities of late dies from Glenn's group V of mint B (Glenn 2020, nos. 483–500). Another feature reflecting the Bactrian prototype is the new way of rendering the eye. Yet the portrait on specimen 10 retained some features characteristic of our Bukharan Series 4 and 5 as well. The most noticeable of them is the rendering of the lips. The reverse presents a similar combination of old local and newly borrowed features: the figure of Heracles retains proportions common for the Bukharan imitations (Series 3 to 6), lion skin covering the rock acquires the second paw (the first one appeared on Series 4), and the monogram RK is introduced, albeit already in distorted form.

Specimen 11 is interesting in several aspects.[17] Its obverse is very close to original tetradrachms of Euthydemus, although some features such as the eye and the second chin are obviously exaggerated. The very specific rendition of lips on coin 11, which obviously emulates one of the original tetradrachms (cf. Glenn 2020, pl. 25: 427), persists into the next Series 7. The reverse of specimen 11, however, follows local tradition and is very close to the previous coin 10. Given the relatively high weight of the specimen (16.12 g) it is worthwhile to note the shape of its blank, which is an uneven plate, very thick on one side and narrowing almost to nothing on another. This coin comes from the collection of Alexander Burnes, who acquired it in Bukhara among other imitations (Burnes 1834, Plate "Bactrian and other coins", no. 1).

SERIES 7

The earliest specimen of this Series (**Pl. 1/3:12**) closely reproduces the type of mint B, Group V (Glenn 2020, nos. 412–503, esp. 415–419) and it is only the manner of execution, severed end of the royal name in the legend, and reduced weight (13.28 g – 11.82 g) that distinguish it from the original tetradrachms of Euthydemus. The following five specimens of this Series are clearly the products of local development (**Pl. 1/3:13–17**).

17 It was always considered to be an original tetradrachm of Euthydemus. Simon Glenn, however, included it in his catalogue with a remark "imitation?" (Glenn 2020, 228, pl. 25: 504).

SERIES 8

The three specimens gathered in Series 8 (**Pl. 1/4:18–20**) also appear to be the result of local development. The differences between them and previous Series 7 are mostly "stylistic" and are likely to result from the appearance of a new die-cutter at the mint.

SERIES 9

The facial features of the royal effigy on the coins of this Series (**Pl. 1/4:21–24**) changed to the "aged" version of Euthydemus' image, but the depiction of coiffure remained the same as on previous Series. As a result, it is not possible to determine the exact portrait model on the basis of the obverse. The monogram on the reverse points to mint B, Group VI in Glenn's classification.

SERIES 10

The earliest known coin of this Series is closely linked to the late coins of Series 9, but the facial features – first of all, the noses – are quite different. The upper lip on specimens 28[18] and 29 (**Pl. 1/5:28–29**) seems to be transforming into a moustache (?), which could reflect an individual feature of an actual appearance of a nomadic ruler.

HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE

Two important conclusions can be derived from the coins of the first three series: 1) As these earliest Bukharan imitations reproduced the features of the earliest types of tetradrachms produced by Bactrian mints A and B, we can assume that these Sogdian imitations were issued sometime at the beginning of Euthydemus' reign. 2) The significant transformation of the type during the minting of Series 3 suggests that this was a protracted coinage, continued possibly for a decade or even two. These two observations remove the seeming "contradiction" between the two aforementioned categories of numismatic evidence, because both now point to the early reign of Euthydemus as the time when Greeks of Bactria lost control over Soghd.

The second set of conclusions can be derived from the updates of imagery that we see on Bukharan coins starting with Series 4. Why would Sogdians need to align the design of their imitations with the type transformations in Bactrian coinage? The answer to this question lies in the system of relations between the monarchs of sedentary Bactria and the new nomadic rulers who took from them the lands of Soghd. Euthydemus himself described the dangers of his situation during a conversation with Teleas, the representative of Antiochus III, sent by the Seleucid king to the besieged city of Bactra. Requesting the lifting of the blockade, Euthydemus claimed that otherwise neither of the kings would be safe, because "great hordes of nomads were close at hand" posing "a danger to both" and that once these nomads would be allowed "into the country (Bactria), it would certainly be utterly barbarized." (Polybius XI, 34). The typical solution employed by sedentary rulers in such cases was a security payment

18 I am acquainted with this specimen only through the publication of A.A. Musakaeva, who gives metrological data as: W 15.48, D 28, axes 12:00 (Musakaeva 2014, 51, no 7, tabl. 2: 10, p. 341). This, however, looks unjustifiably exaggerated against the background of other coins of this series and the general history of early Bukharan imitations.

to restless nomadic neighbors to forestall their attacks.[19] During the Graeco-Bactrian period such a large international monetary "transfer" was likely to be paid in tetradrachms, the highest available silver denomination.

No doubt the influx of silver coins received by Sogdian rulers from Euthydemus flooded the relatively small monetary economy of Soghd. Such a situation would create a constraint for the local mint, as these new Bactrian coins were superior to the imitations of earlier Euthydemus' tetradrachms. Indeed, being struck in Sogdiana for some time, the coins of imitations series had already suffered from the gradual reduction of weight down to ca. 12 g. To compete with the new full weight tetradrachms arriving from Bactria, the moneyers of Bukhara came up with a new series of imitations with an updated portrait "matching" the contemporary tetradrachms of Euthudemus (change of hairstyle on series 4). More adjustments can be seen on the reverses of series 5. It appears that the Bukharans also raised the weight of their coins, although it was still not really calibrated and remained way below the full weight of the prototype.

Most likely Euthydemus had to pay his nomadic neighbors repeatedly and the periodic influx of his coins provoked several updates in Bukharan imitations. Three more "updates" of types are reflected in series 6, 7, and 9. With the death of Euthydemus the influx of his tetradrachms ceased, and consequently the Bukharan mint terminated attempts to align its imitation with the original Bactrian tetradrachms. With the presently available materials, it looks like series 9 was the last one to comply with new types introduced in Bactria. Starting with Series 10, the type of Bukharan imitations froze and remained immobilized until the introduction of a Sogdian legend in the 1st century CE (Naymark 2024).

While the two sets of conclusions formulated in the previous section of this article are built on the solid material basis, in this section I would like to formulate a more speculative and less certain hypothesis in regard to the chronology of the events. I by no means insist on the correctness of this theory and present it here with the understanding that it would need material proof in the future.

Bactrian tetradrachms that served as the prototypes for Series 4–9 of the Bukharan imitations belonged to the later part of Euthydemus' reign. Osmund Bopearachchi and Brian Kritt suggested specific dates for these original Bactrian coins, while Simon Glenn cautiously abstained from offering any precise chronology with his classification. Having no personal opinion on this matter, I am, however, tempted to propose an absolute chronology of early Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms, with the understanding that it is mostly speculative and thus tentative.

The sequences of coins within series 4–9 demonstrate very little internal development – there is almost no degradation of the type within each of them. Of course, there are very few coins of each series at our disposal, and there is a chance that later specimens do not appear in our slim sample. This is, however, not very likely – after all, there are six separate series and the absence of later specimens in all six of them in a random sample is not very plausible. It seems more likely, that these six series came in rapid succession, within a few years.

Imitative Series 3 constitutes a very different case. Although we currently have only three specimens belonging to it, these display all the traditional signs of a long imitational coinage: the degradation of imagery, the blundering of the legends, and a significant drop of weight. It is more than likely that the coins of this series were struck over a relatively long time span.

19 The best documented Central Asian case of this nature is the huge payment made by Sasanian Shahan Shah Peroz to Hephtalites in the 5th century CE. Following it, the drachm of Peroz became the most commonly imitated Sasanian coin in the region.

Let us juxtapose these observations with the few pieces of information regarding the life and career of Euthydemus preserved for us by narrative sources. We know that Euthydemus attained the throne around 230–226 BCE by eliminating the members of Diodotid dynasty. Soon after that, the Bukharans started issuing imitations of his early tetradrachms. While we know almost nothing about the two earliest coin series of this coinage, the third one was likely struck for a while – the suggestion of a decade or even two would not be out of order. We also know that Antiochus III besieged Euthydemus in 206 BCE in his capital city of Bactra. According to Polybius, Euthydemus was able to persuade Antiochus to leave him in charge of Bactria arguing that a potential nomadic invasion would put them both into a grave danger. The Seleucid king concluded a peace with the Bactrian king and moved on to India, while Euthydemus – who had just suffered a serious defeat and narrowly escaped the complete elimination of his power – was left face to face with his nomadic neighbors. Being in a very vulnerable position, Euthydemus would need to pay his northern adversaries off. The appearance of large masses of his coins on the market caused the updates on the side of the Bukharan mint (series 4). As it was customary, Euthydemus would need to make recurring, most probably annual, payments, and these were the cause of the further updates (series 5 to 9). The relative abundance of coins belonging to series 4–10 versus very few specimens of early series 1–3 could result from greater availability of silver – after all Euthydemus' payments were probably very substantial.

While the minting of Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus, as we could see from the materials presented in this article, started right after the collapse of Greek power in Soghd, the history of this coinage stretched for another four and a half hundred years – it was terminated only by the Sasanian conquest of Bukhara in the 3rd century CE. Quite in accordance with the theme of the conference, the Hellenistic design of the Bukharan imitations of Euthydemus' tetradrachms persisted for centuries "entangling the past and the present."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adylov, Sh. T. 2000: Raskopki na yugo-vostochnom uchastke tsitadeli Paykenda. In: *Raskopki v Paikende v 1999 godu*. Sankt-Peterburg, 20–28.

Alram, M. 1986: *Nomina Propria Iranica in Nummis. Iranisches Personennamenbuch* IV. Wien.

Atakhodjaev, A.Kh. 2013a: Données numismatiques pour l'histoire politique de la Sogdiane (IVe–IIe siècles avant notre ère). *Revue Numismatique* 170, 213–246.

Atakhodjaev, A.Kh. 2013b: Numizmaticheskie dannye k politicheskoy istorii Sogdiany IV–II vv. do n.e. In: M.D. Bukharin (ed.): *Scripta Antiqua. Voprosy drevnei istorii, filologii, iskusstva i material'noi kul'tury. Al'manakh* 3, 243–279.

Atakhodjaev, A.Kh. 2019: Numizmaticheskie dannye k politicheskoy istorii Sogdiany IV–II vv. do n.e. (Addenda et corrigenda). *Scripta Antiqua* 8, 29–61.

Atakhodjaev A.Kh. 2021: Données numismatiques pour l'histoire politique de la Sogdiane (IVe–IIe siècles avant notre ère) (Addenda et Corrigenda). *Revue Numismatique*, 25–55.

Atakhodjaev, A.Kh. – Naymark A.I. 2021: Neopublikovannye nakhodki kushanskikh monet v Sogde. *O'zbekistan Arkheologiyasi* 24/1, 42–62.

Bernard, P. 1985: *Les monnaies hors trésors. Questions d'histoire gréco-bactrienne*. Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum 4. Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan 28. Paris.

Bopearachchi, O. 1990: Podrazhaniya monetam Evtidema i data nezavisimosti Sogdiany. In: Iu.F. Buriakov (ed.): *Kul'tura drevnego i srednevekovogo Samarkanda i istoricheskie svyazi Sogda. Tezisy dokladov sovetsko--frantsuzskogo kollokviuma*. Tashkent, 30–31.

Bopearachchi, O. 1991a: *Monnaies gréco-bactriennes et indo-grecques. Catalogue raisonné*. Paris.

Bopearachchi, O. 1991b: The Euthydemus' Imitations and the Date of Sogdian Independence. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 2, 1–21.

Bracey, R. – Naymark, A. 2024: *Sogdian Coins in the British Museum*. Tashkent.

Burnes, A. 1837: *Travels into Bokhara* I–III. London.

Cribb, J. 2007: Money as marker of Cultural Continuity and Change in Central Asia. In: *After Alexander. Central Asia before Islam*. Proceedings of British Academy 133. Oxford, 333–375.

Curtis, J. 2012: Anthony Green (1956–2012). *Iraq* 74, viii–ix.

Davidovich, E.A. 1955: Neopublikovannye monetnye nakhodki na territorii Uzbekistana. *Trudy Instituta istorii i arkheologii AN UzSSR* 7, 155–174.

Drouin, E. 1893: Une médaille a légende sémitique d'un roi de la Sogdiane. *Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'histoire ancienne* 1893/avril, 173–176.

Dvurechenskaia, N.D – Gorin, A.N. – Sheiko, K.A. 2016: Monety iz kreposti Uzundara (po rezul'tatam rabot 2013–2014 gg.). In: M.D. Bukharin (ed.): *Scripta Antiqua. Voprosy drevnei istorii, filologii, iskusstva i material'noi kul'tury. Al'manakh* 5, 349–366.

Ernazarova, T.S. 1974: Denezhnoe obrashchenie Samarkanda po arkheologo-numizmaticheskim dannym (do nachala IX v.). *Afrasiab* 3. Tashkent, 155–237.

Erzakovich, L. 1986: Russkie monety v Turkestane. In: N.S. Rovenskii (ed.): *Pamiatniki istorii i kul'tury Kazakhstana* 2. Alma-Ata, 51–54.

de la Füye, A. 1910: Monnaies incertaines de la Sogdiane et des contrées voisines. *Revue Numismatique* 4e série, 14, 6–73, 281–333.

de la Füye, A. 1925: Monnaies incertaines de la Sogdiane et des contrées voisines. Deuxiéme partie. *Revue Numismatique*, 4e série 28, 26–50, 143–169.

Glen, S. 2020: *Money and Power in Hellenistic Bactria*. New York.

Göbl, R. 1978: *Antike Numismatik* 1-2. München.

Gorin, A. 2014: Novyi selevkidskiy monetnyy dvor: Samarkand-Marakanda. *Materialy po khudozhestvennoy i dukhovnoy kul'ture Uzbekistana*. Tashkent, 29–49.

Gorin, A. 2015: A new Seleucid mint: Samarkand-Marakanda. *Anabasis* 6, 94–106.

Gorin, A.N. – Dvurechenskaya, N.D. 2018: *Katalog monet kreposti Uzundara (Juzhnyi Uzbekistan)*. Materialy Tokharistanskoi ekspeditsii 11. Tashkent.

Guliamov, Ia.G. 1956: Arkheologicheskie raboty k zapadu ot Bukharskogo oazisa. In: *Trudy instituta istorii i arkheologii* 8. Tashkent, 149–161.

Guliamov, Ia.G. 1958: Bir tanga tarikhi. *Fan va Turmush* 2, 22.

Hobbs, R. 1995: Roman Coins from Merv, Turkmenistan. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 14/1, 97–102

Hoernle, A.F.R. 1899: A Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia 1. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, extra number 1. Calcutta.

Holt, F. 1999. *Thundering Zeus. The Making of Hellenistic Bactria*. Berkeley.

Kamyshev, A.M. 2002: *Numismatic Heritage of Kyrgyzstan*. Bishkek.

Kamyshev, A.M. 2008: *Vvedenie v numizmatiku Kirgizstana. Uchebnoe posobie*. Bishkek.

Kastal'skii, B.N. 1940: Neizdannaia greko-baktriyskaia tetradrakhma-medal' Antimakha bitaia v chest' Evtidema I. *Vestnik drevney istorii* 12-13 (1940/3-4), 339–347.

Kazamanova, L.N. 1961: Podrazhaniya tetradrakhmam Evtidema v sobranii GIM. *Vestnik drevney istorii* 77 (1961/3), 120–127.

Köhler, H.K.E. 1850: Médailles Greques. In: H.K.E. Kohler: *Gesammelte Schriften* I. *"Serapis" oder Abhandlungen betrefend Das Griechische und Romische Altertum* I. Sankt-Petersburg, 1–29.

Kostikov, E.A. – Shirinkin, P.S. 2015: Ocherki istorii Prikam'ya epokhi srednevekov'ya v numizmaticheskikh artefaktakh – "Velikiy Serebrianyi Puť", Volzhskaya Bulgariya i B'iarmalend. In: *Epokha vikingov v Vostochnoi Evrope v pamiatnikakh numizmatiki VIII–XI vekov*. Sankt-Peterburg, 34–68.

Kostenko, L.F. 1871: *Puteshestvie v Bukharu russkoi missii v 1870 godu*. Sankt-Peterburg.

Kritt, B. 2001: *Dynastic Transitions in the Coinage of Bactria. Antiochus-Diodotus-Euthydemus.* Classical Numismatic Studies 4. Lancaster.

Kritt, B. 2015: *New discoveries in Bactrian Numismatics*. Classical Numismatic Studies 8. Lancaster.

Kul'tura 1983 = *Kul'tura drevnebukharskogo oazisa*. Tashkent.

Kurbanov, G. 2001: Obzor doislamskikh numizmaticheskikh kollektsiy Bukharskogo muzeya-zapovednika. *Numizmatika Tsentral'noy Azii* 5, 91–95.

Kurbanov, G.N. – Niyazova M.I. 1989: *Katalog greko-baktriiskikh monet iz fondov Bukharskogo muzeya.* Bukhara.

Lerner, J.D. 1993: *A Historical Perspective of the Graeco-Sogdian Kingdom of Euthydemus.* Ph.D. Thesis. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Lerner, J.D. 1996: A Graeco-Sogdian Mint of Euthydemus. *Revue Numismatique* 151, 77–94.

Lerner, J.D. 1999: *The Impact of Seleucid Decline on the Eastern Iranian Plateau. The Foundations of Arsacid Parthia and Graeco-Bactria*. Stuttgart.

Masson, M.E. 1940: Proshloe Bukhary. *Pioner Vostoka* 38, May 24. – *non vidi*, cited after Masson 1954, 87.

Masson, M.E. 1950: K periodizatsii drevnei istorii Samarkanda. *Vestnik drevney istorii* 34 (1950/4), 155–166.

Masson, V.M. 1954: Drevnesogdiiskaia moneta iz sobraniya Muzeia istorii Akademii Nauk UzSSR. *Trudy Muzyia istorii Uzbekskoi SSR* 2, 85–88.

Masson, V.M. 1955: Denezhnoe khoziastvo drevnei Srednei Azii po numizmaticheskim dannym. *Vestnik drevney istorii* 52 (1955/2), 37–47.

Mielczarek, M. 1997: Remarks on the numismatic evidence for the northern Silk Route. The Sarmatians and the trade route linking the northern Black Sea area with Central Asia. In: K. Tanabe – J. Cribb – H. Wang (eds.): *Studies in Silk Road Coins and Culture. Papers in Honour of Professor Ikuo Hirayama on his 65th birthday.* Kamakura, 131–145.

Mitchiner, M. 1973: *The early coinage of Central Asia*. London.

Mitchiner, M. 1975: *Indo-Greek and Indo-Scythian Coinage 4. Contemporaries of the Indo-Greeks*. London.

Mitchiner, M. 1978: *Oriental Coins and their Values. The Ancient and Classical World.* London.

Mitchiner, M. 2004: *Ancient Trade and Early Coinage*. London.

Morris, L. 2023: Merchants and Nomads: Political and Economic Organization in Sogdiana and the Middle Syr Darya under the Kangju Confederacy. In: S. von Reden (ed.): *Handbook of Ancient Afro-Eurasian Economies 3. Frontier-Zone Processes and Transimperial Exchange*. Berlin, 145–270.

Mukhamedzhanov, A.R. 1978: *Istoriya orosheniya Bukharskogo oasisa.* Tashkent.

Musakaeva, A.A. 1990: Antichnye i rannesrednevekovye monety Muzeya istorii narodov Uzbekistana. In: E.V. Rtveladze (ed.): *Numizmatika Uzbekistana*. Tashkent, 18–31.

Musakaeva, A.A. 1991: *Monety Zapadnogo Sogda. III v. do n.e. – VIII v. n.e. (opyt tipologii i istoricheskoy interpretatsii.* Synopsis of, Ph.D.Thesis. Samarqand.

Musakaeva, A.A. 2014: *Stanovlenie i dinamika razvitiya denezhnykh otnoshenii v zapadnom Sogde v epokhu antichnosti i rannego srednevekov'a*. Turanskie monety 2. Tashkent.

Naymark, A.I. 1987: Drevnie monety iz Kum-Sovtana. In: *Vtoraia numizmaticheskaia konferentsiya. Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii.* Moscow, 50–51.

Naymark, A.I. 1991: Soghdian Coins. In: K.A. Abdullaev – E.V. Rtveladze – G.V. Shishkina (eds.): *Culture and Art of Ancient Uzbekistan* I. Exhibition Catalogue. Moskva, 153–164.

Naymark, A. 2001: *Sogdiana, its Christians and Byzantium. A Study of Artistic and Cultural Connections in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages.* Ph.D. dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington.

Naymark, A. 2003: Returning to Varakhsha. *The Silk Road* 1/2, 9–22.

Naymark, A. 2005: Nakhodki grecheskikh monet v Sogdiane. *Numizmatika i epigrafika* 17, 116–138.

Naymark, A. 2008: O prichinakh poiavleniia podrazhaniy illinisticheskim monetam v Sogdiane. *Vestnik drevney istorii* 264 (2008/1), 55–70.

Naymark, A. 2012: Vizantiiskie anonimnye follisy iz Fergany i Semirech'ya. In: *Numizmaticheskie chteniya 2012 goda. Materialy dokladov i soobshcheniy. K 150-letiyu so dnia rozhdeniya Pavla Vasil'evicha Zubova.* Moskva 4–5 dekabria 2012 g. Moskva, 31–40.

Naymark, A. 2014: Seleucid Coinage of Samarqand? *Journal of the Oriental Numismatic Society* 221 (Autumn 2014), 1–5.

Naymark, A. 2015: Coin collecting in colonial Turkestan (from Russian conquest to the end of the 19th century). In: B. Callegher – A. D'Ottone Rambach (eds.): *4th Simone Assemani Symposium.* Trieste, 26–27 September 2014. Polymnia. Numismatica Antica e Medievale. Studi 9. Trieste, 139–156.

Naymark, A. 2016: Finds of Hellenistic coins in the Bukharan oasis. In: S. Stark – F. Kidd – D. Mirzaakhmedov – Z. Silvia – S. Mirzaakhmedov – M. Evers: Bashtepa 2016. Preliminary Report of the First Season of Excavations (with an appendix by Aleksandr Naymark). *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 48, 250–256.

Naymark, A. 2022: Immobilized Types in Sogdian Coinage. The case of mules between Antiochus imitations and Hyrcodes. *Journal of the Oriental Numismatic Society* 250 (Winter 2022), 46–53.

Naymark, A. forthcoming: Podrazhaniya tetradrakhmam Evtidema s tamgoi. Alany v Bukhare v 1 veke n.e. In: *ZENO Festschrift. Collection of articles devoted to the 20th Anniversary of Zeno.ru International Project / Oriental Coin Database*. Moskva.

Naymark, A. – Atakhodjaev, A. 2023: Three Parthian coppers from Soghd. In: R. Muradov – A. Fribus – N. Dubova (eds.): *From the Kopet Dagh to the Oxus. Exploring Ancient Central Asia. Studies in Honor of Victor N. Pilipko*. Moskva, 161–175.

Naymark, A. – Yakovlev, A. 2011a: Dve mednye ellinisticheskie monety iz Varakhshinskogo massiva zemel' drevnego orosheniia. *Numizmatika Tsentral'noi Azii* 10, 25–46.

Naymark, A. – Yakovlev, A. 2011b: Two Seleucid coins from the Bukharan oasis. *Journal of Oriental Numismatic Society* 206 (Winter 2011), 6–8.

Nil'sen, V.A. 1959: Kyzyl-qyr. *Istoriya material'noy kul'tury Uzbekistana* 1, 60–78.

Obel'chenko, O.V. 1974: Kurgannye mogil'niki epokhi kushan v bukharskom oazise. In: B.G. Gafurov (ed.): *Tsentral'naya Aziya v kushanskuyu epokhu* 1. Moskva, 202–210.

Obel'chenko, O.V. 1992: *Kul'tura Antichnogo Sogda.* Moskva.

Omel'chenko, A.V. 2011: Podrazhanie tetradrakhme Evtidema s gorodishcha Paykend. In: *Numizmatika Tsentral'noi Azii* 10. Tashkent, 47–54.

Otchet 2011 = *Otchet o raskopkakh v Paykende v 2009–2010 godakh*. Sankt-Peterburg.

Princep, J. 1973: Observations on Lieutenant Burnes's Collection of Bactrian and other Coins. In: A. Burnes: *Travels into Bokhara* II. Karachi – London – New York, 463–475.

Rtveladze, E.V. 1984: La circulation monétaire au nord de l'Oxus á l'époque gréco-bactrienne. *Revue Numismatique* 1984, 61–76.

Rtveladze, E.V. 1987: *Drevnie monety Sredney* Azii. Tashkent.

Rtveladze, E.V. 1990: Modeli genezisa monetnoi chekanki v sredneaziatskom mezhdurech'e. In: G.A.Puga-chenkova (ed.): *Na sredneaziatskikh trassakh Velikogo Shelkovogo puti. Ocherki istorii i kul'tury*. Tashkent, 176–187.

Rtveladze, E. 1999: Coins of Ancient Bukhara. In: A. Petruccioli (ed.): *Bukhara. The Myth and the Architecture*. Proceedings of the international symposium sponsored by the Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture at Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cambridge, 29–37.

Rtveladze, E.V. 2002: *Drevnie i srednevekovye monety istoriko-kulturnykh oblastey Uzbekistana* I. Tashkent.

Rtveladze, E.V. – Gorin, A.N. 2015: Hellenistic Coins from Kampÿrtepa. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 21, 120–182.

Rtveladze, E.V. – Musakaeva, A.A. 1986: K istorii denezhnogo obrashcheniya v Zapadnom Sogde (Klad podrazhanii tetradrakhmam Evtidema iz Bukhary). *Obshchestvennye nauki v Uzbekistane* 6, 35–38.

Sestini, D. 1831: *Descrizione d'alcune medaglie greche del museo del Signore barone Stanislas Di Chaudoir*. Firenze.
Shishkin, V.A. 1940: *Arkheologicheskie raboty 1937 g. v zapadnoy chasti Bukharskogo oazisa.* Tashkent.
Shishkin, V.A. 1963: *Varakhsha*. Moskva.
Shishkin, V.A. 1969: K istorii archeologicheskogo izucheniya Samarkanda i ego okrestnostey. In: *Afrasiab* 1. Tashkent, 3–121.
Smirnova, N.M. 2005: Greko-baktriyskie i indo-grecheskie monety iz sobraniya Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha. *Numizmatika i epigrafika* 17. Moscow.
Smirnova, N.M. 2008: O rannikh podrazhaniyakh tetradrakhmam Evtidema I (230–200 gg. do n.e.). *Vestnik drevney istorii* 264 (2008/1), 71–79.
Suleimanov, R.Kh. 1979: Ob istokakh rannesrednevekovoy kul'tury drevnebukharskogo oazisa. *Uspekhi sredneaziatskoi arkheologii* 4. Leningrad, 17–21.
Teggart, F.J. 1969: *Rome and China. A Study of Correlations in Historical Events*. Berkeley (reprint of a 1939 edition).
Tychsen, Th.Chr. 1828: De Numis Graecis et Barbaris in Bochara, Nuper repertis, inprimis Numo Demetrii, Indiare Regis cu observationibus super numo pro Antigoni Asiae Regis Habito auctore Th.Chr.Tychsen. In: *Commentationes Societatis Regiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Resentiores, Classis Historicae et Philogicae* 6. Göttingen, 3–16.
Vasmer, R.R. 1929: (Fasmer). Spisok monetnykh nakhodok II. *Soobshcheniya Gosudarstvennoy akademii istorii material'noy kul'tury* 2, 281–324.
Widemann, F. 2009: *Les successeurs d'Alexandre en Asie Centrale et leur héritage culturel. Essai*. Paris.
Wilson, H.H. 1834: Professor Wilson's note. In: A. Burnes. *Travels into Bokhara* 3. London, 459–462.
Yakubovskiy, A.Yu. 1940: Arkheologicheskaya ekspeditsiya v Zarafshanskuyu dolinu 1934 g. (Iz dnevnika nachal'nika ekspeditsii). *Trudy Otdela Vostoka Ermitazha* 2, 113–163.
Zabelina, N.N. 1949: Novaya moneta s legendoi ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΕΥΘΥΔΗΜΟΥ. *Kratkie soobshcheniya Instituta istorii material'noy kul'tury* 28, 101–102.
Zabelina, N.N. 1952: Obzor drevneishikh monet iz kollektsii respublikanskogo istoriko-kraevedcheskogo muzeya Tadzhikskoi SSR. *Soobshcheniya istoriko-kraevedcheskogo muzeia Tadzhikskoi SSR* I. *Arkheologiya*. Stalinabad, 73–85.
Zeymal', E.V. 1978: Politicheskaya istoriya drevnei Transoksiany po numizmaticheskim dannym. In: V.G. Lukonin (ed.): *Kul'tura Vostoka. Drevnost' i rannee srednevekov'e.* Leningrad, 192–213.
Zeymal', E.V. 1983a: The Political History of Transoxania. In: E. Yarshater (ed.): *The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods* 2. *The Cambridge History of Iran* 3. Cambridge.
Zeymal', E.V. 1983b: *Drevnie monety Tadzhikistana*. Dushanbe.
Zeymal', E.V. 1983c: Nachal'nyi etap denezhnogo obrashcheniya drevnei Transoxiany. *Srednyaya Aziya, Kavkaz i Zarubeshnyi Vostok v drevnosti*. Moskva, 61–80, 155–162, pl. XIII–XX.
Zeymal', E.V. 1990: Iz istorii kollektsii drevnikh sredneaziatskikh monet v muzeinykh sobraniyakh Uzbekistana. In: E.V. Rtveladze (ed.): *Numizmatika Uzbekistana.* Tashkent, 7–17.
Zeymal', E.V. 1996: Münzen von der Seidenstraβe. In: W. Seipel (ed.): *Weihrauch und Seide. Alte Kulturen an der Seidenstraβe.* Wien, 357–380.
Zeymal', E.V. – Nikitin, A.B. – Koshelenko, G.A. 1985: Tablitsa CXIII. Denezhnoe obrashchenie Sogda. In: G.A.Koshelenko (ed.): *Drevneishie gosudarstva Kavkaza i Srednei Azii*. Moskva, 431.

Polybius. *Histories.* Trans. E.S. Shuckburgh. London – New York 1962 (1889).

Aleksandr Naymark
Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York
naymarkaleksandr@gmail.com

Pl. 1/1: Early Euthydemus Imitations from Bukhara. Series 1–3. 1 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, В-Инд-400, W 15.5 g, D 29 mm, axes 12:00. 2 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, В-Инд 404, W 14.65 g, D 25 mm, axes 9:00. 3 – Dmitry Markov Collection, New Jersey, W 13.67 g (prior to cleaning 14.06 g), D 24.40 × 25.88 mm, axes 12:00. 4 – Ashmolean Museum, W 13.43, D 26 mm, axes 12:00. 5 – British Museum 1902. 06. 08-409, W 11.63, D 25.8 mm, axes 12:00.

Pl. 1/2: Early Euthydemus Imitations from Bukhara. Series 4–6. 6 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, B-Инд 403, W 10.50 g, D 25.5 mm, axes-12:00. 7 – British Museum, 1853. 03. 01-1259, W 13.68 g, D 24.6 mm, axes 12:00. 8 – British Museum, OR 0275 COC 328/36, W 10.50 g, D 26 mm, axes 12:00. 9 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, B-Инд 423, W 13.34 g, D 25.5 mm, axes-12:00. 10 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, B-Инд-407, W 14.11 gr, D 27 mm, axes-12:00. 11 – British Museum 1858.0731.2, W 16.12 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00.

SERIES 7

Pl. 1/3: Early Euthydemus Imitations from Bukhara. Series 7. 12 – British Museum, COC 275, RPK p. 194, 1, W 12.08 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 13 – Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cabinet des Médailles, Inv. 6436, W 11.90 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 14 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, В-Инд 408, W 11.98 g, D 26 mm, axes 12:00. 15 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, В-Инд 412, W 12.31 g, D 24.5 mm, axes 12:00. 16 – Zeno 217633 from Roma numismatics E-sale 53, February 7, 2019, lot 467, W 11.82 g, D 25 mm; axes 11:00. 17 – Ashmolean Museum, W 13.28, D 26 mm, axes 12:00.

SERIES 8

SERIES 9

Pl. 1/4: Early Euthydemus Imitations from Bukhara. Series 8–9. 18 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, B-Инд-425, W 11.16 g, D 25.5 mm, axes 12:00. 19 – Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cabinet des Médailles, Inv. 6435, W 11.19 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 20 – Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cabinet des Médaille, Inv. 6434, W 11.78 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 21 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, B-Инд 414, W 13.16 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 22 – American Numismatic Society 1944.100.74387 (ETN), W 11.47 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 23 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, A-ДГ-37744, W 11.68 g, D 26 mm, axes 11:00. 24 – Hermitage, Dept. of Numismatics, B-Инд 415, W 11.51 g. D 25.5 mm, axes 12:00.

Pl. 1/5: Early Euthydemus Imitations from Bukhara. Series 10. 25 – Yale University Collection 2001. 87. 14337, W 10.73 g, D 25.4 mm, axes 11:00. 26 – Panjab Museum, Lahore, W 11.20 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00 (Whitehead 1914, no. 11). 27 – Ashmolean Museum, W 11.37 g, D 25 mm, axes 12:00. 28 – Tashkent Museum, H-15/7. Cf. footnote 18 *infra*.